

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JUNE 17, 1957

FIVE CENTS

SPOT-
LIGHT

'Exact Information' From Two Experts

Coming back to the question about the H-bomb tests which we discussed last week, there are two cases in point among the clippings on our desk.

What we were concerned with was the argument, which understandably impresses many, that we laymen (i.e., ordinary citizens) really have no basis for entertaining an opinion as to whether the H-bomb tests should be stopped or not; for we aren't competent to decide the technical questions as to the degree of danger represented by the unleashing of man-made radioactivity into the atmosphere. If Willard Libby, scientist and AEC commissioner, assures us all that the risk is inconsequential, why should we prefer to believe other scientists (even the 2000 of them who signed the latest petition) when they disagree?

We commented last week in terms of the burden of proof; now we'd like to remark how often the argument itself is made disingenuously. We have one example for each side of the Atlantic.

Take Viscount Cherwell, who got considerable cis-Atlantic publicity on his speech of May 8 in the House of Lords replying to Albert Schweitzer's appeal against the H-tests. He opined that Dr. Schweitzer and the Pope had both allowed themselves to be diddled "by the inaccurate propaganda of the friends of Russia." And he said:

"I am surprised that men in high positions without scientific knowledge or exact information should issue appeals on scientific questions on which they are not competent to judge."

Now if, in the light of these words, Lord Cherwell himself issued a sort of

(Continued on page 2)

WASHINGTON'S CHINA POLICY IS WAY OUT ON THE LIMB

By GORDON HASKELL

The recent decision of the British government to ease the total embargo on trade with Communist China is another straw in the wind blowing hard against Washington's policy in Asia. And the relatively mild reaction from official circles in the capital, including some who formerly were most prominently associated with a "hard" China policy, indicates the strength in this country also of the pressures for a reassessment of American foreign policy in this field.

It was not so long ago that it was considered to be something close to political suicide for any prominent politician in this country to so much as hint at the idea that some sort of normalization of relations with the Peiping government might be desirable. The "China Lobby" and Senator Knowland (R., Formosa) were quick to hurl the term "treason" at any view which questioned the all-out support by Washington of Chiang Kai-shek's government in Formosa as the one and only legitimate gov-

ernment of China, or urged the recognition of the unpalatable fact that the Communist government in China runs the country, and must be dealt with accordingly.

The announcement of the new British policy came almost simultaneously with the anti-American demonstrations and riots in Taipei. Chiang's regime was revealed to the whole world to be at least as fraudulent in its claims of representing the true sentiments of the Formosan people as is the Peiping regime in its claim to represent the will of the people of China. One of

the myths on which the China Lobby had based its intimidation of political discussion of American policy in Asia was deeply undermined.

But the weakness of the reaction of the American government to the British trade decision cannot be ascribed to this alone.

The same general change in political mode which has reduced the United States, and has, in fact, thrown it on the defensive, has also affected the China Lobby. In addition, in America as in Britain, West Germany, Japan and other countries, economic pressures have been coming to bear gradually but inexorably against the "no trade" aspect of America's policy. In this country, they have served to split the capitalists in their attitude toward China trade.

Quite aside from the general political approach which led the

(Turn to last page)

'Disarmament' as a Weapon

By SAM TAYLOR

The disarmament negotiations over the past decade reveal a pattern of remarkable consistency.

They begin with a renewed hope that perhaps this time some tangible progress can be achieved. American and Russian proposals are scrutinized with the utmost care to see whether the old proposals are now worded in such a way as to conceal a

modification slightly below the surface. There are usually a few weeks of hurried optimism and then the despondency, both real and feigned, over the inability to make any tangible progress.

This ritual starts up on about an average of once a year. Neither side can afford not to dutifully show up at the meetings, appear to make a few concessions or apparently daring proposals before

getting down to the wrangling over basically irreconcilable positions.

These disarmament negotiations are the small price the two giant powers pay to public opinion for the fantastically dangerous and wasteful arms race. And in a certain sense, it is these negotiations which make possible the continuance of the arms race. What better way is there to justify its continuation than by going through the motions of trying to put an end to it? Thus far it is the minimal price a terrorized world has demanded of the U. S. and Russia.

That no agreement has been reached even to limit armaments, conventional or nuclear, attests to the irreconcilability of the struggle between the capitalist and Stalinist military blocs. That they continue to "negotiate" attests to the fact that a nuclear war is unthinkable to the great mass of the people everywhere and even to their ruling classes.

THIN SLICE?

And yet it cannot be ruled out despite the record of all previous attempts that a limited agreement can be reached to cover a "thin slice" of disarmament or arms limitation. The thinner the slice, the more likely an agreement. If they set their sights low enough, a limited, tentative proposal can be accepted covering different aspects of the problem, none of which is important or decisive.

This will be heralded as a significant break-through or agreement in principle

(Continued on page 4)

FEAR OF A NEW YALTA IS IN THE AIR AMONG AMERICA'S ALLIES

Despite the differences on disarmament, discussed in the accompanying article, there is always a possibility or a tendency toward a deal between the U. S. and Russia. There is the growing apprehension in Europe that a political settlement may be reached at the expense of the national aspirations and prestige of Western European countries.

Side by side with the enthusiastic view that a break in the nuclear deadlock may perhaps be developing, goes the apprehension that it may be the beginning of a new Yalta. European observers, particularly the British, French and Germans, have noted with increasing concern that all real discussions were taking place between Har-

old Stassen and his Russian counterpart.

In an editorial in the June 13 issue of *The Reporter* entitled "Europe's Fear of a New Yalta," Max Ascoli outlines this suspicion:

"Since the end of the war, the fear has lingered among statesmen and publicists abroad that the conflict between the U. S. and the USSR could end in a partition of the world between the two. That fear now affects a far larger number of people. What goes here? ask those who thought that a bridge was needed between the two superpowers and were kindly available to build bridges or play the honest broker's role. The avowed or crypto-neutralists who have been legion in Europe for years do not cherish the

prospect of their nations becoming somehow neutralized, with no longer very much to say in international affairs."

This form of dissatisfaction stems from the knowledge that the U. S. as leader of the Western bloc is perfectly capable of engaging in a course of action contrary to the wishes and feelings of its junior partners and then forcing everyone else into line. This has both a progressive and a reactionary side to it. There was this feeling at the time of the involvement in the Korean War and later over the British and French aggression in Egypt. Right now it is over possible U. S.-Russian agreement to limit nuclear weapons to those powers who already have them—U. S., Britain and Russia.

A Matter of Conscience: The Arthur Miller Case

Playwright Arthur Miller was found guilty on two counts of contempt of Congress, growing out of his refusal to give the House Un-American Activities Committee the names of others who had attended together with him what the committee called a "pro-Communist writers' meeting" in 1947. He faces a maximum sentence of one year and a maximum fine of \$1000 on each of the two counts.

The case began in June 1956, when Miller was called before the committee during an investigation into "The fraudulent misuse of American passports by those in the service of the Communist conspiracy." At this time Miller spoke freely about his own associations with various groups, and said that he had on occasion given "a dollar or two" to these organizations. To this he added, "I was never under Communist discipline."

He was then asked by the committee counsel Richard Arens to name the person who had invited him to the meeting in '47, and to identify some of the other people who were there. He refused saying "I'll tell you anything about myself . . . I cannot take the responsibility for another human being."

When eight days later in a surprise ceremony he was married to Marilyn Monroe, the committee was quick to respond with a wedding present. They gave him, in the words of Representative Walter, another "opportunity offered by the committee to avoid contempt." He declined the gift in a letter to the committee reiterating his refusal to implicate others, formally stating that he did so on "grounds of conscience."

At this time he was also carrying on a fight to secure a passport to join his wife, who was making a picture in England. He was granted the passport in July. When he returned in November, the House, by a vote of 373 to 9 had cited him for contempt of Congress. His case was now in the hands of the Justice Department.

The facts in the case and the position taken by Miller make it an outstandingly

clear test of the right of an American to refuse to turn stoolpigeon. There is absolutely nothing else involved.

It is not the only such case, of course; on the contrary, there have been others who took a more praiseworthy stand on the question, broader than enforced stoolpigeonry, of what is known as "cooperation" with the witchhunting committee. If Miller's case is yet outstanding, it is of course because of his intellectual prestige and high rank as a playwright.

It may be regrettable that there should be a difference in the impact on public opinion between an injustice to an unknown and an equal injustice to a prominent figure; but it is understandable. The individual units of public opinion may have reservations about the unknown: is it really true that he takes this stand only because of conscience, or does he have some grisly sin to hide, or (hsst) is he really covering up for his unpopular practice of filching atomic secrets for the Kremlin. . . ?

In the case of a prominent victim whose very business is to translate his values into literary form and present them to the public, this sort of thing is at a minimum. One feels more vividly, more personally, what it means to swing the government cop's billy over a man and force him to spit on his own life and works.

Also indicted for contempt along with Miller was Pete Seeger. Seeger, a folk singer, was long associated with Stalinist circles. In a mimeographed sheet explaining his position, Seeger made an interesting comment on the meaning of his Constitutional privileges: "The difference between quoting the Fifth Amendment or the First is roughly this: the Fifth means you have no right to ask me this question. . . the First means you have no right to ask anyone this question." Seeger is at present out on \$1000 bail.

SPOTLIGHT

(Continued from page 1)

appeal by systematically belittling the dangers of the H-tests, what shall we think of his qualifications? Well, he is a "professional physicist"—in the engineering field.

But, good lord, does this really give you "exact information" about the biological effects of nuclear radiation? And if you have this more "exact information" than we commoners have, why can't you pass it on to us so that we can compare it with the statements of the numerous British and American nuclear physicists whose views on the subject differ?

As a matter of fact, the government doesn't claim to have "exact information" on some of the vital questions involved—for example, the long-run genetic effects of radiation-induced mutation, which recently caused Ralph Lapp to make the spectacular proposal to the congressional investigating committee that a human sperm bank be started to preserve the present variety of homo sapiens in any eventuality. To be sure, Lapp was mainly trying to shock the committee and the country to a realization of the stakes, but if a dramatic counterbalance was needed it was because of the type of complaisance theorized by the British lord with his "exact information."

On May 27 another expert came to the fore, reeking with exact information, and competently made all the front pages plus columns of news space inside. This was Harry Truman, jumping into the breach to save the country from being "panicked by the Soviet campaign of fear incitement . . . by their propaganda of the horrors of the fallout in-

tended primarily to cripple the defense efforts of the West."

We leave aside this contemptible McCarthyite slander against the anti-H-test scientists, which gave advance aid and comfort to the maneuver of the congressional witchhunters to probe the possible "subversive connections" of Dr. Linus Pauling when he helped to organize the petition of the 2000 scientists. We are interested at the moment in Prof. Truman as a man with exact information.

There's the well-known case of the man who handily refuted a charge with two points: "First, I wasn't there; and second, he hit me first." Truman's reply to the problem is something like this: First, there's no danger to speak of; and second, we're learning what to do about it.

Our expert's scientific competence was laid on the line in the following passage: "We may therefore have to run some risk of an occasional radioactive fallout in order to conduct the experiments necessary to maintain our nuclear strength." (Italics added.)

And in another precious sentence he conceded that "radioactive fallout could grow into a menace" but—"But already it is being distorted by well-meaning people beyond the scope of its immediate threat . . ." (Italics added.)

So it is a distortion to discuss the "menace" in terms of its vital longer-range threats.

Even Truman, of course, has a perfect right as a citizen to have his opinion about the H-bomb issue; that's exactly our point. His arguments can be weighed for what they're worth in the marketplace of

LABOR SCOPE

USA 1957: Anti-Union Terror in Mississippi

By BEN HALL

The rule of White Supremacy in the South stands against the advance of trade-unionism, and nowhere more starkly than in Mississippi.

Here from the pages of the June 1 issue of *Justice*, published by the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, is a typical story. The head over it is: "Mob Attacks ILG Organizers in Miss."

"J. C. Willis and Waymon Mitchell, ILGWU organizers, were beaten by a mob of about 25 persons that stopped their car in front of the Leaksville, Mississippi court house on May 24, about 7 p.m. The ILGers were driving two employees of the Bisila Dress Co. to a union meeting in Lucedale.

"Only a week before, on May 16, workers at the Bisila plant in Lucedale, by a two-to-one margin, had voted for the ILGWU in a representation election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board. "Victory in the balloting, following a two-month organizing drive, produced the first crack in the network of non-union shops in southeast Mississippi, according to E. T. Kehrer, director of the Southeast Region.

"In the mob were several Bisila plant supervisors, as well as Bisila himself. The crowd closed in on the men. Willis was stabbed several times. He was hit on the head with a heavy weapon which tore away a large section of his scalp.

"Willis was then dragged around Leaksville by a marshal or deputy marshal, and for half an hour was exhibited

as an example. He was thrown into jail, charged with assault. He was denied medical attention.

"The two women members had run off in fright. Looking back, they later said, they saw several of the mob advancing toward Mitchell with bare knives. They then drove to Lucedale and alerted ILGWU members in that town. They said they feared Mitchell had been murdered.

"At their anxious request, the Sheriff of Lucedale called the jail in Leaksville. He pleaded that Willis be released and that a doctor be allowed to examine him. Both requests were denied. Willis was finally bailed out around 3 o'clock in the morning. He is in a hospital in Pascagoula, Miss., with a possible skull fracture.

"The mob had striped Mitchell and beat him on the back with heavy pipes. He escaped and stumbled toward a river, began to swim across. The mob found him again. He was shot at with rifles while he tried to reach the other side.

"The following weekend was filled with terror. Members of the union were threatened, as was a union lawyer in Leaksville.

"A conference with Governor James P. Coleman of Mississippi was scheduled to be held May 28. The ILGWU intends to take action in the courts and through federal agencies.

"Mitchell is from Haleyville, Alabama; Willis is from Calhoun, Mississippi."

News and Views from the Trade-Union Press

An impressive feat is accomplished by *The Teamster*, official publication of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

In past issues, the magazine has ignored the plight of President Dave Beck or commented incidentally. Some local Teamster publications have taken refuge in silence. But in its June issue, the *Teamster* goes into detail.

Beck contributes his usual "President's Letter" but only to decry anti-labor hysteria. But nine of the issue's 32 pages revolve around the Senate hearings and the action of the AFL-CIO Council against Beck.

"Revolve" is just the word; for the central point is never touched upon. Everything is covered up in a mass of subterfuge and technical detail. Not once are the charges against Beck reported nor the scandals revealed at the hearings alluded to.

Naturally, under such a set-up no defense has to be offered!

ACTU ON DEMOCRATIC CODE

Labor Leader, published by the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists, editorializes on the new AFL-CIO Code of Democratic Practices. It finds a big difference between the problem in unions controlled by racketeers and in those which are not:

"As far as the racketeers are concerned, it comments, "here a total absence of democracy is part of the operation. They are businessmen and business is not an area where democracy prevails. For this reason, a union election in some locals of the Jewelry Workers, for instance, is an inconceivable phenomenon. The question for the bonafide movement is a different one. Here the structure of the movement is democratic but

ideas, like anyone else's. Unlike the good lord who was surprised by Schweitzer and the pope, we don't propose to limit opinions on the subject to Q-cleared scientists who are let into the inside dope by the AEC.

That's why no one need be intimidated by the argument that you can't oppose the H-bomb tests now without first acquiring scientific competence to decide for yourself as to the dangers of radioactivity. The burden of proof is not on us. It's on the authorities—in the three nuclear capitals that have just given us a record concentration of radioactive blasts—who are poisoning the planet without exact information about the consequences of their action.

often in the practical order the substance of democracy is noteworthy by its absence. . . . Apathy is often blamed for the lack of more militant participation on the part of the rank and file. It just might be though that a few more leaders could put a little more trust in the rank and file and some of the apathy problem would disappear."

GE AND UNIONISM

Tension is building up between the General Electric Company and both the UE and IUE.

IUE Local 201 struck GE plants in Lynn and Everett, Mass. for five days in April over local grievances. Twenty thousand workers were affected. At the same time, 1000 production workers at the General Electric Capacitor plants in Fort Edwards and Hudson Falls, N.Y. struck under the leadership of their Local Union No. 332, UE.

In a letter to the company endorsed by the IUE's GE Conference Board, a union negotiating committee replied to the company, stating that "delegates attending the conference were shocked at the reckless, irresponsible tone of your letter, not only in the slanderous charges against our union and organized labor, but also in what appears to be the attempt of the company to add another item to the list of repudiations of the 1955 contract."

World History—Year by Year

The bound volumes of LABOR ACTION

1950-54.....\$3 per vol.

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

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

Independent Socialist Press
114 West 14 Street, New York City

WHY THEY 'MISUNDERSTOOD' THE COMMUNIST PARTY CONVENTION

By H. W. BENSON

Not many commentators understood what was happening in the American Communist Party last year. It had been plunged into a deep crisis first by the 20th Congress and then by the Hungarian events; a bitter internal dispute showed that the party was split into irreconcilable tendencies with one group genuinely taking steps away from Stalinism. It might seem odd that so few were willing to notice it.

Now we have the abridged, but comprehensive, text of the proceedings of the 16th National Convention of the CP held February 9-12. It was here that the fight was momentarily patched up and the differences temporarily resolved in the name of party unity. A reading of this 351-page book only gives a limited picture of the true situation in the party, only a poor hint of the depths of the internal divisions.

The Communist world, still dominated by Stalinism without Stalin, has its own reasons for deliberately misunderstanding the situation. Everywhere, the Communist Parties are eager to restore the old balance; to overcome the world crisis without making fundamental changes; in fact, to pretend that there never really was a crisis at all.

But in the United States, Stalinism was shattered and the national CP torn apart within. To maintain the myth of world Communist unanimity and unity, it is necessary to misread and distort the meaning of the fight in the CPUSA and the results of its recent convention.

What made it possible for world Stalinism on the one hand and many of our own anti-Stalinists on the other to underestimate the significance of the fight in the CP was the fact that the basic differences were not highlighted but were slurred over at the convention.

In the *Daily Worker* on June 4, Alan Max finds it necessary to correct the record.

Accounts of the CP convention in the United States had been published in *Pravda*, in *L'Humanité*, in the British Communist press, and in various Latin American publications. Max discovers one curious common element in all these reports: "All these accounts seem to have one thing in common," he writes, "a lack of familiarity with the proceedings of the convention."

In the March issue of *International Affairs*, an English-language periodical published in Moscow, he discovered that the Russian reporter, T. Timofeyev, had made the identical error in his account of the February convention. Max felt impelled to write an Open Letter in reply.

MOSCOW VERSION

Timofeyev's conception of the convention is a simple one. He reports the rise of a "revisionist" and opportunist "right wing" in the party and he reports with satisfaction that it was overwhelmingly defeated. His "revisionism," of course, refers pseudonymously to the Gates tendency. The convention victors, in his view, were no others than the defenders of "Marxism-Leninism," a euphemism for Stalinism.

A few excerpts reveal the mood of his report:

"In recent months, the situation was aggravated by revisionist and right-opportunist elements who tried to utilize the party's policy of overcoming past left-sectarian mistakes to put forward the liquidationist idea of converting the party into an amorphous 'political association.' There was also a proposal to organize a 'mass party for socialism' into which the Communist Party would dissolve. The revisionists urged the rejection of a number of basic Marxist-Leninist principles. They also put for-

PROCEEDINGS: 16th National Convention Communist Party, USA, February 9-12, 1957. New Century Publishers, 351 pp., 2.75 paperbound.

ward a policy implying departure from the principle of proletarian internationalism."

We remind the too trusting reader that "proletarian internationalism" is a synonym for an utter dependence upon the Moscow line.

"The firm Marxist-Leninists in the U.S. Communist Party resisted the revisionist and liquidationist moves," says Timofeyev, adding later:

"The hopes of reaction, which on the eve of the convention claimed that the CP was facing a 'split' with most of its members advocating 'rejection' of the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism were shattered. . . Differences which had earlier come to the fore were resolved. Party unity was strengthened on the basis of Marxist-Leninist principles."

It is with obvious satisfaction that the Russian writer looks at his world movement: "Everywhere, including the United States, the Communists are repulsing the attempts of the reactionaries. While overcoming past mistakes of a dogmatic and left-sectarian nature, the Communists in the Western countries are at the same time vigorously opposing revisionist and liquidationist tendencies."

HITS BACK

Alan Max, of course, objects to all this; for he interprets the convention quite differently. He insists that the convention endorsed a new approach and chides Timofeyev for not mentioning it; he quotes from a resolution unanimously adopted by the new National Administrative Committee that spoke of a "new course."

"But where in T. Timofeyev's article," asks Max, "is there a single word about 'the extremely sharp turn which the Party is now making'? Where is there the slightest indication of any 'new course' or of what the *Political Affairs* editorial calls 'this new, creative approach and broader understanding of theory'? Or the *Political Affairs* estimate that 'in abandoning the earlier idealistic and uncritical attitude towards the lands of socialism while recognizing their historic role and achievements, the party has strengthened its ability to promote true proletarian internationalism? Where is there the slightest hint of the party's new approach to Social Democracy, or of the convention reply to Jacques Duclos of France?'"

Max hopes, finally, that when the printed proceedings reach *International Affairs* it will correct its estimate. "Such an account, especially if it remained uncorrected," he writes, could only tend to shake the confidence of your readers in the ability of your journal to give sound political estimates."

One can understand Max's dissatisfaction and sympathize with his remonstrances. But he must face one question that remains after a thorough reading of his "Open Letter."

If we omit its distinctive Stalinist slant, the "wrong estimate" of *International Affairs* is shared by virtually every important ideological tendency in the United States with the exception of a few radical sects. Why?

The common conception, or misconception if you like, is that the CP remains today just what it was yesterday. If this thought is prevalent within the Communist "family," can one be surprised to find that it dominates public opinion in the United States, not merely

among bourgeois right-wingers but among liberals and laborites as well?

We turn now to some aspects of the proceedings not only for the facts but also for the source of the misunderstandings.

SLURRING OVER

(1) *The Main Political Resolution:*

• Reprinted in a lengthy appendix, the main political resolution was finally adopted at the convention almost unanimously, with the votes of the leaders of all three groups. Summing up his views Foster referred to all the main convention documents:

"And I must say that I have voted for every one of these documents, that I have been present when they were adopted, and as far as I know, there were no others that I would vote against."

One may dig deep into the resolution and perhaps find many things that Foster should reject, but the fact is that it became the basis for unity at the convention and for slurring over all differences. The proceedings show, too, that it was this unity, not the real differences among the tendencies, that was underlined.

This stands in sharp contrast to the pre-convention discussion. In the months before the convention, the Draft Resolution became the starting point for a vigorous debate, for a presentation of a tentative but clearly anti-Stalinist line, for an attack upon the apologists for Russian domination. It is true that all this was not wiped out at the convention but it was minimized.

In the pre-convention period there was a line of division, apparent to all, between those who endorsed Russian intervention in Hungary and those who opposed it. But there was only incidental references to Hungary at the convention, in almost every case snide attacks on the critics of Russia.

The differences, then, emerged in the debate on the Draft Resolution; they were submerged in the adoption of the Main Political Resolution at the convention. The resolutions are fundamentally the same but the debates were different.

(2) *"Right-opportunism":*

The party wing led by Gates which had really begun to move away from Stalinism was labeled a "right-opportunist" current by the party Stalinists. Neither Foster nor Dennis wanted a head-on fight with Gates; their moral standing was not high enough at the height of the party crisis. But they attacked "right opportunism"—Dennis anonymously, and Foster by referring to Gates by name.

But in the atmosphere of unity, the Gatesites remained silent.

In a dozen different ways the convention inserted one little amendment after another to the Main Resolution denouncing, rejecting, and warning against "right-opportunism." In the context of the party situation, this was and could only be an attack on the Gatesites, a setback for them and a step backward for the party.

FOSTERITE GAINS

(3) *"Left-Sectarianism":*

The convention agreed that "left-sectarianism was the main danger and the source of all the main 'mistakes.'" In the pre-convention period, some party members presented the raw truth. They insisted that the party had been isolated because it had come forward as an apologist for a regime in Russia which had been exposed as a regime of police terror. But nothing much was heard of this at the convention.

"Left-sectarianism" was portrayed as nothing but a series of individual extremist "mistakes" which derived, in part, from a mechanical application of a line accepted unthinkingly from abroad. Yet it was not this which broke the party's spine but the fact that in all its tactical moves "right" or "left" it came forward as the defender of a tyrannical government in the name of "socialism"; thus it defamed socialism and isolated itself at the same time.

The fight over "left-sectarianism" and

"right-opportunism" came to a head when opposing reports were submitted by William Schneiderman, for the majority of a Resolutions-subcommittee, and by Esther Cantor, a Fosterite, for the minority.

Schneiderman said that "this sharp division of views dealt with the line and the content of what this discussion is all about." And he emphasized: "without attempting to impugn the motives of any comrades who make amendments or such proposals, it is known to this convention and the whole party that there is a current which is fighting to reverse the main direction of the draft resolution."

In her report, Esther Cantor demanded that the resolution be sharpened up in its rejection of "right opportunism."

The convention listened to what Schneiderman had called a basic difference and instructed the Resolutions Committee to try to bring in a unanimous report on the question—which it did. The final compromise agreed that left-sectarianism, not opportunism, was the main danger, but that the party had to struggle on "both fronts" and it repudiated "existent right-opportunist tendencies."

It may have seemed like mere word-juggling to some. But it represented little successes of the Fosterites in stemming the tide of anti-Stalinism and in cutting away at the Gates wing.

FEW SPOKE UP

(4) The replacing of the party by a "Political Action Association" was rejected by the convention.

We knew this fact before the proceedings were printed. In the pre-convention period, the proposal was vigorously advanced and strongly defended. But we know now that it was not defended at the convention itself by more than a word.

These aspects of the convention, and others, demonstrate what the mood of unity meant in practice. It is true that the Duclos letter was repulsed; that Foster was not able to restore the status quo; that the Stalinists could not turn the party back to the old mold. But every advance in thinking had been made before the convention in the pre-convention debates.

Foster did not win. But he and those who agreed with him on fundamentals were able to stop the movement away from Stalinism and to stall the political development of the party members.

One delegate, Bob of New York, voted against a section of the Resolution:

"... it does not sufficiently explore one of the major factors responsible for our errors, both to the right and left throughout our history, and that is, a fundamentally incorrect conception of proletarian internationalism. . . . Proletarian internationalism means that if we believe in and support the Soviet Union and socialism, we must speak out against every Soviet policy, whether domestic or foreign which hinders socialism in the world."

But this voice, still speaking from the standpoint of one who believes that Russia is socialist, was a lone one.

Delegate William Mandel was alone too in speaking against the inclusion of Foster and Dennis on the new National Committee. "These two men," he said, "have lost all possibility of respect of this party. . . . The American people will never regard as independent a party marked in the slightest degree by the presence of such leaders or by half-way statements on such policies, if that is the future assured by this convention."

In the period since the convention, the party at best has been standing still. Of the executions and jailings in Hungary we have heard not a word. In New York the Fosterites make progress.

But now, at least, Alan Max speaks out against one Russian interpretation of the convention. It is not a move that can have far-reaching consequences in altering the attitude of American radicals toward the CP. Perhaps it can become the starting point for a new definition of views inside the party.

Disarmament Talks---

(Continued from page 1)

opening the way to further and more meaningful agreements. But immediately after the break-through, each side runs into the main or serious positions of the other. These are not going to be whittled away by a series of salami slices until the whole salami of the arms race disappears.

The resolving of the arms race depends on the extent that the political differences can be resolved. And as long as the U. S.'s condition for disarmament is the dissolution of the Russian empire and the opening up of Russia to complete inspection (and by implication a degree of control) of Russian military potential, and as long as the Russians want a complete dismantling of U. S. military alliances and bases all over the world, a return of U. S. military power to the continental limits of the U. S., as well as inspection over U. S. military potential, it is difficult to see how any meaningful step will be made.

But even the attempt to agree on a "thin slice" is fraught with tremendous difficulties. Even now it appears that the meeting of the UN Disarmament Subcommittee in London will only manage to come up with an agreement to agree that a "thin slice" agreement should be reached as a "first step." Exactly what is to be contained in such an agreement may very well be left over to a meeting of the Big Four.

DISARMAMENT AS A WEAPON

Already Secretary of State Dulles has indicated a willingness to meet later this year, or perhaps the beginning of 1958, to discuss the details of the initial step. And even then such a meeting of foreign ministers may do nothing more than prepare the ground for a Big Four meeting of the heads of state some time later.

Such a stretched-out time-table may be entirely agreeable to the Russians, who are now feverishly working on the problems of developing the long-range intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM).

Whether such a "thin slice" can be negotiated depends on what either side believes to be its advantage, aside from the propaganda value of appearing to be conciliatory and really desirous of disarmament. In general all previous proposals by both the U. S. and Russia were carefully designed to strike at the other's weakness and to build up a political and military advantage. A detailed accounting of every major proposal made by either side will show how each is skillfully tailored to gain a military advantage while giving up as little as possible, or else to score propagandistically.

Khrushchev's bold, as well as demagogical, call for the withdrawal of all troops from Europe is just such an example of the latter type. President Eisenhower's "Open Sky" inspection proposal, which was subsequently admitted to be inadequate from the U. S. point of view, is another. Such proposals, rather than being a means toward an agreement, actually were a barrier.

Another characteristic of these negotiations is that the Russians have consistently taken the initiative in proposing outlawing of the H-bomb, the withdrawal of all foreign troops or new conferences to discuss disarmament. The failure of one conference was the incentive to start beating the drum for another one within a matter of months.

WHAT U. S. WANTS

The purpose has been to keep the Western alliance, and specifically NATO, off-balance. While the U. S. is exerting the maximum pressure to build up the military forces in Western Europe, Russia has been proposing a bewildering array of "peace" and "disarmament" demands. Its goal quite naturally was to raise every impediment possible against the military build-up in Western Europe,

while at the same time it engaged in as rapid as possible a military build-up itself, especially in nuclear weapons.

The U. S. on the other hand has been proposing a series of inspection schemes designed to set up a thorough system of inspection before any real limitation or control. The purpose was quite obvious; it would open up the Russian mainland to U. S. military intelligence, which could gain valuable information not now possessed, while offering the Russians corresponding access to plant and military-installation locations which are probably already known to the Russians anyway. This exchange of information would easily be more advantageous to the U. S.; hence the adamant Russian opposition to any effective inspection proposal.

Given their objective in respect to NATO and specifically their attempt to prevent the rearming of Germany, the Russians have faced the problem of how to get around the U. S. inspection proposals and keep the door to negotiations open. Therefore they have made a number of concessions toward the U. S. positions.

When the "Open Sky" proposal was made, the Kremlin denounced it as a disguised form of espionage and a trap, in which the U. S. would get all the information it wanted at the early stages and then refuse to go along in the disarmament stages of the proposal.

Later Russia modified this opposition to the point where they have proposed, under certain conditions, to open up a

large area of East Europe and Russia itself to aerial inspection in return for certain areas of the U. S. They have gone so far over, at least on paper, that they are proposing aerial inspection for a larger area than the U. S. seems willing to agree to.

INSISTENT QUESTION

A conciliatory attitude of this type is possible for the Russians, since, given the U. S. attitude of distinct coolness toward the effectiveness of the "Open Sky" inspection, it commits them to no real inspection of Russian territory. And more important, it encourages all those tendencies among the NATO allies, especially in Germany, that look toward a reduction of military expenditures at the time when the entire NATO military structure faces dissolution. It keeps the pot of disarmament boiling and it probably won't commit them to anything specific for at least another year.

The more conciliatory the Russians appear to become, and the greater the possibility of a "thin slice" agreement, the more it calls into question the entire military orientation of U. S. foreign policy, in particular NATO. U. S. proposals at these disarmament conferences have been designed to permit the Western military build-up to continue, and are seriously concerned only with inspections.

But it is being asked with increasing frequency: if the Russians are really going to make a serious disarmament proposal, then what happens to NATO,

S. F. Meeting Discusses Future of American Socialism

San Francisco, May 25

Somewhat belatedly, public confrontation of views on socialist regroupment came to San Francisco last night.

Speaking on the topic "What is the Future of American Socialism?" were Ted Enright for the Independent Socialist League, Al Richmond for the Communist Party, William Warde for the Socialist Workers Party, Vincent Hallinan speaking as an unaffiliated socialist, and Charles Curtis for the Socialist Party. The discussion, which drew a crowd of about 200 people, was sponsored by the Independent Socialist Forum of the Bay Area, a local forum group including all radical tendencies.

Opening the discussion for the ISL, Ted Enright proposed the building of a broad, inclusive "Debsian" party of democratic socialism as the proper road toward socialist reunification.

The American workers will scorn any movement which is anti-democratic or is tied in any way to Stalinist totalitarianism. And only the hopeless sectarian believes that the whole of the radical movement can be "regrouped" into submission to the complete and "pure" program of any of the existing sects. Only a movement which has room for a wide variety of divergent democratic socialist tendencies can now hope to gather together convinced socialists and begin again to win mass influence on the American scene, he said.

Speaking for the Communist Party, Richmond made a verbal bow to the necessity of discussion and mutual criticism among radicals. But he then proceeded to avoid any real discussion either of different views within the radical movement, or of how opponents of capitalism might work together. He argued, instead, that the growth of the socialist movement depends upon its action on the immediate problems of the people, and that the Communist Party has demonstrated the greatest capacity for such action. (Meaning: "regroup" by joining the CP.)

ISSUE OF STALINISM

Warde, after giving a standard SWP analysis of the international situation, asserted that radicals could unite—if at all—only after prolonged discussion had led to programmatic agreement. (Meaning: "regroup" by joining the SWP.)

Hallinan, receiving the friendliest response of the evening from an audience

largely composed of former members and sympathizers of the Communist Party, proposed creation of a new party to run socialist candidates in California, a party which should take no stand on "remote" international questions; he specifically cited the Hungarian Revolution as an issue which should not be allowed to mar "all-socialist unity." This ostrich-reaction to events beyond the three-mile zone was subjected to severe criticism in the discussion period.

Charles Curtis, speaking for the Socialist Party, sharply criticized the suppression of all democratic rights within the Stalinist empire, and denounced the anti-democratic record of the Communist Party. Emphasizing that democracy and socialism are inseparable, he called upon former Communists to repudiate totalitarianism and to join with the Socialist Party in rebuilding the democratic socialist movement.

The discussion from the floor was far more heated than at any previous meeting of the Independent Socialist Forum. A good part of it was given over to attacks on the Socialist Party by the SWP—including attack upon its membership in the Second International "which includes Guy Mollet." In reply, Curtis stated the Socialist Party's opposition to Mollet's Algerian policy and pointed to the wide variety of tendencies included in the international.

LIVELY DISCUSSION

The only concrete proposal for unity brought out in the discussion was the ISL's offer to merge with the Socialist Party in the work of building a vigorous, inclusive democratic socialist movement.

An ISL speaker from the floor made clear that while the Socialist Party still had a long way to go in awakening to present opportunities and in opening its ranks to all democratic socialists regardless of their particular theoretical views or past affiliations, nevertheless the broadness of its composition and of its tradition made the Socialist Party the best available arena for genuine socialist reunification. The entry of other radicals into it, moreover, would greatly transform the Socialist Party from its present dormant and sectarian condition.

The evening as a whole, while it produced a rather hot and steamy atmosphere, contributed considerably to the task of laying before the radical public the various positions now current on regroupment.

SEATO and the Baghdad Pact? Will it not mean a change in the entire set of assumptions on which American foreign policy is based—that is, peace through deterrence, or reliance on massive retaliation with nuclear weapons?

The decision of the Eisenhower administration to make a counter-proposal to the Russian proposal of April 30 to a limited "decree broke new ground in recent thinking about U. S. foreign policy. Its effects will probably be much less in the disarmament negotiations than in renewed thinking about the assumptions of the foreign policy of the last decade.

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!

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

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

LABOR ACTION • 17th YEAR

June 17, 1957 Vol. 21, No. 24

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

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

Japanese Students Lead in Protest on H-Bomb Tests

By MEL STACK

On May 17 the students of Japan collectively demonstrated against H-bomb tests. World-wide protest against these tests, which hold such inherent dangers to humanity, has been steadily mounting from all areas of the population: the scientists, labor movements, even the Pope. And now the Japanese students have symbolically added the voice of youth.

Everyone knows how the Japanese people feel about the American and Russian experiments. After all, they were the first to be experimented on; and it is their country, of all the major countries, which is closest to the present-day proving grounds. They were the ones who had hundreds of thousands killed at the end of World War II by the Bomb, the ones who saw their ships come back with fishermen and tuna contaminated by fall-out radiation, the people who are continuously doused by radioactive rains, and who must take great precaution even in regard to the water they drink lest it be too "hot."

Thus it is not surprising to find them in the forefront of opposition to the use and testing of nuclear weapons.

The Japanese parliament was the first to petition for the cessation of the tests. And during May, the people of Japan twice demonstrated their total opposition.

The first demonstration took place on May Day. Approximately 3 1/2 million Japanese turned out for the rallies, the largest participation in years. Originally it was planned that the major slogan would be the traditional "Down with the Tory Cabi-

net," with all other issues, including the H-bomb, remaining secondary. However, a spontaneous reversal took place. At every meeting in the country, the major, dominating, overwhelming slogan was to "Prohibit Nuclear Weapons Tests."

At the Tokyo rally, attended by over 300,000, a tremendous banner was hoisted with the inscription, "To Hell With Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs!" And of course every rally passed resolutions calling for an end to the bomb tests.

MASS RALLY IN TOKYO

Then on May 16, Great Britain exploded its first H-bomb. On May 17 the Japanese students retaliated with massive protest rallies.

The National Federation of Student Self-Government Associations (known as Zengakuren) had previously proclaimed May 17 as the "All-Japan Student Action Day in Protest Against Nuclear Wars," with the slogan of "Oppose Preparations for Atomic Warfare." Zengakuren says that 350,000 students demonstrated.

According to *Mainichi*, 21 student bodies of 16 universities went on strike and rallies were held at 63 places with 350,000 students of 168 schools participating

in the rallies. At the Maiji University, classes were closed at 10:30 in the morning. At Waseda University, 2500 students gathered in the Okuma Auditorium for their protest meeting, the first time in 4 years that the auditorium was used for such a student rally.

But the really impressive events took place in the capitol, Tokyo.

On Thursday, May 16, the British embassy had been picketed by 250 student leaders representing the various student groups and universities. This was the kickoff for Friday's events.

At 1 p.m. on Friday, the student rally began in Hibiya Park. After the speeches 10,000 of the students marched to the Defense Agency Building and then to the British embassy. Only at 7 p.m. did the rally finally break up.

The *Japan Times* reports that "all traffic was stopped on the avenue separating the embassy compound from the Imperial Palace moat as the students roamed around." The Metropolitan Police Board had mobilized 1000 guards to be certain things did not get out of hand. But there was no cause for alarm; this was not a mob; these were serious youth who realize what great dangers to humanity lie in the testing of H-bombs. There was no violence at this protest demonstration against the worst violence of all, the H-bomb.

And after the students had dispersed, ten remained to begin a two-day hunger strike in front of the British embassy.

WORLD PROTEST MOUNTS

Mainichi criticized the students for calling the rallies in response to the immediate question of the British tests, for not including the Russian and American ones as well. This is a fair criticism, although the content and symbolism of the demonstrations ramified to all testing by all governments. The students should have spelled this out as *Mainichi* suggested.

We must remember that the Japanese

student rallies take place in the context of the growing total hostility of all peoples to the menace of the H-bomb and the governments who conduct the tests. It is not simply the Japanese people.

For example, the May Day rallies in England were organized around the theme of living costs and rental increases. Yet when the thousands marched through London, the dominating posters and banners were "Ban the Bomb" and "Stop the Tests."

In Germany, in the middle of May, the Social-Democratic Party introduced a resolution in the lower house calling for the immediate cessation of the tests. Adenauer was forced to offer a compromise which pulled the teeth out of the socialist motion. But even this indicated the great pressure being exerted by the German people.

IT CAN BE STOPPED

And in the United States, 2000 scientists, led by three Nobel Prizewinners, signed a statement which outlined the great dangers of an increasing radiation level and called for a halt.

Everywhere protest mounts. Everywhere the people realize the threat.

But the United States, Russia, and now Great Britain continue their tests, drop their bombs, contaminate the atmosphere, push the radiation level up and up, increase the dangers.

So what if it is possible that many thousands may die of leukemia and others suffer genetic damage that will only show its results in future mutations? The arms race takes precedence.

It takes precedence—only if the people remain silent. With enough pressure the tests can be stopped, as the calling of the Senate investigating committee indicates. But it means more pressure, more rallies, resolutions, statements.

The American students and youth must take up the protest from the Japanese. After all, this time it is their lives, their future children's lives, which are at stake.

Give Thanks, We're Saved Again

By SAMUEL PETERSON

On May 21 a Special Committee of the New York City Board of Higher Education struck a daring blow against the efforts of subversives to undermine the political reliability and conformism of New York college students. A notorious subversive, Warren Austin, masquerading as a professor of English at City College, was approached in the very act of conducting a final examination. Warren was suspended from his position and removed from the room in which he was giving an end-term exam in composition to a class of engineering students. This heroic action was performed single-handedly by the chairman of the department.

Austin commenced his teaching career in 1931, some 27 years ago, and is regarded as a competent teacher. Nonetheless, the Board's Special Committee was not taken in by the fraud, and recognized what lay beneath the surface.

The publicly-known evidence assembled against him consisted of the fact that Austin was a close friend of Morris U. Schappes during the 1930s and attended various social gatherings with him; also that he had signed during this time certain subversive petitions and contributed money to certain subversive organizations. Schappes was a known Communist on the City College faculty until 1941, when he was forced out.

At about that time Austin appeared to lose interest in petition-signing and in contributing funds to these organizations, and seemed to devote himself to Shakespeare. The Board's Special Committee was not taken in, however.

In 1954 Austin was asked to appear at a meeting of the Special Council of the Special Committee, where he was shown a picture of himself and Schappes, taken many years ago at a picnic. He was also confronted with a petition he had

signed 23 years ago calling for the reinstatement of a teacher who was a Communist.

He was asked if he had ever been a member of the Communist Party, to which he replied in the negative. This hearing closed on a friendly note, as did a subsequent one in 1955. The whole affair seemed to be closed.

But in October of that year he found that his promotion had been held up. An inquiry to the CCNY president produced the reply that his case was still "unfinished business." He requested and received another interview with the Special Committee, at which again matters appeared to be cleared up.

But on May 20 of this year, he was notified that charges of "conduct unbecoming a teacher and falsely denying membership in the Communist Party" would be pressed against him that night. He immediately asked for another interview, but was told that it would only be possible "if a resignation were in the offing." And the next day he was suspended and removed from his post in the midst of conducting that exam.

To be sure, there may be some people who will question why a subversive should be interrogated just because he may belong to the CP. And others may ask why he was suspended before his trial has been held. And still other voices will be heard to question the procedure whereby his suspension was effected in front of a class of students, an act that might cause embarrassment and humiliation.

But then, what can one expect from carping "ritualistic liberals"? What do they want anyway? He will be getting a trial, won't he? Besides, doesn't the Board of Higher Education have the obligation to protect the minds and hearts of naive students from influences subversive of the best American traditions of democracy, fair play, and square shooting?

A LESSON FROM SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

The 'Color-Blind Age'

By TOM KAHN

This May, which marked the third anniversary of the Supreme Court decision on segregation, brought forth in the *N. Y. Times* a series of six articles assessing the progress of integration in the Southern schools.

The articles, written by the *Times'* ace reporter on education, Benjamin Fine, give accounts of community reactions to desegregation in studied cities—Wilmington, Del.; Charleston, W. Va.; Lexington, Ky.; Kansas City, Mo.; Tulsa, Okla.; San Antonio, Texas.

However, based as they are on snatches of interviews with students, teachers and parents, with little sociological commentary or generalization or prognosis, the articles seem, at least to this reader, all too often to be vignette sketches of localized community psychology with no indication of how typical of broader areas the attitudes of the smaller communities are.

Another example of the inadequacy of Fine's reportings is his failure to penetrate farther into the deep South—Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana—where there is more adamant resistance to integration. The writer's eschewal of the real sore-spots, accounting for some perhaps unfounded optimism, detracts from the study as an inclusive over-all survey.

Despite these limitations, however, the *Times'* series makes valuable contributions as a study of the marked and basic changes in social attitudes evident in those areas where integration has made institutional progress.

For example, the interviews with students reveal a consistent pattern: a scale indicating a correlation between age, grade and acceptance of racially mixed classes.

The articles point out that integration in the lower grades has proceeded virtually without incident. Fine's observation on integration in elementary schools in Charleston seems to hold true generally for the areas considered:

"On the elementary level, almost without exception, Negro children and white ones play and study together. As was found in Wilmington, Del. the youngsters here are 'colorblind': They make no distinction between races in the classroom or in the play yards."

However, interracial fraternization off-campus usually lags behind that on-campus, and the disparity widens the higher the grade. Moreover—and the point loses none of its significance for all of its reiteration—association between Negroes and whites of high school age is less free and uninhibited than in elementary school.

(Turn to last page)

THE PROGRAMMATIC SIDE OF THE RUSSIAN STUDENT UNREST

'Socialist Revolution Against the Pseudo-Socialist State'

A NOTE ON THE BACKGROUND OF THIS DOCUMENT

Here is the full text for the first time in English (as far as we know, and as far as the full text seems to be publishable) of the exceedingly interesting "Letter from a Russian Student" which has been appearing in excerpts in two or three publications, including the Young Socialist Challenge.

What we find especially interesting in this complete text are the sections dealing with programmatic questions of the anti-Stalinist revolution, as discussed by the Russian students, which have been skimmed in previous excerpts.

It is translated here from its feature publication in Demain, the well-known French weekly, for May 2-8. A note by the editors of Demain states that the writer of the letter is a student at Moscow University of Russian nationality.

The letter, dated early January 1957, says Demain, "came to an Austrian journalist Werner Scharndorff who lived for several years in the USSR (particularly in the camps) and kept up reliable relations there. The Russian original and the identity of the

student allowed us to verify the authenticity of this document which Werner Scharndorff was willing to put at our disposal. . . . We have cut out only some passages that are without interest . . . and we have tried to 'depersonalize' the text in order to make impossible any identification of its writer."

The ellipsis-points in our text below are reproduced from Demain; we have made no cuts ourselves. Subheads and footnotes are added by LABOR ACTION.

A German translation of this letter appeared in the Austrian organ Forum. The Nation for April 6 printed excerpts translated from this source; the Challenge for April 15 reproduced this in turn. This excerpted version omitted the programmatic side virtually completely. The New Leader for May 20 printed a larger selection of excerpts; last week Challenge reproduced two additional paragraphs from this source. Thus LABOR ACTION readers have seen parts of this letter before, in snippets and sections, and in a different translation.

Letter from A Russian Student

It was through news broadcast by Western radio stations, as well as a news item broadcast by Radio Warsaw, that we learned the West knew about the events at Lomonosov University in Moscow. But we had to note that their development and importance was not correctly understood in the West.

For us Soviet students, November 30, 1956 was a memorable day; some say it was an historic day. After Professor B. E. Siroyechkovich had given his lecture on Marxism-Leninism, a discussion arose, as usual. In the course of this discussion, one student posed an essential question, a question which perhaps bears within itself the whole fate of our Marxism.

He first explained entirely correctly Lenin's teaching according to which the general strike is the weapon of the proletariat, and according to which a general strike which has been launched for economic motives can, under certain historically determined circumstances, become a political strike and end up by being transformed into an armed uprising.

After insisting on this thesis of Lenin's, and after pointing out that the general strike could never become the fighting weapon of the exploiting class, the student asked how, in a socialist state, or to be altogether concrete, in Hungary, a general strike could have arisen, seeing that one couldn't have a general strike directed against a Communist workers' and peasants' government. . . .

Professor Siroyechkovich's reply limited itself to repeating the arguments given by our press. That wasn't enough for a university discussion. He began by talking of the terror spread by the Horthy-fascist officers and the diversionist activities of the Western imperialists. . . . His words were drowned by the protests of the students who, by dint of quotations from Lenin, showed that the professor had not grappled with the basis of the problem. . . .

In conclusion, the students invoked a classic formulation of Lenin's, according to which the

duty and the task of the "party of a new type"¹ is to make its own the demands of the workers that are put forward in a general strike and give them the most effective orientation. In any case, the "party of a new type" doesn't have the right to fight against the general strike with the methods used by the state of the bourgeoisie and the exploiters, that is, with emergency legal sanctions, armed force, and forced dissolution of the workers' councils.

When it got to this point, the discussion degenerated into chaotic vociferation; the professor decided to clear the hall.

News of this happening very rapidly made the rounds of the student population of the university discussions broke out; late in the night, Hungarian students who were guests from the University of Moscow were awakened, to ask them for information on the situation in their country. The Hungarians weren't used to such frank discussions and, taking into consideration the successive reversals in the political situation which had just taken place in their own country, they evaded all questions that were at all sensitive ones.

But in spite of that, the little they did reveal furnished the Soviet students with points of comparison with the situation in the Soviet Union. . . .

Exploiting Class?

Little by little a capital question—capital from the viewpoint of an "already realized socialism"—crystallized in their minds. Here it is:

Can't one consider that the party apparatus, although it has no formal title to the ownership of the means of production of the community, has become a class of exploiters in the original Marxist sense of this concept, through its effective control over the means of production, through its utilization of them, through its power to control the assignment and distribution of the labor force, and, finally, through its control over wages? And if this is so, can't one consider that the utilization of the general strike weapon against the party apparatus can be legitimate and even necessary?

¹That is, the newly founded Communist Party, as discussed by Lenin.

The debate faltered on this essential question; it ended without the participants being able to agree on an answer.

The next day, handwritten sheets of paper made their appearance on the Komsomol² wallboards of Lomonosov University; they demanded truthful reports on the events in Hungary and a frank discussion on their meaning. Although these sheets were very quickly torn off, their content was spread by word of mouth through the whole university.

At noon, new notices were tacked up which called Komsomol militants to a meeting to discuss the "shameful incidents" of the day before. The expression "shameful" was soon scratched out, but the notices remained on the wallboard.

"Excesses"

The meeting took place in the quarters of the Ostrovsky Club. It was opened by Linkov, the secretary of the university Komsomol, who declared it was the duty of the Komsomol to prevent in the future any "excesses dishonoring the university" like those of the day before.

The audience was forced to regard this declaration as a provocation; new "excesses" took place immediately. Quickly a motion was adopted which put forward as the sole topic of discussion "the Hungarian question in the light of Marxism-Leninism," thus taking away from the party functionaries all control over the exchange of views.

The first speaker spoke of a "hypertrophied bureaucratic apparatus" which had alienated itself from the masses and had tried to maintain itself in power by Beria's methods. Although this statement was applied to Hungary, the allusion to the Soviet situation escaped no one.

The comparison was even put forward explicitly: "There is cause to wonder," declared the speaker, "whether the non-execution of the decisions of the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the USSR is not such as to provoke among us a similar development, and whether our workers invoking Lenin's teachings, are not one day going to rise up against their bourgeoisified and bureaucratized exploiters?"

Linkov protested against these statements that were "hostile to the party" and wanted to cut the speaker off; he ran into so lively a resistance from the participants in the meeting that he preferred to walk out of the hall, surrounded by his collaborators. The discussion went on nonetheless, and even several Komsomols participated in it.

Branding the System

In the evening, the discussion was taken up again at the "Literary House" by a writers' and students' circle.

The events in Hungary no longer formed the central theme; they were no longer brought up except as an example of the development for which the premises existed everywhere, including in the USSR itself. . . . So they didn't fail to raise, as a consequence, the question of classes in the Soviet society. Almost in their totality the participants in the discussion judged that the official formula about "the alliance of the workers and peasants with the intellectuals, under the leadership of the working class" did not correspond to the real situation, and that the opposition between exploiters and exploited continued to exist in the Soviet state.

Only the distinguishing mark of the exploiting class, it was pointed out, had changed by the abolition of private property in the means of

²The Komsomol is the Young Communist League; also, a member thereof.

They Go Straight to Heart of the Class Nature of the System...

production. The property rights of the workers over the means of production, they added, are purely formal; furthermore, the preference which the party, based on a centralized administration, gave to the development of heavy industry had juridically fixed the class differences in Soviet society: the beneficiaries of this policy had for their own protection installed a class justice similar to the one that in bourgeois society has the role of protecting the class of exploiters. As in capitalist society, the class justice of the socialist state puts the label of high treason on any movement of opposition against the exploiters and therefore represses it. This state of things, they added, means that the objectives of the October Revolution had been transformed into their opposite. . . .

Inevitably the young writers present at this meeting also began to talk about freedom of literary and artistic creation. Starting with condemnation of the cult of personality, they condemned the type of Soviet literature which had been born in the Thirties, a literature which they looked on as a product of propaganda, influenced by the cult of personality and run by party functionaries who were enemies of culture.

Different Roads

They also talked about the "different roads to socialism," the principle of which had been approved by the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the USSR, and it was pointed out that since the Yugoslav and Polish peoples had already started on their own roads, with the *de facto* approval of the Soviet Union, this possibility likewise had to be granted to the different peoples of the Soviet Union, each of whom had undertaken the construction of so-

cialism in particular conditions.

It was in this connection that formal differences showed up among the participants in the discussion.

The students and writers who were natives of Russia proper [Great Russia] absolutely refused the possibility of seeking to reach socialism in their own way to the Ukraine, the Baltic countries, the Central Asian countries, etc. . . . If one starts on this road, they pointed out, we risk endangering the economic potential of the Soviet Union and seeing it dissolve into a whole series of national states, whereas the idea of the national state must be considered historically obsolete, since in point of fact the state is not to be defined by the nation but by its social structure and economic space.

The next day, rumors circulated in Moscow about a meeting that the Komsomol Committee of Moscow had called to discuss the incidents at Lomonosov University.

The Komsomol leaders had wondered, to begin with, whether they ought to consider these incidents as negative or positive phenomena. One of the committee members, Artemov, was of the opinion that they ought to react against demagogic tendencies that were too pronounced, but that the incidents considered in themselves had rather a positive side, for they were such as to stir the youth movements to shake off an inertia that had lasted too many years. This viewpoint was not approved.

The committee decided to "advise" the rector of the university to expel a certain number of students, who would be named on a list to be drawn up by the Komsomol. At the same time they imposed severe censures on the university's Komsomol secretaries, for "insufficient contact with the students and grave errors in ideological work."

In point of fact, on December 3 the rector's office announced the expulsion of 150 students for "hooliganism"; at the same time it made it known that courses in Marxism-Leninism were suspended till after the New Year's holiday.

For the first time in the history of the University of Moscow, the administration was forced to suspend courses because the professors were not capable of facing up to questions coming up in a discussion. The students considered this fact as a success, as a victory over the Komsomol people. The latter had hoped that the agitation would finally calm down; but in fact the discussions went on in the clubs and in University City . . .

For Revolution

It was in the course of these discussions that there was forged the slogan of the "socialist revolution against the pseudo-socialist state."

Lenin himself had created its ideological bases, and had minutely described the methods and fighting tactics to follow. The students of Russian nationality were the first to adopt this slogan, for they saw in it a possibility of maintaining the unity of the state. The students of other nationalities took rather to the principle of "different roads to socialism." The traditional opposition between the Russians proper and the other nationalities of the USSR clearly showed itself on this occasion.

By all appearances socialism will not be able to maintain itself among us on any long-term basis unless it shows itself capable of realizing in some way the slogan of "socialist revolution against the pseudo-socialist state." On the other hand, the formula of "different roads to socialism," even though it has been enunciated by the present leaders of the Soviet Union, seems to indicate a development which, instead of leading to a rebirth of socialism, rather seems necessarily to end in the birth of new autonomous (indeed, sovereign) entities, in which nationalism would raise the danger of bursting the framework of the unitary state and consequently leading to the liquidation of its socialist institutions.

The importance that the Komsomol gave the discussions inside the university necessarily had

the unexpected result that similar discussions started up in other places also. In mid-December, the Komsomol militants of the Moscow military district had to have a meeting to take up analogous discussions inside the garrisons.

"Demagogic elements in the ranks of the youth, on the occasion of different party meetings, have recently abused inner-party democracy, made abusive usage of the right to criticism, and devoted themselves to massive attacks, usually unjustified, against local and central leaders of the party, against the party leadership, and against the system itself. These attacks, launched in the name of ultra-revolutionary slogans, were exacerbated to the point of turning into reactionary and counter-revolutionary threats . . ."

Leningrad Goes Further

Around mid-December, we learned that incidents had also taken place in the schools and higher-education institutions of Leningrad. Faithful to the old revolutionary tradition of Leningrad, the students down there went much further than we.

They regularly publish a mimeographed student journal *Goluboy Buton* (The Blue Bud) which is controlled neither by the administration nor the Komsomol, in which they discuss questions of contemporary Marxism, artistic creation, etc. In spite of violent attacks directed against the editors of this journal by the local Komsomol, no measures have been taken against them.

This fact made a profound impression on Moscow. The journal continues to appear; many of its articles are copied in Moscow, circulate from hand to hand, and furnish bases for other discussions.

The authorities have sought to put a check-rein on this intellectual development among the students. At the end of December it was decided that students who were natives of the Baltic countries could not continue their studies at Lomonosov University in Moscow but had to go back to universities in their own regions. As motivation for this measure, it was indicated that, while the general wave of discussion had not spared the universities of the Baltic countries, the discussions there were limited to a study of "different roads to socialism," which did not risk leading to developments stamped with the nationalist, anti-Russian, bourgeois and separatist ideology.

They Are Not Alone

We know that lively discussions broke out likewise at Kiev, Kharkov, Sverdlovsk, Novosibirsk, and as far as the universities of Central Asia, for example Tashkent.

All of them ended by posing the alternatives: Either a genuinely socialist reality was re-established, if necessary by revolution (this viewpoint was defended in the front line by the Russians proper), or else it will be necessary to borrow from "different roads to socialism," the latter solution finding its supporters especially among the Soviet citizens of nationality other than Russia, who stress that this type of development has not only been approved by the 20th Congress but that it has already taken on factuality.

The Komsomol's reactions, and the precipitate measures which it thought it had to take in certain cases, give the youth groups the conviction that they are not isolated and that the wave of discussion has taken hold of almost the whole Soviet youth.

There is no doubt that here is one of the most interesting political movements that can be seen since Stalin's death. It is notable that this movement was not unleashed by leading circles and that it was born spontaneously, inside the socialist camp. It is probable that the solutions, too, will be found inside the socialist camp. The leading circles certainly do not favor them; but it is hardly likely that they will be in position to oppose them.

How the Students Converted the Teacher

Gyula Hay was one of the most prominent of that notable group of Hungarian writers and intellectuals who turned the Petofo Circle of Budapest into a preparatory center of the revolution against the Stalinist regime, showing exceptional courage in this period in sticking his neck out in open dissent from the party line.

There is a very interesting statement quoted from Hay, on his evolution out of Stalinism, given in the Indian socialist weekly *Janata* (Feb. 17) in the course of an article by Ignazio Silone.

Silone prefaces the passage:

"I have before me as I write the explanation that was given to friends of mine who visited Julius Hay, the old Communist dramatist, in Budapest. To tell the truth, I remember Hay from the time of our common exile in Zurich as a rather hard man and a particularly narrow-minded Stalinist."

And he cites Hay:

"Several factors contributed to my evolution," said Hay. "The first of these, I admit, was a simple matter of taste. Like all our writers and artists, I suffered from Stalinist bad taste in matters having to do with culture and aesthetics. Another factor was the experience of the permanent injustice in our society. Also, I was struck by the obvious bankruptcy of an economic system which, according to our affirmations, ought to have proved its superiority to all others, and which, in actual fact, has ruined the country.

"The fourth and perhaps decisive factor was the behavior of the younger generation. For though it's true that writers have been in the vanguard—which is in keeping with an old Hungarian tradition on which we pride ourselves—I admit readily that, in my own personal case, it was not I who roused the spirit of freedom in the younger generation, but that, on the contrary, it was the younger generation that drove me forward.

"For years I gave courses and addressed students and young workers at meetings and in clubs; I was constantly aware that what I said had no power to convince them, that my explanations seemed to these young people to be mere eyewash. I began to speak more freely about bureaucratic excesses and deviations from socialism in our country. The more leeway I gave to my critical spirit, the more I felt myself carried along by an irresistible generation.

"Our young people are thirsting for freedom, and we writers have understood this. It is perhaps our poet Zeik who has best expressed what I mean: 'I was too cowardly to remain dishonest.'"

Washington's China Policy —

(Continued from page 1)

American government into its policy of supporting Chiang Kai-shek against the Chinese Stalinists, there were strong elements in and around the China lobby who were oriented toward a policy of an American military reconquest of China for the capitalist world. They dreamed of the vast opportunities for investment, trade and exploitation which such a reconquest would afford American capitalists in general and themselves in particular.

DOLLAR PRESSURE

But as the years go by, and Chiang's dream of reinvading China grows ever more distant, pressures for more immediate, though perhaps not so grandiose, economic objectives begin to take their toll. Textile manufacturers, suffering heavily from Japanese competition in the United States and Latin American markets, look to China as an outlet for Japanese economic energies which would lessen their pressure here. Shipping interests would rather make a dollar now in the China trade than dream of millions at some uncertain time in the future.

The strength of this pressure for loosening up trade relations with Communist China is attested to by the weight directed against it by those who seek to "keep the lid on" in China policy.

The "Committee of One Million Against the Admission of Communist China to the United Nations" responded to the British decision by issuing "An Appeal to All Free Men . . . NO TRADE WITH THE ENEMY." A key paragraph in this appeal reads:

"Such trade can only contribute

to the destruction of a free economy. How can any manufacturer, working on the basis of a free competitive system, hope to ever compete in the world market with goods produced by the massive slave-labor force of Communist China? To foster such trade, even in the hope of an immediate cash profit, is to ignore the obvious facts. Ultimate ruin faces any free economy attempting to compete on an equal basis with a slave economy."

EVEN THAILAND

The last sentence in this paragraph rings strangely from a committee the overwhelming majority of whose members are undoubtedly on record, on other occasions, with the contention that America's "free economy" is infinitely superior to that which prevails in the Communist world. But that is an aside.

This committee, which combines as diverse and strange a conglomeration of persons, politically speaking, as one could ever hope to get on one letterhead, is testimony to the breadth of support America's "hard" policy in Asia has enjoyed in this country in the past. It is not without significance, however, that in a lengthy manifesto replete with references to "the free nations of Asia," there is a studious avoidance of the specific mention of Chiang Kai-shek's regime in Formosa.

And it is not only in its Formosan bastion that America's "hard" line in Asia is in trouble.

In a dispatch from Bangkok dated June 9, the New York Times reports that the press of Thailand has been engaged for some time in a campaign which "calls for Thailand to adopt neutralism, pull out

of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization and develop closer diplomatic relations with Communist China."

"One of the disturbing elements in the current anti-United States onslaught," the Times dispatch adds, "is that it is not limited to Communist-oriented newspapers. They [observers] say that two of the newspapers leading the attack usually are identified in one way or another with two of Thailand's strong men. They are Premier Pibul himself and Field Marshal Sarit Thanarat, minister of Defense."

FEELER?

The significance of this development lies in the fact that Thailand's police dictatorship has been the most "pro-American" regime in Southeast Asia for some time, has received more than \$100,000,000 worth of economic aid since 1951, and Thailand is still the headquarters of SEATO.

Though Pibul Songgram, Thai dictator, still claims that Thailand will not "swerve" from her present foreign policy, and disclaims personal control of one of the newspapers prominent in this campaign, the fact that it is permitted to go on without hindrance from the dictatorial government shows that at the very least this is an attempt to feel out, if not to placate, popular sentiment in his country toward the policies of his regime.

The British decision on trade, the weakness of the American reaction to it, the anti-American demonstrations on Formosa and the neutralist press campaign in Thailand all point to the gradual disintegration of the policy by which the United States has sought to block Stalinism in Asia.

The question now is, what is to replace it?

BANKRUPT OLD LINE

The "hard" line in Asia was based on one central idea. The only way to contain and eventually roll back the sweep of Communism in Asia was to support, prop up, and hold in line every non-or anti-Communist government in Asia. For this purpose, it did not matter whether the regimes were democratic in any sense or were a brutal police dictatorship or even imperialist. Since the more responsive to the popular will the regimes tended to be, the less "reliable" they tended to be for the American policy, the tendency was to base it most firmly on the most reactionary anti-Communist regimes in Asia.

To this policy, socialists, and some liberals, counterposed the idea that only a policy of supporting the aspirations for freedom and democracy of the peoples of Asia, regardless of the economic or governmental forms which they might develop in their revolutionary strivings, could both contain the spread of Stalinism and preserve peace in the area. Implicit in this approach was the idea that the United States should withdraw its support from the reactionary regimes and ruling classes which oppose these revolutionary strivings, and find ways and means of supporting the anti- or non-Stalin-

ist popular movements throughout

The fact that the administration's "hard" line in Asia is beginning to disintegrate does not mean that a new policy based on thoroughly democratic principles is emerging. A danger is that in place of the old attempt to form a ring of arms around Communist China (the economic and political boycott of the Peiping government was a part of this policy) a new policy will come into being which seeks to make a deal with the Stalinists for a stabilization of the present division of Asia between its Communist and capitalist spheres.

Independent socialists have been and continue to be opposed to any policy of "preventive war" against Communism, or to any policy of military containment which bears within itself the inherent risk of precipitating a world war. They have opposed it not only because they are for peace, but because they have considered it reactionary in general and self-defeating to boot.

A CHANCE TO ASSESS

But a policy which seeks to stabilize the present world relationships on the basis of an imperial-



CHIANG KAI-SHEK

ist deal between the Communist and capitalist overlords of the world is also reactionary and self-defeating.

The urge for democracy and freedom is as powerful as it ever has been. The recent upheavals in Eastern Europe demonstrate that it is as powerful in the Communist sphere as it is among the underdeveloped and subject nations of the capitalist world. Though a "normalization" of inter-government relations is far preferable to a "brink of war" crisis atmosphere, it can neither solve any of the deep antagonisms which continue to exist, nor freeze the mass political movements and strivings which threaten to upset any inter-imperialist deal which may be reached at the present time.

Thus, the new winds blowing against the old "hard" U.S. policy in Asia present the American people with a chance to reassess the policy of the government and their attitude toward it.

In this atmosphere the ideas summed up in the phrase "a democratic foreign policy" have a far better chance of getting a hearing than they had in the era of hysteria which preceded it.

CHALLENGE

(Continued from page 5)

Says Fine:

"However, integration stops in the classroom and on the athletic field; it is not carried over into the home. When a colored student at the Thomas Jefferson High School came to a party given by one of his classmates, he was asked to leave.

"Please don't take this as a personal affront," the mother of the boy giving the party said. "We just aren't used to having Negroes at our parties. Maybe when integration is farther along we'll be able to invite you."

"PROBLEM CHILD"

The above is typical. Even in cities having no influential concentration of rabid racists, racism prevails in a "liberalized," diluted, and thus pervasive and baleful form. No one is immune to the silent pressure, including the moderates, the "good" Southerners.

It cannot be denied that progress is being made. Fine points to encouraging signs that race-consciousness among the younger students is being cut away and a new crop of genuinely liberal-minded school teachers is being cultivated as a result of integration. But this embryonic Southern liberalism runs up against reactionary community codes that often produce painful conflicts.

In his article on Wilmington, Fine relates the experience of a nine-year-old boy named Larry who "became a close friend of Kenney, son of a prominent Negro. They went fishing and hiking together. Larry approached his father: "Dad, Kenny is in the Cub Scouts. I want to join his pack."

"The father answered swiftly and

sternly: 'No, Larry, you can't. I don't want you to join a club with Negroes in it.'

"Larry cried. He refused to join the Scouts in another part of the city. He stopped seeing Kenney. Larry has now become a problem child. He has been in several scrapes in the last month. His teachers are afraid he is on the way to delinquency.

"What happened to my boy?" Larry's father asked. "He used to be such a nice boy. Now look at him. I just can't understand it at all."

YOUTH REBELLION

The story serves as an illustration of the dramatic widespread transformation of attitudes among the young people of the South. There is a significant youth rebellion against the old homespun and socially reinforced notions about Negroes and a discarding of traditional feelings about minority groups in general. What course this rebellion will take—whether it will become the basis of a healthy twentieth-century South—depends to a large extent, on the pace of the desegregation of schools.

The material presented in the N. Y. Times series underlines the peril inherent in the "gradualist" approach; that is, the tendency of youth (especially those in the lower grades of school) who are not integrated, to develop molded prejudices under the influence of parents and bigoted segments of the community.

To prolong the "transition period," to delay the integration of fundamental social institutions, is to isolate and endanger the anti-racists and to threaten the burgeoning new force in the South.