

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

AUGUST 29, 1955

FIVE CENTS

SOUTH AFRICA

Congress of the People Adopts a FREEDOM CHARTER

... page 7

The New Military "Code of Conduct"

DISCIPLINE IS NOT ENOUGH

... page 4

The Geneva Atom Conference

Peace—Or Competition?

By SAM TAYLOR

The first international conference on the peacetime uses of atomic energy which recently ended at Geneva revealed to the public some of the potentiality of atomic energy for the benefit of mankind. It was a welcome change from the "peacetime" use of atomic energy concerned with the destruction of civilization: the construction of nuclear weapons.

The conference was a public and ostentatious display of scientific conviviality. The impression from the press accounts would almost lead to the belief that the rivalry was between scientists of various nations, each competing to reveal the greatest amount of scientific data; of scientists of the leading nuclear weapon nations meeting in the corridors to swap the latest techniques.

SECRETS REVEALED?

While much information was made available to the general public, it was hardly a conference which revealed secrets. Any information regarded by either side as really important and secret, or possibly unavailable to their nuclear and political rivals, was not presented in the papers delivered at the conference.

As is very often the case, these conferences are the public demonstrations of already existing situations. In this case, it was made possible by the fact that, for all practical purposes, nuclear parity exists between the two rival imperialist blocs. Research on the use of atomic energy both for weapons and industrial uses has proceeded to the point where the overwhelming bulk of technical data is known to all researchers. This is not due to the activity of spies, but is a product of years of research into bigger and more destructive atomic weapons.

The United States Atomic Energy Commission, for example, is in the process of releasing hundreds of patents, processes and research papers for use by big corporations and public utilities. They certainly did not reveal to the Russians anything not already known or in the process of being released for the benefit of the giant corporations. And it is more than certain that the Stalinists

revealed just enough to demonstrate that not only have they mastered the techniques of nuclear weapons but also the industrial use of the atom.

But the rivalry at this Geneva conference was not solely between the Russian and American governments. That rivalry existed and was very real. However, the scarcely concealed cut-throat competition between the United States and Great Britain was of greater interest.

Great Britain sees the age of atomic energy as her opportunity to forge ahead once again, if not as the leader, then as a serious challenger for the leadership of this new industrial revolution. When the conference opened, the British made no secret that they viewed it as an opportunity to sell atomic reactors abroad, and that they wanted to get the jump on the Americans. And it was symbolic of the weakness of Britain in the economic struggle against the Goliath American capitalism that the only sale of a reactor at the conference was made by an American corporation, Westinghouse.

The reasons for Great Britain's feverish interest in the industrial use of atomic energy are two. First is that for most areas of the world energy and electric power are expensive. For nations far removed from easily accessible sources of water power, and without significant known sources of coal and petroleum, atomic energy becomes a paying proposition.

Britain entertains the idea of regaining her one-time position as the workshop of the world, at least in the limited area of the manufacturing of atomic reactors for sale to the majority of the world which does not have the industrial

(Continued on page 3)

The British Govt. Has a Worried Look:

Is U.S. Going "Soft" In Cold War Lull?

By GORDON HASKELL

Now that several weeks have passed since the Geneva conference, the peans of praise which went up on all sides at the end of the gathering are giving place to some soberer reflections on just what was accomplished.

Interestingly enough, the soberest reflections of all seem to be taking place in London. In fact, things have reached a pass in which stories, obviously inspired from the highest levels of the British government, indicate that at these levels it is felt that the conference was far from an unqualified success; and further, that the responsibility for whatever went wrong at Geneva falls not on the Stalinist representatives, but on the shoulders of Dwight D. Eisenhower and his advisors.

Everyone concedes that Eisenhower stole the show from his allied colleagues at Geneva. His moralizing speeches, topped by his proposal for an exchange of military "blueprints" and mutual reconnaissance from the air of military installations set the tone at Geneva. But what bothers the British Foreign Office (and probably the French government as well, though the latter has been more reticent in "leaking" its dissatisfaction) is not so much that Eisenhower's earnest dramatics put their representatives in the shade.

What seems to bother them are two far more concrete problems which came to the fore at Geneva: (1) The evident tendency of such a conference "at the summit" to transform itself from a meeting of four more or less equal great powers into one of two. (2) The tendency of the American delegation to permit sweeping phrases of good-will to take the place of carefully worked-out proposals which have as their object either to put the Stalinists on the spot, or to arrive at an

actual inter-imperialist deal on the basis of limited but concrete bargains.

Actually, these two problems are really part of one. The British and French government leaders know very well that they are junior partners in the American-capitalist bloc of nations. They recognize that the United States and Russia are the great powers in the world today, and all but the most romantic and irresponsible among them are willing to accept this state of affairs and try to do the best they can for the ruling classes of their respective countries within the limitations thus created for them.

On the other hand, Britain and France are not only the most important (and hence vital and indispensable) junior partners in the American alliance; they are also the two partners who have most at stake in the way of imperialist holdings and commercial interests in all parts of the globe, as well as the most direct and vital interest in anything which may change the balance of power in Europe.

Further, they are partners whose domestic position is by no means as secure as that of the Americans. Though both the British and French economies are prospering at the moment, their prosperity is very precarious. Any sudden shift in the present patterns of world trade could have a most upsetting effect on them. The same is therefore true of any political deals which might affect these patterns. And quite aside from their economic situation, a radical turn in world political relations could lend decisive strength to the political oppositions which threaten both the British and French governments, unless such shifts are made in a way that they will benefit the governments now in power.

All of the above considerations dictate that from the British and French point of view any actual deal with the Stalinists must be approached with the greatest of caution. They must be in a position to know in advance exactly what is to be traded for what, and to be able to exercise a veto power, at the very least, over any deals which they believe run contrary to their interests.

It is at this point that the tendency of the Geneva Conference to turn from a Big Four to a Big Two meeting gives them cause for concern. As G. L. Arnold reports from London in the *New Leader*

"Apart from being nettled by the suddenness with which the president conjured this gigantic rabbit out of Mr. Stassen's hat [the proposal for mutual inspection—G. H.] the British and French had reason to feel that he was addressing himself directly to the Russians, in a manner foreshadowing the possibility of a genuine "talk at the summit" on some future occasion, with none but the Big Two present (probably

(Turn to last page)

(Turn to last page)

The Army Bags Another "Red"

By JACK WILSON

DETROIT, Aug. 21—Until this past week Dr. Alfred H. Kelly, head of the history department at Wayne University, was living the kind of life one would expect in academic circles in these times.

His reputation was unassailable. He took great pride in being an outstanding supporter of the status quo in American politics. It was not too long ago, for example, that he debated against Irving Howe, and ridiculed such concepts as a new political realignment. He vigorously defended the witchhunt against the Stalinists in academic circles. Dr. Kelly was quite influential also in disintegrating student groups, a notable success of his being to liquidate the American Youth for Democracy chapter on the Wayne campus.

Surely, here was a man above all men for whom the excesses of McCarthyism

were merely a disturbing but temporary phenomenon. Here was the American university professor personified.

And then it happened. On Thursday, August 18, the *Detroit Free Press* came out with a big page one story: "Wayne Rips Army for Slur on Prof."

DEMANDS RETRACTION

The story went on to say that Dr. Kelly demanded that the army retract an accusation that he was a member of the Communist Party or sympathetically associated with the party.

It was difficult to believe for a moment. Dr. Kelly accused by the army? For Detroit, this was as sensational as if Dr. Sidney Hook were suddenly accused of being a Stalinist in New York. It was simply an impossibility.

What happened is this: An ex-Wayne student, Sanford Waxer, was just asked

to accept an "undesirable discharge" from the army, among other reasons because he was acquainted with Dr. Kelly, who was one of the suspect acquaintances of Waxer!

The army wrote the following letter to Waxer.

"Information has been received by the Department of Army furnishing reasons to believe that you may be subjected to coercions, influences or pressures which may cause you to act contrary to the best interests of the national security."

"This information is to the effect that you associated with persons who were members in or in sympathetic association with the Communist Party."

These persons are: Howard and Hope Smith, Saul and Peggy Wellman (Wellman is a leading Michigan Stalinist), and

"Dr. Alfred H. Kelly, a contributor to

ON THE JIM CROW FRONT

NEGRO LEADERS LOOK FOR NEW ALLIES AS

Fight Looms on School De-Segregation

By SCOTT ARDEN

With the end of the summer vacation period now approaching, the school segregation question is again breaking into the national news.

A number of Southern communities, scattered through ten states, from Maryland to Texas, have conceded that the de-segregation ruling of the Supreme Court is "legal" and have ended segregation in their schools, or plan to do so when the class-rooms reopen in a few weeks.

Unfortunately, these communities form a distinct minority. All reports indicate that the core of resistance to the anti-segregation decree has hardened, and that a long and costly fight, on many fronts, will be necessary before even limited integration on a meaningful scale can be achieved.

Though hailed in some quarters as a "victory for the NAACP," the weak-kneed order handed down by the Supreme Court last May destroyed all hope for wide-spread integration in the immediate fu-

SPOTLIGHT

HUTCHINS ON CIVIL LIBERTIES

In presenting the first report on the activities of the Fund For the Republic, Robert M. Hutchins, head of the Ford Foundation which set up the Fund had a number of trenchant things to say about the state of civil liberties in America today.

Although the political atmosphere which surrounds the issues of civil liberties has improved over what it was five years ago, Hutchins observed that "the cold war has thrown the whole subject into unusual disorder."

In discussing the impact of the cold war on civil liberties Hutchins observed:

"In view of the weapons now available and of the examples of subversion that other countries have offered, the danger has seemed great, though often mysterious and intangible. It has appeared that the peril to the country could be dealt with only by methods that drastically departed from those which have characterized Anglo-American jurisprudence.

"A political party in this country has been identified with the 'enemy.' Those associated with this party have therefore come under suspicion as an imminent danger to the state.

"The range of suspected persons has been enormously extended by resort to guilt by association. The evidence offered to show that a man is a danger to American institutions has often been farcically remote." Hutchins' report said that the treatment accorded by Congressional investigations and administrative hearings has not always been in the spirit of the 6th Amendment, which provides for a speedy trial and the production of witnesses.

"A kind of continuous propaganda and social pressure has kept up that has tended to suppress conscientious non-conformity," the report continued.

"Political advantage has accrued from claiming that others were indifferent to the threat of communism. The result has been that governmental officers, university presidents, and ordinary citizens have felt it necessary to exhibit inordinate anxiety on this score."

The Fund for the Republic has spent \$2,514,738 since it was incorporated by the Ford Foundation in December, 1952 "to advance understanding of civil liberties" in the United States. At the present time it has a number of projects in progress. Among them are a study on "blacklisting in the motion picture, radio and television industries"; a study of "Post Office interference with the flow of information and opinion"; a grant to Stanford University for an "analysis of testimony of witnesses in proceedings relative to communism"; and a grant to the Association of the Bar of the City of New York to make a study of the federal loyalty-security program.

ture. The Court's order to the states to proceed with "deliberate speed" toward compliance with its previous decision (outlawing Jim Crow in the nation's schools) has given Dixie's officialdom many a good chuckle, and properly so, from its point of view.

"Deliberate speed" is the South's "out" —and will be exploited to the hilt. The court carefully avoided setting any dates or time limits on integration. Enforcement decrees issued by federal district courts in Virginia and South Carolina have been interpreted to mean that local school officials can drag out compliance for at least another year, and probably indefinitely.

The technique is simple—"advisory committees" are being appointed. Instead of rejecting the petitions of Negro parents outright, they will "consider them!" (read: sit on) which will further delay legal action. Other Southern states are already setting up their local "advisory committees," and though the tack varies from state to state, one feature is common to all; the plan seems to be: fight every case, in every community, appeal them all and bankrupt the NAACP.

PROBLEMS BEGINNING

Because of this the NAACP's problems will be just beginning when they eventually are able to drag these cases into court. It will have to push extended, and expensive lawsuits in hundreds of school districts throughout the South. When these are eventually won, as they probably will be, de-segregation forces will then face desperate last-ditch action which (contrary to the opinion of many liberal observers) may in some states include abolition of the whole public school system.

Most Southern states, of course, will not go so far—when the chips are down. The chips, however, are by no means down and already the ditches are being dug. (Space considerations make a detailed report unfeasible at this point but a few of the more important specific cases are reported below and future issues of LA will carry others.)

Texas, which is not deep South, has a compromise plan which is simple if not subtle. Texas Attorney General Sheppard, the *Afro-American* reports, revealed the scheme last week. Sex segregation instead of race segregation. Boys, white and Negro, will go to one school, girls to another. The theory is that this will preserve the purity of Southern (white) womanhood.

SHOWS HER TEETH

In Georgia, which is deeper both Southwise and ditchwise, no compromise is envisioned. She showed her teeth this July when her State Board of Education voted to revoke "for life" the license of any teacher who belongs to the NAACP or who "supports, encourages, condones or agrees to teach in, a mixed class."

Last week in a mood of profound moderation, by local standards, the Board adopted an amendment which enables any teacher now holding membership in the NAA or similar "subversive groups" to retain his license by taking an oath that he has resigned such membership by September 15th.

Georgia's attorney general, Gook, who sponsored the Anti-NAA resolution has announced the appointment of "25 deputies" to assist his office in its fight to preserve race segregation in the state's schools. While declining to give either the names or specific functions of these "deputies", Cook did announce that they were "prominent citizens" who would serve without compensation.

Another Witchhunt

A sidelight of which should be of especial interest to non-racists who support the witchhunt was furnished when Cook was asked how the school boards would know which teachers are or are not NAA members. Cook stated that all state employees had been required last year to fill out sworn "security questionnaire" forms, which listed all organizations in which they held or had held membership.

All the racists have to do is cull these "security" forms. Any teacher who held membership in the NAA but failed to list it is of course subject to immediate dismissal, if not perjury charges. Those who answered honestly will either lose their jobs or resign such membership.

Not content with outlawing freedom of opinion and association within its own borders, Georgia sent Governor Griffin to address the Alabama General Assembly at Montgomery. In keeping with his previously stated position that Georgia would have segregated schools or no schools, he urged the state of Alabama to stand beside Georgia in defying the Supreme Court's decision.

BLOCK FUND-RAISING

In the meantime, an Alabama state senator introduced a bill to block "NAACP fund raising" in that state.

The bill would require that an organization seeking to conduct any sort of fund-raising drive would first have to register with the attorney general and receive a certificate from him authorizing the campaign:

No certificate, of course, would be granted, under the provisions of the bill, to any group encouraging disregard of or resistance to Alabama laws, especially those pertaining to "association of the races."

Other states have other dodges, each of which will require knock-down drag-out legal fights—and the fact that the South realizes that it is fighting a delaying action doesn't alter the situation.

Growth of Leadership

Perhaps the healthiest development in the struggle to date is the slow but steady growth of militant Negro leadership, especially in the South.

Though the "Good Negro" Uncle Tom, who clings to his separateness with a fictional fervor has been revived as a paying profession, usually in the form of a Negro state college president who likes

his job, "Taming" is distinctly on the decline.

Increasingly the Negro community leaders of the South (including even state college presidents) are raising their voices—and not too softly.

More important, they, and their colleagues in the North, have become considerably shrewder about choosing their "friends". The charming fantasy long sung by the Southern Liberal and his Northern brethren of a changing Southern leadership, with all trouble and "excesses" coming from the ignorant, backward "poor-whites" and a few demagogic politicians on the one hand, and meddling Northerners, Negro and white, who "don't understand the problems of the South", and lack patience and moderation as well, on the other—this fantasy is already dead, if not yet buried.

CITIZENS COUNCILS

The "Citizens Councils" did the killing and their counterparts, which are springing up in various forms throughout the deep South, are doing the spadework.

Citizens Council or Committee, local school board or State's Rights League, whatever the name, all the groups which are spearheading the fight against integration share one common feature. They are not headed by or composed of Southern "crackers," "poor-whites" or the tobacco-chewing stereotype of the Huey Long follower. Almost without exception the leadership and membership are drawn from the "respectable" and "educated" elements of the white communities—bankers, business-men, doctors, lawyers, high school teachers, college professors, well-to-do farmers, etc.

(Tara to last page)

IUE Militants "Shocked" at Weak Pact Signed With GE

By JOHN WILLIAMS

On August 12, the negotiating committee of the International Union of Electrical Workers (IUE-CIO) agreed to sign a contract with the General Electric Company covering over 100,000 workers throughout the United States. The agreement comes up for ratification by the GE Conference Board on August 25. (The Conference Board consists of representatives of each GE local in IUE).

statement, the agreement gives at least "40 cents an hour" spread over five years and major improvements in many phases of the contract. The union also won an escalator clause, computed quarterly, and only upward. It won some important concessions in a greatly improved health

According to the official IUE-CIO benefits plan, plus improvements in the pension plan which will become non-contributory in 1958, and will be reduced next year from two per cent to one per cent of wages. There were also improvements with respect to lay-off of union officers, as well as in other minor respects.

Nevertheless, however much IUE President James B. Carey and John Callahan, GE Conference Board chairman, try to play up these gains as a tremendous victory, the fact is that militants throughout the IUE are amazed and shocked at the signing of the GE contract at terms less than half of what was won by the IUE in its contract with General Motors. They are particularly dismayed that the union leaders jumped at the company's first offer, although the contract does not expire until September 15 of this year.

The situation is made even more embarrassing by a pamphlet issued by the Conference Board entitled "1955 The Year of Decision." The pamphlet did an excellent job of attacking the company and the Stalinist-controlled United Electrical Workers, and mobilized the union for an all-out fight against the GE speed-up, super-profits, and union busting. In addition, the negotiators had the backing of the national convention and subsequent ratification by the locals of a

"no contract-no work" policy. They were further strengthened by the addition of many locals won over from UE in the preceding year, including the Schenectady local with about 20,000 members.

Everyone was behind the IUE's Eleven Point Program, which featured the Guaranteed Annual Wage; but the only thing the union won on this score was a promise by GE to reopen the contract in three years for a look-see on this question. If the GE Conference Board ratifies the contract signed by its negotiating committee, this will be the first major setback suffered by the CIO on the GAW since the Auto Workers started the ball rolling with their Ford contract.

First indications are that the ranks are bitterly disappointed at receiving a contract which binds them for five years, and which averages only 8 cents, while the UAW won 20 cents this year and established the principle of the Guaranteed Annual Wage in a three-year contract. As this is written, a number of locals have already voted to turn down the agreement.

What makes the GE contract even more important is the fact that it is traditionally the pace-setter for the entire electrical industry, and locals and chains which have contracts coming up, like Westinghouse, feel their fight for the GAW and the GM pattern sabotaged.

As of this moment it appears that there is a deep-seated opposition to the GE contract in the GE locals of the IUE, and in the International union in general. The possibility exists that the ranks may vote down this poor contract, and demand a fight for a better one. If this should happen, it shouldn't bother James Carey too much, since he has always publicly proclaimed that GE and its personnel director, Boulware, have to be tamed.

It appears that the only taming of this notorious union-busting corporation will come from the initiative of the ranks. It is indeed a sad commentary that Carey should be in such a hurry to get a poor settlement, when the ranks were ready to fight. In previous years his requests for strike votes were turned down by workers who had been demoralized by years of Stalinist UE-GE backdoor agreements. It is possible that this time the ranks will show that they have left the union leadership behind.

The Jewish Partisans of World War II

By AL FINDLEY

This spring and summer marked the tenth anniversary of many incidents connected with the ending of World War II. Among them have been the anniversaries of partisan units; the meeting of American and Russian forces at the Elbe; the liberation of some of the worst concentration camps, etc.

The commemoration of these anniversaries brings to mind the fact that while the story of Jewish suffering in the Ghetto and in various concentration and extermination camps has an extensive literature, and there also exists a fair amount of material on the uprisings in the Ghettos (Warsaw, Bialystok) and in the camps, there is only a small amount devoted to the Jewish partisan movement, a movement which embraced tens of thousands of people.

UNIQUE MOVEMENT

I am not referring here to Jewish participants in the general partisan organizations. In addition to this participation, there was an independent and unique Jewish partisan movement in the forests and swamps that was different from the others and had its own problems; which in some places like White Russia (and to some extent in the provinces of Polesia and Wolynia) took on the character of a genuine people's movement.

The first work published about the Jewish partisans was Moshe Kaganovich's "The Jewish Participation in the Partisan Movement in the Soviet Union." Undoubtedly there are some good reasons and some not-so-good ones for the picture he paints of the partisan movement wherein, as the title suggests, the Jews are completely subordinated to Russian directed partisan organizations. In a Hebrew edition published later in Israel, Kaganovich touches on the Jewish "forestman" who had his "own problems," but only in passing and only as an appendix to the general partisan movement.

After Kaganovich, there appeared a score of books in Hebrew and Yiddish on the subject. With minor exceptions, the theme of these books is:

(1) Idealization of the entire partisan movement, with a mixture of apologetics for Stalinist Russia and praise for the Stalinist commanders of the partisans.

(2) Idealization of individual partisans. Every single one is a hero, a courageous fighter, a noble person, etc.

The emphasis throughout is entirely on actions, operations, blown up bridges, etc.

The partisan movement, however, appeared in an entirely different light to the Jewish "forest people" and "swampmen."

HARDENED SOLDIERS

The majority of non-Jewish partisans were soldiers in the Russian army who escaped Nazi encirclement and capture, as well as some who escaped after having been captured. They were hardened and trained soldiers, prepared for military action. A second, and much smaller component was made up of local Stalinist officials who fled the towns in fear of German reprisals.

Both the former and the latter were alone and without any family responsibilities. It was also easy for them to visit the native villages from time to time. They had comparatively few obstacles to movement on the roads, since they were more or less similar to the bulk of the native population, and could melt away into it.

The Jewish partisans were different. They came from the slaughter in towns and villages. Sometimes an entire Jewish village would leave for the wilderness in anticipation that the Nazis were preparing a blood bath for them. Entire families, with their old people, the infirm, women and children stole away into the swamps or forests. More often, the remnants of the first roundup fled in anticipation of the final extermination of the Jews of a particular town or village.

Thus, the Jewish partisan had special problems and responsibilities: for his partisan unit; for his own family; and for the Jewish population in the forest—the so-called "citizen camps" where the unarmed, the old people and the women and children lived.

While the non-Jewish partisan could

direct almost his entire attention to one front, the Nazis and their local helpers, the Jewish partisans had to defend themselves from the common enemy (the Nazis), but in many cases also from other partisan groups who had little sympathy for the Jews.

Many a Jewish partisan is known to have died by the treacherous bullet of a fellow partisan. In particular the Jews were the targets of some of the separate national guerrilla bands that fought against both Germans and Russians. Some of these were composed of reactionary, anti-Semitic and chauvinist elements, like the Russian Vlassov group, the Ukrainian Banderov and Vulkov groups, etc. Some of these made it a practice to show their heroism against the Jews first.

It was precisely the antagonism of the other partisans that at first forced the Jews to establish their own organizations. In many places the Jews were the first to arrive in a particular forest. This situation, and separate existence continued until orders from "above" abolished national organizations and merged all under a single partisan command.

CITIZEN CAMPS

However, only those capable of fighting were integrated into guerrilla units: the men, and only the men who had arms. The Citizen Camps were left to their fate, with no one to defend them or to feed them. But even after integration, Jewish partisan groups remained, with Jewish unit names. Within the general

partisan organization there were also areas where some units were overwhelmingly Jewish in composition.

In battle strategy, a different approach developed between the Jewish and non-Jewish partisans. The latter placed their emphasis on waiting for the proper time—that is for an offensive from the "Motherland" to go into action. The emphasis was on not provoking the enemy to clear the forests.

MORE ACTION

The Jews, on the other hand, were among those who demanded more action; who raided villages to take revenge on the Nazi and collaborationist killers, etc. And this despite the fact that they had families in the forest to protect.

This was one frequent complaint of the other partisans against the Jews: The Nazi search parties are looking for escaped Jews. If it were not for these people, the Nazis might tolerate us for a while. As a result, Jewish partisan units were frequently "expelled" or "transferred" from their forest or swamp strongholds to other localities. This fact may explain to some degree why the Polish Stalinist government does not publish much material about the partisans, and why thousands of partisans voluntarily left their countries of birth and their comrades-in-arms to become emigrants and seek new homes elsewhere.

The operational front of the Jewish partisans was a very long one. It stretched from the forests near Warsaw through those near Lublin to the far-away Pinsk swamplands. They occupied

dozens of forests from Tarnopol in Galicia to Minsk in White Russia. The area is estimated to cover about 500 kilometers in length, and almost that in width.

Some of the Jewish partisan groups were small, with only a few score people. Others, like the "Kalinin" groups, more commonly referred to as Belsky's division (after its leader, Tenia Belsky) had more than 1200 people in it.

Jews became the leaders in the forests. In many sections of Europe the Jews had been intimately connected with the lumber industry. Jewish "Vozakes" from White Russia knew the forests and the best way to get the lumber out of them. They now became masters of the quickest and safest routes out in case of enemy attacks. Jewish workers of Polesia whose job it had been to tie up the lumber for transportation knew all the hidden corners in the swamps and could lead units through the canals to encircle the enemy. Other Jewish lumber workers had similar skills which made them specially suitable for guides and scouts for the partisan units.

The full story of the Jewish partisans with their heroism, suffering, tragedy and greatness has yet to be assembled and written.

The material in this article is based on Mordecai Bernstein's introduction to the book *Velt in Flamen* by Joseph Deich, "Yiddish," Buenos Aires, 1954. The book itself is a personal and "unvarnished" story of one Jewish partisan.

Peace—Or Competition? — —

(Continued from page 1)

potential to go into the commercial production of this new energy source. The failure to make a sale at the conference was a serious blow to this dream.

CARRY COALS

The other reason is that Britain is running out of coal and of men willing to go down into the earth to run the inefficient British mines. Conventional electric utility plants are becoming expensive, and Britain has been forced to "carry coals to Newcastle" at the cost of depleting her dollar and gold reserves. Therefore, while atomic energy is still expensive, it is becoming less expensive as against the traditional sources of energy. The result is that the British government plans to build seventeen large atomic stations by 1965, far more than any other nation has scheduled.

In this sense, Britain has taken over the leadership in the peacetime uses of atomic energy. But it is doing it at a cost that will be felt at a later time. In order to jump ahead in industrial use at this time, Britain is producing relatively inefficient and primitive atomic reactors. The likelihood is that these reactors will soon be obsolete, if they are already not obsolete right now. But because of the energy needs of the British economy, these inefficient reactors are "economical."

However, in view of the continuing research into better reactors by the American corporations, which may very well be available for commercial production by the time the British are in a position to produce on a large enough scale permitting significant exports, the tendency for importing nations and companies is to wait for the better reactors. And this is the significance of the Westinghouse sale of a more efficient type of reactor to the Fiat motor company of Italy.

REPEAT PERFORMANCE

The course of the atomic energy revolution is repeating in the short space of a few years the history of Britain's loss of economic dominance which took place as the Industrial Revolution evolved through the 19th and 20th centuries. At first Britain developed new forms of production, and took the industrial lead. But when other capitalist nations came upon the scene with newer and more efficient technology, Britain paid the price for this early leadership by being saddled with an obsolete industrial machine, and thus fell behind its new rivals. This is the dilemma of British capitalism which bears down with equal weight on British socialists who still seek a national solution to the problems of their economy. The United States, on the other hand,

is not faced with the problem of expensive energy. Abundant and cheap supplies of coal, oil and water power are still available, and there is not the same urgent need for atomic energy. Compared to existing energy supplies, atomic energy is expensive, given the present state of technology.

However, the large corporations and the utility companies are going ahead on a large-scale research program. They are experimenting with many types of reactors to see which is the most efficient. Therefore when they do plan to go into commercial production, it will be based on a much more efficient reactor than the British now have.

AMERICAN WEALTH

The resulting difference in British and American operating technology will not be due to any unique characteristic of American capitalism, or to the inherent genius of American engineering skill, let alone to the "superiority" of Americans as a breed apart from other men. Rather it will be due to the wealth of American capitalism and the favorable supply of other sources of energy.

The cost of the present experimentation is high, but there are good reasons why it is being carried on. The *Wall Street Journal* of August 22 gives two practical reasons for this research:

"Officials of the companies which make reactors say frankly that most of their utility company customers have no early expectation of cutting costs by building atomic plants; their primary motive is to stake this out as an area of private rather than public power." (Emphasis added.)

"And since the first atomic stations are at best going to be less economic than orthodox modern coal-fired plants—are, in effect, going to be subsidized by purchasers and their power customers—the American gambling spirit [of experimenting] comes into play. Instead of concentrating like the British on one 'sure' type of plant, the Americans are experimenting with a bewildering variety."

In other words, since building these atomic power stations will not cost the producers much (since the consumers will pay for them), and the costs are tax deductible anyway, these corporations can afford to "gamble."

Thus while most attention is focused on TVA, Dixon-Yates and water power in the West, the private utilities are carving out for themselves the fruits of the multibillion dollar atomic energy program pioneered at public expense. The tens of millions involved in a Dixon-Yates deal is small change against the billions involved in the atomic energy development.

Labor Action FORUM • New York City

Thursdays 8:45 PM

Sept. 1 **"ENGELS ON AMERICA"**
Albert Gates

Sept. 8 **"GERMAN SOCIALISM 1900-1914"**
Abe Stein

Sept. 15 **"REPORT ON YSL CONVENTION"**

Sept. 22 **"WORKERS' CONTROL IN ISRAEL"**
Al Findley

114 West Fourteenth Street

The Army's New "Code of Conduct"

DISCIPLINE IS NOT ENOUGH

By H. W. BENSON

By official proclamation, no less than an "Executive Order," a new "Code of Conduct" is promulgated for the armed forces. It comes as the recommendation of the Advisory Committee on Prisoners of War, which spent two months digging into history and current events, from ancient Rome to the Korean War, for an answer to the knotty question: how shall American fighting men face the enemy in battle and as prisoners of war. The committee's investigation led to the clear conclusion that our men had not been "prepared" to confront Stalinism as prisoners in Korea. What is not clear from the code's text is what it is supposed to prepare for. There are some hints.

President Eisenhower put down his paint brush and palette for a moment to sign the decree; he practiced a few golf shots before donning his waders and striding into his favorite Rocky Mountain stream to hook a 17 inch rainbow trout. In his absence, James C. Hagerty, presidential press secretary, announced that the code would begin a program to "fortify" American war prisoners against "brainwashing" and forced confessions. While the president endured the rigors of swift running waters and icy streams, Gen. John E. Hull, former Supreme Commander in the Far East and vice-chairman of the Committee that devised the code, attributed the collapse of American resistance in prisoner camps "to the corner drug store type of life that many of our people" are accustomed to. A program of "hardening" and self-abnegation seems to be his inclination.

Two of the many "consultants" who advised the Committee are admirably prepared to lead such a program. Former Secretary of the Air Force Harold E. Talbott might initiate an indoctrination program on: "Self-sacrifice in the public interest." Former Secretary of the Army Robert E. Stevens, out of the depths of his experience with Joe McCarthy, might lecture on: "Stubborn Resistance to Would-be Dictators . . . Until They frown."

Marine air reservists were submitted to a planned program of self-flagellation as soon as the code was announced. In war games at Camp Pendleton, California, "The captured reservists were questioned and then made to exercise to the point of near exhaustion. Their clothing was removed and they were placed in hot cages or pits that were too shallow for standing and too cramped for sitting. They were denied food, water and tobacco." According to this New York Times report, "none of them cracked." But was the torture barbaric enough? Perhaps we must reserve judgment until a few well-

chosen victims are tormented to death. How about a "Defy the Torturers" award to pin near the Sharpshooters Medal?

RESISTANCE TO TORTURE

Discussion of the Code degenerates into a debate over resistance to torture. The Air Force is reported to have taken a lenient view of men who yielded to force; the other armed services, a harsh view. Major-General William Dean, who was a prisoner of war for three years, understood why men collapsed from pain and sickness. He would rather take poison than be captured again. Admiral Dan V. Gallery proposed that service men be allowed to sign or say anything after a national proclamation that such acts by American prisoners had no validity. But the zealous heroes of the committee room will have none of this. Their code admonishes Americans to be firm and uncompromising but it dodges the political and social reality of modern imperialist antagonisms.

More than one third of the American prisoners died in captivity. Stalinism is capable of the most extreme acts of barbarism; what is reported in Korea is a repetition, in the context of imperialist war, of methods that Stalinism has employed for years. Hundreds of thousands of anti-Stalinist Russians have gone to death in slave labor camps for "crimes" of oppositionism. Democrats, socialists, unionists have been tortured and murdered by its agents. Yet, it is not terror and torture that has created the "problem" of Korean prisoners. The Advisory Committee report makes this revelation only in passing:

"The committee made a thorough investigation of the 'brainwashing' question. In some cases this time-consuming and coercive technique was used to obtain confessions. In these cases American prisoners of war were subjected to mental and physical torture, psychiatric pressures or 'Pavlov's dogs' treatment. Most of the prisoners, however, were not subjected to brainwashing, but were given a highpowered indoctrination for propaganda purposes."

LEARNED NOTHING

If we learn from the committee's report only that Americans can break under torture we have learned exactly nothing. Many movements of dedicated, brave, selfless men have fought against totalitarianism, fascism and Stalinism, under difficult illegal, underground conditions. They learned through bitter experience that virtually every man can be brought to his knees by fiendish devices and compelled to give information against the very people whom he loves and for whom he fights. They learned not to depend on the frail powers of resistance even of the most dedicated fighters. In case of arrests they assumed that the victim would be driven to the point of capitulation. Automatically they took counter measures. They fled, and they warned all their associates. They asked only that the victim of the brutal totalitarian police summon all his physical and mental reserves, hold out for as many hours or days as possible, and al-

low them precious time to escape. The form of organization itself as well as standard precautions were adapted to the inevitability of human frailty.

Every account of life in totalitarian concentration camps agrees that under conditions of bestiality and brutality to which prisoners are submitted, the ruling power can always organize a tiny minority of the inmates into a privileged corps to help rule over the defenseless majority. So it is in the Russian camps; so it was in Hitler Germany; so it was in the Warsaw Ghetto on the very eve of mass extermination. Only the Frank Merriwells of America; the General Halls (scourge of the drugstore cowboys), can dream of warding off for Americans by practicing calisthenics what other peoples have endured.

The Advisory Committee's report is surprisingly frank. Where it tries to ornament the facts we can easily read between the lines. A minority of prisoners became collaborators with the Stalinist jailers, coerced by terror or lured by favors or by a combination of the two. Of 4428 returned prisoners, 565 were detained for investigation of possible cooperation with the enemy. Of these, 373 were finally cleared and the remaining 192 held for further investigation of possible "serious offenses against comrades or the United States." The committee concludes that "only one out of 23 American POW's was suspected of serious misconduct." One out of twenty-three. By what standard is this "only" a tiny percentage?

POLITICAL COLLAPSE

But the majority—officers and men alike—despite their resistance to collaboration, collapsed politically in the face of Stalinism.

They could not withstand Stalinist demagoguery; they could not answer the arguments of their enemies. They were leaderless and disorganized. Here in the committee's own words is the tragic picture:

"By design and because some officers refused to assume leadership responsibility, organization in some of the POW camps deteriorated to an every-man-for-himself situation. Some of the camps became indescribably filthy. The men scuffled for their food. Hoarders grabbed all the tobacco. Morale decayed to the vanishing point. Each man mistrusted the next. Bullies persecuted the weak and sick. Filth bred disease and contagion swept the camp. So men died for lack of leadership and discipline.

"When plunged into a Communist indoctrination mill, the average American POW was under a serious handicap. Enemy political officers forced him to read Marxian literature. He was compelled to participate in debates. He had to tell what he knew about American politics and American history. And many times the Chinese or Korean instructors knew more about these subjects than he did. This brainstorming caught many American prisoners off guard. To most of them it came as a complete surprise and they were unprepared. Lectures—study groups—a blizzard of propaganda and hurricanes of violent oratory were all a part of the enemy technique.

"A large number of American POW's did not know what the Communist program was all about. Some were confused by it. Self-seekers accepted it as an easy out. A few may have believed the business. They signed peace petitions and peddled Communist literature. It was not an inspiring spectacle. It set loyal groups against cooperative groups and broke up camp organization and discipline. It made fools of some men and tools

of others. And it provided the enemy with stooges for propaganda shows.

"Ignorance lay behind much of this trouble. A great many servicemen were ten-agers. At home they had thought of politics as dry editorials or uninteresting speeches, dull as ditch-water. They were unprepared to give the commissars an argument.

"Some of the POW's—among them men who became defectors—had heard of communism only as a name. Many had never before heard of Karl Marx. And here was communism held up as the salvation of the world and Marx as mankind's benefactor.

"The committee heard evidence which revealed that many of the POW's knew too little about the United States and its ideals and traditions. So the Chinese indoctrinators had the advantage.

"The uninformed POW's were up against it. They couldn't answer arguments in favor of communism with arguments in favor of Americanism, because they know very little about their America. The committee heard a number of ex-POW's who stated that a knowledge of communism would have enabled them to expose its fallacies to their camp-mates. The Red indoctrinators tried hard to win the support of factory workers. But as one of them put it, 'We'd heard all that guff before. Back home, we knew their line.' Knowledge was a defense weapon.

"While it might be argued that few of the men became sincere converts to communism—indeed, the percentage seems to have been infinitesimal—the inability of many to speak up for democracy distressed loyal POW's. Active collaborators aside, there were other passive prisoners that 'went along.' They lacked sufficient patriotism because of their limited knowledge of American democracy."

TRAGIC PICTURE

To repeat: there is the tragic picture. Wherever men cannot reply effectively to reactionary totalitarianism, there is tragedy. Why? The Committee concludes that responsibility lies in lack of education; in a failure to teach the American way of life. For those people, then, the answer seems to lie in a new dose of concentrated "Americanism."

Yet, for at least ten years, we have been drilled intensely in the "American Party Line." "Communism" and "subversion" are hunted out everywhere. From kindergarten to college, from park toilets to Supreme Court bench the search has gone on. Textbooks and comic strips are carefully scrutinized to reflect nothing but unadulterated "Americanism."

Now an official government committee reports that in the Korean War where Americans for the first and only time confronted Stalinism in person on a world scale, this "Americanism" collapsed. Where the police, the jails, the schools—all the institutions of society are in the hands of our politicians, they are experts: they repress; they threaten; they forbid by government decree. But where our official "Americanism" goes forth without a thought-police bodyguard, it disintegrates before the ideological offensive of Stalinism. The Committee speaks of "a war for the minds of men." In Korea, the ruling parties of capitalist United States lost a battle among their own people.

The backward people of Asia, we are told, accept Stalinist propaganda because they are hungry and poor.

Let them know the American way and they will be immune to Stalinism. So goes the refrain of well-meaning liberals. With groceries and pamphlets all will be well. Americans have seen the American capitalist way. Yet in Korea, where they could defend it militarily with arms in hand they could not defend or explain it politically, even to themselves. Some, like General Drugstore Dragon Hull, conclude that we are too well-fed and comfortable. But Asian and American alike, one with his poverty the other with his luxury, fall victim to Stalinism, each in his own way.

On a world scale, capitalist America has been unable to unite the peoples against Stalinism. In Korea, it was unable to inspire its own soldiers with its foreign policy. Korea was partitioned by rival imperialists after the last world war and then turned into a battleground. The Korean people were faced with a choice between rival dictatorships, one supported by the United States; the other by Russian and Chinese Stalinism.

In its report, the Advisory Committee passes over the political line of Stalinist interrogators in Korea but we can easily

(Continued on page 6)



LABOR ACTION

August 29, 1955 Vol. 19, No. 35

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

Young Socialist CHALLENGE

August 29, 1955

Edited and Published by the YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE

FIVE CENTS

Kinship Grounds for Suspicion In U.S. Armed Forces Witchhunt

By EDWARD HILL

Article Three, Section Three of the Constitution of the United States defines the most serious crime that a democracy knows: treason. In doing so, it adds that conviction for treason shall work no "corruption of blood." By specific constitutional statement, the children of proven traitors are absolved of assumption of complicity in their relatives' actions.

In a series of recent cases which are not concerned with treason but with the far less serious "crime" (since we are here dealing with a "quasi-judicial" concept, a half-crime), the principle of corruption of blood has been invoked against those who are so unfortunate as to be born the children of parents who join the Communist Party, read the *Daily Worker*, etc.

In the Landy case (which has previously reported in LABOR ACTION), the most recent development has been the creation of a hearing board. Before this took place, however, a Government Committee attempted to use the difficulties which Ensign Landy had found himself in to force his mother to tell all concerning her past associations. Thus, the threat of a son's future was used as a subtle method of coercing testimony.

CLOSE TO FATHER

In the case of Airman 3/c Stephen Branzovich, a 22 year-old Reservist, the Air Force has charged: "You have maintained a close continuing association with your father, Charles Branzovich, who is reported to have been in 1943, and for an unspecified time thereafter, a member or close affiliate of the Communist Party, at or near Pittsburgh and Sharon. During 1947, your father is reported to have referred to himself as a Communist. Also, your father is reported to have, prior to 1950, exhibited editorials taken from the *Daily Worker* to his fellow employees at or near Sharon."

In detailing the charges, the Air Force accused Branzovich of having refused to tell whether his father was sympathetic to Communism, had indoctrinated him with Communist ideas, etc. In this case, the pressure of the future is used upon the son in order to force him to testify against his father. In addition, Branzovich himself was accused of having read the *Daily Worker*. He replied that he had only read the sports page.

Still another instance of guilt by kinship came to light in the case of Fred Karpoff, Jr., a metallurgist. He was denied a Government job because his parents had bought insurance from the International Workers Order. Karpoff said of his case, "My parents still hold their insurance—it's worth about \$1,000. But what could they do. If they threw

the policies away, they could never get insurance at their ages. And was I supposed to stop fraternizing with my parents? They're not Communists. They have absolutely no Red ties."

In the case of Coast Guardsman Norton Pierre Gaston, a commission is being denied because of his association with his mother. He appears to be in a somewhat better position than some of his co-victims since Vice-Admiral Alfred G. Richmond, Commandant of the Coast Guard, was reported to have said, "I hope it will be resolved, and I hope it will be in his favor."

The last of the recent cases came in with regard to Joseph H. Summers of Providence, R. I. Summers is or was, a metal worker at the Quonset Naval Air Station. He was fired from his job on July 29, on the grounds that his parents had previously belonged to an organization on the Attorney General's List. In his case, and that of Karpoff, the charge is not even of Communist Party membership on the part of the parents, but merely of membership in an organization which had been (arbitrarily) listed by the Attorney General of the United States.

NORMAL GROUNDS

To these recent cases must be added those cited in the Watts report on the Army Discharge system. Out of the one hundred and ten instances of discharge for political reasons which he investigated, Watts discovered allegations against mothers, fathers, brothers, sisters, step-mothers, step-fathers, and in-laws. There were well over thirty citations of this nature—enough to make it plain that kinship is considered normal grounds for suspicion in the eyes of the Government.

Strangely enough, the Constitutional provision protecting the children of convicted traitors probably does not apply in these cases. For we have here "quasi-judicial" matters, i. e., cases in which the accused is not charged with a crime, does not have a right to the various protections afforded defendants in criminal proceedings, and is not "sentenced." This last point must be understood in context. Although the accused is not formally sentenced to prison, the result of these various hearings can be loss of job, loss of Commission, and the ruining of a career. The very nebulosity of these proceedings keeps them from being inhibited by the constitution's strictures on corruption of blood and by the Fourth Amendment which provides that property should not be taken without due process of law. In the strange world of the witch-hunt, a good name, a job, a future, is not property, and association of a parent with an organization on the List can have consequences for a child more serious than treason.

German Rearmament Means Less "Butter" for People

By MICHAEL HARRINGTON

One of the factors which has contributed to the growth of left-wing sentiment in the European Social Democracy in the last five or six years is the burden of armament production imposed upon nations in NATO. When Bevan resigned his post, this was one of the major points which he made. The cost of an armament economy to a European nation almost inevitably means a cut-back in the production of consumer goods or, as in the case of England, a reduction of welfare services.

However, one European nation, Germany, has been exempt from this burden. In the decade since World War II, it was forbidden to re-arm. To be sure, the Germans were forced to pay a bill for the occupation, but this had a far different effect from re-armament. It created buying power for the troops stationed in Germany and thus, in a sense, returned to the economy anyway. The main point was that production was not diverted from consumer's goods.

This factor certainly played a role in the tremendous growth of the rebuilt German economy. It was, of course, not the only factor, but it was an important element in returning that nation to economic health. (Labor peace, i. e., an intense exploitation of the workers, was probably an equally important element in Germany's re-invigoration.) With the Paris agreements, however, the German economy is slated to lose this privileged status.

CONSEQUENCES

It is, of course, impossible to say whether the German army will actually come into being. Changes in the international situation, and a vigorous workingclass opposition within Germany, may eventually frustrate the American goal of integrating Germany into NATO. But if re-armament does take place, certain economic consequences will follow. Some of these were recently discussed in an article by H. J. Dernburg in the July issue of *Foreign Affairs*. They bear repeating.

From the currency reform in 1948 until 1951, the German economy expanded rapidly on the basis of utilizing existing industrial capacity. New investment was primarily directed toward the restoration of ruined capital equipment. In 1951, actual expansion beyond pre-war levels began. In 1953, the German gross national product increased seven per cent, in 1954, eight per cent. Investment was increasing at a level of ten to fifteen per cent a year.

In order to achieve this rapid growth, there was a constant expansion of the working force. Almost two million workers were added to the economy in 1953 and 1954. However, there was no question of a labor shortage. The Germans were building from scratch, from the ruins of World War II, and were able to expand the labor force for six years without running into any major problems. But in 1954, this process had run a natural course. The German economy had achieved full employment. It is this fact which is of great significance in discussing the impact of re-armament on the nation.

Dernburg lists two major problems of the re-militarization of Germany: "First, the men drafted into the army will be withdrawn from production, thus further slowing down the rate of growth. Secondly, resources of labor and capital that otherwise would have been allocated to production for nonmilitary consumption and investment must be used for the establishment and maintenance of the army. . . . While this change in the pattern of production will not involve a decrease in the gross national product, it will obviously cut down the amount of goods and services available for non-military consumption and investment. The Germans, to use a familiar phrase, will have guns, but less butter than otherwise."

This is a familiar problem. In one form or another, it plagues the economy

of every re-arming nation in the world except the United States. In the United States, the vast productive establishment of the economy is such that the military sector creates consumer buying power without cutting down on the production of consumer goods. Indeed, as we have often pointed out, the American permanent war economy produces a situation of guns and butter, the guns providing a guarantee of the economic stability of the rest of production.

In all other nations, however, the situation is otherwise. Without the resources of the United States, these countries are forced to divert capital and welfare services into arms production. It was this factor which caused a cut-back in the participation of various European nations in NATO—and this factor which provided the basis for the development of left-wing movements in Social Democratic parties.

In Germany, the particular form which this problem takes is a result of the full-employment economy. As a result of the diversion of man power and capital into re-militarization, Dernburg assumes that arming will slow down the rate of increase in consumer's goods by half. Clearly, then, there is a real possibility that this process could be accelerated by the development of inflationary pressures in the economy: that the people will have even less.

HAPPY COMPROMISE

The *Foreign Affairs* article (which is, of course, oriented around the assumption that German re-armament is a good thing) goes on to discuss ways of coping with this problem. Among them is the idea that Germany, which is already strong in the world market, should purchase its arms abroad rather than manufacture them. In this way, the difficulties would be transferred to the area of balance of payments in international trade where Germany is stronger. As a result of this, and other possibilities, Dernburg concludes that the problems of German re-armament "will have to be solved, not by a mass of controls and legalized violence as in the Nazi state, but by well-considered economic and fiscal policies and happy compromise between conflicting policy objectives."

Stated in any fashion, however, it is impossible to escape the fact that it is the workers and the consumers who must bear the burden of German rearmament. The bourgeoisie has nothing to fear but profits. The people may well face the competition of imported labor, a reduction in the rate at which living standards increase, inflation. And in one form or another, this is an inevitable consequence of the militarization of every country in the world. It is the price which the workingclass is forced to pay even in these days of cold peace.

Get the Challenge

every week — by subscribing to
Labor Action. A student sub is
only \$1 a year!

ATTEND THE YSL SUMMER CAMP—SEPT. 6-11

Last Chance to Register Before Going to the Camp

At Genoa City, Wisc.

Fill out and send in the blank below.

YSL — c/o Meier
5426 S. Maryland
Chicago 15, Ill.

I would like to register now for the YSL camp.

\$5 deposit enclosed. Please bill me for \$5 deposit.

I may attend the camp; please send me brochure.

(Make checks payable to D. Meier or Young Socialist League.)

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY ZONE..... STATE.....

Registration for one for couple

POLAND

New CP Leadership for Cold War "Thaw"?

By A. RUDZIENSKI

According to a United Press dispatch, the central organ of the Stalinist Party in Poland, *Trybuna Ludu*, has published a new resolution of the Polish CP's Central Committee which suspends "forced collectivization" of individual farms for a period of five years. Despite the fact that the process of collectivization was very slow in Poland, the new policy signifies a retreat under the pressure of the peasants and the weight of the general domestic and foreign situation.

A new climate (a "thaw," as it is often called) has been created in Poland, in which some political prisoners have been released. Among them are Gomulka and his friend Spychalski and, according to information in the Polish exile press, also Cardinal Wyszynski. This is not due solely to the new turn in Russian policy.

Despite the advancing recon-

struction of the country, the regime in Poland remains isolated from the people, and politically very weak. Thus, following the Russian "turn," a new political means was needed which could strengthen the situation of the government, and soften the political and social conflict between the regime and the population.

Once the regime had destroyed the political opposition and its legal expression, the peasant resistance became the stronghold of the anti-Stalinist opposition. If the government wants to emerge from its isolation and end the political war, it has to begin with the peasants. Thus the new policy is primarily a political means or tactic, even if it is also true that forced collectivization had threatened Polish agriculture with bankruptcy since the productivity of the *Kolkhozes* (collective farms) and even of the *Sovhozes* (State farms) was lower than that of the individual

peasants, despite the technical superiority of the former.

The internal situation of the Polish Stalinist party is uncertain in the face of the recent changes in Russian policy. The leading group of the Warsaw politburo, Mine, Bierut and Zambrowski is considered the "Russian" group of the Polish CP. They are led by Bierut, agent of the GPU and murderer of the old Polish Communist and Socialist leaders. In the period of the worst Stalinist reaction, this group has suppressed the domestic resistance group, led by Gomulka and composed of old Communist and Socialist cadres, who have been accused of "Polish Nationalism," and "collaboration with American-British imperialism."

But in spite of all pressure, Gomulka was not broken in prison, and did not "confess" his "collaboration" with the British and Americans. In view of this situation, Spychalski should be the scapegoat of the regime. But his release, under the pressure of the changed political situation, signifies a defeat for the Bierut group, and its retreat.

At the last plenum of the Central Committee of the Polish Stalinist party, an attempt was made to adapt the Polish situation to the new Russian policy. But it seems that the Kremlin requires more radical personal changes in the Warsaw Politbureau. Bierut did not participate in the last trip of the satellite leaders to Moscow before the Warsaw Conference, or in the Warsaw meeting of the Russians and their satellites. It was not Bierut who represented the Warsaw regime on these occasions, but rather Cyrankiewicz, a politically insignificant puppet and ex-socialist Bierut was dismissed, first, from the presidency of Poland in favor of Zawadzki, at which time he assumed the presidency of the cabinet as prime min-

ister. Then he renounced this post, staying on only as general secretary of the party.

GPU HANGMAN

But Bierut's GPU career, his record as the hangman, not only of the Polish anti-Stalinist resistance, but also of the group around Gomulka, makes him now, after the rehabilitation of Tito and the Belgrade agreement, a complete anachronism as the political leader of Polish Stalinism.

The new political situation requires a new man. Who can replace Bierut? If the rehabilitation of Gomulka would be too dangerous for the stability of the regime, then there must be a new man, who is not so heavily charged with a GPU and hangman's past as Bierut.

Who he may be will depend on the course of Kremlin policy for Poland. Probably "they" would like to bring together all Polish Stalinists and pro-Russian socialists, and might also seek to open negotiations with other political parties, which continue to exist as political currents, in spite of all persecution and the lack of political representation. In any case, Bierut's credentials as the leader of the governing party seem to have lapsed, and a new political period is beginning in Poland.

The new "softer" course toward the peasantry is the best kind of political rehabilitation of the Gomulka "party" with its claim that "the Polish way to socialism," may be different from "the Russian way." Even if the retreat of the regime is thought of by them as a stratagem by which to gain time and to prepare a new attack, much depends on a correct policy of the Polish workers' and peasants' resistance, and on that of the international left, which should seek to change this maneuver into a political defeat for Stalinism.

We face great changes in Poland, and everywhere else.

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

FBI and Civil Rights

To the Editor:

LABOR ACTION recently (August 1st) carried a small item on the late Justice Jackson's views on the "Subversive List" and the FBI. The section on the "List" questions its legality and attacks the uses it has been put to. Coming from a Supreme Court Justice this is fine, and certainly we welcome it.

What follows is not so fine. The item goes on to read: "With regard to the FBI Jackson ironically enough approached the question from the unexpected angle of the FBI's activities in enforcing civil-rights statutes in the Southern states. What Jackson looked on with suspicion was the development of a national police. . . ." etc.

Nowhere was it made clear that while socialists agree with Jackson's criticism of the "List", we do not agree with him on the FBI. In fact, the manner in which the item is handled gives the distinct impression that we agree with both of his criticisms.

This could be simply an editorial error or, on the other hand, it could be an accurate, though offhand, expression of a point of view held by the editors. Though I'm inclined to the former explanation, the possibility of the latter makes clarification, if not correction, necessary.

That is, to state it briefly, socialists should not, in my opinion, support or welcome attacks on the FBI from this point of view. Without going into a lengthy discussion of socialist theory of the State, it should be clear that while we do oppose the FBI (and all other branches of the State apparatus of any exploitive social system) it is as a repressive arm of a State we oppose, not because we are in principle against centralized government or a national police—which we are not.

We are against this particular national police because we are opposed to the State it defends.

While we condemn its acts of repression against freedom of thought and political expression, and by doing so condemn the socio-economic system that requires such repression, we should not condemn it when it performs the legitimate functions of a national police, i. e., deals with real criminals or protects the civil rights of any individual or group.

Rather, we call upon the FBI (and other federal agencies) to protect civil rights when the local authorities refuse, or are unable, to do so. The clearest example of this is precisely the one Jackson "ironically enough" deals with. As opposed to Jackson, we call upon the FBI to enforce civil-rights statutes in the Southern states, and our criticism of the FBI on this score is that it does not do so.

Of course, socialists do not expect the FBI to provide impartial, adequate pro-

tection of the civil rights of Negroes or anyone else (which would be a legitimate function), instead of spending its time hunting down and persecuting individuals and groups whose "crime" is ideological deviation (an illegitimate function).

Therefore, at the same time we call upon the FBI to protect civil-rights, we point out, predict and explain its failures to do so—and posit and strengthen our socialist alternatives.

To make my point quite clear: In the advent of the rise of a strong fascist movement socialists would call upon the bourgeois State to protect the working-class, and democratic groups and institutions generally, from fascist violence—at the same time that they point out that the bourgeois State cannot be relied on for such protection and that the workers must prepare to defend themselves.

The failure of the State to exercise its powers in response to this demand serves to expose the class nature of the State (if not actual sympathy and/or collaboration with the fascist movement) and educate the more backward sections of the masses who still cling to illusions about the "impartiality" of the state.

Should a bourgeois State, for its own reasons, actually take real action to curb the violence of a fascist movement, socialists would certainly not criticize it for doing so, whatever other criticisms they might have.

To summarize: The way LA handled its reporting of Jackson's attack on the FBI gives the impression that LA agrees with him. In my opinion LA should not agree with Jackson on this question and in any case, because the question is clearly of more than passing importance, LA should clarify its attitude.

SCOTT ARDEN

Reply

We would think that the term "ironically enough" which preceded the quotation from Justice Jackson on the FBI indicated a certain reservation, and even hostility toward it. This is especially true in view of the last paragraph of Jackson's remarks to the effect that "I cannot say that our country could have no central police without becoming totalitarian, but I can say with great conviction that it cannot become totalitarian without a centralized national police." If by "totalitarian" Jackson meant either Fascist or Stalinist, it appears that his ideas of how such regimes come into power were woefully mistaken.

As to the rest of Comrade Arden's letter, we agree with the general line of his argument.

When he says that "we oppose all . . . branches of the State apparatus of any exploitive social system," we gather that he means this in the sense that we advocate a completely new form of governmental structure. —GKH

Code of Conduct — —

(Continued from page 4)

Imagine the questions they put to American prisoners. Why are you fighting here? If you are for democracy, why do you interfere with the right of Asians to decide their own lot? Why do you support a dictator like Syngman Rhee who helps the landlords against the poor people?

YOU TOO . . .

True, our war prisoners could reply with justice to one another and to their jailers: you Stalinists too are dictators; you too represent a class of exploiters; you are imperialists; you do not belong here.

But for that, they would have to have confidence that the foreign policy of their own country truly represented democracy for oppressed people and liberation for all nationalities. If they could not answer with confidence, the fault lies not in their "education", not in their intelligence, not in their courage, but in the foreign policy of their country. American foreign policy, now in the hands of capitalists who defend imperialism and capitalism throughout the world will become genuinely democratic only when it is determined by labor.

But this is the era of the American Party Line. Foreign policy is a sacred cow. Democratic and Republican leaders quibble on details but unite on essentials. Senator Estes Kefauver has the answer. The man who might have been president complained to Secretary of Defense Wilson that our men in Korea were demoralized because war policy came up for public discussion.

According to the New York Times, Kefauver "implied that political propa-

ganda' even in Senate debate well might have confused a prisoner on the merits of the objectives for which he had fought and been captured in Korea . . . Such criticism was heard, he added, 'as useless war' and 'Truman's war.' This criticism, he said, was joined by senators for the record and 'by men who are now in highly important positions in the government.'

His solution seems to be: no criticism of war and war policy! This democratic Democrat unwittingly adopts the outlook of totalitarianism: weakness lies in internal discussion. But the strength of democracy should lie in the resolution of its problems in open and public debate. If a policy cannot withstand the test of free discussion at home, can it be expected to stand up in a Stalinist concentration camp?

"The Red indoctrinators tried hard to win the support of factory workers," reports the Advisory Committee. "But as one of them put it, 'We'd heard all that guff before. Back home. We knew their line.' Knowledge was a defense weapon." In the unions and in the shops, thousands of organized workers learned about Stalinism and its real aims by participating in the inner political struggles of their unions. These experiences were enough to render them immune to Stalinism in Korea but obviously not far-reaching enough to enable them to change the general mood in the camps. We note also, today's governmental policy of repression aims to eliminate such political conflicts by eliminating the political rights of Stalinists.

The political fate of our prisoners in Korea cries out for a new policy: for full democracy at home; for a democratic foreign policy abroad.

SOUTH AFRICA

Congress of the People Opens Campaign

We reprint below the *Freedom Charter* adopted by the Congress of the People of South Africa. The Congress of the People unites the efforts of the African National Congress, the South African Indian Congress, the South African Colored Peoples Organization, and the Congress of Democrats in a freedom campaign. It is directed by an Action Council which will coordinate the efforts of the above listed organizations in the campaign.

The first meeting of the Congress was held in late June in an open field at Kliptown, near Johannesburg. Some 3000 people assembled to adopt the *Freedom Charter* which had been prepared by many groups whose suggestions had been edited and combined in

the *Freedom Charter* by the Action Council. There were over 2000 Blacks present at the gathering, as well as about 300 Indians, about 600 Colored (persons of mixed descent) and over 100 whites. Two hundred South African police were also present, armed with automatic weapons.

At a given signal, the police announced over loudspeakers that all people assembled would be searched. This was done, and in addition all whites present were photographed. A few people whose passes were not in order were arrested. Despite the provocative behavior of the police, and the understandable anger of the assembly, the people remained orderly and thus a blood-bath was avoided. The *Freedom Charter* was adopted as the official program of the Congress of the People at this meeting.

A special conference of the Congress of the People held recently at Durban decided to get the *Freedom Charter* signed by one million people in South Africa by June 26, 1956. Although further information on the plans of the Congress of the People for pressing their struggle for freedom in South Africa is lacking, it would appear that they propose to engage in a period of mobilization and education of a mass following on the basis of the campaign to gather signatures to this charter.

LABOR ACTION wishes to draw the special attention of its readers to the far-reaching economic demands of the *Charter*, in addition to its revolutionary (for South Africa) social and political provisions. Further information on the progress of this campaign will be carried in LABOR ACTION as it becomes available in this country.

THE FREEDOM CHARTER

We, the people of South Africa, declare for all our country and the world to know:

that South Africa belongs to all who live in it, black and white, and that no government can justly claim authority unless it is based on the will of the people;

that our people have been robbed of their birthright to land, liberty and peace by a form of government founded on injustice and inequality;

that our country will never be prosperous or free until all our people live in brotherhood enjoying equal rights and opportunities;

that only a democratic state, based on the will of all the people, can secure to all their birthright without distinction of color, race, sex, or belief;

And therefore, we the people of South Africa, black and white together—equals, countrymen and brothers—adopt this Freedom Charter. And we pledge ourselves to strive together, sparing nothing of our strength and courage, until the democratic changes here set out have been won.

The People Shall Govern!

Every man and woman shall have the right to vote for and to stand as a candidate for all bodies which make laws.

All people shall be entitled to take part in the administration of the country.

The rights of the people shall be the same, regardless of race, color, or sex.

All bodies of minority rule, advisory boards, councils and authorities shall be replaced by democratic organs of self-government.

All National Groups Shall Have Equal Rights!

There shall be equal status in the bodies of state, in the courts and in the schools for all national groups and races.

All people shall have equal right to use their own languages, and to develop their own folk culture and customs.

All national groups shall be protected by law against insults to their race and national pride.

The preaching and practice of national, race or color discrimination and contempt shall be a punishable crime.

All apartheid laws and practices shall be set aside.

The People Shall Share in the Country's Wealth!

The national wealth of our country, the heritage of all South Africans, shall be restored to the people.

The mineral wealth beneath the soil, the banks and monopoly industry shall be transferred to the ownership of the people as a whole.

All other industry and trade shall be controlled to assist the wellbeing of the people.

All people shall have equal rights to trade where they choose, to manufacture, and to enter all trades, crafts, and professions.

The Land Shall Be Shared Among Those Who Work It!

Restriction of land ownership on a racial basis shall be ended, and all the land redivided amongst those who work it, to banish famine and land hunger.

The state shall help the peasants with implements, seed, tractors and dams to save the soil and assist the tillers.

Freedom of movement shall be guaranteed to all who work on the land.

All shall have the right to occupy land wherever they choose.

People shall not be robbed of their cattle, and forced labor and farm prisons shall be abolished.

All Shall Be Equal Before the Law!

No one shall be imprisoned, deported or restricted without a fair trial.

No one shall be condemned by the order of any Government official.

The courts shall be representative of all the people.

Imprisonment shall be only for serious crimes against the people, and shall aim at re-education, not vengeance.

The police force and army shall be open to all on an equal basis and shall be the helpers and protectors of the people.

All laws which discriminate on grounds of race, color, or belief shall be repealed.

All Shall Enjoy Equal Human Rights!

The law shall guarantee to all their right to speak, to organize, to meet together, to publish, to preach, to worship, and to educate their children.

The privacy of the home from police raids shall be protected by law.

All shall be free to travel without restriction from countryside to town, from province to province, and from South Africa abroad.

Pass laws, permits, and all other laws restricting these freedoms shall be abolished.

There Shall Be Work and Security!

All who work shall be free to form trade unions, to elect their officers and to make wage agreements with their employers.

The state shall recognize the right and duty of all to work, and to draw full unemployment benefits.

Men and women of all races shall receive equal pay for equal work.

There shall be a forty-hour working week, a national minimum wage, paid annual leave,

and sick leave for all workers, and maternity leave on full pay for all working mothers.

Miners, domestic workers, farm workers and civil servants shall have the same rights as all others who work.

Child labor, compound labor, the tot system and contract labor shall be abolished.

The Doors of Learning and of Culture Shall Be Opened!

The Government shall discover, develop, and encourage national talent for the enhancement of our cultural life.

All the cultural treasures of mankind shall be open to all, by free exchange of books, ideas, and contact with other lands.

The aim of education shall be to teach the youth to love their people and their culture, to honor human brotherhood, liberty, and peace.

Education shall be free, compulsory, universal and equal for all children.

Higher education and technical training shall be opened to all by means of state allowances and scholarships awarded on the basis of merit.

Adult illiteracy shall be ended by a mass state education plan.

Teachers shall have all the rights of other citizens.

The color bar in cultural life, in sport and in education shall be abolished.

There Shall Be Houses, Security and Comfort!

All people shall have the right to live where they choose, to be decently housed, and to bring up their families in comfort and security.

Unused housing space to be made available to the people.

Rent and prices shall be lowered, food plentiful and no one shall go hungry.

A preventive health scheme shall be run by the state.

Free medical care and hospitalization shall be provided for all, with special care for mothers and young children.

Slums shall be demolished, and new suburbs built where all have transport, roads, lighting, playing fields, creches, and social centers.

The aged, the orphans, the disabled and the sick shall be cared for by the state.

Rest, leisure and recreation shall be the right of all.

Fenced locations and ghettos shall be abolished, and laws which break up families shall be repealed.

There Shall Be Peace and Friendship!

South Africa shall be a fully independent

(Continued bottom of next page)

U.S. Softening? — — School Fight Looms — —

(Continued from page 1)

behind locked doors). It would be an exaggeration to say that this is becoming an Anglo-French nightmare, but it is something more than just a passing apprehension."

But, aside from hurt national feelings, why should the British and French governments fear a Big Two deal? After all, the United States is a loyal ally, and has their interests at heart, does it not? Perhaps. But at the same time, American imperialism has its own interests, and its nature is such that no British or French imperialist can be sure that his particular interests might not be sacrificed, or traded lightly, in the interest of some American objective in another part of the world. Further, the American performance at Yalta is too fresh in the memory of the British Foreign Office to permit its inhabitants to rest easy.

Richardson, reporting from London in the New York Post for August 14 quotes from the right-wing Tory publication *The Spectator* as follows:

"Whatever else he may not be, Sir Anthony is a brilliant diplomatist, and knows that the value of strict down-to-earth rules of the diplomatic game is that they make it quite clear what one is being asked to trade for what.

"Not so in the high-level meetings like those at Geneva. And not so, in particular when one of the attending statesmen is President Eisenhower.

"Eden is believed to be very worried about the attitude of President Eisenhower during the talks. It must have brought back memories to him of some of the conferences during the 1939-45 war, when Stalin and Sir Winston Churchill tossed towns and cities and villages about in an atmosphere of general conviviality.

[To complete the *Spectator's* picture, one should add the name of Roosevelt to the participants, and "provinces, countries and halves of countries" to the real estate and peoples "tossed about."—G. H.]

"It is not that President Eisenhower is personally liable to these aberrations,

but that America is clearly on the verge of a drastic change of mood. It is quite possible—especially since the next presidential election is only a little over a year away—that America will now become as tender toward Russia as she hitherto has been tough. The results would be disastrous for the West. The gist of all the stories about Sir Anthony Eden's doubts is that he will seize an early opportunity to try to resist the growth of this new climate of opinion, here as well as in America."

It is likely that *The Spectator* is too "pessimistic" in its appraisal of the extent to which the American government's mood may change in the near future. All the concrete conflicts of interest between Stalinist and American imperialism still exist, and it is most improbable that either the Russians or Americans will be tossing countries around in the Yalta manner.

Yet the British, who until a few months ago had to expend all their efforts to restrain American belligerency in Indochina, the Formosa Strait and elsewhere, have something very real to worry about.

During the "hot" phase of the cold war, American foreign policy had nothing to counterpose to the politically dynamic appeal of Stalinism but armed force and threats of armed force. If the Geneva Conference should be the opening scene of a long period in which an appeal to arms is placed in the background, American foreign policy would be left without the only weapon it has known how to use in the past. The vagueness of Eisenhower's diplomacy at Geneva was not so much a "personal aberration" as an expression of the vagueness of American foreign policy in such a situation. But it is precisely such vagueness which makes uneasy the representatives of governments whose delicate domestic and foreign position makes it imperative for them to know exactly "what one is being asked to trade for what" in this phase of the imperialist struggle for the world.

(Continued from page 2)

More and more the Negro is ceasing to depend on his "powerful white friends" of yesterday, and increasingly is depending on himself, his own organizations and his natural allies, the more advanced sections of the labor union movement.

Humphrey Doubletalks

"Big liberals" in the North have only contributed to this tendency. When Senator Hubert H. Humphrey hopped up on the Senate floor the day before adjournment to whoop it up for his party by "deploring the absence from the calendar of any civil rights legislation" he drew an icy response from the Negro press. In view of the fact that he, as a leader of the Senate liberals, refused to raise the issue of rule change at the beginning of the session, knowing full well that unless Rule 22 (filibuster) were deleted there was no chance whatsoever to pass any civil rights legislation, his "I once again remind the Senate of its responsibilities to end once and for all discrimination against any of our fellow Americans because of their race, religion or national origin" was taken exactly as seriously as the Fourth-of-July speech of any machine ward-heeler.

In answer to his "deep regret . . . that none of these bills has reached the Senate floor" the Negro press bluntly called him a liar, pointing out: (1) Humphrey "urged Adlai Stevenson to meet with minority leaders for the purpose of soft-pedaling their legitimate demands for first-class citizenship." (2) Humphrey supported Eisenhower's position that the vital anti-segregation amendments to the housing, school and military reserve bills "were extraneous." (3) Humphrey has now been pronounced "completely acceptable to the South" as a candidate on the national Democratic ticket—a far cry from the Humphrey of 1948 who fought for a strong civil rights plank and the Humphrey of 1952 who urged the ouster

of Dixiecrat delegates from the Democratic National Convention.

Small Fry Too

Small-fry northern liberals are climbing on the "party harmony" bandwagon too. Doris Fleeson, whose "liberal column" appears in at least ten newspapers spread across the country, attacked Negro leaders for being "too insistent" and "putting liberal friends in Congress under undue strain" by demanding that anti-segregation amendments be tagged to important pieces of legislation.

Fleeson pointed to the recent physical attack on Rep. Adam Clayton Powell by Rep. Bailey of West Virginia (whom she describes as a liberal, despite his alleged "no nigger's going to call me a liar" statement) as "evidence of the intense strain on Democratic Party relations with Negro Leaders." She went on to say, the *Chicago Defender* reports, "There comes a point, too, at which crusades reach a peak where pause must be taken to relax and regroup."

REGROUPMENT

Fleeson's advice is being seriously weighed by Negro leaders—none of whom have any intention of "relaxing" but are giving special thought to the "re-groupment" suggestion.

The fact that an occasional liberal has held firm (New York's Sen. Herbert Lehman for example), doesn't alter the fact that Democratic Party liberals have for the most part labeled anti-Jim Crow legislation "expendable." And this hasn't led to any illusions about the Republicans. The 84th Congress took only one step in the field of civil rights legislation, and that was a step backward. The law passed in 1942 exempting soldiers from the payment of poll taxes was dropped from this year's legislation. Aside from this brilliant advance, the record of both parties is a total blank.

Adam Clayton Powell, after being kicked in the teeth (almost literally) in his fight for anti-segregation legislation, is back on the political tight-rope, and this time without a net. He's off to the Near East as "unofficial mediator", and this time with "almost unlimited" State Department funds—in contrast to his Bandung jaunt which the State Department tried to sabotage, up until his famous speech whitewashing American racism, that is.

With almost no trustworthy voice in the nation's government and with the majority of its "liberal friends" forging chains instead of breaking them, the new Negro leadership is increasingly looking long and hard at the American labor movement, the only force with which it could meaningfully regroup.

Though some of the older eyes will be concentrated on the Democratic Convention this fall, many of the younger ones will be turned on the AFL-CIO merger.

And its up to the more advanced sections of the labor movement to make sure that these eyes like what they see.

Army Bags Another "Red" — —

(Continued from page 1)

and supporter of the American Youth for Democracy cited as Communistic and subversive by the attorney general of the United States of America."

This letter came out thanks to Attorney Charles Lockwood who is handling this civil liberties case, as he has so many other important ones in Michigan.

Waxer, incidentally, says he does not know the persons involved but once went to a social gathering downstairs in an apartment house in which the Wellman's live. He is also accused of knowing his brother-in-law who is accused of being a Stalinist, which is most unlikely since he is a right winger UAW shop leader!

As for Dr. Kelly, he understood the assignment, at the request of the University, of destroying the chapter of AYD and he succeeded! Kelly, by the way, did give a character reference to Waxer, when Waxer applied for a commission in the army.

The reaction of the army to the well-known political role of Kelly was simply to say, "We don't evaluate information on individuals, we only act on it!" All of which caused the *Detroit Free Press* to publish a blistering editorial attacking the whole procedure of the army in these cases, and demanding a full inquiry up to the office of Charles E. Wilson. The editorial was entitled "Sheer Atrocity." One of its main points was "What kind of kangaroo courts are we allowing to be operated today?" Its cartoon was entitled, "One of My Best Jobs." It showed an idiotic looking general named Goofup, smiling at the headline "Wayne U's

Prof. Kelly Smearred." Behind the general is a file cabinet called "Army Security System" with four sections, "Gossip, Red Tape, Rumors, and Half-truths."

As the *Free Press* points out, what is involved here is far more than a real blunder on Dr. Kelly. The whole security system is exposed as ridiculous.

"If this is a sample of the way our military intelligence operates, what confidence can we have in it now in regard to any matter involving national safety and security? And finally, will the American people sit by, simply nursing their justifiable resentment in the face of a slanderous procedure that damages a man's reputation without the faintest semblance of proper legal procedure?"

An army spokesman claimed that the army did not gather this "information" on Dr. Kelly or the others. It was received from "another department," meaning of course, the FBI and the Department of Justice. It will be interesting to see if an inquiry pursues this angle, and finds out what fantastic "information" the FBI compiles on individuals. Who in the Detroit office, for example, allowed this frame-up of Dr. Kelly to occur? And also of Leo Schaffer, Waxer's brother-in-law?

Dr. Kelly is going to Washington to appear before a Senate committee to set the record straight. In his case, a clearance and apology are obviously coming easily. But the incident nevertheless stands. Waxer still has a fight on his hands.

It will be interesting to see what lesson is learned from this by not only Dr.

Kelly but also his associates, many of whom claim to be the strong liberal "but oh-so-silent" type.

Another Detroit newspaper made the point that while Dr. Kelly can win since he is a man of position and power, what about the thousands who are not so strong, and who have literally suffered in silence?

The Waxer-Kelly cases are worth following, for it remains to be seen what ugly methods of operation are exposed and who tries to cover up for whom. And how long it will take Waxer to get an honorable discharge which will entitle him to finish his schooling under the GI bill of rights.

And by no means least. Will Dr. Kelly continue to live in the pre-August 18 dream world he has been so busy selling to students, and defending against all critics.

'THE NEW INTERNATIONAL'

is the leading Marxist magazine in the United States, internationally recognized as among the foremost organs of Marxist thought and political analysis in the world.

SEND 35 CENTS FOR THE CURRENT ISSUE

OR SUBSCRIBE AT \$2.00 A YEAR

New International, 114 West 14 Street, New York City

THE FREEDOM CHARTER

(Continued from page 7)

state, which respects the rights of all nations.

South Africa shall strive to maintain world peace and the settlement of all disputes by negotiation—not war.

Peace and friendship amongst all our people shall be secured by upholding the equal rights, opportunities and status of all.

The people of the protectorates—Basutoland, Bechuanaland, and Swaziland shall be free to decide for themselves their own future.

The right of all the peoples of Africa to independence and self-government shall be recognized, and shall be the basis of close cooperation.

Let all those who love their people and their country now say, as we say here:

**"THESE FREEDOMS WE WILL
FIGHT FOR, SIDE BY SIDE,
THROUGHOUT OUR LIVES,
UNTIL WE HAVE WON OUR
LIBERTY."**