

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JANUARY 21, 1957

FIVE CENTS

Mass Treason Trial Staged For "Apartheid" Opponents

By CYNTHIA SPEARE

As the bombs and bullets of racists wrack our awakening Southland, while black-skinned bodies lie strewn in streets of Port Said, another great crime is being perpetrated in the community of Johannesburg, South Africa.

This crime is clothed in the name of "justice." One hundred and fifty-six men and women are standing trial on the charge of treason—for in South Africa, the mere advocacy of racial equality is equivalent to "treason!"

This atrocity began in the month of December, when one hundred and fifty-three educators, clergymen, writers, and labor and political leaders were arrested in pre-dawn raids. They were whisked away—some even from hospital beds, and notwithstanding the abandonment of infants and children—to waiting planes by police, while their homes were ransacked and personal documents seized.

The sole charge against these people was that they had been among 4,000 delegates to a Congress of the People in June, 1955, which had proclaimed a ringing Charter of Freedom, proposing the abolition of Apartheid (racial segregation), and popular control of industry, banks, and other socially necessary services. This charter has been construed by the prosecution as a call for violence and subversion, constituting treason—a crime punishable by death under South African law.

Among the defendants are Alan Paton, noted author of *Cry, The Beloved Country*; Prof. Z. K. Matthews, principal of Fort Hare University for Africans; Mrs. Marion Bunting, editor of *New Age*; Leslie Messina, secretary of the South

African Congress of Trade Unions, and many other intellectuals and libertarians of international repute.

On the first day of preliminary hearings, the courtroom was stormed by Africans who stood six deep around the doors and hung at the windows. In the streets, police dispersed crowds with clubs and tear gas, finally opening fire with Sten guns, injuring over two dozen demonstrators!

The stage for wholesale repression of resistance to enslavement was set in this nation of eleven million Negroes and two million whites, shortly after the close of the Second World War, under the Malan regime, which proclaimed that it would "under no circumstances entertain the idea of giving administrative or executive or legislative powers over Europeans to non-whites." It then proceeded to inaugurate a system of taxation favoring or totally excluding whites, and placing the heaviest levies upon the native population; it declared support of the South Africa Act of 1910, decreeing that all members of Parliament must be of European descent, and barring Africans from voting (with the exception of the Cape, where the franchise was granted to a handful of non-whites able to meet rigid property qualifications).

The enforcement of this political policy climaxed a whole series of legislation designed by Boer and British invaders in the 1910's, to subjugate the African people to economic servility. Such innocuous statutes as the Native Land Act, has rendered Africans propertyless, inducing cheap migratory farm labor, and providing reserves of catch-penny min-

(Continued on page 6)

"I WANTED FREEDOM"

Interview With Two Participants In The Hungarian Revolution

... page 3

Report on Italian CP Congress

... page 6

ISL Case Against the "Subversive List"

... page 7

Eden's Fall Helps Labor's Left Wing

... page 2

TIME IS RUNNING OUT

The Kadar puppet regime in Hungary is moving toward full-scale counter-revolutionary terror in a desperate attempt to finally crush the resistance of the Hungarian people to its rule.

This was made clear when the regime announced a whole new series of "crimes" for which the death penalty can be meted out by its summary courts. The new decree prescribes the death penalty for the "crime" of damaging or conspiring to damage public utilities or other plants declared indispensable by the government. All establishments hiring over 100 workers are considered "indispensable." Such acts as illegal intrusion, loitering, or any other action which interferes with work in such plants, or inciting others to "damage" plants in this way fall within the meaning of the decree. It also includes such crimes as conspiracy or revolt against the government.

Wide-scale arrests of present or former leaders of Workers Councils continue to be announced from Budapest. The decrees do not apply only to acts committed since they were promulgated, but have been extended retroactively to acts committed in earlier stages of the revolution. Thus the Kadar regime is going back on the promises of leniency and amnesty with which it sought to induce the workers to cease active opposition to it at an earlier stage.

Reports from Hungary indicate that although active mass resistance appears to be on the wane, workers in one plant after another go on strike and demonstrate against the terror, so that the reorganized storm troopers of the regime, backed by Russian tanks, have to be called out to quell "disturbances."

A bitter joke is going the rounds in Budapest. "Only two forms of intervention can help Hungary," they say, "one natural, the other miraculous. The natural thing would be that god would help us, the miracle that we would be helped by the United Nations."

It would appear that they are not far from wrong. An additional "intervention" could help them: support from the labor and socialist movements of Europe and the rest of the world. So far it can be said that the Hungarian revolution has done far more to help these movements than they have done to help it. Time in which this imbalance can be redressed is rapidly running out.

Aftermath of the Elections

The Struggle for Democratic Party Control

By SAM TAYLOR

The attempt of Northern and Western Democrats to set up a National Advisory Committee through which they would have a co-equal, if not decisive voice in the running of their party as opposed to the conservative Congressional leadership has finally come to the middle of the road—a meaningless compromise between Senator Lyndon Johnson and the liberal leadership.

The National Advisory Committee is being quietly buried beneath the accolade of compromise and public assurances that the differences of last week and last month were merely "misinterpretations" between two groups united in a common outlook.

The dispute which developed is a dim shadow of the real differences in interests that exist between sections of the Democratic Party. The Northern labor section, the most progressive group in the American party structure, and the

Southern section, containing some of the most reactionary elements in American politics.

While the opulence of American capitalism provides a solvent for a great many of the social conflicts in this country, it cannot move fast enough or far enough to blunt the pressure of the Negro people for full equality.

Therefore it is on the civil rights question that the dispute breaks out in its sharpest form. But the differences are wider and more fundamental than civil rights, for they line up in opposition to the conservative Lyndon Johnson-Sam Rayburn bloc (the Texas Twins), far more diverse elements than those who are being pressured to move on civil rights.

After the November election, the dispute broke out over leadership of the Democratic Party. Stevenson's defeat and the election of a Democratic Congress in the face of the lopsided Eisen-

hower majority was all that was necessary for Lyndon Johnson to put forth his claim. Adlai Stevenson was more or less eliminated since it is extremely unlikely that he will be nominated for a third time.

Three days after the election, Senator Johnson held a press conference in which he stated that he was glad that the people had endorsed his policy of "responsible opposition" by reelecting a Democratic Congress. "We are a good and reasonable group of men working for the good of the country without parties, labels or cliques."

When asked whether the Democrats would offer a legislative program of their own Johnson replied, "No, we'll wait for the president. We'll support him when he's right and oppose him when he's wrong."

Senator Johnson's press conference was almost a direct answer to the opening gun of the Northern liberal attack

on his congressional leadership. The day before Johnson's meeting with the press, Senator John Kennedy in a speech in Worcester, Mass., blamed the loss of many votes on the compromises on civil rights, and forecast continuing and increasing bitterness between the Northern and Southern wings of the Democratic Party in the coming session of Congress.

The struggle for party leadership seemed to have been joined. Senator Johnson privately circulated a memorandum analyzing the election in which he claimed that the 1954 and 1956 Congressional elections vindicated his approach, while the Adlai Stevenson method of campaigning had been tried twice and it failed. Stevenson's campaign tactics were described as "the endless search for partisan 'issues' and an effort to find grounds on which to oppose the Republican Party."

The Johnson-Rayburn concept of lead-

(Turn to last page)

LONDON LETTER

Eden's Fall Helps Labor Party Left Wing

By OWEN ROBERTS

London, Jan. 11

It took Sir Anthony Eden thirty-two years to climb the tough and twisting path which ultimately led him to Number Ten Downing Street and the job of British Prime Minister. Having made the ascent he managed to stay perched on his lofty pinnacle for exactly 645 days—and then came the swift drop into political obscurity and the crashing penalty of failure. Officially Eden's resignation was on health grounds, and four doctors provided the high worded medical excuse for his action. But, ill though Eden may be, everybody in Britain knows that the medical certificates were but another piece of paper to cover up the cracks in the Tory Party and that in reality Eden was pushed over the precipice of resignation during the scuffle which has been ruffling the hair of members of the Tory Cabinet for many months past.

LINE UP OF FACTIONS

The line-up of the opposing factions within the Tory Camp were reported in LABOR ACTION last October together with an outline of their attitudes. On one side, in a pro-Eden faction, there was ranged Harold Macmillan, then chancellor of the exchequer; Lord Salisbury, Tory leader of the House of Lords; and Selwyn Lloyd, the foreign secretary. On the opposite side, in an anti-Eden faction, stood R. A. Butler, chancellor of the exchequer from 1951 till 1955, Sir Walter Monckton, minister of defense; Peter Thorneycroft, president of the Board of Trade, and several others.

The pro-Eden faction favored a strong line against Egypt over the Suez Canal problem and generally supported the tougher economic policies introduced by Macmillan after he took over the job of chancellor of the exchequer from Butler. The anti-Eden faction were in favor of an easier policy on Suez—primarily because of the economic repercussions of a tough line—and were generally in opposition to the economic policies followed by Macmillan and supported by the pro-Eden faction.

It was the clash between these two opposing groups, coupled with its echoes throughout the Tory Party, which finally led to Eden's resignation. The medical worries about his bile duct were a secondary factor to the political worries about biliousness of his Cabinet colleagues.

Although the choice of a new prime minister is, in British constitutional language, a royal prerogative, the sovereign only makes a choice after consultations with politicians—and then chooses a man who can command a majority in the House of Commons. The choice of Harold Macmillan as the new prime minister, coupled with the politicians chosen by the Queen for consultation, indicate that Eden was kicked out by his own faction. He was axed by his own supporters in the Cabinet because, at the critical moment in the Suez war, he went soft and pulled out the British forces from Egypt.

CHURCHILL AND SALISBURY

Two men were called to Buckingham Palace for consultation before the Queen selected the new prime minister. One was Sir Winston Churchill, now only an ordinary Tory back bench member of Parliament, and the other was Lord Salisbury. There is little doubt that it was

Salisbury who decided on Eden's successor. This belief is strengthened by the fact that on Monday, three days before the announcement of Eden's resignation and before the doctors had even made their diagnosis which provided the official excuse for Eden's quitting, Lord Salisbury went down to Sandringham and paid a visit to the Queen. Ever since the days of Elizabeth the First, when the first earl of Salisbury acted as adviser to the sovereign, the head of the Cecil family has made and broke British politicians. The present Lord Salisbury, and head of the Cecil family, is proving no exception to that rule.

Lord Salisbury, as a member of the pro-Eden faction, plumped for Macmillan because he is the man in the Cabinet prepared to carry on where Eden left off after his feet got cold. Butler, who had taken over Eden's job as prime minister while the latter holidayed in Jamaica, was passed over because he was too soft and because the hard core of the "Suez Group" of the Tory Party (who favor an extreme imperialistic line in the Middle East) had indicated that Butler would be completely unacceptable to them as a prime minister. Thus the pro-Eden faction within the Cabinet have secured a victory at the expense of Eden himself.

Macmillan has yet to form his new cabinet, and when he does its composition will reveal just how deep the present cleavage within the Tory Party goes. If Butler, and some of his more prominent followers, are handed out responsible government posts it can be taken to indicate that the rift is now narrowing and Macmillan hopes that it can be patched up. If, on the other hand, Macmillan cold-shoulders Butler and his associates, and either gives them no posts or only minor ones, it would seem to indicate that the division is deep and it is only a matter of time before further upsets occur. But, whatever the composition of Macmillan's Cabinet, there will certainly be no change of course in the government's policies as a whole. Macmillan has been installed precisely because he will continue to steer the same course—only with more determination and courage than that shown by the ex-captain Eden who has been pushed overboard because his hand became unsteady when the call to battle stations was sounded by the Tory right-wing.

MIDDLE CLASS SUPPORT

Although Macmillan will be able to carry with him the right-wing Tory members of Parliament there is little doubt that his elevation to the job of prime minister will further antagonize the middle class supporters of the Tory Party who, while perhaps not playing an active part within the Party itself, are an extremely important part of its voting strength at election times. As previous despatches from London have indicated, the middle class supporters of the Tory Party have been growing more and more antagonistic to the policies pursued by the government during the past twelve months or so. Macmillan, as chancellor of the exchequer during this period, is considered by many middle class Tory supporters to be the man primarily responsible for the economic policies which have caused them so much discomfort in contrast to the easier time they had during the four years when Butler was in charge of the Treasury. Now that Macmillan is prime minister

the disgruntled members of the middle class will be even more inclined to withdraw support from the Tory Party, on a temporary basis as a mark of discontent with current economic policies.

This factor will undoubtedly influence, and probably has already done so, Tory thoughts about a general election. Almost as soon as he was installed as prime minister, Macmillan told reporters that there would be no general election. He added that, if there were an election, the Tories would win it; but in saying this he must have been aware that he was making a statement which ranked only second to the statement that Eden resigned because of poor health. The plain fact is that almost everybody in Britain now believes that a general election should be held as soon as possible. Even the Tory rank and filers express such an opinion in the belief that their Party would come out tops. But the decision rests with the government—and they are more realistic than their supporters outside of Parliament and realize that were any election to be held in the near future the Labor Party would be swept back into office.

LABOR'S CHANCE

But, although the final decision on the date of a general election rests ultimately with the government, public opinion can do a great deal to influence such a decision. This is particularly true at this moment of time when Macmillan will be doing all he can to restore confidence in the British government in the eyes of the remainder of the world—something he cannot do if a large section of the British public itself is loudly de-

manding a chance to choose a new government.

Before the Labor Party within the next few months there stands the job of building up a mass feeling against the government and constantly pushing forward the demand for a general election. The signs are that the Labor Party intends to do just this—as evidenced by demands for a general election by Party Leader Hugh Gaitskell, Deputy Leader Jim Griffiths, and the vice chairman of the National Executive, Tom Driberg, all within a few hours after Eden's resignation was made public. Every member of Eden's government, the Labor spokesmen have said, bear equal responsibility for events of the past year—therefore they must all follow Eden's example and get out.

Whether the Labor Party can put on sufficient pressure to force a general election is open to speculation. But even if it cannot the campaign it wages will help to strengthen the Labor Party itself and to increase the militant feeling which has been developing within the Party in recent months. At such times, when the Party is on the attack, the situation within the Party always swings in favor of the left-wing and the attitude of the Party as a whole invariably shifts over several degrees to the left.

With the Tory government at sixes and sevens and losing an important section of its supporters; with the demand for a general election growing among the public and the prospect of big anti-Tory campaigns by the Labor Party, the wind seems set fair for Britain's Labor left wing.

In the Middle of Prosperity The Economic Squeeze Continues

By JACK WILSON

In all the dazzling economic forecasts for the year 1957, there is a tendency either to overlook or else to underplay the real story of convulsions and costs that occur in this period of so-called prosperity.

It may be surprising, for example, to learn that even if the auto industry achieves its 1957 goals, the state of Michigan will still have an average of 170,000 unemployed workers for the year. If the industry doesn't quite make it—and its figures usually are too optimistic, as we pointed out last week—Michigan faces the prospect of an average of 200,000 unemployed workers in what is being called the greatest year in American economy.

The prediction of high unemployment in Michigan came from the annual report of Max Horton, director of the Michigan Employment Security Commission, and is based on estimates turned in by over 2200 Michigan employers.

This signifies that large areas of Michigan will be "distressed labor areas" all year. Manufacturing employment in Michigan averages around 1,074,000 compared to its peak of 1,220,000 in 1953.

While detailed statistics aren't available on another aspect of the true state of the economy, the many empty factories in the Detroit area testify to the trend that the N. Y. Times reports on January 2 under the head, "Small Business Has Big Troubles."

Hundreds of small vendors and auto-parts suppliers have been forced out of business. Two car manufacturers will be lucky if they last out the year: American Motors and Studebaker-Packard. Either Chrysler gets back into the Big Three (it is there by courtesy only now) or else it is in serious trouble.

What this means in employment is shown by the fact that auto workers now number an average of 640,000 yearly, compared to 850,000 in 1953. The social cost and hardship in this process of squeezing out the small manufacturer hardly needs elaborating.

The apprehension felt was put by Prof. Harold D. Wess, a marketing expert: "If and when small business disappears from our midst, then our free-

enterprise system will be no more. I use 'when' because I fear that unless appropriate action is taken, it is possible that small business will no longer be present...keeping our economic system healthy and dynamic."

Since the auto industry, as an example, has shrunk from 150 separate manufacturers of 50 years ago to five today—and soon to three—it can be stated with confidence that this important sector of American capitalism is doing its part as a gravedigger of "free enterprise."

In this swiftly changing economic picture, the limitations of trade-unionism as such to cope with the problems becomes increasingly apparent, and painfully so to the workers. For the additional cost of the impact of automation is bound to accelerate the fundamental process of concentration of wealth and development of monopoly in industry. Only General Motors, Ford and to some extent Chrysler can afford the cost of automation which is necessary for them to survive.

How this works out has already been illustrated in another industry and its union.

In 1947, average employment in the coal-mining industry was 419,000, and the average miner produced 6.42 tons of coal a day. Today employment is around 225,000 and the production per man per ton of coal a day is 10.5. In terms of this fabulous increase in productivity, the gains of the coal-miners union seem picayune indeed, especially when one remembers that half of the coal miners are permanently unemployed, or displaced, and don't share in the gains.

This trend doesn't show up as clearly and quickly in the auto industry, nor affect the UAW as forcibly, since automation is just beginning to make its impact felt and it is cushioned by defense orders.

As for the UAW, most of its membership is non-automotive now, with aircraft increasingly dominant in the overall picture. Michigan, as the automotive center, does however feel this trend, as the unemployment figures show. Thus the UAW in Michigan continues more or less along its traditional lines, while elsewhere it resembles more the rest of the labor movement.

Labor Action FORUM • New York City

Thursday, January 24.

Impact of the Hungarian Revolution On the Independent Left

Julius Falk

Managing Editor, the New International

Thursday, January 31

Eight Years of the Arab-Israel Conflict

Dr. Don Peretz

of the Foreign Relations Department,
American Jewish Committee

Labor Action Hall

114 West 14th Street, 3rd Floor — 8:30 p.m.

Interview With Two Participants In the Hungarian Revolution

"I WANTED FREEDOM"

By ROSZA PIROS

Vienna, Dec. 31

These past several days we have been interviewing Hungarian refugees who recently fled here from the Russian repression in their own country. All the refugees interviewed were agreed on the following points regarding the Hungarian Revolution.

(1) The revolution was triggered off by demonstrations of students who were joined by workers.

(2) The revolution merged the social-revolutionary and national-independence aspirations. The revolutionary aspect was evidenced by the workers who seized power in the factories through the workers' councils, which were composed of elected representatives from the industrial, office and technical workers for each factory. The struggle for national independence against Russian domination united almost the entire Hungarian people, including the Hungarian army, the Communist youth, and former conservative and reactionary elements as well as the workers, students and peasants.

(3) Contrary to the Communist newspaper reports the dominating forces of the revolution were not the former Horthy reactionaries or fascists but the students and workers.

FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY

(4) The Hungarian people did not wish to replace the Russian dictatorship with a reactionary Horthy or fascist regime; they desired freedom and democracy independent of both West and East blocs.

Some firsthand impressions of the Hungarian revolution can be gained from a couple of interviews which we give below from our notes. We cannot give the names but the first, Mr. X, was a young engineering student, and the second, Miss Y, was a worker in a heavy-industry plant, both in Budapest.

Q—Where did you study in Budapest?
A—I was a student at the Budapest Technical Institute.

Q—Did you take part in the October revolution?

A—Yes; in fact, the students at the Technical Institute started the first demonstration on Oct. 23.

Q—Could you tell us exactly what happened on Oct. 23?

A—The Technical Institute students, soon joined by other students, marched silently to the Bem and Petofi statues which commemorate the heroes of the Hungarian Revolution of 1848. We were joined by the workers as the factories let out. The students and workers together marched to the Parliament, where the silence was broken by the crowd shouting for more freedom and for Imre Nagy as prime minister. A government minister

This account from Vienna is sent by a friend of ours who is now traveling in Europe. She is a Hungarian-American who conducted the conversations with the Hungarian refugees in their own language.—ED

made a speech which did not quiet the crowd. Then Imre Nagy spoke to us, but he did not satisfy the crowd either, for he told us to go home and everything will be all right. The crowd wanted more than that, but it did disband.

IT WAS CHAOS

Q—What was the most unforgettable aspect of the revolution to you personally?

A—The demonstration the next day by the students and workers in front of Parliament. I will never forget it. We were waving the Hungarian tricolors and yelling our demands when suddenly machine guns opened fire on the crowd from the top of the Agricultural Ministry building. The man next to me was killed. I ran for shelter and so did everyone else. It was chaos. I found a place to hide from the shooting in a doorway. Then the four Russian tanks which were sitting in the square joined the Hungarian Revolution; they hoisted the Hungarian tricolors over the tanks and turned their heavy guns on the Hungarian secret police in the Agricultural Ministry building. Many people were killed in the battle, perhaps 600. I finally made it home safely when the shooting quieted down.

Q—Why do you think the Hungarians revolted?

A—We wanted freedom.

Q—What social system did the Hungarian people want?

A—The revolution included almost the entire Hungarian people of different political beliefs, radical and reactionary. The workers and students were dominant, and it is certain that the Hungarian people would never go back to capitalism.

TALK WITH A WORKER

Q—What kind of job did you have in Budapest?

A—I was a worker, for the past several years, in the—plant, a heavy-industry factory.

Q—Were you a member of a trade union?

A—I was a member of the Iron and Steel Workers Union.

Q—What did the union do for the workers in your plant?

A—Although it was voluntary, most workers belonged to the union. Union membership entitled us to free transportation in Budapest and to cheap vacations. The union also worked to improve the safety and health conditions in the plant. It could not do too much for us, however, for it was dominated by the Communist party and the state. We could not strike.

Q—Would you tell us what happened on Oct. 23 in Budapest?

A—First, I must say that conditions for several months prior to October had been improving. In fact, the government had even issued some passports for travel to the West. It was this relaxation that made possible the demonstrations which started the revolution. When I got off my shift the students had already been joined by many workers and were demonstrating in front of the Parliament, waving the red, white and green banners without the red star. This demonstration was obviously spontaneous, unlike the May Day parades which were compulsory for us. The demonstrations continued the next day. When the shooting began, the revolution was really on. I don't know who fired the first shot.

Q—Who led the revolution?

A—There was no leaders; it was spontaneous.

ALL BACKED REVOLT

Q—Who supported the revolution?

A—All Hungarians except the secret police. The workers and young people were most active.

Q—What did the Hungarian army do?

A—Initially the soldiers were not permitted outside their military posts. However, they smuggled out weapons and ammunition to the people. Later the army joined the people.

Q—What part did Cardinal Mindszenty play in the revolution?

A—A minor one that was overplayed by the press.

Q—Do you think that the cardinal would have become active in Hungarian politics, perhaps a prime minister?

A—No, never. The Hungarian people would not accept him or any other cardinal as prime minister. He is a poor politician, anyway. The Hungarian people were almost unanimous in wanting Imre Nagy as prime minister; he is beloved by the people.

Q—What part did the old Horthy-Esterhaszy conservative and reactionary elements play in the revolution?

A—Many of this group left Hungary between 1946 and 1948 when the Russians permitted some emigration to Western Europe. Those who remained had no power and there was no evidence that they were important in the revolution.

WORKERS COUNCILS

Q—What type of social system did the Hungarian people want?

A—The people hated the Russian dictatorship, which had reduced them to a standard of living lower than before World War II, but they did not want to replace it with Western capitalism. In each factory workers' councils were formed. These councils included representatives from the factory workers, the office workers and the technical workers. The workers' councils fired all management officials who did not sympathize with the revolution. In many cases the management went with the revolution. The workers wanted to operate the factories through their councils under public ownership. The people also wanted to be able to have tiny private shops which could employ perhaps three or four persons. The people wanted freedom and democracy, not Communism or capitalism. They did not want to go back to the Horthy regime.

Q—What was it like during the days when the revolutionists were in control? [Just before Nov. 4.—Ed.]

A—People worked very hard and will-

ingly. They felt that it was a miracle that the Russians were leaving.

Q—Why didn't the people give up their arms as Imre Nagy and the government requested?

A—The people love Nagy but would not give up their weapons until the Russians were out of Hungary.

DID RUSSIANS JOIN?

Q—Do you know if any Russian soldiers joined the revolution?

A—Yes. It is definitely true that Russian soldiers joined us. The Russian army has a real demoralization problem. Some Russian soldiers had been told that they had come to fight fascists in Berlin while others thought it was Egypt. They soon learned it was a people's revolution. It was easy to speak with them, for most of us young people had been forced to learn Russian. Many of the Russian soldiers were friendly to us, and many of us gave them bread which they needed badly. You might be interested in two incidents concerning the Russians. One: My stepbrother met some Russian officers in the public baths and he spoke Russian with them. They told him that the conditions in Russia were worse than in Hungary and the Russian people would revolt if they got a chance. Two: A friend of mine saw a Russian soldier shot right on the spot for talking with a Hungarian boy. The Russian officer who shot the soldier was immediately killed by the gunfire from a Russian tank which was standing nearby. The Russian tank joined the freedom fighters.

Q—Did the Hungarians want or expect any outside help after the Russian siege of Nov. 4?

A—The Hungarians definitely wanted aid, including military assistance, but we did not really expect much.

I SHALL NEVER FORGET

Q—Did you participate in the women's demonstration to the grave of the Unknown Soldier?

A—Yes. It was a magnificent thing to behold; I shall never forget it. Thousands of women silently paraded right in front of Russian armored cars. One of the armored cars blocked off a street on our route, so I acted as a guide giving directions to the demonstrators to go around the block.

Q—What do you think will happen in Hungary now?

A—I don't know, but the Russians must leave or Hungary will be completely destroyed.

Q—Do you believe the Hungarians could have achieved their goals peacefully?

A—I don't know.

Q—Do you believe the bloodshed was worth it?

A—Yes. Our courageous revolution has shown the whole world what Communism is, and we have stopped it. Communist Party members everywhere must now know what Communism is.

Q—What do you think of Kadar?

A—Kadar is a broken man and a tool of the Russians.

Q—Would you tell us why you personally decided to leave your home in Budapest?

A—I wanted freedom. I did not want to fear that when the doorbell rang it might be the secret police. Many young people were deported to Russia. Some were just taken out of food queues and taken away. I know of one boy who died on the way to Russia. I was afraid that if I made an error in my work they would say it was on purpose and deport me.

NEW YORK SPECIAL EVENT

HUNGARY:

THE REVOLUTION AND THE AFTERMATH

Speakers

ANNA KETHLY

Norman Thomas
William Kemsley

Leon Dennen
Dr. Harry W. Laidler

Community Church (35th St. and Park Ave.)

Friday, January 25th — 8:00 P.M. — 50¢

Sponsors: Socialist Party; Social Democratic Federation; League for Industrial Democracy; Workers Defense League; Post War World Council

THE FIGHT FOR SOCIALISM

by

Max Shachtman

*A basic primer on the ideas
of Independent Socialism!*

\$1.00

Cloth \$2.00

Labor Action Book Service
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

Statement by a Minority of the
Jewish Labor Bund in Israel
On the Government's War on Egypt

The Road We Must Take

By J. ARTUSKY

The majority of the Bund in Israel has decided to solidarize itself with the *fait accompli* of the military action against Egypt. I believe this position to be incorrect (and I represent the minority opinion of the National Committee). It is especially incorrect now, after the military victory, when a "sobering" process has set in among the people. They now begin to see the dark sides of the "victory" and the great damage it has brought to Israel.

That the Arab countries threaten the existence of Israel, that the danger is especially sharpened by the Czech-Egyptian arms agreement, is and was well known to the government of Ben-Gurion. In the past year a sharp debate has been raging on how Israel should react to this danger.

HERUT ISOLATED

The Herut party, which always stood for "preventive war," was isolated for a long time. In the course of the last year it was joined by the General Zionists [the conservative bourgeois party] and by Achdut Avodah [the split off from Mapam].

Until the last minute the Ben-Gurion government fought against this position. It favored not a preventive war but a strengthening of its defenses... Ben-Gurion declared... all impetuous advices for a preventive war... are criminal. A war that is not forced on us by others will not solve any of our problems even if it should end in a victory for us...

The day before the action, Mapam, which is a government party, came out against it. True, the next day when war became a fact, Mapam changed its position and took its place on the side of the military action. But the fact that until a few hours before the action Mapam opposed it, shows how much truth there is in the propaganda that "We had no choice"—that it was "five minutes to 12."

[Here Artusky presents quotations from Mapam and others arguing against preventive war, before the action.]

What then finally swayed the Israel government to change its position, and, in the face of its previous declarations, start a war with Egypt, The official motivation is "to liquidate the fedayeen."

No one could and no one did take this seriously. Didn't Ben-Gurion know this when he spoke to the Knesset two weeks before? Didn't the fedayeen also come from Jordan, Syria and Lebanon in the pre-war period the danger of war threatened not in the Egyptian sector but in others! Did the war solve the fedayeen problem?...

FAVORABLE CONJUNCTURE

No, it was not the fedayeen question that decided the government to take this dangerous course. It was a "more important" factor: "The favorable conjuncture"—the favorable conjuncture that France and England had decided to recapture the Suez Canal and break Nasser's power. For this they needed Israel to start the military operation in order to give them a pretext...

Under the influence of the "favorable

conjuncture," the government took the advice which it had previously rejected as "criminal" and as coming from "fascist demagogues," and capitulated to Herut. Menachem Beigin triumphed.

[Artusky also discusses another point claimed to be a motivation for the attack: the agreement signed for the unification of the armed forces of Egypt, Jordan and Syria; this did not precipitate the war, he says. Given the rivalries among the Arab rulers, it might never have gotten off paper, and if it did it would take a lot of time to put it into effect.]

... Militarily we won the war against Egypt, but did we win politically? It seems to me that there can be no question: politically we lost the war!

First, there is the fact that we started the war. We gave almost all countries the opportunity to label us aggressors. We may console ourselves that anyway "they are against us." But they were not against us when the state [of Israel] came into existence. The fact that 65 countries against us is a serious political blow...

We gave the Arab states the opportunity to prove that they are right in their fear of the aggressive and expansionist tendencies of Israel. We incited against ourselves not only the Arab world but the entire Asian and African world that now looks on us as agents of colonial and imperialist powers.

With the military action we widened the political and psychological gap that separates us from the Arab peoples. It is ridiculous to believe that the military victory brought peace nearer. On the contrary it has strengthened both the hatred against and fear of Israel...

In the exultation over the military victory, the government, with the enthusiastic agreement of the Knesset, declared it would not permit any foreign forces to enter its new-acquired areas, that the old armistice lines no longer were valid, and it proclaimed the captured island of Yitvas part of Israel... Only under the strong pressure of the UN and Eisenhower did the government retreat from this position... and declared its willingness to withdraw... However, there still exists a belief that "something" will remain in our hands. Special reference is to Gaza and the island of Yitvas.

SOLVE SECURITY PROBLEM?

Of course, from a military point of view, the acquisition of these areas would be a victory. Will it solve our security problem? Will it bring peace closer? Will Egypt or any Arab state accept such an aggression, or will this grab pour oil on the flames of Arab enmity against us?

Another point: along with Gaza we got a sizable Arab population. According to 1955 UN figures there are 310,000 Arabs—95,000 natives and 215,000 refugees from Israel.

When, a few years ago, America and England proposed that, as a price for peace with the Arab countries, Israel admit 100-125,000 refugees, the Israel government categorically refused. They argued that the refugees are enemies of Israel and will be a fifth column, and therefore cannot be admitted.

For 100,000 refugees in a peaceful manner as a payment for peace, there was no room in Israel. For 300,000 Arabs via war, there will be room... that shows how sincerely the Israel government strove for peace!...

This is only cited to show the complicated problem that territorial acquisition poses for Israel.

WHAT IS WAY OUT?

We are asked, "Yes, but what is the way out?" Can you deny that the Arab states want to destroy us and were preparing to accomplish this purpose?

No, nobody denies it. We therefore never questioned Israel's right to defend itself or its preparation for defense. But it is one thing to defend yourself when attacked and another to initiate a preventive war... Right now there was no immediate danger of war. Till Egypt

could digest the Soviet arms the Israel army would become stronger.

It is also doubtful whether the Arab states headed by Egypt would have been able to engage in a war with Israel. The present war has shown that no war can be localized any longer, that outside forces are dragged in. Every war, even the most local one, bears the danger of becoming another Korea, if not a world war. It is doubtful if the big powers—for their own reasons—would have allowed an Arab attack even if the Arabs were militarily stronger.

Until that time [when the Arabs could digest the Russian arms] great changes could have taken place in the Arab states in general and in Egypt in particular. It is common knowledge that notwithstanding their common hatred of Israel (a hatred deepened by the military attack), there are serious conflicts among the Arab states themselves. In addition the Arabs are struggling not only against Israel but against the colonial great powers.

The case of the Suez Canal proves that for Nasser freeing the canal from British and French rule was more important than his hatred for Israel. Otherwise he would not have embarked on the Suez conflict.

LOOKS TO NEW FORCES

It is also not decreed that Nasser will be dictator of Egypt forever. After the overthrow of King Farouk, Egypt is going through a period of internal social and political ferment. New forces could grow up and abolish the dictator and democratize the country. The present war hindered that process...

The way out lies in seeking a road to peace with the Arab world. We recognize that peace is difficult, but war is not inevitable, and peace is not impossible... Many serious political and psychological obstacles must be overcome. Arabs must accept the idea that Israel is a historical fact that cannot be wiped off the map. The hatred of Israel must be rooted out, as must the fear of Israel. This is a difficult task. It demands a lot of time and patience, but it is the only road we must travel, the only road that can assure our existence.

This requires a definite policy by the Israel government, a policy not of sharpening antagonisms but of easing the relations with the Arabs. It requires a broad propaganda among the Arab people. It requires a policy of proving by deeds and not only by words that we have no expansionist tendencies; that we are not against their freeing themselves from foreign imperialism. It requires a democratic and equal treatment of the Arab minority in our midst. It

Among the many regrettable consequences of the assault on Egypt initiated by the Israel government was the fact that a wave of pro-war feeling washed over the country and swept away some political ideas which previously had not only been common but platitudinous: in particular the detestation of the "preventive war" concept and its implications for Arab-Israel relations.

One of the victims was the Israel organization of the Jewish Labor Bund, or rather its majority. While the international leading committee of the Bund denounced the military attack on Egypt (see LA Dec. 10), a majority of the Bund group in Israel adopted a resolution which justified the attack. We are very glad to report, however, that the leader of the group, Comrade J. Artusky, though in a minority, took a strong stand against this.

In its rationale for justifying the attack, the short majority resolution pretty much repeated the official set of reasons. It pointed to the Russian-Egyptian arms deal, to the common military staff set up by Egypt-Syria-Jordan, to Nasser's statements about being in a state of war, to the raids of the fedayeen bands; it asserted that "Soviet Russia received bases in Egypt in exchange for its military equipment"; and concluded: "As a consequence of the danger of attack in preparation by Egypt and other countries, and the daily victims that fell on the borders, came the action of the Israel army." It then wound up with some standard, or once-standard, generalizations about opposing territorial aggression, supporting Arab aspirations against imperialism, and acting in accord with the UN.

In the December issue of its monthly *Lebensfragen*, which reports the above position, there is also a fine discussion article by Comrade Artusky in which he gives his position on Israel's attack. We present a good portion of it here, condensed.—ED.

requires a policy that is in full contrast with the conduct of the present government...

CLOSER RELATIONS

The first and most urgent condition is: carry out the decisions of the UN and withdraw... We have to show... that we want no territorial aggrandizement but only want to secure our existence. Demand that the UN use its moral force to bring about closer relations with the Arabs that will prepare for a real peace.

We must remember, and especially Bundists in Israel must remember, that it is our fate to live among Arab peoples. We cannot destroy them by force and they are no longer in the stage where they can be dominated. They are our neighbors... Of course, we cannot capitulate to them... We cannot demand from them that they capitulate to us. The difficult road of looking for an understanding by mutual compromise is the only road... That is the road we must take.

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

Proposes Support To Satellite Peoples

To the Editor:

In the past few months as the Polish and Hungarian events have unfolded, pointing up the major crisis of Stalinism in attempting to hold down these areas, LABOR ACTION has taken what I believe to be the correct position on aiding these developments, in calling for the unconditional withdrawal of NATO troops from Western Europe independently of what the Stalinist bloc may do. By this action the Russians are in a position where they no longer have the excuse of a Western military force on their Eastern European borders. This not only undercuts their base but will help in the spread of the revolution and the possibility of a link-up with socialist groupings in the West.

The second demand in calling for mass demonstrations and work stoppages is a basic minimum to at least let the Polish and Hungarian masses know that we sympathize and support them in their

struggles against Stalinist overlordship.

Working within the framework of the two proposals which LABOR ACTION raised, I see where an important extension could be made: a demand by the socialist and labor movement in this country for the offer of political asylum to all Russian troops who refuse to bear arms or suppress the struggles of the satellite people in their fight for independence. This can have a far-reaching effect upon the Soviet army, for numerous reports have come out of Hungary showing where many Russians did not have any wish to suppress the people, where in some cases many went over to the other side, others throwing down their arms and seeking political asylum in bordering states.

Also, another demand which can be put forward is in calling upon all seamen and longshore unions to refuse to load or unload all Russian and satellite ships in all U.S. seaports as long as the Russians remain in Eastern Europe and hold the people down.

ROBERT DAVIS

New York, Jan. 1

LABOR ACTION • 17th YEAR

January 21, 1957

Vol. 21, No. 3

Published weekly by Labor Action Publishing Company, 214 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone: WAtkins 4-4222—Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1874.—Subscriptions: \$2 a year; \$1 for 6 months (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canadian and Foreign).—Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

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

A Free Student Press And Sex at Rutgers

A controversy at Rutgers University over the rights of the student newspaper may well have repercussions throughout the state and in the legislature. And it all began with a discussion of sex.

Walter M. Cummins, a senior, is a senior editor of the campus paper, the *Targum* (the name is Hebrew for "interpretation"), an eighty-seven year old publication. Last November 8th, he wrote an editorial on "Sexual Restrictions." Its main point was to ask that the university relax its rules and allow women to visit student rooms and fraternity houses during specified hours (a system in force at various staid institutions like Yale and Vassar).

NATURAL IMPULSES

In his piece, Cummins disclaimed any intention of arguing for "free love or legalized prostitution." "Every now and then," he wrote, students "find someone or ones they like and have a need to display this affection." And there was a reference to the fact that most of Cummins' school acquaintances were "not celibates." But the main burden of the article was no more than a plea to allow "the release of natural impulses through necking."

When the piece appeared, the students and faculty were somehow hostile to Cummins' style, but no one raised the issue of his right to discuss such matters in the newspaper. And indeed, the attitude which comes through in most of the quotes from the *Targum* article is one of over-coyness and an inverted puritanism. Had the criticism stopped there (and been joined to agreement with Cummins' main point, the liberalization of university rules), the whole affair would have simply illustrated the usefulness of a free university press.

After a campus religious group pushed a censure through the ten-man *Targum* editorial board, Cummins himself admitted that the article had been hastily written, that it was open to misconstruction, etc. However, the matter appeared to have ended there. No one was particularly shocked, and all seemed satisfied that nothing would come of the whole fracas.

At the time that Cummins' article appeared, the campus was in the midst of another controversy, and this might have been the cause of the quiet which prevailed. Arthur Godfrey had been invited to speak at Rutgers on air power, and some members of the faculty had taken exception to his appearing there. This occupied the forefront of student interest, and Cummins' discussion was more or less forgotten.

POWERFUL ATTACK

On January 4th, two months after the publication of the *Targum* editorial, the *Monitor*, official organ of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Trenton, mounted a powerful attack against Cummins—and the *Targum*. It brought charges against the "moral standards" of Cummins, and attacked the paper itself for printing the "offensive and shocking" article. And then came the real pressure: "By reason of the newly found status of Rutgers as a state university, the mere suggestion of the existence of a condition of moral laxity among students at the institution becomes a matter for thorough investigation by Governor Meyner, the New Jersey State Department of Education, the

Legislature, and the trustees of the university."

Indeed, the *Monitor's* article did not appear until public hearings on the budgetary allocations for Rutgers were about to begin. Some at the University regarded this two-month delay and coincidental timing as part of an organized campaign to put the university on the spot and to get a maximum amount of effect out of the attack. At this writing, the university itself has been giving a partial defense of Cummins, refusing to take disciplinary action, but asserting that this kind of incident will not be allowed to happen again. Last week, the governor rushed into the fray, attacking the "irresponsible article" and referring to Cummins as "a maladjusted boy." Meyner reported that he had demanded assurances from the university that this kind of a thing would not be allowed to happen again.

At the same time, the sentiment on the *Targum* itself seemed to be one of fighting against any attempt of the state, or administration, to impose censorship on the paper. H. Joseph Volz, editor in chief of the *Targum*, said, "... I see no reason why faculty censorship should be imposed on that paper. If that happens, I will resign on principle."

STUDENT RIGHTS

From the fragments that appeared in the press, it is fairly clear that Cummins' article was something less than a good defense of a worthy cause. But that question has now become subordinate. In almost every State University, there is the problem of outside pressure groups who try to dictate academic policy and conditions of student life. In some cases—the University of Wisconsin's refusal to decharter the Labor Youth League after attack from Legionnaires—a solid defense has been made. In the situation at Rutgers, it is not yet clear what positions the faculty, administration and editorial staff will take. We can only hope that they will defend the rights of the student press, and oppose the attempt of outside groups to dictate policy.

New Prop to Shore Up Selective Service

National Guardsmen to Serve Six Months

There was a new development this week in the attempts of the government to deal with the crisis in Selective Service: now six months of active duty is to be required of all National Guardsmen.

As *Challenge* has reported in the past, the various plans of Selective Service and the Army which were calculated to build the armed forces on the basis of volunteers have largely failed. The much-heralded "deal" whereby a youth could join the Army, serve six months on active duty, and then become a reservist for the next seven and a half years, was a failure. This was admitted last year by the secretary of the army himself. The reason: there were not enough of the youth who were signing up for the plan. At the same time, as *Challenge* readers will remember, the Army made a series of admissions about Universal Military Training, indicating that they would no longer fight for it because they felt that it, too, would fail.

The newest development is one more aspect of this continuing crisis, an at-

The Kadar repression continues in Hungary, with the latest blow aimed at the revolutionary Hungarian youth. It involves the setting up of a phony regime "youth" front.

On January 12, the Communist Party paper *Nepszabadsag* announced that a student meeting had been "postponed for technical reasons." On the day before, eight leaders of Mefesz, the university organization which had replaced the old government organization, Disz, were arrested. The grounds for this act was undoubtedly the fact that Mefesz, a week before, had held a meeting which reiterated the student demands of October 23, 1956,—the demands of the first day of the Hungarian revolution!

The program of the January meeting thus called for freedom of the press, abolition of the death penalty, freedom to travel in the West, importing of Western literature, and the restoration of the independence of the universities. Even more significantly, the students meeting of two weeks ago once more demanded that Russian troops be withdrawn from Hungary, and asserted the right of various political parties which accept socialism. These demands were the basis of the arrest of the Mefesz leaders.

KADAR YOUTH FRONT

Even before the arrest, the Kadar regime had begun to develop its own youth front. At a meeting of the Provisional Executive of Mefesz, delegates appeared from the "Federation of Revolutionary Young Workers," i.e. the Stalinist youth organization. They insisted on a "revision" of the previous resolution. As a result of their pressure (its exact nature is undocumented, but one is not hard put to guess the varieties of intimidation that were used), the Executive spoke of the "spontaneous, unsystematic nature" of the revolution and asserted that coun-

ter-revolutionary forces had been able to distort it.

But even this "tamed" Executive Committee of the Mefesz was too much for Kadar. A new meeting was to have been held, but it was canceled, even as the youth leaders were arrested. In addition, another regime front, the National Federation of the United Peasant Youth, sent a letter to college and university students expressing "the indignation of juvenile workers, young intellectuals and peasant youth" over the resolution of the Mefesz membership meeting, the one which had reiterated the demands of October. This was the obvious prelude to the dissolution of the revolutionary youth organization and the creation of a new front. And that event was not long in coming.

GROUP DISSOLVED

On last Saturday, Mefesz was dissolved, or rather taken over, lock, stock and barrel, by three Kadarist youth fronts (probably the Revolutionary Young Workers, the United Peasants, and the United Students). This new grouping then held a meeting whose main theme was... opposition to youth "provocations" against the regime! And thus it was that a temporary end was put to the independent organizations of the Hungarian youth, at least in a legal form. But it is clear from last week's reiteration of the revolutionary demands of October that the youth themselves continue in the same spirit that animated them for the last four months: intransigent hostility to the regime, commitment to a political program of democratic demands.

As for the new Kadar front, it should be recognized by every socialist and democrat as the terroristic, counter-revolutionary, anti-youth fraud that it is.

tempt to keep an army at full strength in a period in which young people have no political or ideological motivation impelling them toward the service. And at the same time, the reduction in Selective Service calls has precipitated still another problem: as the numbers needed drop, the average age of the draftee increases. This means that America's youth are not called at the end of high school, at eighteen or nineteen, but they are interrupted in their work when they are twenty-two or twenty-three. It has also meant, in practice, that better-off youth, particularly those who can afford college, can stay out of service for years, and perhaps even escape it altogether. (This is not to say that one wants to see youth in the army; but merely, that when a program is a fact, it should be run democratically.)

GENERAL CRISIS

This general crisis was apparent in the new announcement. For, in addition to demanding the six months of service from the Guardsmen, the order now allows all between 18½ and 25 years to enter into the program. It had previously

been confined to youths between 17 and 18½. Thus, the government attempts to keep a semblance of universality in its Selective Service program. But, here again, they will probably run up against the general apathy of American youth toward military service. It will be interesting to see whether the new order results in a drop in recruitment to the Guard. (Parenthetically, the Guard itself may be conscious of this point. Major General Ellard A. Walsh, president of the National Guard Association, has taken strong exception to the new plan, and announced that the Association will fight in Congress for a three-month active duty period. That could be a sign of worry over the recruitment problem.)

This whole situation comes back to the initial and crucial point: that the reduced need for service manpower has been wrecking the universal nature of Selective Service; and that all the volunteer gimmicks thus far thought up have not attracted American youth. As in the case of the UMT announcement of last year, the army has made it clear that it intends to forge ahead by means of some kind of compulsion.

ITALY

CP Congress Opens Up New Perspectives

By LUCIO LIBERTINI

Rome, January 4

The Communist Party of Italy, like the French CP but even more so, occupies a place which is not comparable to that of any other Communist Party in the West. In the first place, it enjoys the active support of large masses of workers; it is the first party in Italy from the point of view of organization, the second party from the electoral point of view. The strength of the CPI is explained by its history. It was born not only to adhere to the Third International at Lenin's request, but to meet the necessity of overcoming the crisis of socialism in Italy, which was paralyzed by reformism and maximalism. Thanks to the work of its outstanding leader Antonio Gramsci (who later died in a fascist prison) the CPI defeated the extremist and sectarian tendencies in its midst, and rapidly took its place as the vanguard of the working-class, establishing close ties with the latter.

During the fascist and illegal period, the CPI participated in the anti-fascist underground more actively than any other political current, representing the opposition of the masses to Mussolini's regime. Its contribution to the partisan struggle was equally great, and about 60 per cent of the resistance organizations were dominated by it. After the liberation, the CPI proclaimed and followed a new policy, oriented towards the formation of a wide front, thus succeeding in absorbing large forces and capturing the administration of cities, provinces, co-ops, etc. Thanks to this policy and to skilful infiltration the CPI obtained a close alliance with the Socialist Party.

DOUBLE NATURE OF THE CP

The 20th Congress and the crisis of Stalinism. These events brought to light the double nature of the party: on the one hand the Stalinist apparatus, on the other hand the working-class party, rooted in the masses and tied to the socialist tradition of Antonio Gramsci. Because of this fact, the movement of the rank-and-file against the leadership was much stronger than in France, and brought about a real and deep-going crisis in the party.

In order to keep this crisis under control, Togliatti took the initiative of developing the theses of the 20th Congress, to the point of repudiating the theory of the "leader-State" and of demanding a greater independence of the Communist Parties from Moscow. The Central Committee of the CPSU censured Togliatti, who accepted the blame. In the following weeks it became clear that a sharp struggle between "Stalinists" and "anti-Stalinists" was taking place in Moscow, and that its outcome was uncertain. From that moment, Togliatti's tactic consisted in skilfully playing a double role by either exploiting his interview to the review *Nuovi Argomenti* or his recantation, according to the needs of the moment. This tactic reached its high point at the Congress, which was dominated by ambiguity and double-dealing.

TOGLIATTI

To understand this ambiguity, it is necessary to analyze the three elements present at the Congress. There was, in the first place, Togliatti himself. His report to the Congress was full of contradictions. On all fundamental issues he naturally lined up with the Russian position: he approved the Russian intervention in Hungary; rejected the thesis that Stalin's "mistakes" were in fact the "mistakes" of the whole system; defended the Russian "model"; did not say a word about Poland. At the same time, he cautiously criticized Moscow and sharply attacked the "Stalinists" within the party, holding forth at great length on the need of a renewal.

In practice, Togliatti chose an ambig-

uous course which would enable him to be on the side of whoever wins out in Moscow. He conducted himself, not as a revolutionary militant, but as a high functionary of the Byzantine Empire, governing one of its remote provinces. It is significant that the intellectual Marchesi, speaking at the Congress to defend Stalin, compared him to the Roman emperors, saying that "Stalin was greater than Tiberius, although less fortunate, since Tiberius' historian was called Tacitus while Stalin's historian is only Nikita Khrushchev."

THE APPARATUS

The second element at the Congress was the apparatus. This apparatus (the CP has several thousand paid functionaries) has lost its militancy and its sectarianism of former years. Ninety per cent of the delegates were paid functionaries, but they appeared tired and distrustful. They had neither the courage to dissent nor the enthusiasm to fight: they confined themselves to occupying the trenches of the party position with their enormous bulk. In this sense, they were a living testimony to the crisis of the party.

The third element was the opposition. For the first time since 1943 an opposition appeared openly at a Congress of the CPI. Its representatives were few (only 7 to 8 per cent of the delegates), it was not organized and it lacked both unity and a clear perspective. The rank-and-file opposition (about 20 per cent in the provincial assemblies) was stifled, divided, filtered and defeated beforehand. The handful of opposition spokesmen who nonetheless arrived at the Congress were themselves surprised to be there at all. As it was, the opposition manifested itself in six interventions: Giolitti, Prestipino, Bertini, Gullo, Banfi, Diaz. It is important to note that none of these delegates spoke as isolated individuals, but as spokesmen for a group: Giolitti spoke for the provincial federation of Cuneo, Bertini for the workers of the Galileo works in Florence, Diaz for the minority in Livorno, Banfi for a group of well-known intellectuals. The common ground of the opposition was its "socialist" orientation, and its condemnation of the Russian intervention in Hungary.

At the end, the oppositionists preferred to conclude a compromise. They voted with the majority, accepting Togliatti's offer of throwing out the most prominent Stalinists (Scocciarro, D'Onofrio, Colombi, etc.) and of revising the Congress resolutions, which have turned out to be the most curiously contradictory documents. The Russian intervention in Hungary, for instance, is condemned in theory and approved in practice.

THE OPPOSITION

Naturally, it is easy to criticize the conduct of the oppositionists and to accuse them of opportunism. However, I am not of this opinion. The negative outcome of their action is not a result of opportunism but of confusion. They were sure of being unable to speak at the Congress, and found themselves in a situation which they had not foreseen, without co-ordination and clear perspectives. Their compromise is actually a postponement, and its purpose is to gain time.

Now they are meeting and discussing what is to be done. They can do one of two things: organize an opposition tendency within the party or decide to break. In the first case, they would have to face a long struggle, which has to be conducted with caution if it is to be effective. A break, on the other hand, requires rapid collective decisions. The danger is that the leadership might use the present stage of confusion to divide them and beat them one by one. In this respect the case of Eugenio Reale is typi-

cal: after having remained silent at the Congress, he attacked violently and alone. He was immediately expelled and has put his friends who remained in the party in a difficult position.

The next weeks will tell how the internal situation of the CPI will evolve. However, I want to stress for the American readers an important fact. There is no doubt that the crisis of the CPI is profound and will cost this party many votes. But even if it lost a million votes, the CPI would remain a great mass party, followed by a section of the working-class without which no serious struggle for socialism can be conducted in Italy. This is why the problem of the correct orientation of the Communist masses cannot be resolved by dissident movements and splits.

From this consideration arises the need for a specific socialist tactic. If the socialists would break sharply with the CPI, from top to bottom, they would destroy the unity on the rank-and-file level that now exists between all workers and peasants, and would hand themselves over to the bourgeoisie, like Guy Mollet has done. On the other hand, if, for fear of such a split, they should stop

criticizing the errors and the crimes of Stalinism, they would not only weaken their own position and stifle the critical ferment in the Communist rank-and-file, but would also destroy the possibility for a socialist policy and for an advance of the working-class as a whole.

SOCIALIST POLICY

A correct socialist policy towards the Communists requires unity on the rank-and-file level and in action, as well as firm and uncompromising criticism on the top level on the fundamental issues. It is necessary that the socialists should take the initiative of proposing the formation of a new united party of the working-class, and that they should make clear to the Communists that the obstacles on this road are Stalinism and reformism.

The Independent Socialist Union has always defended this position, which is now supported by the PSI (Nenni) as well. Consequently, the possibility exists that the great majority of Italian socialists (all except the reformist minority led by Saragat) will soon produce a real alternative for the Italian working-class.

South Africa —

(Continued from page 1)

ers, as well as illegalizing labor organization and strikes. In addition, more than twenty-five per cent of farms are dependent upon convict labor, easily accessible from farm jails which are financed and erected by groups of farmers with the approval and assistance of the Department of Prisons.

In almost every industry, workers are controlled by semi-feudal methods, involving all manner of physical assault, a code of "Pass Laws" which prevent Africans from moving freely about the country, service contracts to employers, curfew hours, and government supervision of rail and bus lines.

HERRENVOLK LIVE WELL

In regard to facilities, theaters, transportation, schools, clinics, and so forth, strict segregation is enforced—the provisions for non-whites being notably and grossly inferior to those for "Herrenvolk."

In recent years, with the accession to power of the Nationalist government, the burden of oppression of the non-white peoples has become intolerable as all attempts to place their grievance before the government have been rejected, and all expression of their views branded "agitation." As a final resort, the African National Congress and the South African Indian Congress launched a "Campaign in Defiance of Unjust Laws" on June 26th, 1952, in emulation of Gandhi's passive resistance movement of the 1930's.

In retaliation the government initiated further repressions, such as: "The Suppression of Communism Act," which gives the minister arbitrary power to ban organizations, close down newspapers, deport individuals, and hold secret inquiries. In a recent application of this Act, the magistrate averred: "It is common knowledge that one of the aims of Communism is to break down race barriers, and to strive for equal rights for all sections of the people, and to do so without discrimination of race, color or creed... thus, anyone who advocates the ending of race discrimination is a Communist and liable to prosecution..." It is under just such edicts that the current treason trial has been promulgated.

We might ask ourselves at this point, why the press in these United States has refrained from giving moral and practical support to arouse public opinion against so obvious an act of political persecution with the exception of the Socialist publications and a few trivial news releases in the *Post* and *Times*. One answer is that such an exposé would not serve the cause of American imperialists whose industrial corporations are doing a thriving and expanding business in South Africa. To cite just a few, there are U. S. Steel and Bethlehem Steel, Kennecott Copper Co., Aluminum Co. of

America, Industrial Nickel, Union Carbide and Carbon, Eastman Kodak, General Motors, International Harvester, U. S. Rubber, Goodyear, General Electric, General Foods, Coca Cola—and so the list runs on into several thousands. In 1953, the Malan Minister of Finance, N. C. Havenga, reported that U. S. firms owned assets in South Africa topping two and one half billion dollars. More than sixty-eight per cent of all gold brought into the United States comes from South Africa, ninety per cent of its chemical grade chrome, ninety-nine per cent of its diamonds, as well as large quantities of wool Karakul, maganese ore and other raw materials.

And if doubt still remains in the minds of any, that imperialism is not the cause of official U. S. reticence and even condonement of political persecution in South Africa, one need only recall the words of John Foster Dulles on January 27th, 1953, in his initial statement as secretary of state: "... Throughout Africa the Communists are trying to arouse the native people into revolt against the Western Europeans who still have political control of most of Africa. If there should be trouble there, that would break the contact between Europe and Africa, Africa being a large source of raw materials."

In 1946, the U. S. opposed the majority-supported United Nations resolution, noting the charge of discrimination against Indians in South Africa, and asking the Union government to report to the next Assembly meeting on the steps taken to remove the grievances. With minor variations, this has remained the tune played over and over again by the U. S. delegation on the South African government's brutal repression of its non-White peoples down through the years.

INVESTMENTS, LOANS, ARMS

Besides being a good investor, official and business circles in the United States have provided South Africa's white ruling class with loans (particularly excessive in the 1948-49 financial crises) and with military supplies, as insurance against "native rebellions."

It is of crucial import that American progressives and socialists do everything in their power to make their protest against this outrage known to the South African government, and to pressure their government into taking a moral stand on the mass treason trial now proceeding in Johannesburg. In further demonstration of solidarity with the struggle of the colonial peoples for freedom from foreign domination, and against racism, contributions to the South African Defense Fund (sponsored by the Movement for Colonial Freedom) may be sent to: Canon Colton's Defense Fund, 2 Amen Court, London, E. C. 4, England.

WEEK by WEEK . . .

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

A sub is only \$2 a year!

The ISL vs. the "Subversive List"

The Government's Case:

"AS MUCH SUBSTANCE AS A VACUUM"

We continue below the excerpts from the "Proposed Findings" submitted by the Independent Socialist League's attorneys, Joseph L. Rauh Jr. and Isaac Groner in the Department of Justice hearings on the "subversive list" designation of the ISL. The first section of this important document appeared in LABOR ACTION for January 7, 1957.

As in the previous section, technical reference citations and footnotes have been omitted, and paragraphing, boldface and subheads have been added to the original text.

PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT

I STANDARDS

1. The Government has at no time defined the standards which the Attorney General considered and will consider applicable to listings under the Executive Orders; so that the organizations never have known and do not now know why the Attorney General considered it lawful and reasonable, either originally to list them in 1947, or to redesignate them in 1953, or to continue them on the list today.

A. From the original listing in 1947 to the receipt of the Statement of Grounds in 1953 the organizations were given no notice or information of the charges against them or the reasons why the Attorney General listed them, let alone any hint of why the Attorney General regarded his allegations as establishing the validity of the categories which were made.

B. The listing as "subversive" was withdrawn on the first day of this hearing, without explanation or description of the standard or considerations applicable. The organizations have not been advised of any Government action officially recording this concession.

C. The Statement of Grounds is the statement of what the Government hopes to prove; it does not and could not explain or justify how and why those allegations would justify the listings under either of the categories which the Government permitted to remain in the case. No genuine clarification of the Statement was made by the Government, despite the specific and basic questions raised by the organizations.

An Evasion of the Problem

D. Throughout the hearing, neither the Government nor the trial examiner would state the standards which were applicable. The most they would do is to cite the Statement of Grounds. This is no more than an evasion of the problem of standards, as indicated in C above.

E. The Government's Proposed Findings of Fact evade the problem of standards. Its introductory page says, with as much accuracy as a truism and as much substance as a vacuum, "The proposed findings should be viewed in relation to whether the organizations are properly designated under the Federal Employee security program as 'communist' and/or 'seeking to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means.'" 1. Then, after more than 100 pages of allegations without any anchor in standards, the Government boldly asserts, "It is concluded that the organizations are 'communist' and are organizations 'seeking to alter the form of Government of the United States by unconstitutional means,' within the meaning of the applicable Executive Order, and are properly designated under the Federal Employee security program." Not one word is attempted on how this conclusion was reached or is justifiable!

A. "COMMUNIST"

2. The organizations offered two clear possible standards for "Communist" as used in the Executive Orders, the two definitions referred to in the hearing as "little c" and "big C."

A. The "little c" standard is that "communist" refers to believers in a society, based upon common ownership of the means of production and distribution, which aims at establishing the principle "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs." This definition obviously refers only to belief; only to the end; and only to the ultimate, ideal society. Under this standard, all issues of action and program, of means to attain the ends, and of positions of specific historical and current political problems, all these issues are irrelevant—only a belief in the end of a certain type of ideal society is necessary to meet the standard.

The organizations many times declared that they certainly were "communist" under this standard.

B. The "big C" standard is that an organization is "Communist" if it "indicates in some way some kind of support for the Communist Party or for the foreign policy of the Soviet Union."

Not Limited to "little c"

3. The Government stated on occasion that the "little c" standard was to be considered applicable; but its Statement of Ground, its proof and its Proposed Findings are not so limited.

A. At the outset of the hearing, the Government declared that the issue was designation as "communist—small 'c.'" To a request for meaningful definition, there was no response except that Executive Order 10450 allegedly spelled "Communist" with a small c. Again, the Government declared that the issue was small-c communism.

The organizations very carefully distinguished between the term, as presumably intended by the Department of Justice, and as actually interpreted and applied by them. They pointed to the fact that Executive Order 10450 actually contains only the upper case word "Communist." In the face of these clear statements by the organizations, and without offering any meaningful definition, the Government reiterated that small-c communism was the sole issue.

B. The Government never defined what it meant by small-c communism. It did say "we are charging you with adhering to Trotskyism." It was urged to state what it meant by that. No reply. Later, even this non-definition was qualified. "We will show that this organization is a Trotskyite organization, in one sense of the term." Neither the one sense nor any other sense of the term was ever defined or clarified by the Government.

Also, the Government did note in the middle of the initial discussion of standards, "There is no standard in the Executive Order that is socialist." But it never defined "socialist." Further, the Government never clarified what distinction it perceived or administered between "socialist" and small-c "communist."

Obviously, the Government had some difficulty with this distinction. It confounded any distinction by one position it tried, that communism is the highest form of socialism. "Naturally," the Government was not talking about the Socialist Party at home or the Labor Party in Britain, but "about Socialism as enunciated by Lenin, as enunciated by Trotsky."

The "small c" Definition

C. There is no "small c" definition of communism anywhere on the record of this proceeding, other than that made by the organizations, and referred to in 2 above. If it was genuinely intended to signify anything, the statement by the Government that the issue was "small c" communism" must necessarily have referred to this. The Government did state, at least once, that its proof would not be confined to this. It never indicated what more it thought necessary for its branding these organizations as "Communist" under the Executive Order.

D. The Government could not have been reasonably consistent or serious in its statement, because it did not recognize the organizations' admission that it certainly was guilty under this standard, and did not accept their position that no hearing was necessary if this standard were really in force. Also, the Government did not in fact limit any of its case to the criterion of a belief in the end of a certain kind of ideal society. The Statement of Grounds, the proof, and the Proposed Findings clearly discuss the issues of program, of means and of policies; the issue of force and violence is sufficient illustration, without need of record citations.

4. The Government implied on occasion that the "big C" standard should not be considered applicable but its Statement of Grounds, its proof and its Proposed Findings include allegations which are relevant only under this standard.

A. The Government never was willing to state flatly that it did not consider the big-C Communist standard as applicable. It was willing to opine that "There is no charge that you are related to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in any manner whatsoever as the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is used with a capital 'C.'" Further, the Government inferentially admitted that the organizations had proved that they were not Communist, upper case C.

B. The prior or present association of the leadership of these organizations with the Communist Party would be irrelevant unless the big C standard was indeed applicable. But this matter was specifically im-

ported by the Government into its Statement of Grounds and Interrogatories, and its Proposed Findings.

5. Except for this case, the Government and the Attorney General have used the word "Communist" in the "big C" sense, meaning some support of the Communist Party or of the Soviet Union.

[The Proposed Findings of Fact then go on to demonstrate conclusively that, while in this case the government denies that the term "Communist" applies, both the attorney general and the Congress have consistently addressed themselves to that meaning of the word both in legislative and administrative "security" matters. The central point made is that there is no legislative or administrative basis or precedent for the government's undefined "communist" category as used in this proceeding.]

B. "SEEKING TO ALTER THE FORM OF GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES BY UNCONSTITUTIONAL MEANS"

7. The Government applied "the form of Government of the United States" to mean the economic system of the United States, and did not confine the concept to the country's political organization.

A. The Government's preoccupation with "nationalization" and "confiscation" are enough to show that the listing was not attempted to be justified on political, as opposed to economic grounds.

B. The Government evidently does not understand the distinction drawn by these organizations between the identity and interests of "the capitalist class" and those of the government of the United States itself.

C. The organizations draw the distinction between political and economic forms very precisely.

i. "The ISL holds that in order to achieve the international socialist society, it is necessary to abolish the existing forms of government of the United States insofar as it is capitalist in nature and function, but not at all insofar as it is republican and democratic." Answer to Interrogatories, No. 24(d).

ii. The organizations made clear that they were definitely "In favor of capitalist democracy as opposed to capitalist despotism, but not socialist democracy."

iii. The organizations do not believe that the Constitution of the United States either requires a capitalist economic system or prevents a socialist economic system.

Clear and Present Danger?

8. The Government did not indicate what time or probability element was included in its "force and violence" definition, and the Government refused to state whether the "clear and present danger" standard was applicable. The Government would not say whether "seeking to alter" by force and violence, as used in the Executive Orders, was satisfied if the organizations merely forecast that force and violence might be used against the workers' state after it had won power, so that the workers might better be prepared for that possibility; or if the organizations predicted that the use of force and violence to resist the assumption of power by the workers was inevitable; or whether the organizations actually had to predict that force and violence might possibly have to be used before power would pass; or whether the organizations would predict that force and violence would inevitably have to be used before power would pass. Also, the Government would not say whether there had to be any advocacy, in the sense of statement of preference, of force and violence. Nor did it say whether there had to be any activity, such as organization or training in force and violence, or whether mere words and beliefs were sufficient to enable the Attorney General to list.

9. The Government did not confine "unconstitutional means" to force and violence as a means of attaining power, but included force and violence as a means of maintaining power which had been obtained constitutionally.

A. The Government made no distinction between force which might be required to maintain power already won legally; and force utilized before the transfer of power to the socialist state and for the purpose of effectuating that transfer. In other words, the Government lumped together all force and violence, whether initiated by the organizations to alter the form of Government, or initiated by others to restore a governmental form already changed legally; the Government's case is that the organizations are responsible for all the force and violence they dare predict or discuss.

10. The Government did not confine "unconstitutional means" to the means of obtaining power, but included the ends which might be served, after power had been obtained constitutionally.

A. The Government considered pertinent the nationalization and compensation policies which the organizations might be planning to apply should they ever come to power.

B. The reference to the nationalization of "gold stores," long since nationalized by the government of the United States, illustrated the government's concern with the verbalization, "nationalization," and the concept of what would be done after attaining power.

(Additional excerpts from the "Proposed Findings" will appear in subsequent issues of Labor Action.)

Democratic Party — —

(Continued from page 11)

ership is that of caretakers. It is a conservative leadership of the conservative section of the Democratic Party which is in uneasy coalition with the labor and liberal forces in their own party and in an easy coalition with the Republicans for political control of Congress.

CARETAKER LEADERSHIP

The interest of this caretaker leadership is not to carry out a social program on housing, education and higher minimum wages. It can get elected without pressing for these measures. There is no real desire to see a Democratic president since a Democratic president has to make some effort to carry out a social welfare program which they oppose to a great extent. Legislation of special interest, like natural gas, can be achieved with greater ease under the present set-up of live-and-let-live with the Republican administration. It is the program of a section of a party which has no real program other than the protection of their narrow sectional and big business interests.

However, the Democratic Party in the rest of the country cannot live on this thin gruel. Outside of the South where Democrats have to win seats against Republicans, and where the Democrats have not won a majority of the congressional seats for the past ten years, and where there is a labor movement demanding welfare legislation and the Negro people with votes who are demanding full equality, the Johnson-Rayburn leadership spells disaster for the party.

And even if only a minority of the American people were for pushing ahead now, it is disastrous for the Democrats to take a "wait and see" attitude toward the Eisenhower administration. Merely from the point of view of self-preservation (a primeval instinct to these politicians), it is difficult to win national elections, as Adlai Stevenson seems to be finding out late in life, by being a do-nothing party for four years and an opposition party for a few months. That is unless you have a sinecure in Texas or a vassalage in Mississippi.

LIBERAL PROGRAM

Late in November six Democratic senators led by Humphrey of Minnesota, Douglas of Illinois and Morse of Oregon issued a direct challenge to Johnson's "follow-the-leader" leadership. They called for the enactment of a 16 point "minimum liberal program" starting with the abolition of the infamous Rule 22. It included: guarantee of full rights to vote and to obtain education in publically-supported schools and colleges, income tax reduction for low income families, top-priority for school and housing construction, elimination of present immigration quota system, 90 per cent parity on farm prices and increased Social Security legislation.

Johnson responded by attempting to drive a wedge between the grouping of Northern and Western senators by offering Senator Mike Mansfield of Montana the post of assistant leader or party whip in the Senate. In the last session of Congress Mansfield, who is usually classified as a liberal, discovered great virtue and benefits for all the people in the natural gas bill, since large natural gas deposits were discovered in Montana.

As the Democratic National Executive Committee prepared for its post-election meeting late in November, a real fight for the leadership of the party seemed to be brewing. The rallying cry of the opposition was: the Democratic Party has to come out with its own program and it has to develop an effective opposition to the Eisenhower administration. James A. Finnegan, manager of Stevenson's presidential campaign and powerful Philadelphia Democrat, came out in opposition to the Johnson-type leadership. However, Stevenson's other appointee, Democratic National Chairman Paul Butler hedged on taking a position.

At the meeting the Southerners failed to split away a portion of the Western Democrats. A combination of Westerners and Northern big city bosses, Mayor David Lawrence of Pittsburgh and Col. Jake Arvey of Chicago passed a proposal for a Democratic National Advisory Committee.

This committee was to be composed of high-Democratic leaders in Congress, in-

cluding Johnson and Rayburn, some governors, mayors and national figures like Adlai Stevenson, Harry Truman and Mrs. Roosevelt. However, it was understood by all to be a rebuke to the Southern leadership when the resolution setting up the advisory committee said "We, therefore, hope our party will make Democratic initiative the order of the day so that we can quickly resume social progress at home and save the situation abroad."

The proposed members of the committee were fairly representative of Democratic Party politicians throughout the country. About half the committee of twenty were to be congressional leaders. But Johnson and Rayburn were not to be bought or sucked in.

Instead they really went to work on sabotaging the committee. Exactly what means were used on each and every senator and congressman may not be known for years. Last week in LABOR ACTION we reported on the price for which Senator Robert Kennedy was bought—a seat on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

LEASH PULLED TIGHT

The leash was pulled up tight on two of the loudest yelping liberals—Humphrey and Kennedy. Both announced support of Johnson for the post of Democratic leader in the Senate. Humphrey expressed the belief that "we Democrats can have disagreements without being disagreeable" and Kennedy discovered that "to quarrel over semantics or tactics or leadership at this time is to pave the way for further Republican successes."

One by one congressional nominees to the National Advisory Committee began to decline to serve. Only two agreed—Senators Kefauver and Humphrey. Senator Kenney did not even have the courage to reply to the invitation.

Kefauver's acceptance is understandable since his is at odds with the rest of the Southern leadership although he bid his acquiescence to Johnson by refusing to support an attempt, sparked by ADA, to have Johnson step down during the fight over Rule 22.

Kennedy on the other hand is a political opportunist who allows himself to be muzzled. Dixiecrats like liberals of his stripe which is why he was their candidate for vice president against Kefauver.

Hubert Humphrey is the link between the Dixiecrat and liberal wing of the party. He is the barking dog of liberalism who is kept on a strong leash; his bark is ferocious, but he has never been known to bite. He can serve on the Advisory Committee, vote against Rule 22 and call for a liberal program—but at the same time he supports Johnson's leadership which has been blocking thus far the carrying out of this program.

MICE OR MEN?

The meager and meek opposition to Dixiecrat leadership in the Senate prompted the syndicated columnist Stokes to ask in the N. Y. Post of December 13, "Who's Fighting Mr. Johnson?"

He starts by pointing out that "the widely advertised 'revolt' of Northern Democrats against their Southern leadership in the Senate is taking a turn that recalls the fable about the big, bold mice

who were going to bell the cat. When the time came, no mouse was willing to sacrifice himself."

And he ends, "What Northern Democrats lack in the fight they are making is someone who is willing to risk the loss of friendship of the Southern hierarchy and the loss of choice committee posts. But such comes along only rarely, as any longtime observer here knows, and as Senator Kennedy demonstrates in his book."

Where is the liberal senator who is willing to fight for what he alleges to be his principles? Where is one who fights as determinedly as the Southern racists do for their reactionary point of view? Where was that fighting band of beleaguered liberals?

When it came to the election of Senator James Eastland as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, a graveyard of civil rights legislation and symbol of racism in the Senate, only Senators Paul Douglas and Joseph Clark of Pa. voted against it.

Less than three weeks after the formation of the National Advisory Committee they began to beat a hasty retreat. Only 8 of the original 20 agreed to serve. The original plan to spark the formulation of a liberal and progressive Democratic program in Congress was changed to one which would, in Butler's words, "concern itself with such inside-the-family problems as formal rules for the Democratic National Committee, new fund-raising programs, political strategy and tactics, and communication both within the party and between the party leadership and the general public."

SKELETON CREW

In short it was proposed that the committee do exactly what the National Committee is supposed to do. Therefore what is the reason for its existence?

A skeleton crew showed up to the January 4 meeting—Humphrey, Kefauver, Stevenson, Truman and Governors Mennen Williams of Michigan and Harriman of New York. A few brave words were set to paper about "keeping faith with the position taken in the 1956 Democratic platform"—a revolutionary action if they really meant it. And it said that from time to time it would speak out endorsing or opposing specific policies or programs regardless of the stand taken by congressional leaders. But the guts were out of the entire fight.

Johnson and Rayburn having won the skirmish, then accepted the peace pipe. They accepted an invitation to a "harmony" breakfast. The result of the meeting was not announced to the press, and there is no indication that anything more important was accomplished other than having a good breakfast. Johnson said that he has an open mind and is willing to "reason together" and Butler that the committee would continue to exist.

The role that Johnson plays is vastly different from that of an Eastland or Russell of Georgia. He is the majority leader of the entire Democratic group in the Senate and therefore in order to retain his position it is necessary to make certain concessions. He can not make it impossible for the Humphreys and Kennedys to work with him. Therefore he announced support to a motion to make it slightly easier to curb the filibuster and that he would step down as majority leader during the fight over proposed civil rights legislation.

RIGHT TO VOTE

This compromise by Johnson and the proposed civil rights legislation by the Eisenhower administration have increased the chances for the passage of some minimum program. The most important of the proposals is designed to protect the right of Negroes to vote and this is the one which will be resisted with the greatest intensity by the Dixiecrats.

The leadership of the conservative Southern Democratic forces in Congress is as strongly entrenched as ever. It is not guaranteed that even if the congressional liberals had carried out a consistent and vigorous fight they could have overturned the conservatives from control of the party. But they could have drawn the issue based on a consistent liberal program. This they did not do, not even on the issue of Eastland. And this is the shame of liberalism which ensnares the labor movement.

The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Get Acquainted!

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

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

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE

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

- Please enter my subscription:
- 1 year at \$2. 6 months at \$1.
 - Payment enclosed. Bill me.
 - New sub. Renewal.

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

To Understand Russia & Stalinism

- Is Russia a Socialist Community?
Debate between Earl Browder & Max Shachtman50
- Stalinist Apologetics: A Review of Isaac Deutscher,
by Max Shachtman. In three issues of *New Internationalist*..... .75
- The New Course, & The Struggle for the New Course,
by Leon Trotsky & Max Shachtman 1.50
- Stalinist Russia,
by Tony Cliff 2.00
- Stalin, A Political Biography,
by Leon Trotsky 4.00
- The Revolution Betrayed,
by Leon Trotsky 2.50
- The Case of Leon Trotsky. Verbatim Report of Dewey Commission Hearings on the Moscow Trials 4.00

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