

# LABOR ACTION

FEBRUARY 10, 1958

TEN CENTS

**ISL Fund Drive  
For 1958 Opens  
GIVE NOW!**

By SAM BOTTONE

The 18th annual fund drive of the Independent Socialist League will begin on February 15. The drive will seek to raise \$10,000, the same goal as last year. Most of our readers know that the main purpose of the annual fund drive is to cover the big deficits produced during the past year for the maintenance of LABOR ACTION and the *New Internationalist*. In addition the ISL has had the financial burden imposed upon it by the necessities of its legal case challenging the attorney general's List of Subversive Organizations.

The need to maintain our press is stressed by the new tasks which confront the socialist movement. The central problem facing American socialists is that of regroupment and the formation of a broad democratic socialist movement. More than any other tendency, the ISL has developed with greater clarity a conception of unification capable of fulfilling the needs of socialism in the U.S. We are certain that our proposal for democratic socialist regroupment around the SP-SDF is making progress, and American socialism is on the verge of a new beginning. As the process goes further, the need to sustain the press becomes even more important.

There are many important problems confronting socialists in the quest for regroupment. The past year and a half has been a period of theoretical and political ferment, and there is a great need for discussions. As a matter of fact, it is part and parcel of rebuilding a new movement. No one can take a stand-pat position in the face of this renewed interest in political and theoretical questions and expect to make a contribution to the talks ahead. But it has to be a genuine discussion in which ideas are seriously examined and reconsidered in the light of the needs of socialism in the U.S. in the present period.

## IMPORTANT JOB

LABOR ACTION is opening such a discussion and hopes to play an important part in contributing to the political and theoretical clarification in which all democratic socialists are vitally interested. Therefore the need to maintain both LABOR ACTION and the *New Internationalist* becomes imperative.

The other important job which lies ahead is the continuation of the fight against the attorney general's listing of the ISL, the Workers Party and the Socialist Youth League. For several years now since the legal fight began, it has imposed an added burden on our financial resources.

Readers of LABOR ACTION know the long and arduous struggle to get even

(Turn to last page)

## Senator Humphrey's Proposals: End to Foreign Policy Log-Jam?

By GORDON HASKELL

It is becoming difficult, these days, to open any magazine of opinion or newspaper without running into someone's program for a settlement of the conflict between the American and Russian military blocs; basis for negotiations on disarmament; new approach for American foreign policy, or the like. Though Russian Premier Bulganin appears to be the most ardent and prolific contributor to this growing literature, he is joined by many others.

A random sampling of current issues of periodicals yields the following. In *The New Republic*, Bertrand Russell suggests "terms as a basis for negotiation." In the *Reporter*, Max Ascoli's editorial is entitled "We Cannot Put Off Salvation." *The Progressive* has an article by Lester B. Pearson on "The Four Faces of Peace," and the *International Socialist Review* (Socialist Workers Party) has a lead article on "Three Programs for Peace." *The Review of International Affairs* (a Yugoslav-Titoist magazine) has an article by G. D. H. Cole on "Western Socialist and World Politics Today" which deals with the same subject. The text of one of Bulganin's letters to Eisenhower is, of course, in the *New York Times*, while the *New York Post* says that "Humphrey Submits Blueprint for a Fresh Foreign Policy."

That is just scratching the surface. To assemble, list and codify all the peace, disarmament and negotiation programs and proposals would be a formidable task

for any scholar. But we do not point to the volume of such proposals so as to poke fun at them. Though among them there are some which are, in whole or in part, utterly ludicrous, the widespread interest in them shows how urgently and passionately the whole of humanity is groping for some way out of the looming danger of nuclear annihilation.

### NARROW APPROACH

One of the things which characterizes most of these proposals is their narrow and "realistic" approach. This does not appear to be a time for grandiose plans for a final solution of man's problems at one fell swoop, at it were, along the lines of the old "Union Now" or the post World War II World Federalism fads. The reality and durability of the cold war has rendered the utopian character of such schemes so apparent that even the naive turn away from them. There is a general tendency to feel that while long-range and more general solu-

tions to the cold war should be sought, what is vital right now is to try to end further nuclear tests, and to head off the new spurt of the arms race in the field of missile warfare.

That is one reason why, except for the American government and its backers, the demand for an end to nuclear tests has taken on such world-wide force. In his latest letter, Bulganin plays the changes on this with considerable skill. And the fact is that more and more it appears to be becoming a demand of such universal appeal that no government based on the popular franchise can really hope to resist it forever. Senator Humphrey has now come out in favor of dividing up the American government's package on disarmament, and negotiating separately such matters as nuclear testing and the production of nuclear weapons. If his speech represents a real trend in the liberal wing of the Democratic Party, the log-jam in American politics on this question may be on the verge of breaking.

The fact is that the demand for an agreement ending nuclear weapons tests has a unique position among all the "agreement" demands, and for an obvious reason. While every other proposal is designed by its proponents to avoid a future danger, or to bring a future advantage, this particular demand is sparked by

(Turn to last page)

## ISL vs. Attorney General's "Subversive List" "Clear Violation of Due Process"

The following letter was sent by the Independent Socialist League's attorneys, Joseph L. Raab and Isaac Groner, to Attorney General Rodgers on January 17.

Dear Mr. Attorney General:

On January 10th, the organizations submitted their Exceptions and Brief in the above referred-to matter. Therein it was pointed out how incredible and unworthy of belief was the testimony of Government witness James Burnham, produced at the last moment to bolster a record utterly devoid of any evidence concerning the organizations and how Burnham, a hostile and biased witness, gave adverse characterization to the motives of the organizations rather than to their activities and expressions, and this on the basis only of a few weeks' membership 17 years ago and cas-

ual perusal of organization publications since that time. However, in the light of a recent authoritative determination of the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, it is clear that witness Burnham's testimony is not only unworthy of belief, but that the requirements of fairness and of due process preclude any consideration whatsoever of the testimony of this witness.

On January 9, 1958, at a time when the Exceptions and Brief of the Organizations had already been prepared, the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit decided the case of *Communist Party v. Subversive Activities Control Board*. In that decision, the Court held the denial to a party in an administrative proceeding of the reports of the Government's witnesses to agents of the FBI concerning the subject-matter of their testimony a denial of the "fundamentals of fair play required in an administrative proceeding." The Court said:

"... the Government upon demand must produce the report made by the witness. We think simple justice, the fundamentals of fair play, require no less. The opinion of the Supreme Court in the Jencks case, as we read it, is based upon the elementary proposition that the interest of the United States is that justice be done. The same elementary proposition applies here and leads to the same result. We must therefore remand with directions to the Board to direct the production of Markward's report to the FBI."

In the hearing granted the organizations there was flagrant denial of the right to impeach Government witness Burnham through his reports to the FBI on the subject of his testimony against the organizations. Burnham was the only witness produced by the Government who had even heard of the organizations. Yet when the organizations attempted to cross-examine Burnham, they were denied the opportunity to show, by what he did and did not tell the FBI concerning the organizations in interviews between the years 1940 and 1956, that his

(Turn to last page)

*Perspectives for Ex-Communists*

... page 6

*The Reuther Profit-Sharing Plan*

... page 2

*New Socialist Movement in France*

... page 7



# Reuther Program Shows: Monopolies Are Responsible For Inflation and Recession

LABOR ACTION's Editorial Board is in general agreement with the approach and conclusions set forth by Associate Editor H. W. Benson both in his article which appeared in the January 27 issue, and on this page. We believe, however, that LABOR ACTION can perform a real service by opening its pages to the widest and most thorough discussion of the Reuther plan.

It is in the interest of stimulating this discussion that we also print below an article by our regular Detroit correspondent, Jack Wilson, who approaches the

Reuther plan from a considerably different point of view. From its text, it will be apparent that Wilson's article was written on the eve of the recent UAW convention. It was received too late for publication in our last issue.

We invite readers of LABOR ACTION to comment on these articles, or on the issue itself. Although we urge readers to keep their comments as brief as possible, serious contributions of up to 1000 words will be printed.—ED.

By W. H. BENSON

There is \$24,000,000 in the United Automobile Workers strike fund. A huge sum but not enough. A special convention in Detroit on January 22-24 taxed members \$5 per month for three months to raise it to \$50,000,000. Even this staggering figure is dwarfed by plans for \$80,000,000 or more—by loans, donations, appeals—if a major strike is forced on the union. (If no big strike occurs, the money will be returned.)

Contracts with Ford, General Motors, and Chrysler expire by June. For the first time in almost 20 years, the union must negotiate with plants closing and layoffs spreading in auto and agricultural implements. This dominated the discussions of the special UAW convention held in Detroit at the end of January. The UAW may soon be plunged into a critical stoppage; the strike fund was part of its preparation.

Even before negotiations are formally opened, the issues are joined in public. Senator Goldwater told a Michigan Republican rally that Reuther is more dangerous to our nation than Russia and its sputniks; the heads of the Big Three auto manufacturers denounced Reuther for undermining capitalism (although Curtice of GM, invited to present his case to the convention, dispatched a brief letter tinged with possible compromise); in Detroit, three daily papers feature company attacks on Reuther; in Washington, before the Senate Subcommittee on Anti-Trust and Anti-Monopoly, Reuther called upon Congress to establish an independent office of Consumers Counsel with power to call public hearings to review price increases in monopoly controlled industry.

By a huge majority, the special convention endorsed a program submitted by the International Executive Board. Upon Reuther's initiative, the board proposed to reverse the unanimous decision of the last regular convention in April 1957 to make the shorter work week without reduction in pay the big demand for 1958. It was debated for six hours, an equal number speaking on each side. There was appreciable opposition and some misgivings. In general, the support was lukewarm rather than enthusiastic. For, few delegates and even fewer members back home were aware of what was involved. For one thing, the new program had been kept a carefully guarded secret until it was abruptly unloaded, full-blown, upon the International Executive Board. No one had time to become quite adjusted to it before the convention was already upon them, and then over.

## PREPARATION

The administration did little to prepare the membership. Its own leading cadres, even Vice-Presidents and Regional Directors were in the dark. For this, criticism and resentment came and it was justified. That said, however, it seems to this observer that the program adopted is a skillful attempt to face the practical bargaining reality of 1958. It utilizes key social and political slogans in the form of economic demands to place the union in the best possible fighting position. There is no answer to the rav-

ages of unemployment. But that is another story.

The program is presented in two parts, each with its distinctive aim: 1. The basic minimum economic demands, and 2. the supplementary demands, the so-called profit-sharing plan.

Nothing dramatic or unusual appears in the basic demands. These are the union's real practical objectives, its demands, properly so-called. The UAW wants a general wage increase; it wants improved pension and welfare programs; it calls for protection to workers displaced by plants closing and moving; it asks for improved supplementary unemployment benefits. And, as Reuther indicated in his reply to Curtice's letter, the UAW has no chip

on its shoulder and is undoubtedly ready for a peaceful compromise if possible. The union, then, in its basic program presents an orthodox, normal program which could be settled reasonably in ordinary times. But, and here is the key to everything, these are not ordinary times. The companies are in an advantageous position. To win ordinary demands, even in part, the union is compelled to resort to extraordinary tactics and slogans. That exceptional power comes from the supplementary demands, directed clearly and simply against the big monopolies. These demands, unlike the others, cannot be considered ordinary collective bargaining demands in any real sense. Consider the union's position:

Eleven percent of the labor force (320,000 workers) in Michigan is unemployed. But the proportion of auto workers is probably higher. Cars are not selling and pile up in the yards; the Big Three don't need production and can take a long strike. All industry is hit by the economic recession; but the auto industry has been turned topsy-turvy for years. Smaller companies have been closing; big companies have been decentralizing; old plants are abandoned or curtailed. And in this combination of technological transformation and economic recession thousands of auto workers have been hard hit. Homes have been lost; cars and TV sets repossessed by finance companies, reminiscent of the big depression. Worst of all, no one knows what tomorrow will bring; everyone fears that his job may move out and that years of sweat, toil and seniority will be in vain and all hope of security

abandoned. Hundreds from Continental, Packard, Murray Body, Hudson are gone and forgotten; their jobs ended and their futures ruined. Plants still in operation are hit by layoffs; they are temporary or permanent? No one knows.

Meanwhile, speed-up is intensified; the companies have the whip hand; so they press harder demanding that work standards be speeded up. If men protest, who cares? Let them strike, production can wait. Every intelligent unionist wants if possible to avoid a big strike, when conditions are so unfavorable. A lot was said at the UAW convention; but no one demanded that the leadership go out and fight come what may.

## WHIP HAND

In April 1957, the convention voted unanimously to make the shorter work week the number one demand in '58. It was an either-or-demand, a blunt decision to strike if the companies refused. But in less than a year, the scene changed and conditions became unfavorable. Reuther obviously wanted to avoid a strike and proposed therefore that the short work week be withdrawn as the key demand. If the union persisted in its previous decision it meant an inevitable strike, and a long one. If it wanted to avoid a strike, it had to change the decision.

Reuther faced the issue squarely without pretending that nothing had changed. Nevertheless, a strike can take place; but it becomes less likely. If it does come it will be easier to settle; for the union's real demands have been scaled down. Naturally, Reuther was not eager to underline the union's weakness; that would damage its bargaining position further. But it was implicit in all he said. Before the convention, he invented a novel argument: the Russian sputnik imposed the need for more work and not more leisure and consequently the UAW must postpone its demand for a shorter week. Actually, he was taking refuge in patriotism from the union's weakness, making a virtue out of necessity. But the argument fell flat; even his closest supporters ridiculed it, pointing to growing lines of unemployed. At the convention, the sputnik argument

(Continued on page 3)

## Reuther Plan Raises Critical Questions

Will It Affect Unemployment? GM's Monopoly Position? Is It An Incentive Plan?

By JACK WILSON

Detroit

Now that the first shock wave of disbelief among both top management and auto workers has subsided over the latest dramatic Reuther plan (profit sharing), the proposals are coming in for a calmer second look. The violent reactions and the intense debate have toned down since the abrupt rejection by the Big Three has made everyone feel that future discussions will be purely abstract. Reuther's proposals seem doomed as a serious bargaining subject. Furthermore the swift rejection indicates that the corporations may force the UAW on strike no matter what it does or does not do.

The prospect of a major strike, which the UAW obviously will try to avoid, has cast a somber feeling on all UAW leaders and the preliminary factional reactions seem to have quieted down somewhat this week.

## DIVERGENCE

The 3000 delegates to the current UAW convention will find it difficult to grasp the full implications of the plan. The sharpest divergence of opinion on profit sharing exists and it is scarcely likely that a three-day convention can convince anyone, although the Reuther forces will have no difficulty in carrying their view.

How can the delegates grasp such a complicated and complex program which has been called "revolutionary" by News-

week magazine, "an attempt of Walter Reuther to run the auto industry" according to the *Wall Street Journal*, "a publicity stunt" by a noted economist who is a friend of the UAW, and "a betrayal of the UAW convention decision to fight for the shorter work week" according to Reuther's embittered opponents within the union? One wonders how the delegates can seriously decide its implications in so short a time when UAW leaders insist that a noted labor journalist like A. H. Raskin of the *New York Times* completely misunderstands it?

According to Raskin, Reuther's plan was essentially the same as the stock buying plan which General Motors and Ford offered in the 1955 negotiations. He wrote, "This one-time socialist made himself the champion of one of management's most cherished ideals for stimulating employee interest in the success of a business—profitsharing."

## STELLATO

Carl Stellato, president of Ford Local 600, emerged from comparative obscurity and again made page one headlines in Michigan with his announcement that he intends to fight for retaining the decision of the April 1957 convention of the UAW to make a shorter work week with no reduction in pay the major goal of 1958 negotiations. Stellato was widely quoted in the press and on the radio saying: "I am deeply disappointed. I am sure there are thousands of other UAW members who are just as disappointed. Ask those thousands who have been laid off what they think of dropping demands for a shorter work week."

In the context of a deep auto industry recession with auto workers plagued by automation, decentralization, speedup and increasing layoffs, it must be said that

Reuther's profit-sharing plan failed completely to grasp either the mood or the thinking of a big segment of auto workers. This may or may not be true in other areas of the country. The current convention of the UAW will indicate how deep is the outright hostility or suspicion to his plan.

Reuther's plan to have employees share in the profits created doubt on two fundamental points, especially since he used General Motors as an example. Would the long range consequence of profit sharing tend to give General Motors a monopoly since the plan might turn out to be attractive to management, the employees and the consuming public? Each would have a tremendous stake in the success of General Motors. This writer makes no pretense of understanding what the reaction to the plan would be in Ford circles, either management or labor, but it may be stated with reasonable certainty that both Chrysler management and a large body of union officialdom in the Chrysler section of the UAW is uneasy and somewhat suspicious that any profit sharing plan of this kind would run Chrysler out of business.

## CHALLENGE

A second major feeling which is not thought out and perhaps cannot even be expressed by many UAW members is that any profit sharing plan is a form of incentive system. These suspicions are aggravated by publicity given to statements such as that released by Harry Bridges who jeered at Reuther for trying to promote layoffs and increase speedups since higher profits and bonuses could only come through that process.

Defenders of Reuther's proposals argue that Reuther is challenging manage-

(Continued on bottom of next page)



# Reuther Attacks Monopolies -

(Continued from page 2)

disappeared completely; neither Reuther nor his followers mentioned it by even one word. In a TV interview Mike Wallace baited Reuther with the sputnik but he evaded it completely, anxious to forget the whole thing. Reuther's sputnik was a dud; it never got launched.

How to make up for the union's weakness? "Reuther," said Ernest R. Breech, Ford chairman, "is a man with a problem." And he went on, Reuther's answer is "to come out slugging for all he is worth." There is truth in that observation. The UAW begins a fierce social and political attack upon the monopolies in order to wrest from them by public pressure what it cannot get by mere economic power. Such is the function of the supplementary economic demands, or profit-sharing plan.

Who is responsible for inflation? Is it big-business or "big labor." For 17 years, reactionary politicians, press and employers have hammered away at the public, workers among them, that the fault lies in "monopoly union" power and wage increases. The debate reaches a critical stage when recession is piled on top of inflation. The UAW points the finger at the tiny minority of rich capitalists, the monopolies, to stimulate and direct all the justified suspicions and antagonisms of the people against them.

## COME OUT SLUGGING

Consider the rationale of the UAW program: its basic demands are justified by average increases in national productivity which make possible advances for all workers as their share in the progress of the whole nation.

But the big monopolies! Their profits soar because their productivity is far higher than the average; and because they are monopolies they can rig prices, mult the consumer and drive profits even higher. And how do they get such power? From enormous accumulations of wealth and machinery amassed by squeezing consumers and exploiting the workers. Their super-productivity brings them excessive profits. A tiny group of executives grabs a hogs portion. They must share it with all! The workers should get their share, the consumers theirs, and, yes, the small stockholders too. And so, the union proposes that excessive profits be split three ways: one fourth to workers; one fourth to consumers in the form of price rebates; and one half to the stockholders and executives. The union comes forward as the spokesman and representative of all against a profit-hungry minority.

This, to repeat, is not collective bargaining in any ordinary sense although it is cast in that form. It is such a radical demand, such a sweeping "invasion" into the dictatorial rights of management that it is virtually inconceivable that the companies can agree to it without the most protracted struggle. The union leadership is fully aware of this fact; it is not spoiling for a fight of such magnitude; it makes its demands essentially as a weapon of pressure.

## MISGIVINGS

Much of the objection to Reuther's program centered around its profit-sharing features. The debate on the floor of the convention and discussions among socialists of all varieties revealed that many of them were repelled by Reuther's program because they themselves were appalled by profit-sharing on principle. They insisted that it was "incentive pay" in disguise; that it deluded workers to believe they had common interests with their employers; that it would pit worker against worker and undermine the spirit of class solidarity. Many militants, firmly in the Reuther camp on most questions, expressed misgivings along the same lines.

But it seems to this reporter that the objections miss the point. On the convention floor and later on radio and TV and at public hearings, union spokesmen exert themselves to arouse the workers and the public against the monopolists as a selfish, rapacious, irresponsible minority driving the nation into depression. To reject a program which does this in reality on the grounds that it might do the opposite in theory is an empty abstraction.

The critics realize that profit-sharing has traditionally been used to prevent unionization. But there is a basic difference here: A plan that is voluntarily set up by the boss can just as "voluntarily" be withdrawn. In that case workers have won nothing as a right; they have been granted a privilege, so to speak. But a profit-sharing plan imposed upon employers by union power, signed and sealed and defended by that power is something else again. Once the workers have won the right to share in the profits, they have taken the first step toward the right to a voice on everything that determines the level of profits. What are profits? What are expenses? What costs are "legitimate" and what "illegitimate"? Is it proper to provide yachts, villas, cars for executives? What shall be allocated for de-

preciation? A hundred factors determine "profits"—hide or reveal it. If workers have the right to share profits they must seek to decide all questions which affect their just return. It is another step toward democracy in industry, toward curbing the unilateral, unquestioned rights of management. And why not? If democracy is good enough in politics, it is good enough in industry.

And yet, this program with all its implications was received and adopted without intense enthusiasm. Carl Stellato, president of Ford Local 600, expressed the views of its opponents in a restrained speech received with modest applause from his friends. He deplored the withdrawal of the shorter work-week demand when workers were without jobs. He asked the union to take up the problems of the unemployed by demanding a reduction in hours and called for a membership referendum on the issues.

## AWFUL LETDOWN

It is true. There is speed-up; there is unemployment; there is real suffering, and above all, there is the all-pervading insecurity. Despite everything, before the convention union members expected Reuther to come up with something, somehow to pull a rabbit out of the hat. But he could not. Instead, he proposed a retreat from the demands of less than a year ago. No one could seriously question the need for retreat.

The great, progressive and powerful UAW! Still, in the heartland of its strength, in the city of Detroit, in the state of Michigan auto workers go without jobs. Thousands have lost everything. What hope does the union hold out for them? For some, there is supplementary unemployment benefits. But after that? And for those whose jobs have moved out from under them? For many of them the union offers nothing, literally nothing.

What has happened in the union is this: the militants who want action on unemployment and don't get it transfer their dissatisfaction into distrust of the collective bargaining program. Some things can be grappled with in bargaining but others cannot. A practical problem arises in 1958: how to conduct negotiations with the Big Three in auto. For that, the union now has an effective program. But for that alone.

To meet the critical job situation, the union needs a fighting political action program. Political action consists of more than elections: It also consists of a program of far-reaching demands backed

up by demonstrations, petitions, rallies and meetings. Reuther seems bogged down in a trickle-down theory of his own: if corporations pay more wages, workers will buy more; plants will run more; the unemployed will be rehired. . . . So goes the theory. But meanwhile? And will those displaced be rehired or others? And when?

## SOAPY WILLIAMS

Governor Mennen Williams came to gladhand the delegates. Here was the governor himself of a state where more than one of every eight workers is unemployed. And what did he suggest? Nothing! He was pleased to blame the recession on Republicans and their "tight money" policy. It seems, according to him, that interest rates are high; companies will not borrow or produce; and so there is unemployment. But, if interest rates were reduced, the Rubbe Goldberg chain of economics could unravel. . . . more borrowing, more building, more production, more jobs. But meanwhile?

A self-proclaimed representative of the common man, a governor comes by invitation to address the leading militants of the UAW. He chats to them while members of this powerful union are oppressed by fear of the future, some in actual suffering. Almost 25 years after the founding of the CIO, when this union has risen to a membership of 1,200,000 and he dares to offer them nothing! And he, in turn, is praised by the union's president and applauded by the delegates. Is there any wonder that the union is not only weakened by unemployment but its membership becomes increasingly disturbed?

The UAW has no program with which to fight politically on behalf of the unemployed. That is what was missing. Is there nothing to propose; nothing to fight for? Drop your hat and the UAW leadership can come up with a dramatic political program and create a storm for it. They might demand a capital levy upon the total wealth of the big auto companies to make them bear the burden of the costs of recession and relocation of industry; they might call for a fund to compensate permanently displaced workers; they might demand big increases in unemployment payments; they might demand a moratorium on all foreclosures. They might demand. . . but they have asked for some of these things and many others—but quietly.

## LET UNION FIGHT

Let the union fight for them. If the governor will not support laws demanded by the union, let it denounce him. If he does, send mass delegations to the state capital and press him on; picket unemployment bureaus with the union's demands. Act, in short, like the UAW. But the union does not. In our opinion, it is so deeply committed to its feeble and cowardly friends in the Democratic party that it fears to embarrass them with a fighting political program.

As the union confronts its direct adversary, the auto monopolists, it is fully able to come forward as the champion of all the people and to demand in clear and stark fashion that wages and prices, and profits be set in the interests of the people. It puts more concretely and effectively the demands of the great GM strike of 1945-46. That is the power, the achievement and contribution of this UAW.

But when it hits up against politics—and that is where the issue of unemployment belongs—it is transformed into a meek creature indeed. It adapts to its pitiful Democratic friends and can no longer speak out effectively for its own suffering unemployed. Such is its terrible weakness and the price it pays: that its own membership is perplexed and diffident as 1958 bargaining begins.

There is a power in the UAW's collective bargaining program as its representatives sit down at the negotiating table. That power must be transferred to the union's politics. It has been true for a long time. But now the unemployed auto workers deserve no less than that: the militant, fighting political backing of their own union.

# Questions on Reuther Plan —

(Continued from page 2)

ment's prerogative to exclusive use of profits; that this has socialistic implications; and that it is an attempt to solve the problems of inflation and win public support. They suggest too that Reuther is again illustrating his social outlook which has been progressive in the past.

For a complete understanding of Reuther's proposal the question must be answered. Why did he propose a reversal of the shorter work week demand at a time when there are at least 150,000 auto workers unemployed? There are two explanations which are not mutually exclusive but rather supplement each other. Within the UAW the Reuther line is that this is not a year for a major struggle in view of the recession, unemployment and uncertainty. Labor Action in recent times has carried articles indicating how deeply the UAW has been hit by the recession and the mood of uncertainty which prevails in many leadership sections. In that context it becomes debatable with honest differences of opinion permissible whether or not the UAW should conduct a major strike struggle.

The second motivation of Reuther is, to put it baldly, that America faces a war crisis in the coming year, and that this is a predominant consideration, which makes "leisure" time, via a shorter work week out of the question. It may

well be that Reuther's political estimate turns out to be accurate, but a more likely judgment is that Reuther has simply succumbed to the same hysteria that gripped Washington since sputnik shattered the dream world of American capitalism.

While it may be too early to form definitive judgments on the over-all effect of the latest Reuther turn, there exists much evidence that Reuther has created more problems with his profit-sharing proposal than he resolved. The current convention of the UAW will enable everyone to estimate more accurately if Reuther can clear up the confusion in his ranks, for a confused and divided membership and leadership hardly furnishes the kind of troops a leader needs when a major combat or skillful retreat impends.

## CRITICAL QUESTIONS

So many critical questions automatically are raised by Reuther's proposal and its long-range implications that it is difficult to see how Reuther can answer them satisfactorily. Some of his opponents in the UAW charge already that his plan is a variation of the Communist party proposals for an incentive plan during World War II. Reuther's statement, in releasing his plan, "I am an American first and a union member second," raised a lot of eyebrows in the UAW. Why that

formulation at this moment? His long-standing criticism of incentive and profit sharing plans in past UAW history may come up to haunt him at this convention.

If the reactionary implications of his latest plan far outweigh any progressive anti-profit aspects, does this signify that Reuther has reached a dead end? Can any union work out "progressive" answers in a period of economic crisis when it becomes increasingly clear that the changing patterns of an industry like auto preclude any union from solving union problems within that narrow economic range. Doesn't this suggest a need for new political paths?

Not the least of the difficulties confronting Reuther at this convention is that the most important delegate won't be there—the unemployed worker, who has however been asking everyone: Is the union deserting me? How can I ever benefit from a profit sharing plan? Reuther has a major responsibility as the head of the UAW to convince not just the delegates, but the vast army of UAW unemployed that he is not creating a two class membership in the UAW, employed and unemployed with his new approach.

The current convention will take up these and other pressing questions in one form or another. It may sound commonplace but this time the UAW and Walter Reuther really are at the crossroads.



## A DISCUSSION ARTICLE

## In the Spirit of Leninism?

LABOR ACTION announces that it is opening its pages to a discussion of all questions relating to the reconstruction and re-unification of the socialist movement in the United States. Articles submitted as part of this discussion must not exceed 1200 words.—Ed.

By DAVID ROSS

Should socialists today consider themselves as carrying on in the spirit of Leninism and Bolshevism? Last November, on the anniversary of the Russian Revolution, many anti-Stalinist socialists concluded ritual discussions of "the place of the Bolsheviks in history" with somewhat qualified affirmations of their Leninism.

Friendly critics of the Bolsheviks, who at the same time consider themselves Leninists, put the matter thus: In evaluating the Bolsheviks one should place most weight on their role as leaders of the Russian Socialist Revolution, the difficult circumstances under which they defended the conquests of the revolution, and their lack of any foreknowledge of Stalinism. Only then should one consider the limitations on democratic rights and the partial degeneration of the workers' state that took place even under Lenin.

While the above analysis has some merit, it is essentially a myopic view which, perhaps because of an identification with the Bolsheviks, fastens upon their ditch-by-ditch struggles and sees their dilemmas and evolution under Lenin as tragedy but not betrayal. Unfortunately we have here no true tragedy of a hero struggling against overwhelming odds: his moral fiber does not last the play, and our hero emerges finally unworthy of the emulation which his philosophy (ideology) has him demand of others.

Max Shachtman said recently in LABOR ACTION (Nov. 18, 1957) that, after "the Bolshevik leaders placed one curb after another upon the ideal of socialist democracy . . ." and "after the civil war ended, the curbs were not only maintained and extended but were even exalted as principles for a normal development of socialism . . ." (my emphasis—D.B.) These "principles" are still with us. Lenin and the Bolsheviks have bequeathed us their last ideology, which still lives to rationalize their rule. The term "Leninism" now must refer to this last ideology, pick and choose as we may among historical facts to seek explanations. The nub of the question is this: What is the place of Leninism, not in past, but in current history; for Leninism has left its mark on current politics, through both ideology and historical example.

## LAST IDEOLOGY

The Bolsheviks under Lenin presided over a one-party system. Their main fault was not a denial of this or that right to their political opponents. The outstanding fact is that they presided over a state under which crucial issues were decided without benefit of control, participation, or even necessary approval by the mass of people. At the close of five years of power Lenin and the Bolsheviks saw no near end to this regime. No political democracy; no workers' management of industry until Russia entered an entirely new and technologically higher stage of developments. Isn't this at best the ideology of a reluctant authoritarianism?

Ideology dies hard. The authoritarian germ in the Bolsheviks outlived them and found a refuge even in anti-Stalinist socialism. While Leninism includes much more than its authoritarianism, this is enough. How then can democratic socialists characterize themselves as functioning in the spirit or tradition of Leninism? To do so is to invite the suspicion that they do not yet fully think like democrats. Lenin's role and ideas during his last period have not fallen into historical obscurity. Leninism today must still include the ideology of its last undemocratic development. No democrat with a sense of proportion should call himself a Leninist.

Conceivably it is possible for democratic socialists to separate themselves sharply from Leninism in its authoritarian period and yet advocate an original Leninism. By summing up their ideology in this way they might point toward Leninism's revolutionary period, and yet make a sharp distinction between this and Leninism's later authoritarian development. This might indeed be accomplished if the qualifying "original" were always inserted and explained, and if there were no softening of the description and characterization of Leninism as it fully evolved.

Apparently this particular combination makes little sense psychologically or politically, as few if any examples of it can be found; Lenin's historical personality too thoroughly binds together his later with earlier ideology. Original Leninists feel called upon to present Lenin's evolution in soft focus. They would be inclined to say of the Bolsheviks' restrictions on democracy, along with Max Shachtman (who does not use the term Leninism in his article): "The man who unthinkingly neglects to maintain the fireproofing qualities of the home cannot, regardless of justified criticism, be equated with the arsonist whose work of destroying the home utterly has been made easier." (ibid.) Unfortunately, the Bolsheviks' role was much more actively compromising to democratic popular rule than simple neglect.

What should be the content and spirit of democratic socialism today? Does the Leninism of the time of the Russian Revolution nevertheless offer a guide to socialist democracy?

Socialists can no longer take for granted that workers' power at the level of factory, office and field will firmly entrench the rule of the working people. Such local democracy is indispensable but insufficient. The Russian workers lost control first at the top levels of the state, and then their local democracy eroded from under them. There is a danger that this will be repeated elsewhere, and not only under equally difficult circumstances. Given the vast complexity of modern society, and the informational and communicational gap between the grass roots and the most central state bodies (to cite only some technical difficulties) maintaining democratic control over the top presents a special, crucial problem. Socialist democracy requires a structural-institutional solution.

## TOWARD THE FUTURE

Leninism was alien to a consideration of formal democratic national institutions. Lenin's *State and Revolution* is semi-anarchistic in its conception of the workers' state. The workers' state power is presented as resting almost entirely with local committees of workers and peasants. The problem seems almost exclusively to be one of establishing full worker participation at the place of production. How to establish a democratic national government to reflect and express most directly the opinions of the people on the great issues of national politics—this was beyond the scope of Leninism both before and after the revolution.

After the revolution the Bolsheviks codified this neglect of formal, national democracy and made a virtue of it. By implication the very idea was linked to bourgeois democracy, a polar opposite to the soviet system. History, not human invention, had provided the workers with workers' councils, the ideal form for their rule, thereby solving once and for all the basic problems of structure in a workers' state. In actual practice this type of thinking served as a cover for the degeneration of the state at its center. There is reason to fear that it might again serve as a screen for creeping authoritarianism.

There can be no democracy in modern society without formal, institutionalized means for as direct control as possible over the central decision-making processes. The democratic socialist movement must work up and put over a new image of socialism which places formal national democracy alongside the grass roots democracy of workers' councils. In doing so it will probably have to reconsider such old, simple, democratic ideas as direct national elections, national proportional representation, and a national assembly to serve as a forum and arena for political struggle. In giving these serious consideration the socialist movement will be going beyond the ideology and spirit of any variety of Leninism.

## YOU and SCIENCE

## A New Drive for Scientific Freedom

By OSCAR FINE

One of the most heartening developments in the wake of sputnik has been the drive to free American science from its strangling web of secrecy. For years the scientists have been conducting a hidden struggle to declassify the mountain of information which has lain buried in bureaucratic cubbyholes marked "secret." For years their pleas have gone unnoticed, but the fears inspired by the technological achievements of Russia have created a widening audience for them. Of course, since their views are still unorthodox and unpopular, their voices tend to get lost in the babble of important personages, company presidents, and official spokesmen in the growing accumulation of testimony before congressional committees and "think" pieces in the weekly magazines. But they no longer go completely unheard, and even though no powerful force has yet come forward to champion their cause, the latter emerges as a possibility for the first time since the cold war began.

In a very important article in the January 9th Reporter, William S. Fairfield has presented their case, drawn from the interviews of scientists before a three man temporary subcommittee on restriction on the flow of scientific information, which were held in March, 1956. This House Government Information subcommittee has just opened a new set of hearings on January 20, and has already heard a plea from one of Eisenhower's top scientific advisers to release 90 per cent of the secret material. Much of this information has already been published abroad or in scattered form here, and is withheld only because of bureaucratic buck-passing or from fear of public opinion (as in the case of the A.E.C. study on nuclear safety matters). Some of this material has been released during the past two years; for example, none of the work at Brookhaven is now secret though clearances are still required for the scientists there. But an enormous amount of work, including abstract theoretical ideas, still lies buried.

## CRIPPLING SECRECY

The force that drives the scientists into this attack upon the idol of security through secrecy, into the daily arguments with the administrators to get material denied them, or more often to allow them to discuss their work with colleagues, is not that of an ideological whim, or a pet prejudice gleaned from a book on philosophy. This secrecy is as crippling to them as if they had been denied the right to breathe air freely, and could only inhale through government stamped tubes from sealed containers. Dr. Loyd Berkner, one of Eisenhower's physicist advisors, and the leading witness is quoted by Fairfield:

"Newton did not know he was looking for gravitation in the particular form that he later announced when he lay under the apple tree and the apple fell on his head. The inspiration came as a consequence of his acquiring a wide range of knowledge. Now, this is generally the fundamental procedure in the really great developments of modern times . . . the laws of mechanics and the concepts of space and time derived from astronomy, together with the work of Planck on high-temperature radiation, led Einstein to postulate the equivalence of mass and energy. Yet today any intelligent military organization, operating under present security rules, would certainly classify the equivalent of Planck's work so that it would be denied to a potential Einstein."

A textbook written shortly after the explosion of the first atom bomb was suppressed for more than two years, even though it had been written by men who had no connection with the bomb, and used only material from the open scientific literature. A classic example of the result of attempts to classify pure science was given by Philip M. Morse, wartime director of the Navys Operation Evaluation Group and now a mathematics professor at M.I.T. He became

interested in the problem of waiting lines in flow processes, such as traffic congestion or jamming of ammunition feeding mechanisms. He knew that some classified studies had been done in the general field for the military, and managed to pry loose enough "basic" information from classified reports on their military applications to warrant the publication of one or two papers. When he published some of his own findings some time later, he was accused by several friends in the military of copying the classified work of another mathematician. The latter, who was also an old friend, told Morse that he had not published the theoretical side of his work because he could not get permission, and that there was a third mathematician who reportedly had done a classified report on the same subject, for another military research group!

## AGILE BRAIN

The nine witnesses coupled with the many letters received from scientists, were almost overwhelmingly for revision of personnel security clearance procedures. "Under these procedures," Dr. Berkner testified, "the scientist cannot avoid becoming the almost unique target, because he is the source of much of the information to be protected." The clearance standards "put a premium on conformity," while scientific greatness "always rises from diversity of thought, never from conformity. . . . An agile brain that can create great things is almost certain to be a nonconformist."

Trevor Gardner, representing the administration, went along with this. "Many of the most creative individuals that are available for work on advanced projects, are themselves unusual enough so that they are not clearable by ordinary standards." He should know, for he was special assistant to the air force secretary for research and development from 1953 to 1956. Referring to the case of "a scientist of international reputation" whose clearance was lifted, he said, "Unfortunately this man has such inventive ability that he keeps coming up with Secret and Top Secret ideas, even though his clearance is removed. [They] can't seem to classify his head."

People working on the same problem for different agencies often are not allowed to talk to each other. This "compartmentalization," as it is called by the defense officials, as well as the other difficulties have led many prominent universities, among them Chicago, Syracuse, Case Institute, Harvard, and M.I.T., to refuse classified government contracts. Many scientists have left the weapons field completely for these reasons, more so than for humanitarian ones.

## GO TO SLEEP

"At the end of the war," said Dr. Urey, "I looked very definitely for some things to do that would not enter into the classified field, and the things which I found to do are as far away from defense things as they could possibly be. Thus, determining the temperatures in the ancient oceans is not likely to become a classified subject, so far as I can see. . . . I may say that selection of such subjects was done definitely with some thought in mind of having some work to do which I could talk about freely without worrying about the question of classification at all."

"I can tell you," said Otto Struve, an astronomer whom Edward Teller frequently consulted, "that if I have a bright idea in the field of nuclear fusion, I would go to sleep and forget it. . . ."

## LABOR ACTION 18th YEAR

February 10, 1958

Vol. 22, No. 3

Published every other week by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone WATKINS 4-4222—Re-entered as second-class matter July 26, 1957 under the act of March 3, 1879.—Subscription: \$2 a year; \$1 for 6 months.—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: GORDON HASKELL  
Assoc. Editor: HERMAN BENSON  
Business Manager: Mel Stack  
Editorial Board:

GORDON HASKELL  
HERMAN BENSONMAX MARTIN  
SAM BOTTONE



## President Eisenhower's Proposals to Congress

# A Budget for Education, Or a Bad Dream?

By JOAN MORRIS

Every year the debate on education legislation in this country concentrates on the same theme, with slight variations. Education is considered by all—Republicans, Democrats, liberals, educators, business men and labor leaders—as a *good* and necessary virtue. Everyone is for it, everyone decries lack of better schools, teachers, books (almost everyone), and of course *money*. While everyone is 100 percent behind improving education facilities, practically nothing has been done to alleviate the problem of incredibly overcrowded classrooms, textbooks handed down to children from the previous generations, incompetent and low-level teaching.

Each time the debate arises in Congress, state legislatures, or local Boards of Education, it boils down to the question of federal aid to education. In the past few years, the discussion has centered around segregation in the schools—whether federal aid should be given to those Southern states which insist on perpetuating separate classes for whites and Negroes. This year will probably see another clash over the integration question, but it will be secondary to a new twist in the debate.

### BEHIND PROGRAM

What is behind the present program is the fact that the Russians are ahead in the missiles race. Embodied in the president's billion-dollar special education aid plan and in the actual budget recommendations of the administration, is his primary concern for national security. Eisenhower devoted most of his message to his four year plan on the role of mathematics and science in education, and concluded that the federal government is forced to give aid to this field, in particular, because of a state of national emergency for the next four years. His preoccupation with technical training and science research is illustrated in the following remark:

"Our immediate national security aims—to continue to strengthen our armed forces and improve the weapons at their command—can be furthered only by the efforts of individuals whose training is

already far advanced. But if we are to maintain our position of leadership, we must see to it that today's young people are prepared to contribute the maximum to our future progress. Because of the growing importance of science and technology, we must necessarily give special—but by no means exclusive—attention to education in science and engineering."

While science and engineering are not to be considered exclusive fields for government aid and concentration, the education message to Congress devotes over two-thirds of its report to those fields alone. The National Science Foundation is elevated to unprecedented heights; Graduate Fellowships in Science are singled out for special attention; improvement of science course content, improvement of science and mathematics teachers' knowledge of subject matter, encouragement of science as a career, strengthening the teachers in science and mathematics; These are titles of sections in the special Education report. Foreign languages, because of their relation to America's "leadership in the free world" and strengthening of the Office of Education are the only two sections not dealing with science and mathematics included in the report. In concrete figures, the special education aid plan breakdown for 1959 shows the following concentrations on science to the near elimination of any other field of education:

National Science Foundation	\$78,000,00
Department of Health, Education and Welfare	
Testing, guidance and counseling	\$17,275,000
Scholarships	7,500,000
Strengthening of Science, Mathematics teaching in public schools	110,000,000

Foreign Language development	1,284,000
Expansion of Graduate Education	7,000,000
Educational Statistics	1,000,000

All outlays by the Federal government with the exception of scholarships are to be matched by the states.

The true significance of these figures lies in the sole reason any special education plan was sent to Congress: our losing the technical war with Russia.

### RELUCTANCE

It was, of course, with reluctance that Eisenhower and his advisors presented their special aid proposal to Congress. The president made it quite clear that the American citizen in his home and community is chiefly responsible for education and that the states and local boards of education are the only governmental institutions required to deal with the matter. For ample proof of the extreme emphasis on local responsibility, pay close attention to the beginning of Eisenhower's message:

"Education best fulfills its high purpose when responsibility for education is kept close to the people it serves—when it is rooted in the home, nurtured in the community, sustained by a rich variety of public, private and individual resources. . . . For the increased support our educational system now requires, we must look primarily to citizens and parents acting in their own communities; school boards and city councils, teachers, principals, . . . trustees and faculties of private institutions."

So emphatic is the notion of federal non-involvement with education that it prompted Bess Furman of the *NY Times* to state that not only were the proposed funds for Health, Education and Welfare cut drastically in this year's budget, but that this is the first time federal retrenchment has happened since the New Deal initiated the idea of national government responsibility for this field.

The immediate reactions to the president's insistence on local responsibility as an excuse for balancing the budget

would naturally come from the Democrats and the liberals in particular. Traditionally fighting for bigger federal aid, but simultaneously attacking the administration for loss of first place in the armaments race to the Russians, the liberals give the debate a kind of grotesque appearance. The trouble with the Eisenhower budget as far as the Democrats, the air force, and other interested parties are concerned is that there is still not enough appropriation to education for science and technical training!

### "MORE"

And while some liberals, like Fullbright, call for huge expenditure on school construction that only indirectly relates to science education, the call is primarily for "more of everything." More education for better scientists and engineers which can enable us to meet the Russian threat.

Only a few non-partisan organizations whose bias is for education, *per se*, sound the alarm for a real thorough-going government aid program in all fields of education.

Although at first glance, the 1959 fiscal year budget shows about a \$100,000,000 increase in health, education and welfare expenditures, it is important to note what was slashed and what added.

A school construction plan costing \$420 million and a \$1,600,000 program to train teachers of mentally retarded children were deleted from the present budget figures. All school plant programs and vocational training is to be financed by the telephone tax receipts rebated to the states. Aside from the ineffectiveness of aid in such a program by the federal government, the inequities in terms of rich states receiving the most tax receipts and poor states, the least, is particularly meaningful.

Yet, if you want to wander through the world of reality as the administration and probably a healthy section of Congress see it, gaze upon the following proportions of figures in the present proposed budget.

Labor & Welfare	
(includes education)	\$3,643,000,000
National Security	
(Military)	\$45,836,000,000

Of the Labor & Welfare expenditures, Education will receive \$460,000,000. Of this, the greatest proportion will go to science education.

### WORLD OF REALITY

While 64¢ of each dollar will go to "National Security," (military and atomic energy) less than 2¢ will go to education for the next fiscal year. All civilian expenditures total 22¢ of the dollar. What an interesting and telling commentary on the American picture of itself and the world. Any real aspirations for peace can only sound like an illusion when looking at the national budget figures. The idea that education must be supported by the states and local communities and that the federal government can only step in when "national security" is at stake is so outmoded and out-worn, has proven so alarmingly inadequate in light of present overwhelming educational needs, that it seems as though we were recapitulating a bad dream.

Yet, tragically, this is the state of the nation.

## YSL Launches 1958 Fund Drive

By SY LANDY

Beginning on Feb. 8, the Young Socialist League will launch its 1958 Fund Drive. This year's drive will be terminated on May 8, giving the organization three months in which to raise \$1450. The individual quotas for units and organizing committees are as follows:

New York	\$ 620
Pittsburgh	50
Chicago	200
Philadelphia	25
Albuquerque	25
Los Angeles	50
Bay Area	125
Seattle	75
Buffalo	25
New Haven	60
Westchester	10
Albany	35
At Large & N. O.	150
(incl. Cleveland, Boston, St. Louis, etc.)	
Total	\$1450

In practically every fund drive, the YSL has said "This year, the need is greater than ever before." This time we can say it with absolute certainty and let the facts prove the contention. The League has more members, units, organ-

izing committees and sympathizers than ever before in its history. The national office mail teems with requests from local groups and individuals for literature, speakers, and other services. The first edition of our introductory pamphlet "What is the YSL?" was grabbed up by prospective members a few weeks after issuance. Two more editions are in preparation, awaiting funds for production; a civil rights booklet and a pamphlet on basic democratic socialism, already written, also await subsidy.

In addition to literature, we have projected the most ambitious series of tours the YSL has ever undertaken. This year we expect to have several tours, which will provide Young Socialist speakers to campus and other youth clubs in nineteen states, stretching from coast to coast. For the first time in many years these tours will reach a significant number of high school students in addition to the collegiate audiences. Aside from the scheduled national tours, the national office has high hopes of being able to subsidize an increasing number of local tours by speakers from the various units.

As is obvious from the scope of these activities, the need for the funds is very

strong. The sooner the money comes in, the sooner the YSL will be able to step-up its activity.

The urgent necessity for heightened democratic socialist activity is clear. We have moved away from the times when we were "hanging on" and "keeping alive the ideals of socialism," to a period in which a unified socialist movement can become a real force in American society. The major political goal of the YSL at this point, is to aid in the creation of just such a movement . . . its already broad ranks and record of positive achievement are only a first step, but an important one in the attempt to merge the democratic socialist tendencies into a broad Debsian group. Our efforts in this direction, sadly enough, take money too.

We have thirteen weeks to reach our financial goal in this fund appeal. With the help of all our members, friends, and sympathizers, we hope to achieve it, and if possible, to surpass it.

Readers of *Challenge* can also pitch in and help. No sum is too small, none too large. Make checks payable to Sy Landy and send them to YSL, 114 West 14 St., New York 11, N. Y.



## Civil Liberties Victory Won In Oregon Case

The case of an Oregon resident denied admission to his state bar association because of "untruthfulness" in answering questions concerning the Communist Party has been successfully challenged in the United States Supreme Court.

The high court reversed the decision by Oregon's Supreme Court and returned the case to the State courts for further consideration after citing its recent decision in the Schwere and Koningsberg cases holding that past or mere membership in the Communist Party would not support an inference of bad moral character refusing an attorney a license to practice.

In the Oregon case, concerning Frank V. Patterson, the Oregon Supreme Court had upheld a ruling of the Board of Bar Examiners. The bar's action had drawn the opposition of the Oregon affiliate of the American Civil Liberties Union.

Patterson, a former Communist Party member, said in testimony before the bar group that he does not believe the Party seeks the violent overthrow of the government. He joined the Party in 1946, but left in 1949.

The examiners' decision denied admission to the bar association to Patterson on grounds of moral character, asserting that he lied in stating his opinions on the real nature and aims of the Communist movement in this country.

The state Supreme Court, upholding this ruling, said basic Communist literature asserts that revolution is the lever to overthrow government and that Congress, through legislation, has recognized the subversive nature of this movement. Because Patterson has the intelligence to understand these points, the court said, he must have known that the Communist Party advocated violent overthrow of the government and that Congress had recognized this point.

### NO EVIDENCE

Lawyers handling the case for the Oregon ACLU contended that when Patterson stated that, in his opinion, the Communist Party did not advocate the overthrow of the government by force, his opinion might have been much mistaken, but that no evidence was introduced into the record to prove that he lied.

The only way in which testimony stating an opinion or judgment such as Patterson was asked to give may be shown to be untruthful, the attorneys stated, is to prove prior inconsistent acts or statements. Furthermore, they asserted, the right to hold any opinion, judgment, or belief, whether mistaken or non-conforming when measured against the prevailing opinion, is guaranteed under the First and Fourteenth Amendments.

The same reasoning, they declared, is also applicable to Patterson's own beliefs, as distinct from his opinion on the beliefs of the Communist Party. Patterson testified that he, himself, did not believe in the overthrow of the government. The Oregon courts held that every active member of the Communist Party necessarily believes in the doctrine of the overthrow of the government. The ACLU, however, held that a man's beliefs are personal and cannot be established from the beliefs of his associates. In the absence of proof of prior inconsistent acts or statements in regard to his beliefs, the untruthfulness of his testimony was not determined, the ACLU attorneys claimed.

From *ACLU Weekly Bulletin*

## New Perspectives for American Socialism The Case for Unity

Introduction by

Max Shachtman

ten cents

INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST LEAGUE  
114 West 14th Street  
New York 11, N.Y.

# John Gates, Former "Daily Worker" Editor, on Perspectives for the Ex-Communists

John Gates, former editor of the *Daily Worker* who resigned from the Communist Party just before the DW collapsed, has written a series of articles for the *New York Post*. These articles are of interest to everyone concerned with the political evolution of the thousands of people who have broken with the Communist Party in the past couple of years.

First of all, the articles make no startling revelations about the CP in this country. As a matter of fact, they have nothing in common whatever with an "expose" of the party. They contain nothing of the intellectual and moral revulsion against the stifling intellectual atmosphere which characterized the American CP for so long, such as permeate Howard Fast's book and articles. The present party leadership is attacked and criticized for their slavish attitude toward the Russian Communist Party, and Gates sees for the CP no role in American society because of its rigid and dogmatic attitude. But in these articles there appears no feeling that the CP betrayed the idealism and devotion of a whole generation, or that through it these qualities were turned to the support of an unworthy goal.

Not at all. As a matter of fact, in long sections of the series one is almost led to wonder whether instead of the title "Why I Left the Communist Party," a more appropriate one might have been "Why Did I Leave the Communist Party?"

Gates has broken with the American Communist Party because he considers it hopeless, useless and worse. He is willing to criticize abuses and excesses committed in the "socialist countries," but only in a friendly, "constructive" way. And above all it is clear that he is not looking for his political future to the rise of a socialist movement in America which will represent a complete break with his past, but rather to the re-constitution of a movement based on that past.

### CANNOT PREDICT

We cannot predict the future political development of John Gates as an individual. He has come a long way in the past few years, and he may continue to travel in the direction of democratic socialism. But his present political perspective, as reflected in these articles, is even if only implicitly or semi-consciously, the eventual creation and development of a political movement in this country which, for lack of a better word, we can only describe as Stalinoid.

Not that Gates comes out for the formation of such a political movement in these articles. In all likelihood, neither he nor most of his friends and colleagues still inside or now outside the CP are remotely ready for that. He says he wants to think, read and talk to people for some time before he decides exactly what he will do. But at the present time, at least, there can be little doubt that the people, above all, with whom he wants to discuss, and to whom he looks for leadership and the initial ranks of the movement of the future are those generally clustered around the Stalinoid publications and organizations.

How can this be deduced? In part by his explicit statement that a new American socialist movement, while independent from the Russian Communists, cannot be "hysterical critics" of them, as he alleges some socialists to have been. But our conclusions are drawn more certainly precisely from the tone and approach he adopts in discussing the past of the Communist Party in this country.

### LEGITIMIZE

The whole effect of his series is, while not holding out the CP of today as an attractive vehicle for political activity, to explain, justify, glorify and above all legitimize it, and hence those who were its members and leaders, for the last twenty or thirty years.

Thus, if one accepts Gate's version of the CP's history, no one who participated

in it need be ashamed, or even embarrassed by his past. They made mistakes, to be sure, but then who didn't? The effect of their respect and awe of the Russian and other foreign Communists was to lead them into sectarian errors, and to isolate them from American life from time to time, but other socialists were sectarian too, and in any event, the CP made mighty contributions to the struggle against Jim Crow, to the CIO organizing drives, and so forth.

In a word, the Communist Party and its members and leaders always have been as legitimate a part of the progressive and socialist movements of America as anyone else, and a lot more so than most. Those of them who have managed to see the light and get out of the shrinking, ossifying sect the CP is turning into can still lay claim to participation and even leadership in the socialist and labor movements of the future, not by openly or tacitly repudiating their past and finding new political ground to stand on, but by simply learning a few lessons about where their movement went wrong in this or that detail, and by discovering the new conditions for its reorganization some time in the future.

Such, it would appear, is the message Gates seeks to convey at the present time. The whole conception is a consid-

## Third Force Group Proposes: A Basis for Peace Discussions For Arab and Israeli Socialists

The following communication has been received from the comrades of the Third Force group in Israel. Despite the fact that it appears to have been delayed in the mails for almost two months, we feel that the problem with which it deals is vital, and that the approach adopted by the Third Force warrants the widest publicity and support by socialists all over the world.—Ed.

In connection with the letter of Mr. Leon Szur and Mr. Fenner Brockway (*New Statesman*, November 23, 1957) calling on Jewish and Arab socialists to meet for a discussion of peace between Israel and the Arabs, we beg to state the following:

There are Jews in Israel who are desirous of a just peace with the Arabs. These peace-minded Israelis are not so few as the "national" leaders proclaim them to be, and they are to be found in all classes of the Israeli population. Yet they have not succeeded till now to influence public opinion in Israel in any noticeable measure.

This is due in great measure to the fact that among the Israeli Jews there prevails a belief—which is largely spread and strengthened by Zionist and especially Zionist-Socialist propaganda—that there are no Arabs who would be ready to conclude a reasonable peace with Israel, and that the only difference of opinion noticeable among the Arabs in respect to Israel is that the majority of them strive not only for the destruction of the state of Israel, but also for the annihilation of all Israeli Jews, whereas the other few Arabs are inclined to treat the individual Israeli Jews somewhat more liberally.

The evil consequences of the Israeli-Arab enmity are felt strongly in Israel, and the terrible dangers which threaten the Middle East because of its disunion and weakness become clearer daily. But since a peaceful settlement of the Israeli-Arab conflict appears to be impossible, the public in Israel is drawn to look and hope for a violent solution. We suppose that a similar state of affairs—*mutatis mutandis*—exists in the Arab countries.

It is therefore most important that Is-

erable retreat from the high-point of clarity achieved by many of the Gatesites inside the CP, and many who left it, just a year ago. But then the Hungarian Revolution was crushed, the Polish one began to disintegrate, and Stalin's heirs appeared to be in the process of re-consolidating their regimes. The great social struggles which had carried many in and around the CP to a height of awareness receded, and with them old thought habits tended to re-establish themselves, or at least thinking went no further than the plateau reached then. In the meantime, in the United States no political movement arose or was consolidated which could attract them by its size, weight and social promise into a new life of socialist activity, and with it, a new intellectual life as well.

There is almost no reason to believe that a serious political movement can be created in the United States on Gates' premises. It is most likely that he and his co-thinkers will mark time politically for a while. A new upsurge of the working class either behind the iron curtain or in the capitalist world may give them, or many of them, a further impulse to clarify their ideas and to accept the real kind of break with their past which is a prerequisite to their fruitful participation in the movement of the future.

raeli and Arab sincere socialists should meet and elaborate a common scheme of peace between Israel and the Arab nations, in order that they should be able to put before their respective countrymen a plan of a practical and just solution of the Israeli-Arab conflict.

We therefore beg to submit herewith, in the name of the "Third Force" movement in Israel—a Jewish-Arab organization ideologically opposed to both capitalistic exploitation and totalitarian despotism—that the basic conditions for a just and stable peace between Israel and the Arabs are as follows:

1. Arab recognition of the state of Israel in its boundaries as they are at present or as rectified by mutual agreement.
2. Repatriation of the Arab refugees and payment of adequate compensation to those of them who will refuse to return.
3. Abolition of all discrimination against Arabs in Israel.
4. Return of all Arab property in Israel to its owners and payment of adequate compensation for the use of and any damage caused to the above property by the state or citizens of Israel.
5. Federation of the Middle East controlling foreign policy, defence and common economic interests of the area and participation of Israel in this federation as a member-state with equal rights and obligations.

As to the fear of Zionist expansion, we submit that there will be no place for such fear in a federation as above.

If the above proposal is considered by Arab socialists as a proper basis for discussion of an Israeli-Arab peace, a meeting of Arab and Jewish socialists for the above purpose should take place without delay.

For the Central Committee  
of  
the "Third Force" movement in Israel,  
M. Stein, Chairman  
A. Zichrony, Secretary

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL  
The Marxist review for serious  
students of social issues  
50 cents \$2 a year



A DISCUSSION ARTICLE

# UNION OF THE SOCIALIST LEFT VS. THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF FRANCE

For a number of years Labor Action has urged all left socialists in Europe who do not belong to the mass social democratic parties in their respective countries to join them and function as a loyal left wing within them.

The general considerations which led us to adopt this view has been re-inforced by the events and developments of the past few years. Nevertheless, the formation of a new left socialist political party with a substantial following in France has impelled many socialists to take another look at the problem.

Saul Berg, a specialist on French socialist affairs, discusses his views of the relationship of the new Union of the Socialist Left (UGS) to the Socialist Party of France in the following article. Comrade Berg has been critical of Labor Action's view on this subject for some time. Not everything in his article necessarily represents our point of view, but it is printed as a contribution to a discussion.—ED.

By SAUL BERG

The formation of the Union of the Socialist Left (UGS), reported in the last issue of LABOR ACTION raises the question of the relationship of this organization to the Socialist Party of France. Are the people who have joined together in the UGS simply a group of impatient sectarians who reject the Socialist Party of France (SFIO) as the organized center for democratic socialists in that country for fundamentally sectarian reasons, or are there special features of the SFIO, and of its place in French society, which create a different problem for left socialists in France from that which confronts them in any other country in Europe?

The struggle in Algeria exposes prominently the lengths to which the leadership of the SFIO is willing to go in lining up with the most chauvinist tendencies in their country. In addition to all else, the Socialist deputies have voted for special powers of arbitrary arrest and detention in Metropolitan France! Aside from the stubborn blindness with which they have followed Mollet on their imperialist policy in Algeria, what are the general policies of the SFIO in foreign affairs, and what has its political way of life been at home?

Obviously the broad lines of its approach to political problems are not dissimilar from those of other social democratic parties in Western Europe. In foreign policy it places its basic reliance in the struggle against Stalinism on the military solidarity of the capitalist West through the North Atlantic Pact. This is also the policy of the Social Democracy in Britain, Belgium, Netherlands, Norway, and Denmark. Germany excepted, the European Social-Democrats tend to be for "neutralism" only where their bourgeoisie is (Switzerland, Sweden, etc.).

## Striking Difference

The French Socialist Party practices ministerial coalitionism with a vengeance. While bargaining does take place the bargaining is definitely within the framework of what is "possible." Translated into plain English that means Cabinet participation any time the bourgeois parties don't insist on excluding you. Here again this is consistent with the practise of all the sister parties except the British, to whom the problem of coalition appears differently because of the existence of only two major parties.

What is most striking in differentiating the French from other European Social Democratic parties is the

lack of inner-party resistance to chauvinist policies at a time when these policies lead to such a crisis for the nation that even a wing of bourgeois opinion (the Mendès-France Radicals, Mauriac, Raymond Aron) recoils from them! At the recent Congress 10 per cent of the party voted for a resolution that recognized Algerian national aspirations as necessarily the basis for peace negotiations, while 20 per cent, though criticizing the methods of Mollet-Lacoste's war against the Algerian people, refused to accept Algerian independence as a possibility. This total vote of 30 per cent against Mollet has been misconstrued as increased strength for the left. This misleading conclusion is reached by comparing the vote with the smaller opposition vote of the previous year when Mollet came to the Congress accused of betraying his election platform and disarmed all but the genuinely left wing critics by accepting a resolution very little different from the platform of the moderate opposition of Gaston Deferre this year which garnered only 20 per cent of the votes this time. Actually the situation has deteriorated each year, for just two years ago the party congress was almost unanimously behind a program of electoral alliance with Mendès-France based on a campaign against the Algerian war!

Furthermore even the section of the Party that advocates recognizing the "Algerian national fact" today consists largely of longtime Party leaders whose past record is pro-colonialist but who simply feel that the struggle is hopeless. Such leaders of this group as Robert Verdier, Oreste Rosenfeld, Daniel Mayer, are completely indistinguishable from the Mollet leadership on all political questions except that of the immediate crisis of Algeria. Within this peace faction could be found a genuinely left socialist tendency led by Marceau Pivert and Jean Rous and mustering perhaps 50 per cent of the party.

To what can the smallness of this left be ascribed? First and foremost, of course, to the fact that the French Communist Party has the support of a far greater section of the workingclass than has the French Socialist Party. We could then ask ourselves how this came about, but that would take us too far afield for our present purpose. Suffice it to say that the Bevanites in Britain undoubtedly reflect the opinions of the more militant section of the workingclass, while in France to a great extent these have been channelized into the blind alley of Stalinism. The membership and voting support of the French Communist Party is predominantly workingclass in a country where the workers are a smaller percentage of the population than anywhere else in Western Europe, except possibly Spain and Portugal!

## Social Composition of SP

Here, we come to what is unique about the French Social-Democracy. The overwhelming majority of its members, and well over half of its voters, are not manual workers. They are predominantly civil service, white collar, professional and technical employees, and, in substantial regions of France, small independent peasants. The French have the only large Socialist party in Europe with a majority that is non-proletarian. The French Socialist Party aims much of its efforts at winning away support from the Communist Party, but even in these efforts the methods it uses (unsuccessfully, naturally) are the only methods that would be countenanced by its own petty bourgeois ranks.

Note that I have stated that the composition of the membership is more non-proletarian than the composition of the party's electoral support. This is the result of the strong syndicalist tradition in the French labor movement. The Communist Party engaged almost from the start in disciplined activity within the unions, but the Socialist Party always followed a policy of non-interference. In many of the civil service unions this makes little difference, because although not organized into factions, so many of the leaders of these unions are Socialist party members that the union policy has been, in practice, closely parallel to the policies of the Socialist Party. Force Ouvriere, the "Socialist" trade union federation, is tied to support of governmental policies by the fact that most of its strength is in the civil service. But the bulk of the leaders and members of the industrial affiliates of F.O. are not in the Party, even when they are supporters of the policies of the F.O. leadership. In the factories, therefore, the Socialist Party as an organized force is simply non-existent, except in three departments of the country (Nord, Pas-de-Calais, Haute-Vienne) where its influence in the factories goes back to the time of Jules Guesde.

The Socialist Party's lack of cadres in industry, together with the weakness of its youth movement, has led to developments in the Catholic trade union move-

ment of which no one would have dreamed a dozen years ago. When the CGT, the largest trade union federation in France, split in 1947 because of Stalinist domination and their utilization of the union for the purposes of Russian foreign policy, some of the best workers who left the CGT joined the existing Catholic body, the CFTC, instead of helping to found Force Ouvriere.

## Program of CFTC

They did this because F.O. started out hesitantly and very poorly organized, while the CFTC, originally almost a company union, had by 1947 won its spurs in genuine trade union activity and was a stable solid organization. The militant elements in SFTC, especially in industry, came under the leadership of the "Reconstruction" group, which stood for secular unionism, and was made up to a considerable extent of non-Catholics. At the same time the first generation of trade union and shop leaders formed by the educational activity of J.O.C. (Jeunesse Ouvrier Chrétien—Christian Worker Youth) in the '30's when it was far more successful than the Socialist Youth, who were paralyzed by their constant struggles with the party bureaucracy, moved steadily to the left and away from the limits that the national CFTC leaders wished to impose on them.

The extent which this evolution in the CFTC has reached today is almost incredible. At the recent convention of the CFTC the minority tendency obtained 42 per cent of the vote for its proposals. These included:

1. A rejection of the Catholic idea of trade union pluralism on principle. For trade union unity on a democratic basis.
2. For affiliation to the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions and withdrawal from the International Federation of Christian Trade Unions. (The CFTC Metal Workers Union has already affiliated with the ICFTU's Metal Workers Federation).
3. For a declaration by the union that its aim is the construction of a democratic socialist society.

The minority controls almost all of the CFTC national affiliates in industry, and in industry the CFTC is clearly stronger than Force Ouvriere. However the majority in the CFTC, as in F.O., is based on the strong civil service, white collar and professional unions.

The development of a secular-minded pro-Socialist minority in the CFTC, completely divorced from any connection with or interest in the French Socialist Party, places another handicap on any left wing seeking to transform the Socialist Party. Not only do most industrial workers, unfortunately, support the Communist Party, but the next largest tendency among these workers is inside the CFTC, isolated from the Socialist Party.

## Left Socialist Perspectives

A natural corollary of the growth of a left wing inside the CFTC has been the growth of independent socialist groups of Catholic origin. These groups, which contributed heavily to the unification congress of the UGS last month were described in our report of the congress (LABOR ACTION January 27, 1958). Many of their members are active in the CFTC, though others are in the CGT. The existence of this new party, with an initial membership of 10,000 together with the isolation of the SFIO from the industrial working class raises the question of whether there is any longer any perspective for left socialists within the SFIO.

By leaving the SFIO the left wing could bring additional forces to the UGS. These forces would be important by their experience, and specially by their clarity on the problem of Stalinism, on which so many of the UGS members are still confused. A fusion of the UGS and the SFIO's left wing would be from the start a substantial force, based not on complete doctrinal unity but on agreement on the living issues with which the French working class is today concerned. Such a party would be to socialists in other countries not an encouragement to irresponsible splits but the proof that a perspective will still exist for authentic socialism in situations where social democracy decays to a point where it has lost its proletarian basis in society.

**BOOKS ARE WEAPONS**

The Communist Party at the Crossroads, by H. W. Benson ..... 25

The New Course, & The Struggle for the New Course, by Leon Trotsky and Max Shachtman ..... 1.50

Stalinist Russia, by Tony Cliff ..... 2.00

Is Russia a Socialist Community? Debate between Earl Browder and Max Shachtman ..... .50

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

**LABOR ACTION**  
INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST NEWSPAPER  
114 West 14 Street  
New York 11, New York

Please enter my subscription:

1 year at \$2.  New

6 months at \$1.  Renewal

Payment enclosed.  Bill me.

NAME (please print) .....

ADDRESS .....

CITY .....

ZONE STATE .....



# Senator Humphrey's Plan --

(Continued from page 1)

the fear that these tests are a present danger to all of mankind.

## NOTHING INHERENT

There is nothing inherent in the nature of American capitalism or of Russian Communism which prevents an agreement on this question. Since it appears probable that both sides are now equipped with extremely powerful fission and fusion bombs in large numbers and in weights and sizes which can conveniently be brought to their targets by ICBMs, IRBMs, airplanes, or in fair-sized steamer trunks, it does not appear that there is any compelling reason even in the insane logic of militarism against an ending of these tests. There is every reason for socialists to initiate, or to back and support every legitimate campaign on the suspension or ending of nuclear tests.

Once one passes beyond this simple demand, however, the situation becomes immediately complicated by the problems discussed in the previous issue of LABOR ACTION. Each program put forward proves, on inspection, to be conceived either as the basis for a practical deal between the two power blocs, or as a means of conducting political warfare.

To be sure, these two aims are not mutually exclusive, and in a sense are bound to inter-penetrate each other. But the general approach in each case is pretty clear.

Bulganan's latest letter is a case in point. It is a brilliant political document. It does not denounce the United States as imperialist, nor does it dwell heavily on "war-mongering circles," and the like. Rather it is couched in terms of a reasonable appeal to good-will and common sense. And while many of its assertions and assumptions can be easily challenged in the context of a polemic, its key proposals are bound to tend to weaken the NATO alliance and to gain the political support of millions of people all over the world. Their effectiveness is enhanced, or even created, precisely by their apparent reasonableness as partial, compromise proposals in a general "disengagement."

Senator Humphrey's proposal that the United States government split up its "package" approach to negotiations and indicate a willingness to negotiate on individual portions of it separately is not a novel idea among Democratic leaders. Suggestions along these lines have been made from time to time by others, but usually they have been rather vague, and

in any event, were not able to gather sufficient support to become a serious political alternative to the government's line. If the constant pounding of the Russians, of voices among America's allies, and of events themselves have finally produced a real movement for the development of an alternative approach, that is all to the good.

## ALL TO THE GOOD

It is all to the good more because it can raise the debate on foreign policy to a higher level than because of the real possibilities inherent in Humphrey's proposals, in their present form at least. Of course, if they could force the administration to negotiate an end to nuclear tests, that would be excellent. But this demand, as we have pointed out above, is uniquely separable from all

other aspects of a real political offensive.

Beyond that, however, the problem of developing an approach and working out a program based on it would still remain. On the one hand stands Dulles and all that he represents with his big, interconnected package which is designed to stall negotiations until the United States clearly forges ahead in the arms race. On the other hand stand those who are anxious for a deal, starting with small things and ending up with a mutual guarantee by both sides of the Stalinization of Eastern Europe. The real interests of democracy and peace, however, require an approach which seeks reduction of armaments and political disengagement as a means of releasing and encouraging the peoples of the world to struggle for democratic solutions to their own problems.

# "Subversive List" --

(Continued from page 1)

characterization on the witness stand of the aims and purposes of the organizations was pure fabrication.\*

Burnham conceded that he had talked to the representatives of the FBI concerning the organizations and concerning the question of whether or not Mr. Shachtman and the organizations advocated the overthrow of the Government. When counsel for the organizations attempted to elicit the contents of these statements to the FBI, a heated colloquy ensued wherein attorneys for the Government pleaded at length with the Hearing Officer not to permit any examination concerning Burnham's statements to the FBI (Tr. 2906-2917). Finally, the Hearing Officer ruled that Burnham could be asked one question concerning these statements (Tr. 2912, 2918). Burnham gave an equivocal answer to that question (Tr. 2921) and counsel for the organizations was then denied opportunity to ask the witness in

simple terms what in fact he had reported to the FBI concerning the organizations and Max Shachtman (Tr. 2921-2924, 2927). But this was not the only denial of the opportunity of impeachment. The Hearing Officer subsequently relented in part and permitted counsel for the organizations to ask Burnham certain further questions concerning his statements to the FBI and thereupon, at the suggestion of the Government in open hearing that Burnham was not under subpoena and could not be compelled to answer (Tr. 2924-2925), Burnham flatly refused to answer any further questions concerning those statements although the Hearing Officer ruled the questions pertinent (Tr. 2925-2932).

On this record there can be no doubt that fundamental due process was denied the organizations, in clear violation of the recent ruling of the Court of Appeals applying the Jencks rule to administrative proceedings. The organizations were denied opportunity to impeach witness Burnham in the manner most directly probative—by eliciting the contents of his previous reports to the FBI on a subject which was the very heart and essence of Burnham's testimony.

It is shocking enough that the Government could produce nothing better against the organizations so long and so unfairly listed than this single witness who conceded that the organizations never overtly advocated the overthrow of the Government, but went on to smear them through devious imputations of bad motive based on nothing better than a few weeks' membership 17 years ago. But it is absolutely indefensible that the Government should rest its case against the organizations on this witness, who provided just the evidence the Government sought and then suggest to the witness that he hide behind nonexistent confidentiality of FBI reports and the absence of any power in the Hearing Officer to subject him to adequate cross-examination.

In view of the clear violation of the due process rights of the organizations at the hearing in the denial of opportunity to impeach witness Burnham and in order to preserve the rights of the organizations to redress in the courts, the organizations request, in the event you should determine to retain them on the list, that you specifically state in your determination whether or not your findings are based in any measure whatever upon the testimony of James Burnham.

We repeat our request for oral argument.

Sincerely yours,  
Joseph L. Rauh, Jr.  
Isaac N. Groner

# ISL Fund Drive --

(Continued from page 1)

a hearing from the attorney general. It is now over ten years since the Organizations were arbitrarily placed on the "subversive list." In 1955 the present hearing was begun and we have yet to get a decision from the attorney general.

Legal expenses in the administrative hearings which are only now nearly completed have been substantial. But now we have to prepare for the eventuality of a long court struggle, and the costs will become even greater. The Workers Defense League, which is sponsoring the case, has contributed greatly to its costs. But once again the ISL will have to carry a heavy part of the burden.

Even the printing of a special 4 page supplement such as appeared in the last issue of LA is costly. However, we feel that such extra costs are justified. The extensive documentation of the case which LABOR ACTION has carried over the past ten years is the only public documentation of the type of administrative injustices suffered by the Organizations and its members at the hands of the Department of Justice under both the Truman and Eisenhower administrations. And we intend to continue to publish such documentation in the future.

This case, even if it has to be carried up to the Supreme Court will be of the greatest significance in the fight for the

preservation of democratic rights for all Americans. There can be no question but that this case will be fought to a successful completion, and the iniquitous attorney general's list will be abolished along with the arbitrary power to penalization by such a list.

But this will be a costly fight, and the only way it can continue, along with our press, is through the generous contributions of our readers, friends and sympathizers to the 1958 fund drive. We know that we can count on your support as has been the experience of the past.

Below is a list of quotas for the branches and areas. All contributions should be made to Albert Gates, 114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N.Y.

New York	\$3800
Chicago	2000
National Office	1150
Los Angeles	650
Bay Area	500
Detroit	450
Newark	450
Philadelphia	200
Pittsburgh	175
Buffalo	150
Cleveland	150
Seattle	150
Oregon	50
Reading	50
Streator	25
Mass.	25
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$10,000</b>

**A Public Symposium**  
**THE MODERN CITY**  
**FACES THE NUCLEAR CRISIS**

hear the  
**Socialist Mayors of Five Major World Cities**

**WEST BERLIN**—Mayor Willy Brandt  
**VIENNA**—Mayor Franz Jonas  
**MILWAUKEE**—Mayor Frank P. Zeidler  
**HAMBURG**—Mayor Max Brauer  
**FRANKFORT**—Mayor Werner Bockelmann

and  
**NORMAN THOMAS**

at  
**COMMUNITY CHURCH**  
40 East 35 Street, New York N. Y.  
**FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1958**  
8:00 P.M. Admission 50 cents  
(Students will be admitted free.)

Auspices  
**New York Socialist Party-**  
**Social Democratic Federation**

**New York**  
**Independent Socialist Forum**

**A Democratic Socialist Evaluation of:**

**Friday, February 14**  
**Isaac Deutscher**  
Speaker: Michael Harrington

**Friday, February 21**  
**Milovan Djilas**  
Speaker: Albert Gates

**Friday, February 28**  
**Amer. Socialist Monthly Review, etc.**  
Speaker: to be announced

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

**CONTRIBUTE TO THE ISL FUND DRIVE**

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

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

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

CITY .....

STATE .....

(Make checks out to Albert Gates)

**CHICAGO DEMOCRATIC SOCIALIST FORUM**

**Friday, February 28** **8:00 p.m.**

**NORMAN THOMAS**  
and  
**MAX SHACHTMAN**

**What Program for Democratic Socialists?**

32 West Randolph St.