

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

ISSUES IN THE SHACHTMAN PASSPORT CASE

... page 6

Trade Unions and Civil Liberties

... page 8

MARCH 14, 1955

FIVE CENTS

Government Witchhunt Thrown on Defensive: It's a New Chance for Labor and Liberals

Split in Justice Dep't, Matusow, New Probes Crimp the Purges—But Will Liberals Act?

By GORDON HASKELL

The winds of the witchhunt have shifted a bit in the past few weeks. In place of a steady torrent blowing against the civil and political liberties and rights of the people, there have been slight lulls followed by uncertain gusts, and even a timid breeze now and then in the opposite direction.

The change, to be sure, is mostly in the realm of private and official talk, not laws or institutions.

One reason for this is the continued absence of Senator McCarthy from the headlines and news columns. The last time he was heard from, he was not holding in his hand a list of "Communists" in the State Department. Instead, he was seeking to explain his relations with one Harvey Matusow. And the fact that Matusow got headlines is in itself a sign of the change.

True, the FBI is still going around the country busily gathering its data on the private and political lives of the citizenry. Men and women in the armed forces, in factories working on government contracts, or in government agencies, are still receiving "interrogatories" in which they are asked to explain why they attended a political meeting five years ago, or why they continued personal rela-

tions with a grandfather (now deceased) who once held life insurance in the International Workers Order.

A FRESHER BREEZE?

The "Subversive List" is still issued by the Department of Justice, and used by the army, the State Department and some state governments as a basis for discrimination and persecution. These and many other institutional and legal procedures have been "built into" the structure of American society, and it will take much more than a small shift in the political winds to dig them out. The basic causes of the witchhunt are still present, and can be the origin of an intensified wave of obscurantism, reaction and persecution at any time.

But a counter-movement has set in. It is feeble, uncertain of itself, scared of its own shadow, but it exists.

Too many cases have come to light of vicious persecution of the "wrong" people. In too many instances has it become evident that whole government agencies have been demoralized and devitalized by uncertainty and fear, when the most the witchhunters could possibly get out of their screenings and charges and administrative trials was the discharge of a tiny handful of people who were powerless to do the "national security" any real hurt if left alone.

And over and beyond that is the fact that the Democrats, though guilty of initiating and prosecuting the witchhunt themselves, felt its hot breath on their own necks during the last political campaign.

Their cowardly reaction in the last Congress, their attempt to counter the charge of "twenty years of treason" with reminders that they had jailed more Stalinists than the Republicans, all that is part of the record of the witchhunt and will remain indelibly inscribed there. But once back in power in Congress, some of them have been casting about for means to prevent a repetition of the experiences, through which they went in the first two years of the Eisenhower administration, at least as far as keeping their own hides whole is concerned.

The slight change in atmosphere has

A barometer sensitive to the witchhunt climate would, this past week, have registered a slight rise, or at any rate a hesitation in the hitherto slow but steady drop. A series of events have combined to put the security-purgers on the defensive and off-balance, as the adjoining article describes.

It can be significant only insofar as it provides the occasion for the labor and liberal forces to make a push-forward of their own, that is, to stop their endless and futile retreating and make a stand for real civil-liberties issues.

We say "real civil-liberties issues" because, unfortunately, most U. S. liberals—and we are referring to those who have been sincerely trying to brake the anti-democratic trend, and not to those who have been helping it along, like the Hookites—most U. S. liberals have not made their stand against the witchhunt on any truly civil-libertarian basis.

They have lamented the "excesses" of the witchhunt, but this is not a stand for civil liberties.

They have called for more "care" and "caution" in the security program, but this is not a stand for civil liberties.

They have denounced the witchhunt for abusing innocent people, but defense of innocent people is not a stand for civil liberties; for here "innocent" merely means not guilty of nonconformist ideas.

They have obviously enjoyed the Matusow-style discreditment of the informer system, as have we; but all they have had to say about informers is that their testimony should be used more circumspectly, etc.

The witchhunt trend will not be turned back unless and until would-be democrats get up the plain guts to defend the rights of ALL people, including those whose ideas we detest, like the Stalinists; including those who themselves have no mercy for democracy, like the Stalinists and fascists; including all holders of radical and non-conformist ideas.

Many a sincere liberal has kidded himself that it is a smart tactic to make a stir only over a Ladejinsky-type case, i.e., a case of "mistaken identity," i.e., persecution of a man who is not nonconformist at all but merely an accidental victim. One of the troubles with this tactic is that it can produce no meaningful victories in terms of stopping the trend.

The proof is that it has produced no meaningful victories even though it has had many successes.

But now the government leaders of the witchhunt publicly show that they are unsure of themselves, at least momentarily. Now is the time to hit hard, speak up, and take the offensive for democracy.

EAST GERMANY

Toward the 'June Days' Again?

Information from East Germany indicates that the authorities have started the drive to raise industrial norms (stipulated output per man) foreshadowed by Premier Ulbricht on November 15, when he declared (according to *Neues Deutschland*) that nearly 30 per cent of all state-owned industry was running at an "absolute loss," owing to the low level of productivity and the "alarming" failure to reduce costs. Working norms, he then added, were "still not founded upon a proper technical basis." The last time higher norms were suggested, the East German workers rose in revolt on June 17, 1953.

Addressing a conference in Leipzig on January 15, the Minister of the Machine-Building Industry, Heinrich Rau, criticized what he called the amount of "norm-fiddling" that went on, adding that "the authority of the 'technical working norm' fixers must be further strengthened."

Whatever the cause, the flow of refugees from the Soviet Zone of Germany and East Berlin has risen suddenly in recent weeks. According to official reports, about 100 more refugees arrived daily in West Germany in January than in December, the present average being 265.

One East German refugee stated that all 300 workers in his factory were called for individual interviews with the foremen and departmental managers on January 3 and 4, and asked whether they agreed to norm increases. The proposed rise, he said, was "very substantial."

A meeting of the workers was held on January 5, at which there were many protests against the new measures, especially when it was stated that the workers had "voluntarily agreed" to the increased norms. The man claimed that he made a forthright statement himself against the changes, after which, he said, the Socialist Unity (Communist) Party committee demanded his immediate dismissal.

A worker from the Karl Marx Works at Magdeburg reported that the campaign to induce workers to accept increased norms began in December and it was rumored that they would come into effect on January 15. The general reaction, he said, was one of "open opposition."

Finally, a refugee "norm expert" from the East German railways reported that 15,000 railwaymen would be affected by the increased norms. He brought to the West carbon copies of old and new norms from which it was clear that the norms would be raised between 10 and 20 per cent.

—ICFTU "Spotlight" (February)

THE FREE PRESS

Not Only Russia . . .

The newspapers were pretty interesting during the late January Formosa crisis. They wheeled in behind President Eisenhower with startling uniformity, and that's a story in itself, deserving fuller attention than I can give it here.

What interested me particularly was the outbreak of interpretive reporting, designed to condition the public to swallow the President's request for a Congressional sharing of the responsibility for anything he might choose to do in the Formosa strait.

"In defense of Formosa . . . America's readiness to fight . . . The threatening hands of the Chinese Communists . . . A standby declaration of war . . . The United States might be compelled to strike first . . . The Seventh Fleet is ready to cope with any situation . . . The message and the resolution make clear there would be no privileged sanctuary for Red aircraft attacking Nationalist or American targets . . ."

Such were some of the stirring phrases that rang through the dispatches the day after the president sent his Formosa message to Congress.

Anybody who marvels at the way the controlled press in totalitarian countries carries out the official propaganda line might better marvel at the way the uncontrolled press in the United States does the same.

—ROBERT LASCH
IN THE *Progressive* (MARCH)

(Turn to last page)

AUTO WORKERS • UAW

Reuther in Position to Put The Squeeze on Auto Co's

By JACK WILSON

DETROIT, Mar. 7—While the public press continues to view the forthcoming negotiations between the United Auto Workers (CIO) and the Big Three manufacturers as a tragic collision between an irresistible force and an immovable object, the plain fact of the matter is that the union drive is beginning to pick up steam, and the auto companies are behind the eight ball.

The sensational news today that the National Association of Manufacturers is raising a huge slush-and-propaganda campaign fund to combat the idea of a guaranteed annual wage testifies to the gains the UAW has made in the field of public relations.

Another report that Emerson Schmidt, chief economist of the Chamber of Commerce, warned a business gathering that head-on opposition to the UAW program would be futile and fatal shows how the situation is changing.

ONE-AT-A-TIME

These two developments came simultaneously with the first important statements by General Motors and Ford spokesmen indicating opposition to Walter Reuther's program.

But the current production race between the Big Two, Chevrolet and Ford, and their claims for sales leadership in 1954, as well as the outlook for the coming period, have put these companies literally at the UAW's mercy this year.

Neither can afford a shutdown, for it would guarantee the other the No. 1 spot in production and sales in 1955. This is Reuther's ace in the hole, and it is another tribute to the excellent idea of one-at-a-time strategy in the auto industry, which has been Reuther's long-range plan.

Slowly but surely, the mood in the ranks is beginning to change too, as the prospect of steady work for a period and a solid front of the union makes its impact on the "recession"-conscious auto workers.

Only last week, an important UAW local in Jackson, Michigan, voted down a demand by management (in a TV factory employing over 1,500) for the workers to take an 18-per-cent hour cut, "so we can stay in business." The futility of the "Studebaker plan" to aid a manufacturer is becoming known, for every UAW activist knows that after the Studebaker workers took cuts, the company still put in such speedup that a strike vote was necessary.

NUNN'S WORK

Soon the UAW will hold its national convention, and a nation-wide campaign to further publicize the UAW program will gain impetus, especially after the special \$25,000,000 strike fund is authorized by the convention delegates.

Coincident with the development of some confidence in the UAW over the coming negotiations is the victory of the UAW in the spring primaries in Michigan, which have the Republicans screaming and demanding that the UAW radio and TV program funds be investigated.

The basic reason for this is the brilliant work of Guy Nunn, UAW radio commentator, whose programs now are heard on 30 stations, morning and night, and who has finally hit a format that appeals to the rank and file as well as the general public. John Feikens, Republican state chairman, has issued blast after blast at Nunn and the UAW, making a bigger fool of himself each time he opens his mouth.

In the state legislature, Governor Williams has recommended a series of changes in the unemployment compensation laws which would fit them more in the pattern of the UAW's wage program for 1955.

THEY'RE WORRIED

While the auto companies would like to gang up on the UAW, there are two major obstacles: First, they would quickly be charged with monopoly, and they are already sensitive on that score, as General Motors has indicated time and again in policy and financial statements; and secondly, the initiative in negotiations is not in their hands, for if Reuther decides to shut down Ford, unless he gets an acceptable contract, nothing GM or anyone else could do would help Ford regain the loss of No. 1 spot in auto sales for its biggest seller, the Ford.

Even Detroit papers carry stories of the bitterness of the fight between the Big Two on that issue. Chevrolet claims

1954 leadership based on sales to dealers, which do exceed the 1,400,000 sales of Ford. But Ford's figure is based on actual sales to customers, so it claims No. 1 spot for the first time in 19 years. This competition is viewed with positive glee in union circles.

The concern of other manufacturers—as indicated by the NAM slush fund drive—comes from the realization that any gain by the UAW is bound to have repercussions in other industries. The fact that George Meany, AFL president, has endorsed the UAW program causes them further uneasiness.

The fabulous profits of General Motors in 1954—\$806,000,000 net profit—makes the company position extremely vulnerable, so that it begins to appear that the auto companies are going to have to make a choice not on whether they shall give, but on how much of a package it will be.

That depends mainly now on how well Reuther takes advantage of the extraordinary opportunity before the UAW to set a new pattern in 1955 negotiations. The setting is all that a union could ask. A real test of the UAW leadership is at hand, after five years of marking time and retreating in many cases before the reactionary trend that swept the country.

LABOR SCOPE

Heralding Realignment in the New Labor Federation

By B. H.

Most union papers hailed the AFL-CIO merger agreement in long news articles, reprinting the text of the agreement and lauding the Reuther-Meany joint statement. But the January issue of the *Teamster*, organ of Dave Beck's Teamsters Union, is quite restrained.

It duly and briefly notes the unity, announces that Beck is for it, and makes clear that he will fight against any non-raiding pact and will defend every inch of jurisdiction.

The *Bulletin* of the AFL Building Trades Department in its latest issue doesn't deign to notice the event at all.

The same issue of the *Teamster* helps us to follow the new realignment that will take place with unity. It announces the formation of a joint committee by four unions—the Teamsters Union, the Carpenters Union, the Hodcarriers Union, and the International Union of Operating Engineers—to defend their common interests and to promote "complete unity among the four international unions" in advancing a "mutual protection program."

The Hodcarriers is one of the worst run unions in the country. Conventions are almost as rare as financial reports. The Operating Engineers were made famous in New York by Joseph Fay, who finally went to jail for extortion in cooperation with James Bove, then international vice-president of the Hodcarriers and Laborers. Fay assaulted Dubinsky at the AFL convention in 1940 after the latter had asked the AFL to do something about racketeering.

On the other side: The International Association of Machinists (IAM) and the UAW National Skilled Trades Department have been exchanging fraternal delegates at their separate conferences. At the IAM conference in Milwaukee, Secretary-Treasurer Joseph D. Vreckek declared that "The purpose of our participation is to effect the organic unity of the skilled trades organization of IAM-AFL and UAW-CIO." The IAM favors a series of local and national joint conferences with the UAW skilled

ON THE JIM CROW FRONT

Jim Crow Hangs On in Army and D.C. . . . Negroes Looking Hard at Labor Unity

By SCOTT ARDEN

Jim Crow in the army and navy may be on the wane, but the old bird is far from dead.

Adam Clayton Powell, Negro congressman from New York, unleashed another attack on the House floor when he accused the army and navy administrations of laxities which "have negated the policy of announced desegregation in those branches of the armed forces," the Pittsburgh *Courier* reports.

His broadside against the navy accused it of discouraging enlistments by Negroes. His blast at the army stated that it was following a policy of lessening opportunities for promotion of Negroes.

To our knowledge neither President Eisenhower nor any of his spokesmen have replied to Powell's charge that "less than one-tenth of 1 per cent of the officers of the U. S. army are Negroes."

At the same time, Congressman Charles C. Diggs Jr., Michigan's first Negro representative, demanded an investigation of discriminatory and segregative practices at the Army War Center at Fort McClelland, Alabama.

The center attracted national attention last fall when army Chief of Staff Ridgway dedicated the center and news releases heralded the supposedly integrated facilities and non-segregation policy of the installation.

In a letter to Secretary of the Army Stevens, Diggs charged that Negro War personnel and visiting civilians are not permitted to dance at regular "white enlisted dances" arranged by the center.

Diggs stated that Negroes were ordered off the floor and informed that a dance is held "for them" on a different

night of the week. Negroes, he continued, have also been excluded from army-sponsored recreational trips and from participation in some sports events.

RACISM IN D. C.

If ghosts exist, old Senator Bilbo's was chuckling in the corridors of the House Office Building in Washington last week.

The Man (as he modestly referred to himself) would have been "right pleased" by the 24-karat bigotry binge held by his somewhat more alive pals at the hearing, before the District of Columbia subcommittee on Police and Firemen, on two bills introduced several weeks ago by its chairman, Rep. Davis (Dem., Ga.).

In response to a "charge" that some Negro firemen in the nation's capital have been elevated to lieutenants and captains over white firemen, the bills would revoke the order of integration handed down last year and would remove certain officers who had been upgraded.

The chamber was packed, the *Defender* reports, with a large delegation of white firemen and their families and supporters (no Negro firemen were present), who applauded the spokesmen against integration and even joined in spontaneous "testimony" occasionally, all without objection from Chairman Davis.

The weight of the testimony given was that integration had "wrecked morale" and "lowered efficiency."

The hearing was not outstanding until Elmer F. Stein, a battalion fire chief, took the stand and began referring to colored firemen under his command as "niggers." When Congressman Klein of New York asked him to refrain from using that term, Chairman Davis pounded his gavel vigorously and rebuked Klein for attempting to correct the witness.

After one attempt to use the word Negro, Stein complained that it was placing him "under an awful strain" to break his "life-long habit" and that he was "Southern-bred" and had used the word all his life and didn't intend to stop.

The bleachers cheered, and Rep. Williams (Dem., Miss.) got into the act by volunteering the information that "back home" Negroes used the word when speaking to each other and "nobody thought anything about it."

Williams then queried Stein as to whether Commissioner Samuel Spenser ever entertained colored firemen (or other Negroes) in his home and whether his children went to school with colored students.

Shortly after the hearing adjourned, Congressman Powell of New York, who was informed of Stein's remarks, fired off a telegram to Commissioner Spenser demanding an immediate investigation and that Stein be dismissed from the Fire Department for "flagrant and blatant" anti-Negro conduct. Spenser replied without delay and promised a full-scale investigation, which we don't doubt he'll carry out.

It is sort of hard for the U. S. government to parade itself before the colored peoples of Asia and Africa as the leader of "the free world" when it can't hide the cesspool of racism in its own back yard.

LOOKING AT UNITY

The coming merger between the AFL and the CIO has provoked somewhat mixed reactions among Negro workers—despite the support it is receiving from Negro labor leaders, which in itself is not without a trace of reserve.

A. Philip Randolph, president of the AFL Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, said: "A united, powerful free trade-union movement is a potent ally in the unrelenting fight against bigotry and intolerance."

Willard S. Townsend, head of the CIO United Transport Service Employees Union, stated: "With the combined power of both organizations the struggle for civil rights will therefore be stepped up immeasurably; of course, the challenge for stronger and more alert Negro leadership must be fully recognized."

While Randolph, a militant fighter for Negro rights, will undoubtedly be glad to function in a less isolated framework, Townsend's qualification, beginning with the "of course," reflects the reservations (conscious or otherwise) that are common currency.

The membership of the merged organization will be about 15,000,000, of whom over a million and a half are colored. The

trades as part of a continuing cooperation in action.

FORCE AND VIOLENCE

The next item you may consider the symptom of something profound or a mere curiosity.

David J. McDonald, president of the Steelworkers Union—not one of America's outstanding radicals—sent a personal representative to attend the first convention of the Bolivian trade union federation, Central Obrera Boliviana.

In his report, Angelo Verdu, the representative, contends that the Bolivian labor movement "leaps neither to the extreme left nor extreme right. . . . The overwhelming majority are trade-unionists who sincerely believe that their emancipation from social and economic despair lies in following a middle-of-the-road course without resorting to the dangerous paths of the extremists." They support the government; but working conditions are bad, wages are low, the workers have many justified grievances.

Then, right in the official publication of the Steelworkers Union, we read: "Since the present government gained control after a revolution in April of 1952, the workers and 'Compesinos'—farm laborers—are still armed with rifles, machine guns, and ammunition. Labor unions have a militia of armed semi-trained men. This so-called 'Peoples Army' is supposed to exist to support the revolutionary movement, but what now seems a protective device for the present government at some time in the future can become its own downfall if circumstances force the workers' guns to be turned in another direction."

Add another name to the attorney general's "subversive" list!

ANTI-UNION WEAPON

The NLRB has ruled that the Marine, Cooks and Stewards Union, one of the unions expelled from the CIO, is barred from representation elections. The grounds for this action are interesting: the union has been penalized for failure to make its financial reports public.

In this case, the reason for the union's failure to file reports is probably its unwillingness to reveal its weakness after facing a long struggle with the SIU on the West Coast, still not resolved.

It goes without saying that the same device can be used to kill off any union at a critical moment when the publication

(Continued on page 7)

(Continued on page 4)

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

BRITAIN

Will Labor Keep London?

By BERNARD DIX

LONDON, Mar. 3—In four week's time Londoners will be going to the polls to cast their votes for 126 county councillors who will be responsible for the running of London for the next three years.

At the present moment the line-up on the council is 106 Labor councillors and aldermen opposed by 44 Tory councillors and aldermen. Thus Labor has a firm control which the Tories are going all-out to break, and to place the fate of London in the hands of the party of vested interests after a lapse of 21 years.

It was in 1934 that the Labor Party swept the Tories from office and gained control of the world's largest municipal authority for the first time in history. This election came at the time when Britain was suffering under the grip of the so-called National Government and there were more than two millions unemployed. The Labor victory was undoubtedly a bitter blow for the Tories and ever since they have coveted this seat of power.

The Labor administration which took over the ICC in 1934 immediately began to operate measures which put into reverse the policies practised by the Tories—who delighted in cheese-paring economies in order to "save the rate-payers money."

BIG DIFFERENCE

The first priority was housing. In the last four years of Tory rule only 118 houses had been built, and there were 750,000 London families in need of homes, many of them living in appalling slum conditions of overcrowding, dirt and disease. Labor launched a vast housing plan which included the demolition of vast areas of slums and the creation of large modern housing estates. In five years 30,000 new houses were built in London, accommodating 125,000 people, 83,000 of whom were rehoused from their slum dwellings which had been torn down under Labor's program.

Hospitals too came in for special attention by the new Labor administration. London's hospitals were largely dilapidated due to financial starvation and disorganization. Feeding arrangements in the hospitals were far from satisfactory; few facilities existed for modern surgical treatment, and the staff were overworked.

Labor began a policy which grouped the hospitals together for efficient administration and opened a full range of specialist units with full-time consultants. Rebuilding, modernization and re-equipping were undertaken to bring the hospitals in line with the needs of London. Lastly, but by no means least important, the working hours for the nursing staff were cut from 66 to 54 per week.

21 YEARS OF LABOR

Another aspect of Tory policy which was immediately tackled by the new Labor council was the care of the unemployed. The Tories had boasted during the election campaign that they had saved 1,000 pounds a day on relief; this they had done by forcing the unemployed down to disgustingly low standards and subjecting them to all manner of indignities in the so-called "workhouses."

One of the first acts of Labor when it took power was to increase the outdoor Poor Law relief by some 750,000 pounds a year in order to provide the distressed with the sheer necessities of life. The workhouses were also subjected to ruthless treatment directed toward securing the best possible for those members of the working class who had become absolutely destitute.

It was in this way—hampered by the restrictions of a Tory-dominated central government, handicapped with the legacy of years of Tory misrule on the council itself—that Labor began its control of London. This control has continued uninterrupted for twenty-one years.

There have been several occasions when it looked as though Labor would be unseated and the Tories would once again climb into the saddle. The most notable of these was in the 1949 elections when the results gave the Labor and Tory Parties 64 seats each with the almost defunct Liberal Party holding a single seat. But through a majority of aldermen Labor retained its control and three years later successfully reasserted its dominant position by reducing the Tory opposition to a mere 38.

APATHY THE DANGER

The forthcoming elections this month will undoubtedly see the Tory party making a supreme effort to secure control of this vitally important council. It will serve as a testing ground in preparation for the

general elections for Parliament which are expected this year, and will indicate the lie of the land.

Labor's biggest foe during these elections is apathy; it is the voters who stay at home rather than those who vote Tory that present the biggest problem; for the average poll in the ICC elections is only one-third of those able to vote.

But in addition to this apathy on the part of the electorate there is the apathy within the Labor Party machine itself, a factor which has been mentioned in earlier articles. Time and time again during the past few weeks I have spoken to active Labor workers who have expressed an almost complete lack of interest in the forthcoming election and look upon it as a rather boring routine task. This is to be expected to a certain extent; it is a reflection of the frustration arising from the lack of sympathy with the party policy on a national scale, and is also a typical symptom of an election in which the issues are local rather than national or international in character.

It will be a pity if this apathy persists and thereby assists the Tories during the campaign; for a defeat for Labor in London will be a catastrophe and a possible prelude to a crushing defeat on a national scale at some later date this year. As parochial as the issues may seem in the London election they are all part and parcel of the daily class struggle and as such must be pursued with the utmost vigor. If the Tories take over London, then London's workers will feel the full weight of the Tories' national policy, which has to some extent been cushioned by the Labor forces on the ICC.

It is to be hoped that the Left forces of Labor will assist the rank-and-file to shake off this apathy and go into this election to smash the London Tories and use the campaign as a vehicle for the wide propagation of socialist ideas.

ISL FUND DRIVE

We're Still 7 1/2% Behind Schedule

By ALBERT GATES
Fund Drive Director

Some printer's devil did us dirt last week. He lost the box score totals and left our story unfinished. For those of you who searched for the standings to measure your own progress, we apologize. In any case, those who deserved it got the mention in the column itself.

To date, we have collected \$3252 or 32.4 per cent of our goal. While this is not a bad showing, we are still running behind schedule in our ten-week campaign by 7.5 per cent. The percentage figure doesn't seem like much, but actually that represents nearly \$800 that we are behind our pace.

St. Louis is still in first place, but tied by Streator which is also 100 per cent. Don't think because their quotas were small that it was easy. It is just that they always respond to the urgency of the drive.

Although we haven't heard from Chicago in the past week, its early push

FUND DRIVE BOX SCORE

Branch	Quota	Paid	%
Total	\$10,050	3252	32.4
St. Louis	25	25	100
Streator	25	25	100
Chicago	2,000	1017	50.8
Pittsburgh	125	60	48
Cleveland	150	65	43.3
N. Y. City	3,800	1489.50	39.1
Detroit	200	55	27.5
Nat'l Office	1,500	325	21.6
Bay Area	500	100	20
Philadelphia	250	44	17.6
Seattle	150	25	16.6
Newark	400	21.50	5.3
Los Angeles	600	0	0
Buffalo	250	0	0
Indiana	75	0	0
Akron	50	0	0
Reading	50	0	0
Oregon	50	0	0

LONDON LETTER

Tories' Financial Manipulations Won't Help the Little People

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, Mar. 3—Last week the Tory Chancellor of the Exchequer announced the increase of the bank rate from 3 1/2 to 4 1/2 per cent. This came as no surprise to the City, London's Wall Street, where the pound had been weakening for the past few weeks, and where industrial shares had shown a distinct tendency to slump.

What is the significance of this financial manipulation to the average man and woman?

Firstly, the rise in bank rate will make money more difficult to borrow. This means that the Public Works Development Fund will have to ask higher interest rates from local authorities, and this will eventually be reflected in higher rents of houses being built by these authorities.

Furthermore, money borrowed to build hospitals, public libraries, etc., whose repayment comes out of rates the public has to pay, will now cost more. Thus every house-owner, and, ultimately, rent-payer, will have to pay more in the long run.

At the same time, the Chancellor of the Exchequer announced that there is to be a curtailment of hire purchase (installment buying). People will have to pay a larger deposit, and have a shorter time in which to repay it than hitherto. However, as English people are much less prone to buying expensive articles by hire purchase than Americans, it is not anticipated that the change will affect business much.

It would be fair to say that this financial manipulation will have a general depressant effect on buying, but not on essential foods, etc., and it will only have a marginal effect on rising rates and rents.

TORIES' MOTIVES

What has caused a Tory government to take measures to decrease internal trading?

When they came to power in 1952, the terms of international trade were definitely against Britain. Prices of manufactured goods were falling about 1 to 2 per cent compared with the Korean in-

crease in raw materials. This militated against the economy of capitalist Britain. The recent years of comparative international peace and lowering of world tensions have allowed a fall in material prices, but all the industrial countries gained equally from this, and competition to sell manufactured goods is now greater than it ever has been since the war.

When a slump threatened last year, Butler indulged in a policy designed to stimulate spending, increased home demand, home profits and home investment. At that time Labor MPs pointed out the likelihood of inflation. Ever since then there has been a continual fall in the prices of non-essential consumer goods, and a continual rise in the cost of food and other essentials.

The reason for this last rise is not far to find. An article in *World Review* some years ago showed clearly why under the present system (inflationary tendencies must continue throughout the world.

Populations are increasing, spending power is increasing and circulating money is increasing at a greater rate than world wealth production—viz., industrial and agricultural productivity. Until this imbalance is corrected by a rational system of economic control, or (temporarily) by international birth control, inflation must continually increase—too much money chasing too few goods, in a word.

TEMPORARY RESPITE

By the use of controls a capitalist Tory or Labor government can manage to safeguard its economy temporarily, so that its workers and capitalists receive a larger share of world production than their numbers would entitle them. But it does not tackle at the roots the problem of increasing production throughout the world. This can only be done by world socialism.

Over and above the world problem of inflation and increasing population is the present problem of the United Kingdom. Ten years after the end of the war, she is only just self-supporting.

She does not produce sufficient surplus—a minimum of \$1,400,000,000 a year to invest in backward countries hitherto so lucrative. She has done virtually nothing to replace the quarter of her capital which she spent during the war. Her repayment of interest on war and post-war loans has gone no way to repaying the actual debts estimated at about \$12 billion. Britain has been living with debts since the First World War.

All these factors mean that Britain can survive as a great power only by use of its brains and its manpower. If the favorable terms of trade in the past two years have only just allowed her to remain apparently solvent, the years to come of increasing competition and greater industrial return of agricultural countries bode very evilly for the capitalist economy.

There is, however, one factor which may seriously alter expectations. The industrial harnessing of atomic energy may again place British capitalism, like

(Continued on page 7)

SHACHTMAN TOUR

MAX SHACHTMAN

National Chairman, ISL

on

"Peace Through
'Coexistence'?"

LOS ANGELES

FRIDAY, MARCH 25

8 p.m.

Case Hotel (6th floor)

11th & Broadway
(Downtown L. A.)

Adm.: 85¢ Students: 35¢

S. F. BAY AREA

TUESDAY, MARCH 29

8 p.m.

Finnish Brotherhood Hall

1970 Chestnut Street

BERKELEY

CONTRIBUTE TO THE ISL FUND DRIVE

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

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

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY

STATE

(Make checks out to Albert Gates)

CHICAGO

Kennelly's Anti-Negro Smear Fails to Save His Job

By SCOTT ARDEN

CHICAGO, Mar. 3—The recent Chicago mayoralty primary was unique in two respects—because of the candidates, and because the election had a distinct race slant.

The 3 major candidates were Merriam, who bolted the Democrats to run on the Republican slate (with strong "liberal" backing); Daley, the machine candidate of the Democrats; and Kennelly, the present mayor, who ran as an "independent Democrat," after having been dumped by the machine.

The race angle was introduced into the campaign by Kennelly, who charged powerful Congressman William L. Dawson, a Negro, with being behind the move which ousted him. In the opinion of the Negro press, and also of this observer, this represented a race-baiting play for support from "white voters"—a last-ditch attempt by Kennelly to hang onto the mayor's job.

Having been unceremoniously junked by the "City Hall boys," including Dawson, and having lost any chance of significant support from the Negro voters due to their justified disgust with his double-dealing handling of the recent racial disorders in Chicago's Trumbull Park housing project, Kennelly seems to have decided that playing on anti-Negro sentiment might win him the primary.

He launched a full-scale attack on Dawson, charging him with "political bossism" and with being linked to the notorious policy rackets which plague Chicago's South Side.

Despite the support he received on this issue from such a strange combination as Chicago's *Sun-Times* ("liberal") and Colonel McCormick's *Chicago Tribune* (ultra-right), he backed the wrong horse.

An editorial in the *Chicago Defender* described Kennelly's tactics as "both dirty and dangerous" and pointed out that his strategy was "clearly designed to arouse the indignation of whites against a powerful Negro leader and influence them to vote their prejudices."

SLATE DEFEATED

Noting that the white press had found Dawson guilty of many crimes without benefit of trial, the editorial continued, "After eight years as mayor with the entire police force at his command, Kennelly has suddenly discovered the policy racket. . . Dawson does not now nor never has had the power to prevent Kennelly from wiping out policy."

At the same time that this editorial appeared, literature warning of a "nigger boss" was circulated in neighborhoods where Kennelly appeared to be strong.

The wave of indignation which arose in the Negro community in answer to Kennelly was so powerful that even the white press had to take note. In an unusually long article the *Chicago Daily News* reported on the attitudes that its reporters had found among Negroes. The following quotes (most of them from statements made by workers) are typical: "This is a racial issue, not a political issue."—"I can't forgive Kennelly for not making the police enforce the law out at Trumbull Park."—"Kennelly and his racial prejudice have got to go."—"I did not like Dawson until the newspapers began to attack him. Then I stopped

and analyzed this situation and found they are playing on racial hatreds."

The editorial policy of the Negro press is perhaps best reflected in one final quote: "I haven't made up my mind (whom to vote for) but I'll be voting against Kennelly."

Both Merriam and Daley quickly saw the way the wind was blowing and jumped on the bandwagon—becoming (at least when speaking to Negro audiences) the "Friend of the Negro" who would, when elected, defend civil rights, etc.

When the polls closed, last week, Daley had won a hands-down victory over Kennelly, and every one of the aldermanic candidates in Negro neighborhoods on the Kennelly slate was soundly defeated.

Kennelly has declined to comment on whether he will throw his support to Daley and the other machine men in the April election, against Merriam who won the Republican nomination with ease.

It doesn't too much matter. As socialists we oppose the candidates of both capitalist parties. But we are pleased to note that a race-baiting politician has cut his own throat. Politically speaking, Kennelly is a corpse.

PUNISHMENT

Other things are happening on the Jim Crow front in Illinois politics. Because he dared to support the cause of fair employment practices, John W. Chapman, the Republican lieutenant-governor of the state, has been muzzled by his own colleagues in the Illinois legislature.

Chapman was stripped of power to speak in the Senate when that body adopted a rule change this February. The rule says, "No person other than a member of the Senate shall speak to the merit of any bill, resolution or motion pending for the Senate."

Reportedly, Chapman himself admitted that the action was taken because he had spoken at the last session of the 1953 legislature urging approval of an "equal opportunities bill."

Jim Crow —

(Continued from page 2)

AFL craft unions have traditionally systematically excluded Negroes from membership, or discriminated against them as members.

Exceptions can be cited but in the main the AFL unions, along with the railroad brotherhoods, relegated Negroes to the outer fringe of the economy. Year after year, Randolph rose on AFL convention floors to plead for the abolition of "auxiliary" (Jim Crow) locals that have no voice in policy and no vote. And year after year, his resolutions were turned down.

When the CIO was founded, with an anti-discrimination clause in each member union's constitution, and practised the solidarity regardless of skin color that the AFL national leadership paid lip-service to, Negro workers responded with enthusiasm, and swelled the ranks of organized labor.

In the twenty or so years since its founding, the CIO has continued to set the pace in labor integration, and the AFL has to a limited extent followed suit—reluctantly.

At the same time that they recognize that the union movement as a whole will benefit from the merger, some Negro workers are now wondering whether the CIO will have to play down its progressive racial policy for the sake of "unity." On the other side, of course, is the expectation that the pressure of the CIO inside the federation may improve the situation in the AFL. In either case, socialist and union militants, both Negro and white, have a job ahead.

There's No Angel Around

to finance LABOR ACTION. It has appeared every week since 1940 because it's been backed by the dime and dollars of independent socialists — AND YOUR SUBSCRIPTIONS.

A sub is only \$2 a year—
Subscribe now!

PRO & CON DISCUSSION

A View of the Crisis in Russia

We present Comrade Rudzienski's discussion of his views on the present Russian crisis, for his analyses always make worthwhile reading; but our readers will recognize that we quite disagree with his whole approach. In lieu of any extended discussion ourselves, we wish only to note: Comrade Rudzienski, of course, holds the view that Russia is "capitalist," and in the letter below he also links this with the picture of a Stalinism which is "finished," whose time is over, using language which suggests a very over-optimistic view of the immediate perspectives of downfall for the whole Stalinist system; a downfall which is to be preceded, if we understand him, by Khrushchev's adoption of a program of concessions to the masses. Also, we have often pointed out, in our own columns, the fallacy of the idea that in some sense army control will or can supersede party control, and particularly that Bulganin in any way represents "army control"; we regret to see that Comrade Rudzienski puts forward these ideas. There are also several other formulations which would seem to us of dubious or little merit.—Ed.

To the Editor:

After the fall of Malenkov, the "Soviet Congress" acclaimed the "new program" of the Stalinist Old Guard, that is, the new Six-Year Plan, with its reintensification of heavy-industry production and acceleration of bureaucratization in the kolkhozes, in accordance with Khrushchev's program and the resumed arms race. Of course, the Congress also promised the martyred masses the satisfaction of their needs, by raising consumer-goods production; but the question is indeed how this will be possible if the state budget is devoted to heavy-industry production; this is the most important contradiction in the "new policy" of the Khrushchev-Bulganin bloc.

It is clear that the fall of Malenkov expresses the profound crisis in the party as well as in the entire regime, and this is, of course, a sign of economic and social crisis in the whole system. Economically, Russia is a part of the world capitalist system, and according to the laws of intercapitalist competitive struggle, it must develop heavy industry and must also raise arms production, because now it represents a bloc of satellites with 600 million people! This means a new series of Five-Year Plans and a new martyrdom for the masses.

But the Russian people are tired, exhausted and disillusioned. They have worked hard and sacrificed for a period of 30 years, chasing the phantom of "socialism in one country," but instead of this socialism the bureaucracy has built a gigantic forced-labor camp, changing Russia back into a prison of the peoples. This disillusionment and exhaustion of the Russian masses is the historical wall against the existence of Stalinism, just as now it is the most important factor in the crisis. The post-revolutionary totalitarian reaction has come up against its historical limits in Russia and therefore in the world; it has touched bottom; it has arrived at its own historical end. It is finished.

WORK IS "FINISHED"

The other, and secondary, factor in this crisis, the other face of the same process, is the historical anachronism of the Stalinist party in Russia; for the party has finished its "career," consisting in the liquidation of the old Bolshevism, the liquidation of the revolutionary period, the ending of the socialist revolution, through its organization of the totalitarian counter-revolution — in essence, the new capitalist reaction—against the "Mohicans" of the socialist revolution. The Stalinist party, under the leadership of the "demi-god" Stalin, carried through this infamous task, by murdering millions of the revolutionary workers, physically and morally annihilating the revolutionary old guard and the old Bolshevik party and replacing it with the new, totalitarian Stalinist party which, using the "same slogans and the same banner," opened the way to capitalist reaction for 30 years. Together with the Bolshevik Old Guard and the revolutionary vanguard of the proletariat, there was also liquidated every trace of peasant, petty-bourgeois and bourgeois opposition, by murdering millions of workers, peasants and intellectuals and by locking 20 to 30 million possible oppositionists in the forced-labor camps, in accordance with the degree of crisis and with the economic (not only political) needs of the bureaucratic totalitarian regime.

Now all this "historical" work of the

"genius Stalin" is over; all possible enemies are annihilated and disarmed; but also the entire Russian nation is annihilated, exhausted, tired, disillusioned, the victims as well as the victors. *Gleichschaltung* in Russia has finished its work, which was interrupted during the war by Germany; and it has hit bottom, exhausting the nation.

Therefore Stalin's epigones, Khrushchev & Co., not only face an economic and political crisis but are also involved in a mortal crisis of the system. They are fighting against their own historical death. They will restore Stalin's iron dictatorship, which was relaxed not only by the death of the dictator but also by the new objective situation, and they are encountering a hitherto unknown resistance from the masses, the powerful pressure of the workers and peasants against the party and government; because the masses have lost confidence in the possibility of "building socialism in one country"; they have also lost trust in the infallibility of the party and the socialist character of the government. They must work harder and harder, in order to eat very badly; while meanwhile their "beloved leaders" are living like kings at their expense.

Malenkov, who belonged to the new generation of the bureaucracy, wanted to find a way out of this situation by promising the masses more food, more clothes and more freedom. But such a program leads inevitably to the gradual liquidation of the Stalinist totalitarian dictatorship, built as it is on the terror, hunger, blood and oppression of the masses. The Stalinist Old Guard will preserve itself and its dictatorship by a return to the "classic" Stalinist dictatorship. But it is too late; Stalinism's time is over; there is no return to the past. The Khrushchev-Bulganin policy must inevitably lead to greater internal tension, to a new political struggle, to a new coup d'etat, because the masses cannot support more burdens and more terror.

"REVOLUTIONARY" BLACKMAIL

The program for new armaments and more international expansion will also heighten international tension and the war danger, but the Russian bureaucracy is less prepared for war than is the U.S. The Russian bureaucracy wants above all to defend the status quo in Europe, and it will expand in Asia only by instigating local wars by oppressed colonial peoples, thus exhausting the fighting capacity of the U. S. The Russian bureaucracy is conservative, also, in using the revolutionary movements of the Asian peoples for the benefit of its own policy, when the world requires genuine revolutionary changes. This is the problem of Russian international policy. They are carrying on a big "revolutionary" blackmail against imperialism; they talk about revolutionary changes, but they want the status quo for this period in the fundamental structure of the world system. For they fear war, without the support of the masses. They need an internal reconstruction, because the party has lost the trust of the masses, and it is no longer the instrument of government.

Objective conditions are stronger than the wishes of men. If the Khrushchev-Bulganin new course cannot begin a war, then what can it do? It must begin with a gradual liquidation of policy control, then of party control and its leadership in the state, replacing it with army leadership. It must give the masses more food, more clothes, more liberty, raising their standard of living and increasing the production of goods and agricultural products. This means appeasement in the world and concessions to the U. S. In this way the new regime of Khrushchev-Bulganin would carry out the defeated program of Malenkov, but this will not be the first time such a thing has happened in the history of Russia and of the world.

If it is not possible for this road to be opened up, then we must wait for new internal tensions, new political crises, new coup d'etats, up until the complete self-annihilation of the Stalinist party, and, of course, in the first place, of the Khrushchev-Molotov bloc, gradually replacing them with the regime of the "marshals," which is initially represented by Bulganin, even if he is Khrushchev's friend.

One way or another, Russia faces great events, and so does the whole world, therefore. The time of Stalinism is over, as well as that of its epigones Khrushchev & Co.

Andrzej RUDZIENSKI



LABOR ACTION

March 14, 1955 Vol. 19, No. 11

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

Associate Editors:

GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL

Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

WORLD STUDENT MOVEMENT

Fate of Two Ex-Leaders Exposes Role Of Stalinist-Run Student Federation

By ALEX NEWBOLD

LONDON, Mar. 2—News has just been received in Britain that two members of the secretariat of the Stalinist-dominated International Union of Students who mysteriously "retired" and disappeared several years ago were, in fact, purged by the East European secret police. The two concerned are a former president of IUS, A. Grohmann, and P. Heilmann, a representative of the East German FDJ on the IUS secretariat.

Although the present whereabouts of Grohmann are unknown, there is good reason to believe that he is at present undergoing a prison sentence for "fascist activity" in the same way as Heilmann, who is at present serving a sentence of five years' imprisonment under Article 6, Section 2 of the constitution of the "German Democratic Republic," which reads: "Incitement to boycott democratic institutions and organizations, incitements to murder of democratic politicians, expressions of religious, racial and national hatred, militaristic propaganda, as well as agitation for war and all other actions directed against equality of status, are offenses in accordance with the penal code..."

This is the article on which indictments against "deviators" are usually based in East Germany.

To understand how spurious a charge of "fascism" against Heilmann must be, it is only necessary to say that his father was put in a concentration camp in 1933 by Hitler, and was murdered there in 1940, while the family, which was half-Jewish, was under constant surveillance by the Gestapo. Subsequently, Peter Heilmann became active in the SED immediately after the war, and became secretary of the East German student youth. He was last seen by representatives from the British National Union of Students at a meeting of the IUS Executive in January 1951, held in Berlin.

At a similar meeting a few months later in Peking he was absent, and John Clews, a member of the IUS Executive at the time, was told by the East German delegate that Heilmann "was too busy to come." Inquiries by his family who lived

in West Berlin only elicited the news that Heilmann was "on vacation." It was not until November 1952 that Heilmann's family learnt that both he and his wife had in fact been arrested on March 4, 1951, and over a year later in May 1952, sentenced to five and three year's imprisonment respectively. "And this," said Peter Heilmann's sister, "to a man who had devoted his life to the Communist cause."

These arrests not only show up the system of police terror which is known to exist in East Europe today, but spotlights the complete subservience of the IUS to the Stalinist regimes. With the circumstances of the disappearances the bureau of the IUS must have been familiar, for both Heilmann and Grohmann were paid officials. Yet there were no protests; not so much as a thank you for the services which the two had previously rendered IUS—there was just a cool silence.

WHAT WENT BEFORE

To those familiar with IUS history all this did not come as a complete surprise. Founded in the immediate post-war years of halcyon friendship between East and West, with its headquarters in Prague, it has ever since claimed to represent the great majority of the world students. This it can only substantiate insofar as a Stalinist student, elected from perhaps a small group of twenty or so on campus, claims to speak on behalf of the total student population of that university. But its exaggerated claims have convinced many national student organizations and many of these still remain affiliated. The British NUS disaffiliated a few years ago, but with a new leadership, unwilling it seems to learn from experiences, it became an associate member again in April 1954.

Previous actions of the IUS which have shown its political dependence include its being passively acquiescent when the Czech students' union was disbanded after the Communist Party coup d'état in Czechoslovakia, and its own action in expelling the Yugoslav union of students immediately after Yugoslavia was expelled by the Cominform.

UNIV. OF CALIF. • LOS ANGELES

UCLA Bruin Staff Replies To Administration's Attack

The following is a reprint of a leaflet published by several members of the Fall 1954 staff of the Daily Bruin, student newspaper at the University of California, Los Angeles. It spotlights one of the tendencies of the witchhunt on the campus—the assumption of censorship and/or control over student newspapers by the administration.

In this case, the UCLA Administration had issued a directive which increased the powers of the faculty sponsor of the newspaper, restricted the printing of controversial articles by students, and changed the methods of electing the editor and editorial board of the paper.

Subsequent to the events chronicled below, several UCLA students, including former Bruin staff members, such as former Bruin Editor Martin McReynolds, commenced publication of a weekly four-page photo-offset tabloid, The Observer. A report on this and other events at UCLA will appear in a forthcoming issue of Challenge.—Ed.

In December 1954 a mock funeral for the UCLA Daily Bruin was held on the Westwood campus, attended by more than 200 "mourners." Petitions were circulated, editorials written and the "uproar" was covered by Los Angeles' metropolitan press, radio and television.

Cause of the excitement was a directive from the University Administration making certain sweeping changes in the campus newspaper. But what were the causes of the directive, and what will be its final effects?

In order to understand the situation, let's take a look at the Daily Bruin and see how it is set up. The Bruin, which started publishing daily in 1925, is the official organ of the Associated Students of UCLA. It is distributed free on campus to the 10,000 undergraduate and 3000 graduate students. Faculty, alumni and administrative employees swell its circulation to 16,000.

Students pay for the paper out of the compulsory \$8 ASUCLA fee which goes into student body funds.

Consistently rated among the top five or ten college dailies in national judging, the Bruin has nevertheless been the subject of local criticism and controversy for many years. Previous to the Administration directive, the Bruin had enjoyed freedom and vitality unknown on many campuses, although its position was actually somewhat weak in comparison to a few of the other top college newspapers. This "freedom and vitality" was demonstrated in outspoken editorials and vigorous news coverage, which periodically drew criticism from student government, Administration and members of the community.

Controversial articles on the feature page also drew criticism. The Bruin feature page was open to any member of the student body to express his opinions, subject only to limits of space, interest and good taste.

SUBTLE PRESSURE

Student government, through its control of editorial board appointments, sometimes expressed its dissatisfaction with editorial or news policies. In the last few years, Student Council several times rejected staff choices for editorial positions or appointed people the staff did not want. In spring of 1951, the appointment to feature editor of a man with no previous experience on the Bruin led to a brief walkout of the majority of the staff.

The Administration also exerted constant but subtle pressure in an attempt to make the Bruin less controversial.

Editors and staff members were in general convinced of the correctness of their position and continued to criticize student government and the Administration when they felt it necessary. They also continued covering the news they thought important in the way they considered best.

The Administration finally stepped into the situation openly in 1954 when it issued a directive changing the manner of selecting editors, the feature page policy and the status of the faculty sponsor.

The directive was delivered to Student Legislative Council December 8, 1954. It had been prepared in secret, although Student Council and "faculty, alumni, members of the administration and peo-

ple in our community" had been consulted. The editor of the Daily Bruin, however, was not officially notified of the changes until a few hours before they were formally presented to the Council with a letter of transmittal from Dean of Students Milton E. Hahn.

In his letter, Dean Hahn stated that "while the Bruin constitution transmitted to you with this letter is not subject to change by Student Legislative Council, the University will welcome your joint sponsorship."

Student Legislative Council did not vote on joint sponsorship of the directive, but set up its own committee to write a constitution for the DB, to be submitted to the administration within the first two weeks of the spring semester.

A petition signed by 3004 students asking for the directive to be rescinded was turned down by Chancellor Raymond B. Allen on the grounds that any suggested changes must come from SLC.

The DB editor attacked the directive in almost daily editorials and a mock funeral was held for the paper in an effort to dramatize the situation, but the directive went into effect December 16, 1954.

Because the directive was delivered at the end of the semester, there was no time for a general election for the spring 1955 editor. He was chosen by the Dean of Students and the ASUCLA president.

The Bruin candidate for editor, a woman with three semesters of experience on editorial board, was turned down in favor of a man with one semester on editorial board and one semester on Student Legislative Council.

The man appointed feature editor had no college journalism experience.

In his letter, the Dean gave five reasons for the directive, mentioning that:

(1) "... there has been a tendency for the Bruin editorial board to perpetuate itself.

(2) "... semi-trained or untrained students have trained other students....

(3) "... the Bruin... is mailed to public officials and to our metropolitan papers....

(4) "... students claim the paper to not represent them, to be biased....

(5) "... preference has been given to those who have spent their lower division years at UCLA...."

The DB editor denied each of the charges individually, except number three, which he said, was one of the "real reasons" behind the directive. He charged that the administration veto over editorial board will intimidate staff members. He said that the directive was a "surprise package" of more administration control disguised as greater and more democratic student control.

YSL FUND DRIVE

Drive for \$1550 Opens March 15

The 1955 Fund Drive of the Young Socialist League opens on March 15.

The YSL has set itself the goal of raising over \$1500 during the three-month period which ends on June 15. That the members and units of the YSL are determined to succeed in this undertaking is evidenced by the fact that several units have jumped the gun; New York and Chicago have already remitted \$10 each toward their quotas.

The following are the quotas for YSL units:

At Large and National Office	\$150
Berkeley	100
Chicago	400
Los Angeles	150
New York	650
Pittsburgh	75
Seattle	25
TOTAL	\$1550

With the exception of Los Angeles and Seattle, whose quotas are tentative, all of the units have accepted their quotas and these are therefore final.

Special commendation should be accorded to the Chicago unit which raised its own quota. The National Action Committee had proposed a quota of \$350 for Chicago but the comrades there insisted that they could do better than that. The Chicago example should help all of our other units to realize that they can not only meet their goals but surpass them.

There is not much point in informing Challenge readers about the importance of the drive to the YSL, for it is well known to all. We, have no angels; we depend on the generosity of our members and friends for our financial support. The publication of the Young Socialist Challenge, the conducting of tours, and the day-to-day operations of the National Office depend upon successfully meeting our quota.

In order to raise the full amount it will be necessary to receive a weekly average of a little more than \$110. Unit Fund Drive Directors should bear in mind, however, that previous experience has shown a high positive correlation between heavy

(Continued on page 7)

YSL FORUM • NEW YORK

Abe Stein
on
**German Rearmament
and the
German Socialists**

FRIDAY, MARCH 18
8:45 p.m.

Labor Action Hall
114 West 14 Street, N.Y.C.

YSL CLASS • NEW YORK

**UNDERSTANDING
MARXISM**

Session 7:
**APPROACHES TO
MARXISM**

**Tuesday, March 15
7:30 p.m.**

Labor Action Hall
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

ISSUES in the SHACHTMAN PASSPORT CASE

By HAL DRAPER

Last week we reported some highlights from the hearing on the Shachtman passport case in the Court of Appeals at Washington. But we now have to present the main issues in the case as they came before the court.

You ought to know what these issues are, even those that are just a bit complicated by legal argument. Because they are all very important issues of democratic rights, and not mere legalisms. The decision in the Shachtman passport case will play an important role in fixing these rights for the future.

The background of the case, briefly, is the refusal of the Passport Office of the State Department, after unconscionable delay, to issue a passport to Max Shachtman, national chairman of the Independent Socialist League, frankly on the ground that the ISL is on the attorney general's notorious "subversive list." One of the very significant features of the case is the fact that the Passport Office did motivate its denial so frankly (to the regret of the attorney general's office, as we shall see).

Acting for Shachtman, attorney Joseph L. Rauh Jr. asked the district court to prevent the State Department (i.e., its Passport Office) from withholding his passport arbitrarily and unlawfully. The government moved to dismiss the Shachtman complaint on the ground, essentially, that the court had no jurisdiction over the matter. On August 2 last, the district court did in fact decide in favor of the government and dismissed the complaint.

The present hearing was on appeal from this lower court's dismissal.

The Government Stakes a Claim

Both in its brief and orally through its Assistant U. S. Attorney Harold Greene, arguing before the three-man court of Judges Edgerton, Washington and Fahy, the government took the position that action by the State Department on passports for citizens was not reviewable by the courts.

It stated this position flatly and categorically. The government brief states: "the Judiciary has neither control nor review power" over the passport function; "there are no judicially reviewable limitations" upon it; "the secretary of state has plenary, complete, and unreviewable authority in this field, and the courts are not concerned"; "the secretary is not . . . accountable to the courts" and "it matters not for what reason he refused appellant a passport." Moreover, "it is he, and he alone, who should have the power to decide the issue." The victim "is foreclosed from challenging the determination anywhere but in the Executive Branch," certainly not in the courts.

Just look that claim over: as we mentioned last week, it is a broad demand for uncheckable and uncontrollable bureaucratic-administrative decree power. The lively argument in the courtroom underlined the sinister extent of the government's claim in a couple of ways.

The first was brought out by attorney Rauh and later re-emphasized by Judge Edgerton. To this layman sitting in the courtroom, the point at first appeared to be a matter of legal technicality, a good and proper one but still a technicality which just happened to favor the Shachtman case. This ignorant reaction was enlightened in the course of the hearing.

Here is the "technicality": When the government moved to dismiss the complaint in the district court, it was (in effect) telling the court that it did not have to hear debate or testimony on the facts claimed in the complaint; but that even if all these facts were true as stated in the complaint, the case should still be dismissed for other reasons—in this case, lack of jurisdiction by the court.

When the lower court agreed, and dismissed, it was saying in effect: "Though all the facts be true as stated, we dismiss the complaint for lack of jurisdiction."

Their Contradiction

Therefore, when the appeal on this dismissal comes before the higher court, it has to be assumed in the courtroom that the facts stated in the original complaint are true. This assumption, for the purposes of the appeal, is legally, logically and morally necessary in order that the decision might be centered on the problem actually before the appeals court: Should the complaint have been dismissed in the lower court?

Here is the impact of this "technicality" on the government's case:

One of the facts stated in the original complaint (which is now to be taken as true) is the fact that the ISL is not a subversive organization but is dedicated to achieving socialism by peaceful and democratic means, etc. The government could have tried to argue

against this in the lower court, if it had wished; it chose not to do so; it chose to try to evade this basic question—by relying on its claimed bureaucratic decree power.

Judge Edgerton harried the government attorney on the consequence of this, quoting the characterization of the ISL from the document: *You contradict this (he told Greene) by citing the attorney general. But the attorney general has to be taken as erroneous, because your motion to dismiss admits the facts in the complaint.*

This, then, is what the "technicality" brought out in a harsh light: **The government is telling the court that even though admitting perforce that the attorney general's listing is a mistake, and even though the ISL be pure as the driven snow and as innocent of subversion as a lamb, it yet has the uncheckable, unreviewable and uncontrollable right to punish a citizen (by depriving him of a passport) for being the victim of the attorney general's error!**

Not Frivolous, He Says

The second spotlight on this claim was thrown by an intervention by Judge Washington. He asked the government attorney: *There are several such "subversive" lists: the House Un-American Committee's, the Tenney committee's (and others). . . . Do you think the attorney general could announce that a passport would be refused to anyone who was ever on any of these lists, on the basis of your claim as to the government's power?*

Greene answered confidently: *Yes, the secretary of state could do so.*

Judge Washington continued: *Suppose he goes further and says, no person who has ever appeared before such a committee and has refused to answer questions is to receive a passport . . . ?*

At this point even Greene, who did not appear to be a mental giant, could see what was happening. His confidence evaporated somewhat. After a hem and a haw, he answered uncertainly: *There is a point (ahem) where such exercises of discretion by the secretary (ahaw) would be considered (ahem) frivolous . . . for example, if he decided on no passports to anyone who attends baseball games . . . (two more ahems) I couldn't tell you where I would draw the line. . . .*

Judge Washington, as it happens, used to be the assistant solicitor-general in the Justice Department at the time when the subversive list was originally published; and perhaps it was especially interesting for him to establish that the government claimed the right to unreviewable discretion on the use of any old list, even that drawn up by the pro-fascist and anti-Semitic Tenney.

Behind a Legal Fiction

The legal status of this government claim of "unreviewability" was well brought out at the hearing, especially through Judge Edgerton's support to attorney Rauh's argument on the point.

It should be explained first that the government's claim is based on the contention that "The issuance of passports is a foreign affairs function of the Executive over which the Judiciary has neither control nor review power." This characterization of the passport function as a part of "foreign affairs" is based on what is today increasingly a juridical fiction: the wording on a passport asks foreign governments to accord the bearer "protection."

However, as everybody knows, the real role of a passport today is that of a permit to leave the country. This has not always been true. For 130 years before World War I, a passport was seldom necessary for this purpose. (In fact, Judge Edgerton took a couple of minutes for a biographical interlude: he related how, before 1918, he used to carry a passport on a trip to Europe but scarcely had to use it.) The right of an individual to leave the country, while of interest to the government, can certainly not be treated as if it were essentially the same as government foreign-affairs activities like making agreements on foreign air transportation or controlling the sale of arms to a foreign nation—though the government brief throws all of these together.

Hiding behind the partly obsolete character of a passport as a request abroad for "protection," the government is, then, trying to make the same claims apply to the real function of a passport, which bears on the rights of American citizens and which concerns a citizen's relation to his own government, not a foreign government.

But the controlling precedent which invalidates the government's claim of "unreviewability" is provided by the Elg case. In this case the courts did in fact review the secretary of state's exercise of discretion on passports. A Miss Elg had been denied a passport on the ground that she was not a citizen. The court decided that she was a citizen, and the Supreme Court proceeded to direct a declaratory judgment to the secretary of state. This decree, said Chief Justice Hughes

for a unanimous court, "would in no way interfere with the exercise of the secretary's discretion with respect to the issue of a passport—but would simply preclude the denial of a passport on the sole ground that Miss Elg had lost her American citizenship."

So too, attorney Rauh asked the Appeals Court, not to negate the secretary's power of discretion, but simply to preclude the denial of a passport to Shachtman on the sole ground that he was the head of an organization on the attorney general's "subversive list." This was clearly as "reviewable" as the issue in the Elg case. Judge Edgerton indicated his agreement with this view rather plainly.

Judge Washington also caught Greene up on this point. Greene started to argue that the Elg case did not affect the Shachtman case because it merely involved correction of a "mistake." Inferentially some remarks by Judge Washington pointed out that the issue before the court in the Shachtman case was also the complaint that a "mistake" had been made—namely, the mistake about the "subversive" character of the ISL. Rauh drove this home.

Role of the "List"

This gets us to the second main issue debated at the hearing. Attorney Rauh set out to pillory the government case on its evasiveness as to the real reason for denying Shachtman a passport, and he succeeded handsomely.

Not before the lower court, but in its present brief, the government put forward the claim that the State Department had not depended solely on the attorney general's list. It tried to patch together an argument that the Passport Office had exercised independent judgment and discretion; to this end it referred to the informal hearing which had been given Shachtman as if this hearing had played an independent role in making up the office's decision.

Rauh was able to blast this pretense with documentary proof of its falsity. Before the court were the texts of the official letters sent by the Passport Office informing Shachtman of the reasons for the denial. They were categorical in giving the attorney general's list as the sole reason (twice). In fact, so frank was the utter reliance on the list that the two notices stated that "when and if" the attorney general changed his listing, the consideration at the State Department would change. And this was after the passport hearing, proving that nothing at the hearing was referred to as a motive for the denial.

The government brief admits: "appellant [Shachtman] was advised frankly why a passport was not issued to him." This statement is in complete contradiction with the government pretense that the list was not the sole grounds. For if Shachtman was indeed "advised frankly" on the grounds, then those frank letters are admitted to contain the real reason. The list was the only reason given. Even in the lower court proceedings, the government conceded the State Department's reliance on the list.

Chopped Down

At the appeal hearing, Judge Edgerton put Greene on the pan: *Mrs. Shipley's letter gives one ground only. Aren't you in a contradiction?*

Greene: *I admit that the notices [to Shachtman from the Passport Office] mostly refer to one reason, but. . .*

Judge Edgerton was not going to be put off by the sly word "mostly": *Do the notices refer to any other reason?* he insisted.

Greene squirmed visibly: *The secretary of state doesn't give out a statement as detailed as a court judgment. One reason given is that the organization is on the list. Another reason given is that he is the chairman of this organization. After this whopper, Greene must have seen a glint in the judge's eye, or something, because he hastened on to say: Of course, this may be regarded as being the same, but still it does refer to another reason. . . .*

Gulp. Then he continued: *Besides Mr. Shachtman was informed in one letter that another reason was the fact that his organ, the "New International" called itself an organ of revolutionary Marxism. . . .*

Judge Edgerton jumped on this, showing his complete command of the facts in the case: *That ground was given only in the tentative notice that was sent him (before the hearing and before the denial of the passport). It seems to have been dropped in going from the tentative to the final stage.*

Greene's case had turned upside down, for now it spoke against him that this motive had ever been given. Having once been given, it had been positively dropped from the motivation when Shachtman was "advised frankly" of the grounds by letters.

(It was at this point, after Judge Edgerton's reply had neatly chopped him down, that Greene remained silent for something like a full minute without knowing what to say. When he spoke it was to change the subject.)

Scandalous Comparison

At several points the argumentation bore on a closely allied subject: the competence of the attorney general's list as a determinant for the issuance of a passport.

One statement by Greene stimulated Rauh to indignant rebuttal later. Greene argued: *True, the attorney general's list was issued as a guide for government employment, but this doesn't make it irrelevant here. If a man is convicted of international smuggling, the secretary of state can use this fact as relevant to the issuance of a passport.*

The very comparison, of course, is a terrific condemnation of the government. If a person is convicted of a crime, that might be considered relevant by the courts. But the government attorney dares to make this comparison with the case of a man who has not even been charged with a crime, who is not even charged with violation of any law, who has not even been convicted

(Continued bottom of next page)

POLAND

New Light on the Gomulka Case

By A. RUDZIENSKI

Col. Swiatlo, the Polish defector whose revelations we have been discussing in our last couple of articles, has also shed light on the fall of Gomulka, whose case excited international attention.

Swiatlo, who is now a political refugee in Washington, had been assistant to Radkiewicz of the Polish UB (secret police).

According to Swiatlo, Gomulka's liquidation had been prepared a long time before his arrest under the personal supervision of "Comrade Tomasz," as his close friends and colleagues called Bierut in the Warsaw Politburo.

Of course, the liquidation was dictated from Moscow, and not in Warsaw. Bierut had received the order from Stalin, and reported it to the Warsaw Politburo as the wish of the Boss (as Stalin was known in Warsaw as well as in the Kremlin). Bierut declared that the Boss had said such-and-such, and there was no more discussion about the matter.

But this decision to liquidate Gomulka and his "faction" put the Warsaw Politburo into a difficulty, for Gomulka had not organized any faction of his own nor made any declarations which could be used to incriminate him. The Kremlin had, in spite of this, ordered his fate as a preventive measure directed against the possible rise of a Polish Titoism after the Yugoslav break.

GOMULKA ISOLATED

Bierut showed that it was with good reason that he—the old spy for the Russian GPU and denouncer of his own comrades, the leaders of the old Polish CP—was president of Poland. He personally took care of supervising the liquidation of Gomulka in fulfillment of the orders from the Boss.

Since Gomulka was still formally party general secretary and still had a circle of friends, like Spychalski (army vice-minister), Jaroszewicz and Lechowicz, the first thing that Bierut did was prepare his isolation by a policy of pressure on the latter. To this end he used Radkiewicz, the Polish Beria, as described in previous articles.

The attack on Spychalski was based on his relationship to his brother, who was a militant in the "Home Army" (*Armia Krajowa*), the heroic resistance army which Stalin hated because of its independence from the Kremlin. Spychalski was charged with "hiding his past" and this relationship from the party, but Bierut promised to save him if he attacked the "nationalist group," in the

first place his best friend, Gomulka.

Gomulka's position could have remained very strong, since he was party secretary, if his friends had defended him against the attacks of the Bierut ("Russian") group; for Gomulka was very popular at this time. Spychalski controlled the army. For these reasons the "wish" expressed by the Boss in the Kremlin was exceptionally difficult to fulfill.

But Spychalski, under the pressure of Radkiewicz, Bierut & Co., broke down and attacked Gomulka at a Politburo session, demoralizing his group of friends and isolating him. Later, after playing this role, Spychalski was himself attacked through a Bierut-inspired machination; he was quickly liquidated politically and arrested before Gomulka. Spychalski and his friends were accused of having contacts with the Home Army and with the "Second Bureau" of the London Polish government (the Information Bureau).

The UB also charged Spychalski, Wiczak and Mankiewicz with having contacts with the Gestapo, and sought to prove this. This was true; but they had been working under the order of Politburo member Albrecht, with the knowledge of the party and, of course, the Kremlin. Now all this was "evidence" against Spychalski and Gomulka.

SWIATLO'S MISSION

But in spite of pressure, duplicity and intrigue, Spychalski, Lechowicz and Jaroszewicz did not "confess" Gomulka's "crimes" in accordance with the orders of the Boss and Bierut's wishes. Then the Warsaw Politburo began to attack Gomulka for "Polish nationalism," for working in the interests of imperialism, and, finally, for being an agent under the orders of American imperialism.

In spite of the complete absence of any proofs, Bierut ordered Gomulka's arrest, and Col. Swiatlo was supposed to carry it out. This was no routine task; Gomulka this time was on "vacation" (a compulsory vacation) at Krynica, and knew how to use his revolver. But Swiatlo carried out the order and arrested Gomulka

in his own apartment, with the help of the general secretary's own guard, who was under Bierut and Radkiewicz's orders.

It was very difficult for Swiatlo to persuade Gomulka to go willingly back to Warsaw; he had to talk him into it from 7 in the morning to 10 at night. The trip was organized with great care because of Gomulka's popularity. It was done in the Stalinist manner: they traveled by private auto and during the night only; it took two days from Krynica to Warsaw, a half-hour trip by airplane.

On arrival in Warsaw, Gomulka was immediately jailed in the UB's special prison, a private house in Miedzyszyn, separated from his wife, who was also under arrest. None of the Politburo members was encouraged to talk to him, because they knew he had never committed the "crimes" for which the Boss wished to convict him. Bierut never went to interrogate him, either. And so Gomulka lived for four years in the special UB prison, without any interrogatory or charge or sentence against him, until the death of Stalin. The rulers did not have the nerve to put him on trial.

BIERUT ON SKIDS?

We see that it is difficult even for the GPU to apply the complete Russian method in other countries, even in a Poland which was so long under Russian occupation.

After Stalin's death, there were rumors of Gomulka's release from prison. But Swiatlo did not confirm this.

Now *Tribuna Ludu*, the official party organ, has again begun attacks against Gomulka. The cautious Bierut preferred to be quiet after the death of the Boss; but now, hearing about the victory of "neo-Stalinism" under Khrushchev, he is trying to buy the favor of the new Boss by accusing his own comrade.

This puppet president, a miserable Russian spy who rose on the corpses of the old Polish Communists whom he denounced as agents of the Polish government to please Stalin, is still continuing his role as a spy, seeking the favor of the new Kremlin rulers. This is the political and moral personality of the leader of Polish Stalinism and the "tamer of Polish Titoism."

But his star also is paling nowadays; for his infamous role and reputation is an inconvenience for the Kremlin's interests in Poland, and he will probably be replaced by Rokossovsky or some other puppet of the Russian "marshals."

Laborscope — —

(Continued on page 2)

of its financial standing could give invaluable information to its opponent, either another union or an employer.

HONEST VOICE

At last a voice of honest criticism from the ranks of the CIO against its so-called friends in the Democratic Party: At the IUE Civil Rights Conference, February 11-12, Al Hartnett, IUE secretary-treasurer, told a simple truth, as reported by the *IUE-News*.

"Hartnett assailed the Democratic liberals in the Senate for refusing to make a fight on Rule 22, the filibuster rule which for so long has blocked civil rights legislation. 'We are against any compromises with Southern conservatives, and we will fight them as we fight other foes' of civil liberties," he said. The decision not to make the fight in the name of party unity, Hartnett said, was really a form of blackmail by the Southern reactionaries and could take other forms, such as anti-labor legislation. Declaring 'some of our friends are backsliding,' Hartnett said we must let them know we don't like it."

London Letter — —

(Continued from page 3)

recent American capitalism, in a new phase of expansion, which will once again delay the agony of expiring capitalism. This is, of course, if a war does not intervene.

This somber possibility brought representatives of the Four Strong Powers to London to discuss disarmament. They agreed on secret diplomacy in an attempt to hide from the peoples of the world their chicanery and bankruptcy.

Unfortunately, Gromyko gave a private interview to the *Daily Worker* correspondent, which gave it something of a scoop, in contravention of the understanding. Gromyko is being hauled over the coals at Lancaster House for not playing the game. In the other respect, he is playing the propaganda game very successfully with the West.

Anyone who seriously imagines that anything substantial can come out of the London conference on Disarmament will surely learn better.

YSL Fund Drive — —

(Continued from page 5)

receipts in the first few weeks of a drive and the drive's final success. All units should aim therefore at making collections and remittances as early as possible. A reasonable goal would be 50 per cent by April 19.

All friends and sympathizers of the YSL and all *Challenge* readers should avail themselves of the opportunity of aiding the socialist cause by contributing their help to the drive. The "At Large" category depends upon our friends. Make your checks or money orders payable to Max Martin and remit to YSL, 114 West 14 Street, New York 11, New York.

Challenge will carry reports on the progress of the drive every two weeks during the Fund Drive period.

Shachtman Passport Case — —

(Continued from page 6)

even of the non-crime of being "subversive," who has not even gotten a hearing on this non-crime.

And yet the government, through its spokesman, equates conviction for a crime with non-conviction, on the basis of a non-hearing, for a non-crime!

It's all the same thing on Animal Farm: peace is war, freedom is slavery. And all men are considered innocent until proved guilty, but some men are more considered than others. . . .

MATTER OF DELICACY

The government also went in for some fakery about "due process." It claimed that the requirements of "due process of law" had been adequately fulfilled by the Passport Office going through the motions of the hearing which it gave Shachtman, "a passport hearing in which the applicant is represented by counsel, and in which he is given full opportunity to rebut allegations of subversion." Anyone interested in what this "full opportunity" was can read LABOR ACTION's report of this hearing at the time.

The government's brief asserts: "Perhaps the hearing was not of what may be called 'quasi-judicial quality' but then procedural due process did not require it to be of such dignity." Or, in other

words, it was held to go through the forms.

Yet the last word in the government brief is the following bit of Americana:

"... the government has an enormous stake in the unembarrassed conduct of foreign relations and thus need not give every passport-seeker a criminal type of trial or a Public Utilities Commission type of administrative hearing when to do so might well jeopardize delicate external relationships. There was no denial of due process."

There is no further information on how giving a formal hearing on Shachtman's passport request might have thrown a monkey-wrench into NATO, or imperiled the Asian aid program, or threatened our Formosa policy, or shaken the pillars of U. S. army occupation in Germany, or menaced the peace of nations in the Near, Middle or Far East, or, in short, how any other delicate external relationship would have been bruised.

But the U. S. government is not so easily convinced that a lethal passport in the hands of Max Shachtman might not do well-nigh irreparable damage to the tender structure of international relationships in the Free World. We can now reveal that in quoting the government brief's last word, above, we left out a footnote, which is appended after the key phrase "delicate external relationships."

MODESTY DOESN'T PAY

This footnote does not exactly explain much about these delicate objects or subjects, in spite of the fact that it is inserted at this crucial point. This is a pity, since if there is one thing LABOR ACTION readers are sure to be curious about, it is precisely the international problem of the impact of Shachtman on delicate relationships. If the Department

of Justice had anything to divulge on this score, they could not ask for a more sympathetic audience.

Be that as it may be or might have been, the footnote is in fact devoted to sternly crushing the statement made in the Shachtman brief that "the withholding of his passport averts no national danger, real or potential, and neither furthers nor protects any national interest."

One might think that the unaffected modesty which glows in this confession would deserve applause, and a nice word for Shachtman's humility, meekness, unpretentious diffidence, even self-abasement.

But no, this cruel footnote destroys the unconceited assertion with two titanic blows: It "is in direct conflict with the best judgment of the secretary of state" (that's the first blow) "and represents, we submit, an entirely unreasonable position" (that's the whole of the second and last blow, and end of quote).

This irrefutable rejoinder literally marks the end of the government case in the brief, and ought to be its finish in the courts.

There is one other aspect of this hearing which LABOR ACTION readers ought to know. That is the material dealing, not with any issues concerning passport rights or even Shachtman's specific passport case, but the peripheral government material on the "subversiveness" of the ISL, as injected into this case.

The next and last article, therefore, will summarize what has so far emerged (in this passport case) that has a bearing on the other and more basic grievance of the ISL: the government's grounds for stamping the ISL "subversive."

YOU'RE INVITED

to speak your mind in the letter column of Labor Action. Our policy is to publish letters of general political interest, regardless of views. Keep them to 500 words.

THE BENDING CROSS

A BIOGRAPHY OF EUGENE V. DEBS

by

Ray Ginger

Now, while they last only \$1.00

Order from:

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

Crimp the Purgers — —

(Continued from page 1)

had its effects even in the organized stronghold of the witchhunt—the Justice Department itself. Two recent events demonstrate it.

The first appeared in the case of Dr. John P. Peters, professor of medicine at Yale. Dr. Peters was fired from his job as occasional consultant on medical projects to the surgeon-general because a loyalty board found "reasonable doubt" as to his loyalty. As is usual in such proceedings, the board did not inform Dr. Peters of all the "derogatory material" in their file against him, nor did they permit him to cross-examine his accusers. In fact (and this is also "normal" in such cases) the board itself did not know the identity of all his "accusers."

Dr. Peters has taken his case to the Supreme Court. His attorney charges that the "star chamber" proceedings against him were in violation of the "due process" clause of the constitution.

In its reply to the charges, the Justice Department asserted that vital sources of information "might well dry up to the detriment of the basic security of the country" if the defendants were given full information in security cases.

But the government's brief, instead of being signed by Solicitor General Simon E. Sobeloff, whose name normally appears on the government's Supreme Court briefs, was signed by Attorney General Brownell. It seems the Justice Department is split on the issue. It appears that Sobeloff and a group of federal attorneys disagree with Brownell's contention that the Peters case does not involve a violation of constitutional rights.

If the Supreme Court should turn out to agree with them, one of the chief procedural atrocities of the witchhunt will have been dealt a hard blow.

ON THE DEFENSIVE

The second incident also involves Brownell. As the cry for a thorough investigation of the whole loyalty program has been mounting in many quarters, the Department of Justice conceived the clever idea of heading off any such investigation by conducting one itself. On

March 5 the press received copies of a letter sent by Brownell to President Eisenhower, outlining proposed changes in the loyalty program which are supposed to "improve" it.

As could have been expected, there was nothing in Brownell's proposals which could actually end the injustice to the individual caught in the "security" program's toils. They are simply designed to eliminate some of the more embarrassing and ridiculous incidents like the Ladejinsky case, by getting departments to consult with each other, and making top legal officers in each department take personal responsibility for the way in which charges are drawn up.

There was no word of the accused's right to defend himself under some minimal standards of fair procedure, let alone anything so drastic as giving organizations placed on the subversive list a chance to defend themselves in open hearings.

The significance of this step, therefore, does not lie in the "concessions" contained in the revisions themselves, but it lies in the fact that the government witchhunters feel themselves on the defensive against criticism and are moved to do something in pretense at reform.

INQUIRIES START

It does not appear that this feeble and transparent "reform" will succeed in staving off further investigations of the whole government "security" program. On March 8 Senator Hubert Humphrey of Minnesota started hearings on a bill which provides for setting up a bipartisan commission (made up of public and private personages) to go into the whole program in detail. Although Senator Humphrey's record in such matters does not instill too much confidence, it is possible that such a commission will be set up some day.

At the same time, the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, headed by Senator Olin D. Johnston of South Carolina, has started to get up steam toward a full-dress inquiry into the whole program. And finally, the Ford Foundation has started a private investi-

gation directed by the Association of the Bar of New York City.

All these investigations may produce very little, or they may make a real dent in the witchhunt. In the long run, their proceedings and findings may make a strong impression on public opinion and hence on the political atmosphere in the country.

READY FOR A PUSH

But their effect will be influenced to no small degree by the pressure exerted on them during the next few months. While the fury of the witchhunt was unqualified, cries for investigations and changes went unheeded, in fact were suspect. Senators and congressmen of both parties were far too busy worrying about getting a reputation of being "soft on Communists" to worry about the injustice done to individuals or the damage done to political liberty in general.

The slight shift in the political atmosphere has made these investigations possible. A further shift will be necessary to make them fruitful.

The "political atmosphere" is created by people, not by elemental forces of nature. This is no time for complacency or the slackening of efforts on behalf of democratic liberties. On the contrary: The slightest sign that the forces of the witchhunt show uncertainty and a loss of momentum should be a signal for a redoubling of the efforts of all those in the liberal and labor movement who want to strike a blow for freedom.

No time has been more propitious in the past few years for raising the demand to abolish the subversive list, to end the thought-police activities of the FBI, to strike from the legal code the infamous Smith and McCarran Acts. Each and every one of these have been formally and officially condemned by many powerful unions and civil-libertarian organizations in the past.

The time is approaching, if it is not here already, when a vigorous effort can transform these formal condemnations into a living political campaign. That would be the most effective way even to get some really positive results from the investigations of the government's security program.

LABOR & CIVIL LIBERTIES

Inconsistent Democrats vs. Purgers

By BEN HALL

We are indebted to one of four readers for raising questions on the attitude of unions toward the witchhunt [letter by J.G.S. in last week's issue]. A hot debate on just such matters is possible at the UAW convention next month when some of its Flint locals try to amend the present union constitution to bar Communists from membership for the first time.

J.G.S. reports a series of contemptible actions by union locals in Seattle undermining the basic democratic rights of their membership. A Steelworkers Union local, upheld by the International board, expelled a member for sympathizing with the Socialist Workers Party. The State CIO Council, he writes, amended its constitution to ban "subversives" from membership. And a local of the Building Service Employees Union introduces a sweeping clause of the same type into its constitution.

He is right in suspecting that this is part of a national pattern of union conformity to the witchhunt. And so J.G.S. expresses his "skepticism at the resolve of the CIO Oil Workers Union to fight the 'bosses witchhunt.'"

Skepticism is a healthy attitude but we should guard against slurring over the real differences that exist inside the union movement on this and other questions. There is conformity but there is also resistance. We can't throw the Oil Workers Union into the same pot with the steel union.

Almost nowhere in the labor movement, and few places elsewhere for that matter, do democrats and liberals face up to this simple question: Will you defend the democratic rights even of Stalinists? The reply comes in varying degrees of evasion. It was precisely with this in mind that we criticized the attitude of the Oil Workers, concluding: "Undoubtedly it will do its best to hold the line against wholesale victimization of militants and dissenters in industry. But can it succeed without facing up to the full obligations of consistent democracy? That's another matter."

But the Oil Workers want to fight the witchhunt and probably will. Its position is that of inconsistent democracy. The Steelworkers Union, as in the story of J.G.S., is actively engaged in cutting off political dissenters. Between these two positions there is a lot of territory.

A whole page of its newspaper, the *Record*, is devoted by the CIO Retail Union to an article on "Labor Hits Injustices in U. S. Loyalty Setup." In the course of the article we read, "Organized labor accepts the necessity of proper safeguards for American safety and defense. More and more, however, it is concerned with the necessity of protecting the individual worker against false accusations and of giving him the chance to answer his accuser."

Like all those unions which want to defend democratic rights, the Retail Union is ready to support a just loyalty program but attacks the injustices in the present arbitrary one. Increasingly these unions are de-emphasizing support and emphasizing criticism.

THEY STRADDLE, BUT . . .

Another union which straddles the issue is the International Union of Electrical Workers (CIO). Like the others, it will not commit itself to defend the rights of admitted CP members. But its position as outlined anew at a Civil Rights Conference on February 11-12 maintains: (1) that refusal to testify by invoking the Fifth Amendment is not grounds for expulsion from the union or dismissal from the job; (2) that the union will not permit employers the unilateral right to discipline workers for refusal to testify before legislative committees. Moreover, this union has in the past supported socialist workers who were victimized for their political views.

Its position is not forthright and consistent enough? Granted. But it could hardly be classified together with the offending Seattle unions.

While the Steelworkers Union expels a man for sympathizing with the SWP, the Auto Workers Union allows members

of the Communist Party to hold membership and defends their right to work. J.G.S. writes that "Ben Hall expresses some amazement that the Leather Workers Organizing Committee (CIO) excludes Communists or party-liners from membership." Regrettably, the intent of the article to which he refers must have been somewhat obscure. The daily life of the national CIO is unquestionably a series of compromises between the Reuther forces of the UAW and the McDonald forces of the Steel Workers Union. When the LWOC decided to exclude Communists two serious possibilities were counterposed: Was Reuther preparing to change the policy of the UAW? Or had the McDonald forces succeeded in imposing their policy on the LWOC?

We have our answer even before the UAW convention. The entire Reuther administration will oppose attempts to exclude Communists from membership and will defend the present constitution against Flint's efforts to amend it along such lines.

DON'T LUMP 'EM

The UAW has fought for the reinstatement of men victimized by congressional committees. A recent case will come before the convention.

A group of alleged CP members were thrown bodily out of a UAW plant in Flint and were discharged. The International union filed grievances on their behalf and demanded their reinstatement. Their cases were dropped by the union in the course of negotiations when the company charged that they had falsified their applications for employment. They will appeal for support by the convention where they are guaranteed a full hearing.

Undoubtedly, a union like the UAW with its power and influence could do far more to stimulate the fight for civil liberties in the United States. But it is miles ahead of unions like the Steelworkers and lives in a different world from the Building Service Union. True, they are all unions. But if we lump them together on this question, we will disorient ourselves in the struggle to defend democracy.

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—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!

INTERESTED? GET ACQUAINTED!

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

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

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE

LABOR ACTION
Independent Socialist Weekly
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, New York

Please enter my subscription:

- 1 year at \$2. New
- 6 months at \$1. Renewal
- Payment enclosed. Bill me.

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE