

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

APRIL 8, 1957

FIVE CENTS

Behind the East German Curtain:

Manifesto by a Communist Opposition

... page 6

A Tourist-Eye Glimpse of the Satellites

... page 7

TWO UNIONS: UAW vs. THE TEAMSTERS

... page 3

THE QUAKERS STAND FIRM IN PHILLY

... page 4

Labor Needs a Code of Democratic Rights, To Pit Rank and File Against the Becks

**SPOT-
LIGHT**

A Different Road In the Mideast Mess

The finger was put on a tell-tale weak point in Nasser's case for blockading Israeli shipping when it was demanded that the Egypt regime say whether or no it considers itself in a state of war with Israel. The Cairo dictator has refused to say because either a yes or a no exposes his hand.

To be sure, no one can dream of unraveling the Middle East mess by simply threading a way through the tangle of juridical rights involved, but this question of belligerence is a bit more than juridical. If Nasser said yes, then he could hardly object if Israel also considered itself at war (though others could); if he said no, then he would deprive himself of his formal basis for excluding Israeli ships from the Suez Canal and probably also from the Gulf of Aqaba.

As articles in *LA* have brought out, the Arab socialists (specifically, the Baath Socialist Party) unfortunately support Nasser's blockade on the ground that it is an alternative to war. This hardly makes sense. A rock-bottom prerequisite in the Middle East, for the operation of any solution whatever, is a firm cease-fire. Anyone who breaks the cease-fire or provokes its breach deserves the condemnation of all people.

In the past week the Egyptian dictator has let it be known that he is ready to give the blockade up if Israel concedes on the Arab refugee issue. In reply the Israelis say they are ready to talk about it. Anything fruitful that emerges of course would be a fine thing, but realism obliges one to fear that both sides are simply playing with that tragic issue as they have been doing for over eight years.

ANTI-EGYPTIAN POTENTIAL

If Israel is responsible for cruelly keeping the Palestinian Arab refugees from their lands and homes, which it grabbed, then it is also true that Egypt (like most of the other Arab states) has shown little desire to do what it can to alleviate the refugees' sad lot. Among the Gaza refugees, there is a reservoir of hatred not only for Israel but also for the Egyptians who have kept them herded in the Strip as in a concentration camp without allowing them to taint Egyptian soil by entering on it, while using them callously as fodder for *Jedayeen* raids.

This anti-Egyptian feeling and potentiality in the Strip is not as well pub-

(Continued on page 6)

By GORDON HASKELL

The Executive Council of the AFL-CIO moved swiftly on the heels of the Senate committee's questioning of Teamster President Dave Beck: It suspended Beck as a Council member and vice-president of the AFL-CIO pending a full investigation and hearing on the charges of racketeering and profiteering made against him. Though Beck had an opportunity to appear before the Council and defend himself, he preferred to fly back to Seattle, and from a safe distance to utter empty boasts about what he is going to do in the future.

Thus the top leadership of the AFL-CIO has moved dramatically to begin the cleanup of one of the most dangerous centers of degeneration in the labor movement.

But as the Senate investigation of racketeering and corruption among trade-union leaders continues, two major problems must be faced and licked by the labor movement.

One is to beat back any attempt employers and their political representatives may make to utilize the corruption revealed by the hearings as a pretext for launching or intensifying their drive against the political and economic gains of the unions.

The other is to use this opportunity

not just to drive the current crop of racketeers and profiteers out of the leadership of those unions which they now control, but to revitalize the spirit and structure of democracy in the labor movement so that it can never again be exploited and disgraced by a section of its leadership.

There can be little doubt that the anti-union forces in the country are going to try to exploit these hearings to create as much of an anti-labor sentiment as possible, and then try to capitalize that into anti-labor legislation.

ATTACK IN OFFING

While the Senate hearings have hardly got under way, the strategy of their attack is already plain. They will seek to

strike at all forms of union security rules and practices along the lines of the "right to work" laws which have already been passed in a number of states. And under the pretext of guaranteeing the rights of union members, they will seek to attack the growing political power and organization of the labor movement.

How far will they be able to go in this attempt? That will depend, to no small degree, on what the labor movement does to counteract their offensive.

One of the most important questions which must be asked is whether the Senate revelations of corruption will succeed in throwing the whole union movement into a defensive posture. This could mean holding back on making any large-scale demands of employers; seeking to avoid any serious strikes at the moment, even if all other considerations point to their necessity from labor's point of view; a let-up in organizing activity on the ground that until the stink rising from Washington lets up, they would not be successful anyway; and above all a retreat from the more independent and active political role labor has sought to play in recent years.

There are already signs that some at

(Turn to last page)

UAW Convention Faces Knotty Problems Automation, Speedup, Politics, GAW, Dues, Rackets

By BEN HALL

A multitude of unsettled problems have accumulated for the 16th convention of the United Auto Workers union. When the 3000 delegates and visitors gather in Atlantic City April 7-12, their sessions should be anything but routine. In addition to the vexing questions that persist from year to year, there will be some big new ones.

To begin with, the industry is going through a vast technological and economic transformation.

Automation is reducing the overall workforce required for present production levels. At the same time it brings mammoth shifts in methods. Some operations are concentrated from widely separated shops into one place in order to adapt them to big-scale operations. In other cases, related operations that once were combined in the old big plants are split up, in a process of decentralization that sees the Big Three spread new plants all over the country at the expense of the old centers in Detroit and Flint.

At the same time, the smaller independent plants which supplied parts and sub-assemblies to the big manufacturers are forced out of business as their for-

mer customers squeeze out the subcontractors and take the work into their own plants for cheaper production. One Detroit Chrysler plant, built only six years ago as the most modern in the industry, is already largely obsolete and plans to cut its work-force in half and assign big chunks of production to newer plants to be built in outlying areas.

Detroit and Flint are hardest-hit by the changes. The costs in human suffering are great as men too old to make a new start lose years of seniority when their jobs fold up under them; when families which must follow jobs to new cities, if they can, are forced to tear up roots, sell homes, break old friendships and move to strange cities. Those who

can, retire on pensions or partial pensions.

The permanent prospect is for greater production with an ever-dwindling work-force. To be sure, it is "progress": in the long run humanity will be better off when more work can be done with less effort. But now—who is to bear the social costs of the change and who is to reap the immediate gains?

There the issue is posed: the union must fight to see that the worker is not compelled to suffer; the companies will, of course, reach out to monopolize the benefits in the form of added millions in profits.

Meanwhile the feeling of insecurity rises in the minds of all and a restiveness and discontent not evident for more than ten years is displayed by thousands of unionists in the big auto centers.

GAW-PLUS

The Guaranteed Annual Wage has proved totally inadequate, in itself, to grapple with the rising problems.

Benefits are too small and too short to make a decisive difference. They cannot, above all, cope with shut plants and moving jobs.

Disappointment is reported; apparently the GAW is temporarily shelved. At any rate, it has been renamed "Supplementary

(Continued on page 2)

UAW vs. TEAMSTERS

See page 3

UAW Convention — —

(Continued from page 1)

Unemployment Benefits, not only by the companies which wanted to depreciate the nature of the union's victory, but also by the union leaders who seem ready to minimize the sweep of the old demand.

Now there is talk of fighting for a shorter work-week. And with good cause. Everyone feels that a shorter week is part of the answer to layoffs and that it is the workers' right to participate in the benefits of automation.

But a shorter work-week and the **Guaranteed Annual Wage** are both parts of a program to meet the issues. It is not a question of fighting for one as against the other but of keeping both as constant objectives.

If the union's advance toward GAW has proved to be inadequate now, it is because it is impossible to solve some of the workers' biggest problems within the framework of pure-and-simple trade-union action against the employer. That has proved true of GAW, and it will prove no less true in the fight for a shorter work-week.

What is required is not to abandon the unions' fight for a Guaranteed Annual Wage at a time when every worker feels anew the insecurity of hourly wage labor, but to raise it above the level of a mere trade-union demand and make it a political and social issue of the day.

If the union was not powerful enough to wrest GAW from the auto manufacturers in time to ward off the impact of technological change on the workers' life, it could have fought a public political battle on the question before the public. In other words, it is not a matter of simple unionism alone but of political action.

THE WORD IS ACTION

But what is political action? It is more than a series of stinging press releases and statements by union leaders. It is more than an election-day call to cast votes for self-styled liberals.

The formation of a labor party would of course make a big change in everything, but that is for the future. And there is no need to wait for that. Political action means the involvement of union members in a public fight on the issues of the day.

When thousands of unionists demonstrated in the Indiana state capital against the right-to-work law, that was a kind of political action that is required. If UAW members are unemployed, if they are hit by plant closings let them demonstrate before the governmental bodies of the city and state for their right to a Guaranteed Annual Wage; let them make their demands upon all politicians, including the election-day liberals whom they helped to put in office.

If the union's victory when it broke the GAW line proved inadequate, let those who deserve the blame take it! Not the union but the employers and their political representatives who run the state and nation.

TO PASS JUDGMENT

In the nation Southern Negroes persist in the fight for Democracy, against segregation.

The convention will undoubtedly adopt resolutions in favor of the Supreme Court decision and against efforts to legalize the NAACP in the South. It will castigate Eisenhower and his administration for its do-nothing attitude. But will it do more?

The convention has a responsibility for passing judgment on the Democrats and liberals whom labor helped to elect.

Before the 1956 elections, Reuther warned the Democratic liberals: *You cannot have Senator Eastland and have us at the same time.* But, in the end, the Democrats did keep both Eastland and the UAW. With what effect on the fight for democracy and equality?

Regrettably, this is not a question likely to be answered by the convention. But will it be asked?

UNCONQUERED TERRITORY

Speed-up remains the unsolved question.

In one sense it will never be fully solved as long as factories are operated for the profit of a small group of em-

ployers. The owners of industry will always try to squeeze more and more production, and thus more and more profits, out of the men who run the machines; and they will manipulate and evade even the best union contract toward this end. When the IUE fought Westinghouse for months, we saw how avidly a big corporation was prepared to resist limitations on its right to control production standards.

Now there is more than the normal problem in the auto industry. The Ford Motor Company and General Motors (it is the feeling of union militants in the Detroit area) have won the battle of production rates against the union.

These powerful corporations have been able to make up, in part, for the costs of union economic demands by compelling their workers to work harder and faster; the stop-watch and time-study are everyday symbols now. Chrysler demands the same of its workers too.

When a company official announced that the union had agreed to tolerate a drive to speed up its workers, a storm of protest came from union members. UAW leaders repudiated the report and announced that they would authorize any legitimate request for local strike action against speed-up. But the fact remains that a feeling is growing that the union, above, is not leading the fight against speed-up below, that it is muddling through.

There is no easy answer; at least no one has suggested any. But what stands out clearly is this: the UAW with all its power has yet to win certain minimum rights on production standards.

The principle which governs virtually every union contract provides that the company has the right to set production standards and to govern the speed of the line. The union has only the right to protest, to grieve, and in the end to strike. The union has the right to strike if it is not satisfied; but, on the other hand, it must strike (if the company insists) or submit. And since the companies are always and everywhere pressing for more production out of the sweat of their hired hands, hundreds if not thousands of grievances, filed and unfiled, arise from day to day.

ISL FUND DRIVE

The Big Quotas Are Lagging Dangerously

By ALBERT GATES
Fund Drive Director

We have now reached the crucial stage of the Fund Drive. Four weeks remain to the official closing, and we are exactly \$6343.50 short of our goal, which means we are behind the weekly average needed to complete the over-all quota in good time.

At the rate the contributions have been coming in, we will need to average over \$1500 weekly to finish on top by May 1.

There should be no comfort for anyone in the fact that this report shows that just a little more than a thousand dollars was received, because this report covers a two-week period and only indicates that our weekly average contributions still range around the \$500 mark.

A glance at the box score will show that only five cities are within striking distance of their quotas, while the majority of assigned quotas are far behind. St. Louis still remains in first place in the drive, followed by the Bay Area (which should complete its drive shortly), Seattle, Buffalo and Detroit.

What should be noted, however, is that these are not the cities with the large quotas. New York, Chicago, Los Angeles and Newark (which made such a splendid start) are the places we count on, and at the time of this report they are too far behind for comfort.

The next two weeks are decisive in the drive, for it will tell us whether the majority of the cities can pull themselves up in time to complete their quotas by May 1. As of now, they have a long haul ahead of them.

This is written for their benefit, since each of these areas should be between the 60 and 100 per cent bracket. As it is,

It is impossible to handle this by unrelated, random local action. In order for local action to be effective, the union as a whole must win new rights over production. It must challenge the company's right to set standards by unilateral action.

Let this not be misunderstood: it is not a simple matter. The plant owners will fight tooth and nail to prevent the union from extending its power over production rates.

First it is necessary, however, to tell the workers that they should have new rights; to explain what is involved; to campaign among the membership and in public on this question as the union has done on every other key issue: such as pensions, wages, GAW.

Now the companies have the rights of dictators over production standards. At bottom, what is at stake is the extension of democracy in industry.

THE HOW OF IT

A dues increase will be proposed by the union's leaders.

A progressive union can always use more money for laudable purposes. But a warning signal is up.

In two unions, membership referendums have rejected requests for a dues increase. In the past year, members of the International Association of Machinists and of the International Typographical Union voted against a dues rise. Union members remain loyal to their unions but they begin to feel that the organization is something apart from them, over them, out of their direct control.

At the UAW convention, the arguments for or against a dues increase will be far less important than how the question is handled.

If the leadership musters all the power of its officialdom to put its proposal over, if it decides to bull it through by sheer weight, then it will get more money, but it will do so at the cost of an irritated membership, alienated just a little more from the union to which they give allegiance.

TOWARD A CODE

Racketeering in labor unions is on everyone's mind.

Every informed union member knows that the UAW is one of the cleanest unions in America, one which has been in the forefront of decent unionism. The convention will doubtless give full moral and practical support to the fight to rid the labor movement of crooks and thugs.

But there are the quick headline readers; there are those whose minds are molded by the daily press. The Senate committee hearings will undoubtedly be used by enemies of unionism to smear all unions and to press for government controls over legitimate union activity and increased restrictions upon them.

More than ever, the union will have to be sensitive to democracy in its ranks and make the members feel that it is their union because they control it.

Reuther will propose the establishment of a Review Board made up of prominent private citizens to provide a court of appeals for members who have been tried in the union. The board would be independent of the union administration with authority to reverse decisions of the International Board on appeals. Such a procedure was initiated some years ago by the Upholsterers International Union.

Such a board can do much to restrain arbitrary authority, but ultimately union democracy must be created and protected from within the union itself. To guard the spirit of democracy requires a reliance on the best elements in the membership and not dependence upon a paid staff of officials.

It requires, too, that the leadership of labor be composed of men motivated by the goals and ideals that have always inspired a labor movement and not by the size of their salaries and expense accounts.

It requires, too, not merely a code of ethical practices to prevent theft, immorality, and racketeering. It requires the enforcement of a Code of Democratic Rights for union members that encourages them in the fight against office-holding dictators and pledges support to them in the fight to restore union democracy where it has been restricted or even wiped out.

These are not matters that can be resolved in a day, not even in a week, at a UAW convention. They are some of the questions already posed for the whole labor movement in the months and years ahead.

they linger way down the list at anywhere between 15 and 43 per cent.

If we skip a report or err in reporting a contribution made, we hear about it quickly. The speed of the remonstrances are astonishing, particularly when compared to the rate of contributions. We are not saying that our friends are wrong in pulling us up on our errors, but we would like to keep our other cheek turned away for the moment and do some remonstrating of our own.

We are calling on all the cities, even

CONTRIBUTE TO THE ISL FUND DRIVE

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

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

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY STATE

(Make checks out to Albert Gates)

those near the top (they have to take up the slack) to get off their respective dimes and make up for the past six weeks of sporadic and indifferent effort.

We are talking particularly of New York, Chicago and Los Angeles. They are the heavyweights in the drive. The National Office could do a little more huckstering in its own behalf, too. If these areas come through there is no doubt we can do it all right.

We have never failed to complete a successful fund drive in the 17 years of the existence of our movement. For the reasons we described in several of our earlier reports, this is certainly not the time for failure. This should be our most successful drive; it should go over and beyond the national quota.

And it should be done swiftly!

FUND DRIVE BOX SCORE

City	Quota	Paid	%
St. Louis	\$10,000	\$3656.50	36.5
Bay Area	25	25	100
Seattle	400	365	91.2
Buffalo	100	80.50	80.5
Detroit	100	65	65
Nat'l Office	400	235	58.7
Newark	1,250	620	49.5
Philadelphia	450	197	43.7
Chicago	200	75	37.5
Cleveland	2,000	740	37
New York	150	45	30
Los Angeles	3,900	1079	27.6
Pittsburgh	650	100	15.3
Reading	200	30	15
Oregon	75	0	0
Mass.	50	0	0
Streator	25	0	0

CONFRONTATION OF TWO UNIONS

UAW vs. the Teamsters Shows the Contrast in Labor

By JACK WILSON

Detroit, March 31

Businessman James R. Hoffa, under indictment for messing around with a Senate Committee with a lot of cash to buy some information, thought he was making quite a reply to the blistering attack by Walter P. Reuther, a labor leader, who said last week that if one-tenth of what was charged against Hoffa was true, Hoffa should be found guilty.

"We're not like UAW President Walter Reuther. He spent ten million dollars at the Kohler Company, four million dollars at General Motors of Canada, and a million and a half at Perfect Circle," Hoffa declared in an interview explaining himself to two Detroit *Free Press* reporters.

As every anti-union employer knows, Reuther certainly is guilty of what Hoffa charged. Reuther keeps spending millions of dollars to organize workers, to win strikes and to advance the interests of the labor movement first. Unquestionably Hoffa's attack on Reuther will be very popular at the Detroit Athletic Club, at the Chamber of Commerce and other anti-union seats of power in Detroit.

The true measure of the kind of leadership that dictatorially controls, runs, and abuses the Teamsters Union as a labor organization may be judged by the criticisms of Reuther made by Hoffa, for Hoffa along with Beck and Brewster dominates the Teamsters.

No one is cheering for Hoffa more than the business interests in Michigan. "I hope Jimmy gets out of this mess because we need him," the Detroit News quotes a top industry leader.

That recent defender of Dave Beck, Senator Joe McCarthy, has tried to divert attention from the racketeering and theft in the Teamsters organization by smearing the UAW and Walter Reuther. McCarthy claims the scandal in the UAW will make the Teamsters mess smell like a rose.

What McCarthy is referring to is not a duplication of the Teamsters leaders' financial manipulations, theft, etc., but rather the same thing that Hoffa mentioned. Like Hoffa, McCarthy thinks it is a crime for the UAW to back workers in strikes and try to win gains for them. The McCarthy attack on the UAW is going to be based on the efforts of the UAW to win the Kohler strike.

McCarthy will call that "squandering," "wasting," etc., etc. Like Hoffa, McCarthy will never quite know what hit him when he tackles the UAW leadership on this ground; for these people just don't understand unionism, especially the UAW kind.

When Chrysler implied that it had an understanding with Reuther, the ranks in the UAW boiled, as we reported recently. All the praise printed in Detroit's papers this week by businessmen for Hoffa may help Hoffa keep some of his Republican friends in Congress and the Senate but they are destroying his reputation in the labor movement, and it couldn't happen to a nicer guy as far as we are concerned.

DEMOCRAT IN ACTION

This Sunday's Detroit *Free Press* devoted a full page and a half to how Hoffa explained himself to reporters. It was a kind of delicate interview, with Hoffa being handled with kid gloves, but it said far more than the reporters or the Detroit *Free Press* intended. (This same newspaper just three weeks ago editorialized that Beck shouldn't be criticized for being a rich labor leader. After all he was in the Horatio Alger pattern.)

Here's an excerpt:

"Jimmy," we asked, "is the Teamsters Union democratic?"

"His eyes blazed. 'Of course it's democratic. The only guys who says it isn't are you guys. We operate a democratic union. It's a union—not a socialist school.'"

A young unnamed warehouseman, a member of 299, is quoted later:

"About three years ago I got up on the floor to raise a point of order. The guy up front told me to sit down or I'd get fined \$25. I kept standing and one of my buddies pulled me down to my seat. I guess

he saved me \$25. As a union, it's OK—but I don't bother going to meetings."

Hoffa said that nobody in the union is ever actually fined. All the fines threatened at meetings are later suspended. "You have to have discipline at meetings," Hoffa explains.

Can UAW members imagine someone trying that in a UAW local? or at a UAW convention? In this illustration is a perfect comparison between the Auto Workers' kind of unionism and the busi-organization methods of Hoffa. That is just one sample of Hoffa's democracy.

The two *Free Press* reporters, Tom Nicholson and Ken McCormick (he once won a Pulitzer prize), asked about the stink in the Pontiac local that is now being investigated by the Senate committee. A 14-member rank-and-file committee asked for the investigation.

Hoffa said: "Hell, those 14 guys aren't even members of the local. They used to be but they've either been fired by their employer or they were independent truckers who went out of business."

Who asked the employers to fire them? This indelicate question wasn't asked.

It is true that following a rank-and-file revolt over the arrest of the officers of the Pontiac local on charges of extortion, Dave Beck put an administrator over the local. His name was Jimmy Hoffa. Hoffa restored the suspended officers although they were found guilty in court. They are still Teamsters officials. No questions along this line by the Detroit reporters. (After all, the Detroit *Free Press* recently wrote a laudatory series on Hoffa.)

What about the rank-and-filers who tried to run for office and got beaten up? No mention.

How often are local union elections held? Hoffa says that in his democratic union this happens once in five years. A rank-and-filer (no name please) said he

never heard of a meeting to elect officers.

Hoffa makes no secret of the fact that there is little turnover in the leadership of the 26 Teamsters locals in Michigan, the Detroit Teamsters Joint Council or the Michigan Conference of Teamsters.

"We haven't had any factionalism here since 1932. We don't have right-wingers and left-wingers—just Teamsters."

"We stay in office because we give our members good wages, good working conditions and service their grievances," Hoffa explained. "Our contracts are the best in the country."

What happened to anybody who ever tried to run for office in the Teamsters Union? No question, no answer. But the hearings on Pontiac will bring a few ugly facts to light on this subject.

REWARDS OF VIRTUE

Hoffa makes a big pretense of being a regular guy with the ranks. He knows hundreds of them by name. He would find it hard to explain that everyone of them who is the least bit critical is afraid to allow the press to use his name when he makes a comment on the union.

"None of the members were reluctant to talk. But if they were unhappy with their plight they didn't give their names," Nicholson and McCormick said. This is democracy with a vengeance. Contrast that with the UAW, and a more proper perspective on the problem of democracy in the union movement may be obtained.

Initiation fees in the Teamsters are \$75 and dues generally \$5 a month. One of the uses for this money is the \$300 weekly salary and expenses that Hoffa's boys get (65 of them in Detroit alone) along with their shiny new Cadillacs each year.

What about financial records so that the rank and file can look at them, as they do in the UAW? Hoffa testified they

were burned yearly. This phase of the Teamsters' operations was left untouched by the reporters.

Local 155 of the milk drivers' union last week voted not to give financial aid to Hoffa in fighting his three-count indictment. Hoffa's boy Brunson Gilbert blew his top on that one: "It was a disloyal attitude and not a true voice of the local's feeling."

The 68 rank-and-filers who had the nerve to vote that way ought to get a vote of thanks from the labor movement . . . and more important, protection from retaliation. The boys are going to call another meeting to rescind that action. Perhaps the presence of senatorial agents may make it a democratic meeting. Perhaps the word will get around on how to vote anyhow. It remains to be seen. Certainly an honest, secret ballot would be in order.

Did Hoffa call a strike against a firm called Test Fleet in Flint? After it went broke a friend of Hoffa's bought it. Mrs. Hoffa and Mrs. Bert Brennan (wife of another Teamster bigwig) were then loaned \$4000 to buy an interest in this firm. They made \$6,000 profit quickly. Since the *Free Press* once carried this story, it's strange the reporters didn't pursue this question in getting a true picture of Hoffa.

NO HELP TO HOFFA

To be sure, the Detroit *Free Press* inadvertently did a public service in printing this full-scale if incomplete interview with Hoffa. For it gave the union movement here a good opportunity to contrast the kind of unionism that was the foundation of the CIO and the practices that have been allowed to go unchecked for a decade in the old AFL. It makes more valuable than ever the democratic traditions of the UAW; it makes the rank and file more keenly appreciative of these values and the union that contains them; and more determined to hold on to them.

The UAW proposal for an impartial board to examine unionists' grievances against their union, which Reuther announced last week as a covention proposal, is certainly a fine example for the other unions to follow. Even in the UAW there have been attempts of bureaucratic-minded secondary leaders to pressure all opposition into silence by threats of charges, suspension of office, etc. This whole pattern takes a beating from the UAW proposal. Every man is guaranteed his fair day in court, and this fact will cool off petty bureaucrats whose real hero in recent years was Hoffa and his kind.

Hoffa's business friends aren't going to be able really to help him. The sympathetic portrayal of him in the Detroit newspapers simply adds sails to his coffin, for he is being found guilty in a higher court than the legal one which may try him on the indictments. His whole career, his wealth, his business friends: they all convict him before the bar of decent union opinion.

CP Apologist Routed at Philly Symposium on Hungarian Fight

By CARL DARTON

Philadelphia, March 30

An audience of 100 at an unusual symposium here on Thursday heard four viewpoints on the Hungarian Revolution. Three speakers, an independent socialist, a pacifist and an American Hungarian Federation representative, effectively opposed the fourth, who was a Communist spokesman, Thomas Nabried.

The discussion, held as one of a weekly forum series at the Messiah Universalist Church, gave no encouragement to the Communist claim that it was necessary for Russian troops to shoot down Hungarian students and workers because it would have been "irresponsibility to permit the chaotic conditions to continue."

Nabried's foremost critic was independent socialist Joseph Davidson, who repeatedly insisted that without democracy there could be no socialism of any variety. He supported and explained the Hungarian Revolution's aims as against the Communists' slanders.

Dr. Lindenmayer, who had been born and raised in Hungary, said the uprising was sparked by students and Communist intellectuals inside and outside the party. Perhaps some few people did have some hope of military help from the West, he said, but the revolution was not started or carried out by landlords, American agents or the military, but by the students, intellectuals and workers. The revolution was not against communism as such but against Russian oppression.

Charles Walker, pacifist spokesman, in the course of a fine analysis of the uprising, pointed out it was mostly non-military and that the non-violent weapon most effectively used was the general strike. As a Third-Camp advocate, Walker said he opposed any American military intervention in such situations; one should work to establish democratic socialism here and abroad, be for a Third Camp on a program of peace, and set an example

here that will stimulate moves to freedom elsewhere.

The Communist speaker laid down a barrage of lies and half-truths: The Russians attacked to defeat native reaction and foreign intervention; the Hungarian social-democrats were playing the same role as when they aided Horthy; Hungarians were told they would get help from the outside; how about Radio Free Europe? etc. He "would not say Russia had no faults," he said, but he didn't mention any.

In a second round, Dr. Lindenmayer pointed out that the Hungarian socialists had not worked with Horthy or Hitler, and told how the post-war Communist regime eliminated opposition parties.

Davidson, stressing once again the interrelationship between socialism and democracy, explained that socialism does not mean simply a nationalized economy. The important question in a nationalized economy is: "Who owns the state? who controls the nationalized economy?" He asked Nabried if he could think of even one "fault" of the present Kadar regime.

In discussion from the floor, Nabried was accused of following the line of the Foster group of the CP. This he denied: "I am not a member of either faction; however, I recognize that Gates is trying to wreck the Communist Party, so naturally the *Daily Worker* does not always represent my viewpoint."

If Nabried is re-examining the CP's view, there was little evidence of it in his talk, except perhaps in the faint and hesitating manner in which he presented his most dogmatic statements.

A recent refugee from Hungary also took the floor to state that the Hungarian people had only wanted a free vote. He closed with a grim reminder to the Communist speaker that he had spent over seven years in prison with Communists who had even less criticism against the Russian regime than Nabried indicated.

Two Vital Pamphlet-Issues

published by Labor Action

10 cents each

LABOR POLITICS IN AMERICA
SOCIALISM AND THE WORKING CLASS

Order from:
Labor Action, 114 West 14 Street, N.Y.C.

Quakers Standing Firm On the Librarian's Case

By M. O.

Philadelphia

In the summer of 1953 the librarian of the William Jeanes Memorial Library at Plymouth Meeting, Pa., fell and broke her hip. The hiring of Mrs. Mary Knowles as replacement caused a furor that was to end with her conviction for contempt of Congress and was to drag Quakers, civil-libertarians, and the Fund for the Republic before two subcommittees of Congress. But the final determination of this case of conscience is still pending.

Mrs. Knowles, while previously employed in Norwood, Mass., had been named by FBI informer Herbert Philbrick as a co-member of a Communist cell in Boston around 1947. Called before Senator Jenner's Internal Security subcommittee, Mary Knowles pleaded the Fifth Amendment and was fired from her job.

Although fully aware of her past, the Library Committee of the Plymouth Monthly Meeting, which has jurisdiction over the Jeanes Library, hired Mrs. Knowles as being the most capable person for the job. In April 1954 Mrs. Knowles left the library since the previous librarian had recovered, but returned to take the position permanently the following September.

Following the permanent hiring of Mrs. Knowles, the two commissioners representing Plymouth Township, which contributes money to the library, told Mrs. Knowles she would have to take the Pennsylvania loyalty oath. The Library Committee backed Mrs. Knowles' right not to take the oath, and some Township funds were cut off. Local American Legion and DAR chapters went on record opposing the continued employment of Mrs. Knowles.

In January 1955, "Citizens for Philbrick," later continued under the name "Alerted American Group," began to pressure for Mrs. Knowles' firing. Few of the Citizens for Philbrick were actually Quakers; few even of the Quakers in it had been active in their Meeting.

FUND MAKES AWARD

Then, in the spring, Robert M. Hutchins, president of the Fund for the Republic, announced a \$5000 award to the Plymouth Monthly Meeting for "courageous and effective defense of democratic principles." He commended the Library Committee and Mrs. Knowles for sticking by their consciences in the face of virulent personal attacks.

In July Mrs. Helen Corson, persistent leader of the "Alerted Americans," hit the headlines with charges that the Fund for the Republic had been hoodwinked. The Overseers of the Friends Monthly Meeting denied Mrs. Corson's claim to speak for members of the Meeting, as she had never been a member of the Society of Friends. At the monthly (business) meeting which followed, no agreement as to disposal of the grant could be reached and the funds were placed in escrow. No unity as to such disposal has been reached so far.

A year later a subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities opened hearings in Philadelphia

on the Fund for the Republic. Chairman Francis Walter, a Pennsylvania Democrat, said the committee wanted to know more about "the factors which prompted the Fund for the Republic to consider the retention of a Communist [sic] a defense of 'democratic principles' worth \$5000 of its tax-exempt money."

The chairman of the Plymouth Library Committee and her minutes were subpoenaed. A special session of the Plymouth Monthly Meeting (the entire congregation, so to speak) cited the First Amendment as protection against interference with religious freedom, and refused Walter the minutes. The New York Times called Walter's tactics "deplorable."

Mary Knowles herself had been subpoenaed shortly after the \$5000 award by the Senate Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary (Jenner's group). Here she did not invoke the Fifth Amendment and made a clear civil-libertarian case out of her refusal to testify.

RASE RELIGIOUS ISSUE

It was as a result of this hearing that Mrs. Knowles was convicted of contempt and sentenced to a fine of \$500 and 120 days on each of 52 counts, to be served concurrently. The case is on appeal and Mrs. Knowles remains employed by the Plymouth Meeting's Library Committee pending final outcome.

Plymouth Meeting has itself prospered both financially and numerically in new members since the case began. The library is also in excellent shape.

Chances for winning the case on appeal are uncertain. There is a complex of legal points involved, including Congress' scope of investigation, the use of hearings to inflict extra-legal punishment, and the extent to which the First Amendment protects individuals from disclosure of unpopular political association.

The religious issue has also been raised. According to the report of the Civil Liberties Committee of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of Friends (of which the Plymouth Meeting is one subsidiary body), just released, the religious issue revolves about "the right of a religious body to conduct its affairs without interference from any legislative investigatory committee."

The Friends are not united in their opinion of the Knowles case. But their actions so far ought to make many liberals who are too willing to compromise in order to be "realistic" blush with shame.

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

Israel's 'Strategic Position' . . . Defensive?

To the Editor:

Hal Draper seems unable to accept the idea that a person can believe Israel's strategic position in the Near East to be essentially defensive and yet give no support to the Sinai campaign. To him there must inevitably be some "straddling." He gratuitously attributes this to Al Findley without a shred of evidence of any vacillation or ambiguity on concrete political issues, i.e., Sinai, domestic Arab policy of Israel, etc.

This is like assuming that Hal Draper, because he has frequently espoused the Arab nationalist contention—that Zionism and Israeli nationalism are inherently and necessarily expansionist and dangerous threats to the Arab states—could not, as a consequence, correctly assess the 1948 Arab-Israeli war and draw the correct political conclusions without straddling.

I would also like to ask Draper what position he would take if, now, after the virtual re-establishment of the status quo before the Sinai invasion, the following situation developed: Israel sends ships through the Gulf of Aqaba and as a result of Egyptian and/or Saudi Arabian attacks on these ships, new hostilities broke out.

Would the fact that the Arab states and the entire Arab nationalist movement were trying to carry out the same objectives they had in the 1948 war have any relevance?

The situation portrayed is not one of those hypothetical "iffy" questions. It is a real imminent possibility and may even occur before this letter is printed.

E. DAVIDSON

The Findley straddle was that "Israel" is in a "basically or historically defensive position." Correspondent Davidson now changes this to defensive "strategic position," in his own search for a perch on the question of Israel's aggression in Sinai.

This proposal to improve on Findley will hardly do. Does "strategic" mean military-strategic or what? and whatever it possibly means, how does it affect political line? Is it the Israeli government, or its policy, which is "strategically defensive," or is it the country Israel, whatever that means? The last, of course, is the same question that Findley dodges.

Both Davidson's and Findley's formulas are simply attempts to find a set of words, whose political meaning would be hard to pin down, that will seem to put

the "defensive" label on Israeli policy in some manner.

This kind of straddle, it should be noted, is worthwhile only for people who do not (definitely not) want to give any support to the Sinai aggression. It is this laudable aversion which gives the straddle the only reason for the existence it has.

Even so, we have pointed out that Findley's formula (LA, Mar. 11) refuses to support Israel's aggression only because the British and French also participated in the attack. This successfully left the door open to supporting the aggression if Israel had pulled off the job alone. Davidson, who wants to defend Findley, evades this very vigorously by energetically underlining the words "without a shred of evidence."

Attention should also be called to a typical device in Davidson's letter: the view that Zionist policy in Israel is inherently expansionist is smeared as "the Arab nationalist contention." (Cf. the Jewish Daily Forward's smear against Norman Thomas, reported last week.) This is the exact equivalent of the notorious method of referring to belief in Negro rights as a "Communist view" because Communists espouse it in their own form.

Re the hypothetical questions:

(1) Socialists should condemn and oppose any Arab attack on Israeli shipping, and for that matter any other act (by either side) which means that new hostilities break out. That includes any act which precipitates war even if the immediate pretext for the act is superficially justifiable in anyone's opinion.

(2) The hypothetical matters raised most certainly do have "relevance" to whether socialists should or should not give support to the Egyptian regime's side in such hypothetical hostilities. Answering no does not yet commit one to giving political support to the other actor in this mess, Ben-Gurion's government. Given the hypotheticals, it is enough to draw our correspondent's attention to the point that opposition to Nasser in general or in any given situation does not automatically commit one to support of war by Israel.

(3) Socialists should certainly not take the stand that, regardless of what Nasser does, "Egypt" is in a "basically defensive position" vis-à-vis imperialism, etc., etc. This would be Findleyism-in-reverse and it is worth mentioning since it mirrors (reversing sides) what is wrong with the Findley-Davidson straddle.

HAL DRAPER

McC's Batting Average Is Down to Zero

When the U. S. Court of Appeals in Washington reversed the contempt of Congress conviction of Harvey O'Connor, the last of seven persons indicted for contempt by the Senate committee formerly headed by Senator Joseph McCarthy had been freed.

Leo J. Kamin, who had refused to name associates in the Communist Party, had been acquitted in Boston and similar

charges against Wendell H. Furry were dismissed there. Diantha Hoag, a Westinghouse employee, was found innocent in Washington of a contempt citation filed after she invoked the Fifth Amendment when asked about passing data to other workers. In New York the Court of Appeals upheld the dismissal of contempt charges against Corliss Lamont, Abraham Unger, and Albert Shadowitz.

A federal District Court judge had found O'Connor guilty for refusing to say whether he belonged to "the Communist conspiracy" when he wrote books that were distributed to U. S. Information Centers overseas. The question had been put by Senator Joseph McCarthy as chairman of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations.

The Court of Appeals, in reversing the lower court, considered the term "Communist conspiracy" too vague.

"The Sixth Amendment . . . provides that in all criminal prosecutions the accused shall be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation," its ruling pointed out. "This required in the present case that the question set forth in the indictment be definite enough to enable the accused to answer it with knowledge of its meaning. . . ."

"One cannot be held guilty of criminal contempt for refusing to answer a question the intended scope of which is so uncertain that if he attempts to answer it truthfully, according to his under-

standing of the meaning, he runs the risk of being indicted for perjury because others understand it differently."

O'Connor refused to answer the question on First Amendment grounds and because he felt the subcommittee had no right to ask it while ostensibly trying to discover whether the U. S. Information Service was efficient. These views were supported by the American Civil Liberties Union in a "friend of the court" brief it filed with the Court of Appeals.

None of the seven cases was decided on the basis of the First Amendment rights to free speech and beliefs, the main point argued by the ACLU in the O'Connor and Lamont cases. Five of the defendants were freed on court rulings that the subcommittee could not question them about their political associations as part of an investigation of efficiency and economy in governmental operations.

—ACLU

LABOR ACTION • 17th YEAR

April 8, 1957

Vol. 21, No. 14

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

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

It's going to be on Friday, May 3, in New York

Celebrate May Day

with the Independent Socialist League and YSL

Entertainment . . . Dancing . . . Late buffet

At ADELPHI HALL, 74 Fifth Avenue, near 13 Street

Chicago Symposium a Success in Face of Sharp Attack

Despite attacks by the American Legion and the Chicago Tribune, and the planting of a stench bomb in a public meeting, a symposium at the University of Chicago, sponsored by the Young Socialist League and the Socialist Club at the University, drew a large crowd (estimated at over 500 by the Chicago Daily News) and heard all speakers.

This civil-liberties victory followed up on the Gates meeting at Columbia, and took place at the same time as CCNY's Buell Gallagher partially reversed his stand on Gates.

The forum was on "Socialism and Democracy." Speakers were Max Shachtman, national chairman of the Independent Socialist League; Fred Fine, National Committee member of the Communist Party; and Mulford Sibley, professor of political science at the University of Minnesota. The chairman was Lawrence Scott of the Chicago American Friends Service Committee.

The announcement of the meeting drew vigorous criticism from many right-wing elements. The Cook County Council of the American Legion, the Chicago Tribune, and various "patriotic" groups protested.

The Legionaires argued that the meeting was a "disgrace" and urged Lawrence E. Kimpton, chancellor of the university, to cancel it. Kimpton replied that it was neither "desirable nor wise" to call off the symposium. He stated that the dean of the Students Office had okayed the meeting, and that he had no intention of overruling this stand.

Kimpton's position was similar to the one taken by Columbia University two weeks ago, when it permitted the E. V. Debs Society and the John Dewey Society to bring John Gates, Communist editor banned from City College campuses in New York, to Columbia.

The Chicago meeting itself was attended by over 500 students and by a detail

from the police security squad and the university police. Outside, members of the American Legion passed out anti-Communist leaflets and urged passers to boycott the symposium.

An announced threat from the anti-subversive committee of the Cook County Council of the American Legion that they would attend and ask "embarrassing" questions failed to materialize. Two stench bombs were set off, but they failed to halt the meeting.

STALINISM VS. SOCIALISM

Comrade Shachtman delivered a speech on the relationship between socialism and democracy. He assailed the notion that the mere transfer of property to state control amounted to socialism. Turning to the Russian reality, he pointed out that a meeting such as the one being held at the university could not take place in that country, and he denounced Stalinist totalitarianism for its denial of democracy.

In answer, Fine assailed Shachtman as "typical of some of the socialists who are still smug in their old dogmas" (an interesting observation for one who was so recently told by Khrushchev that he has been defending terror as democracy and socialism for many years). He went on to call for "a great anti-monopoly coalition and an anti-monopoly government," i.e., he restated the current Stalinist line of turning toward a new Popular Front.

The Chicago Communist Party had billed the symposium as "an event without precedent in Chicago for the past 20 years." In its reporting of the event, the Daily Worker quoted only that section of Shachtman's talk which denounced the lack of freedom in Russia. Nothing was said about the question at issue—the relationship of socialism and democracy.

According to the Chicago Daily News, Fine also defended Russia's intervention into Hungary, and its brutal murder of a democratic revolution.

VALUE OF DEBATE

The Chicago case is a victory for civil liberties—just as the two meetings held at Columbia represented a gain for freedom. Both of these meetings were, in themselves, crushing refutations of all of the high theoretical arguments advanced in favor of banning them.

In this period, debate between Communists and democratic socialists is of extreme importance. Insofar as the line of the Communist convention represented a simple repetition of the tactic of the Popular Front, it offers an excellent opportunity for democrats to confront Communists in public debate and to expose their pretensions to a defense of "democracy" in Russia. And insofar as there is an earnest, sincere and real ferment in the Communist Party among some of its members (who are breaking with Stalinism), it allows democrats the opportunity to discuss issues, to point out inconsistencies; to raise, for instance, the whole question of the Hungarian Revolution.

Challenge has not yet received an eyewitness account from Chicago (this report is based on press reports from three or four sources), but it would seem that Fine was simply presenting a parrot version of the current line. If, as the Chicago Daily News reported, he defended the Russian intervention in Hungary, he is not even at the level of John Gates, the Daily Worker editor, who maintains the position which his paper took last year against the murder of the revolution.

On the other hand, such a debate offers the opportunity to make it clear to a student audience that socialism and Stalinism have nothing in common. It allows the spokesmen of democratic socialism to counter-act the terrible harm that has been done to the cause of socialism by the Stalinists' linking of the Russian reality with the ideals of socialism.

THE AIM OF THE YSL

The Young Socialist League is a democratic socialist organization striving to aid in the basic transformation of this society into one where the means of production and distribution shall be collectively owned and democratically managed. The YSL attempts to make the young workers and students, who form its arena of activity, conscious of the need for organization directed against capitalism and Stalinism.

The YSL rejects the concept that state ownership without democratic controls represents socialism; or that socialism can be achieved without political democracy, or through undemocratic means, or in short in any way other than the conscious active participation of the people themselves in the building of the new social order. The YSL orients toward the working class; as the class which is capable of leading society to the establishment of socialism. —From the Constitution of the YSL

Indeed, a third victory for civil liberties should be added to those which occurred at Columbia and the University of Chicago.

Buell Gallagher, the president of City College, was one of those who stood by the decision to ban John Gates from all of New York's city campuses. In that, he set the cause of academic freedom back. But his recent announcement that he will debate Doxey Wilkerson of the Communist Party in a Free Forum at City College goes a certain way toward restoring his reputation as a civil-libertarian. (Gallagher is a member of the ACLU.)

GOOD TURN

Gallagher's statement of why he is engaging in debate is also heartening. He told reporters that he was taking this step "First, to make clear my complete disagreement with Communism," and then, "to emphasize that no point of view, no matter how repugnant, is barred from our campus."

At the same time, it was announced that Joseph Clark, Daily Worker foreign editor, will speak on April 11 at a public forum during City's "Hyde Park" day. An invitation has also been extended to a speaker from the Young Socialist League.

It is quite probable that Gallagher's reversal is at least in part a result of the considerable student pressure which built up over the ban on Gates. As a member of the ACLU, he was caught in an embarrassing position; various student councils passed motions against the Board of Higher Education action. The campaign on the Gates issue was sparked, in New York, by the Debs Club of Columbia.

All in all, these three cases spell out victories for civil liberties, and the possibility of a resurgence of student activity. They are to be hailed.

Brandeis Case Tests Academic Rights

An important issue of student rights is being fought out at Brandeis University this spring.

It involves a socialist, Richard DeHaan. He has been fired from his job as a faculty fellow at Brandeis, expelled from the university, and denied his masters and doctoral degrees—all without having been informed of the charges against him.

According to DeHaan, he had presented a list of grievances to Dr. Herbert Marcuse (familiar to socialists as the author of Reason and Revolution). These complaints were mainly concerned with the method of handling fellowship awards at Brandeis, and the lack of democracy in the decisions of the Graduate Committee. The awards, DeHaan argued, were not given out according to merit but were aimed at enticing new students to the university at the expense of second-year students.

Subsequent to these criticisms, the Graduate Committee met and voted unanimously not to let DeHaan take his exams for a Masters, or the qualifying exams for a Doctorate, even though he had fulfilled the formal requirements.

At no time, DeHaan reports, has he been given a statement of the reasons which were behind this decision. As a result of this action, DeHaan filed a suit against the university in federal court last December.

DeHaan's suit raises extremely interesting questions. He contends that his position at the university was contractual in nature, and that he complied with

all terms, though he was not allowed to take his degree. He is asking for reinstatement and an award of \$2000. In lieu of this, he is demanding a judgment of \$100,000 against the university.

The basic point which DeHaan is raising is not the question of the accuracy of his criticisms against the Graduate Committee. (At this distance, Challenge cannot check on the issues involved.) It is rather a case of academic due-process.

Can a university fire a graduate student, refuse him the right to take exams, expel him, etc., without stating its reasons? Is the relationship of a student (graduate or undergraduate) to an administration one which is totally devoid of rights, which is subject to the arbitrary will of the university authorities?

ISSUE OF DUE-PROCESS

The whole concept of students rights is a relatively new one in the academic world; yet that makes it no less vital. (Academic freedom was originally concerned with the rights of professors.) It is important that student rights be guaranteed, that the student be given some protection against arbitrariness on the part of administration and faculty. Many of the rights which should be spelled out have been set down by the American Civil Liberties Union in its statement on that subject.

But DeHaan is opening up the question of another sphere of academic freedom, one that is compelling and important.

In an editorial The Justice, campus

newspaper at Brandeis, took an excellent stand:

"The Student Union Constitution, under the article on 'Fundamental Rights,' states that '... It is the right of every student to be informed of the charges against him and to have adequate opportunity to defend himself before being subject to disciplinary action.' We do not know whether this procedure is usually followed by the administration in cases of student discipline. However, there has been disciplinary action (and Mr. DeHaan's dismissal is a case in point), without the student having the opportunity for a hearing in which to defend himself.

"It should not be necessary to state the reasons for the necessity of due-process in the academic community even in cases where a hearing might seem superfluous. It is one of the freedoms we take for granted in every other sphere of social life and there seems to be no valid reason why it should not also be a part of relationships within a university."

In the last paragraph of The Justice editorial, quoted above, the essential point is brought out. Due-process is a basic element of democratic fairness. It should not be confined to "judicial" proceedings, and be considered unnecessary in all of the literally thousands of bureaucratic procedures which have developed in the United States (government, private, academic, etc.).

DeHaan has raised this basic question by his action at Brandeis. His cause deserves the support of every civil-libertarian.

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

Enclosed is \$.....as my contribution to the YSL Fund Drive.

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY

STATE

(Make checks out to Max Martin)

E. German Opposition CP Group Issues a Program in a Leaflet

A political manifesto and program was published in a leaflet by a clandestine opposition group in the East German Stalinist party last month, when oppositionist Professor Wolfgang Harich was put on trial.

Interesting excerpts from this leaflet appear in the current issue of the New Leader, in an article by Rainer Hildebrandt, author of *The Explosion*, the book on the June 1953 rising in East Germany. It is reproduced here.

Harich, a popular 35-year-old professor of philosophy and sociology, formerly editor of the East Berlin Journal of Philosophy, was tried on the charge of trying to overthrow the regime, along with associates, and sentenced to 10 years. Once a staunch Stalinist, Harich developed toward opposition particularly after the June days.

Hildebrandt writes that "On the same day that the 'counter-revolutionary' Harich group was accused in every newspaper of favoring the restoration of capitalism and the granting of East German licenses to Western industrialists, Harich's faction program appeared in the form of thousands of leaflets in Communist offices throughout East Germany."

As appears from the leaflet, the Harich group thought in terms of reforming the Communist Party (in East Germany called the SED, "Socialist Unity Party") from within, and it is hospitable to quite a variety of ideas from a miscellany of sources, from Trotsky to Social-Democrats and Titoists. These are people emerging from the fog of Stalinism and honestly trying to grapple with new theoretical conceptions. They still have illusions about "the alliance with the socialist camp" but seem quite firm on democratic essentials.

They say, according to Hildebrandt: "We take as our model Karl Liebknecht, who broke party discipline in order to save the party."

This refers to Karl Liebknecht's lone vote against the kaiser's war credits in 1915. However, Liebknecht's action turned out to be of significance as a step not toward saving the Social-Democratic Party but toward laying the foundations of a new revolutionary party.

The Harich group's manifesto is an important document as another example of the emergence of revolutionary democratic trends within the Communist world.

SPOTLIGHT

(Continued from page 1)

Heized in this country as the resentment against Israel that fills the refugees, for the simple reason that it does not fit very well into the propaganda which seeks to justify Israel's October aggression by putting the spotlight solely on one side of the total picture. But it is very important, among other reasons, because it is one of the facts which points to the possibility of a peaceful political solution by Israel of its "Arab problem." But it is a solution which would require a fundamental reversal of current Zionist policy.

"The Gaza Strip could have been used as a demonstration-ground to show the Arab masses (in all the states) that Israel means justice to them. That is, a different kind of Israeli regime could have demonstrated this, on the basis of a different policy, for the Ben-Gurion team of chauvinists who regrettably held Israel had no such intentions.

This has been well brought out in A. J. Liebling's "Letter from Gaza" in the March 16 *New Yorker*:

"The Israelis, during their four-month occupation of the Strip, which began when they captured it last November 1st and is ending as I write, did nothing to reduce this human edema on their borders beyond shooting a disputed number of civilians when their troops entered and removing twenty-five families compromised by overfriendliness when they left. Their renewed contact with the refugees seemingly offered an opportunity to begin negotiations for the return of some and the compensation of others, but the chance was neglected, and the popular Israeli line on Gaza following the withdrawal may be gleaned from a piece, signed Diplomatic Correspondent, on the front page of last Tuesday's *Jerusalem Post*: 'To continue to administer this island of misery and hate would be a tiresome and costly undertaking for such a small country as this. The best thing for the refugees themselves is, probably, the way chosen by nearly a million Jews—emigration.' Diplomatic Correspondent's advice to people trapped in a submarine is to call a taxi."

THE ROAD FROM GAZA

While on the subject of Liebling's report from Gaza, another section of it demands quotation as giving one of the rare balanced views of how the Gaza refugees have been bedeviled on both sides: It is a good thing to keep in mind:

"The Egyptians, when they were here, tried to strengthen this romanticism [of revenge] by precluding the hope of any other solution; it was a species of treason, for example, for an individual to admit that he might accept compensation from the Israelis for his land if compensation were offered. Egyptian security agents kept excellent tabs on the interminable public conversations, and there was no temptation to depart from the official doctrine of all or nothing, since there was no possibility of getting past the barrier up the road. In the Egyptian days, no refugee could be found who would say even that he would take his own land back if it meant returning to Israel as an individual and living among Jews. (There is no record, of course, of any such offer's having ever been made.) This legend of the monolithic intransigence of the exiles—not the Gaza lot alone but all the diaspora, in Lebanon, Syria, and Jordan—was in its time useful to Israel, too, because it barred any payments to anybody. The Israeli argument when visitors raise the question of the possibility of piecemeal compensation is that conditions have changed since the Arabs went away—and besides Israel can't spare the money. On the piecemeal resettlement of the refugees in Israel, it is 'We need the land for a hundred thousand Jews we expect from Portugal'—or Pimlico or Guatemala; details are unessential. Many Israelis are not only incapable of thinking that this is a paradox but unable to believe that it seems odd to a foreigner. Yet there are Palestinians on the Gaza beach who say, 'My land is five miles from here, and they have taken it to give it to men from ten thousand miles away.' The difference of opinion is irreconcilable. The degree of intransigence expressed varies, however, with the known political views of your interpreter, who is usually a camp official, and the men among the refugees who have the most substance and education, and who themselves speak English or French, are generally the most reasonable of all. 'I would go back and see if I could live happily in the new environment,' one such said to me—I had been warned against him as a hothead—and then see if I couldn't sell out and go where I felt I had more freedom."

Yes, there would be plenty of ground for a progressive political appeal by the people of Israel to the Arab masses. That road exists, in spite of the too often repeated sentiment that the only way to teach Arabs any sense is to knock 'em on

Excerpts from The Leaflet

We are a group of SED functionaries, backed by a large body of adherents both conscious and unconscious. Our ideas have been derived particularly from the decisions of the 20th Congress of the CPSU and from other contacts with foreign comrades. Personal discussions with Polish, Hungarian and Yugoslav comrades convinced us of the correctness of our ideas. Bertold Brecht strongly sympathized with our group up to his death and saw in it the healthy forces of the party.

We are of the opinion that . . . socialism is an objective process and is not tied to the name of a party which identifies itself with socialism. . . . We discern real possibilities for socialist development in Europe in the following:

In Eastern Europe, economic forms have emerged which, if they are radically reformed and their degeneration is halted, are suited to bring about socialism in the Eastern countries earlier than will be the case in the Western countries with their predominantly capitalist economic forms. A radically de-Stalinized Eastern economic structure in the USSR and the People's Democracies will, in the further course of events, gradually influence the capitalist West. At the same time, the West will influence the East with democratic and libertarian ideas and force the East to dismantle its despotic political system step by step. In this process of mutual influence and interpenetration we see the realization of a genuine coexistence. . . .

The resistance of the People's Democracies to the overlordship of the USSR is an expression of the revolutionary class struggle of the popular masses against the Stalinist party and government apparatus and its methods. When the healthy forces in the party take the lead in this class struggle, it leads to the overcoming of degeneration and the further development toward socialism. Poland is the clearest proof of this.

Since Stalin's death, the Stalinist apparatus has realized that things cannot go on as they have and concessions must be made to the popular masses. An expression of this was the Malenkov policy in the USSR and Khrushchev's criticism of Stalin. The 20th Congress of the CPSU was an attempt to intercept and guide the threatening revolution from below through reform from above. . . . At present, the Soviet Union is trying to transfer de-Stalinization to the People's Democracies just as schematically as Stalinization. This results in friction and in attempts by the People's Democracies to solve the problem of de-Stalinization in their own way. This again forces the Soviet Union to react in a Stalinist manner to these attempts and employ typical fascist methods. . . .

CONCLUSIONS

From the above appraisal of the present situation we draw . . . the following conclusions: We want to reform the party from within. We want to maintain the positions of Marxism-Leninism. However, we want to be done with Stalinism. What results from this for the theory of Marxism-Leninism is: It must be supplemented and broadened by the insights of Trotsky and, above all, of Bukharin; it must be supplemented and broadened by the insights of Rosa Luxemburg, and partly also by those of Karl Kautsky, Fritz Sternberg and other Social-Democratic theoreticians. We must assimilate the Yugoslav experiences and what is

the head, etc.—which is a lineal descendant of the notorious McArthur theory of how to deal with Orientals, of the dictum that "the only good Indian is a dead Indian," and of many related maxims of chauvinism and the military mind.

That road exists, and well-wishers of Israel can help it best by pushing it to take that road, instead of threatening to teach the Egyptians a lesson (all over again) by shooting its way through the Gulf of Aqaba in the name of justice.

new in the theoretical discussions in Poland and China; the 8th Congress of the Chinese CP is of particular significance here. . . .

Our party must take the following organizational measures: The domination of party members by the party apparatus must be completely broken. Democratic centralism must be restored in our party practice according to the principles of Marx, Engels and Lenin. The Stalinists must be expelled from the party.

Production must be redirected toward raising the living standard of the masses of the people; the speed-up system completely done away with; profit-sharing introduced in socialist factories and socialist trade; old-age pensions legally enacted for workers just as for the intelligentsia; bonuses for top functionaries abolished; workers' councils introduced in the factories on the Yugoslav model; small private business promoted and given equal status with nationalized industry; forced collectivization ended; agricultural producers' cooperatives dissolved, in order to avert economic catastrophe; a sound small and medium peasantry developed.

TO REFORM PARTY

Complete intellectual freedom must be restored; the anti-religious campaign ended; . . . the universities granted autonomy; the individual guaranteed complete security before the law . . . ; the State Security Service and secret trials done away with. The government must be reformed . . . through an expanded coalition system headed by a reformed SED; the complete sovereignty of Parliament must be restored. In elections, the coalition must put up unity lists with several candidates [for each seat], so that the population can really make a choice; . . . the administration must be drastically debureaucratized from top to bottom.

A foreign policy must be developed which holds firmly to the alliance with the socialist camp while preserving complete independence and equality of rights; there must be free and independent discussion of necessary measures and common policy with comrades of other People's Democracies. . . .

If we succeed in reforming the SED on the basis of this platform, there will be no second popular uprising in the German Democratic Republic. This makes it our duty to use all our strength to rid the party of Stalinists and, through a changed policy, to recapture the confidence of the working class and the entire nation.

WHAT'S GOING ON?

For the only thorough account of the crisis in the American Communist movement, read the new booklet by

H. W. BENSON

The Communist Party At the Crossroads

25 cents.

Order from:

New International Pub. Co.
114 West 14 Street, N.Y.C.

(15¢ each in bundles of 10 or more.)

World History—Year by Year

The bound volumes of LABOR ACTION

1950-54 \$3 per vol.
are an invaluable record of the social and political issues of our day, and a socialist education in themselves. Completely indexed from 1949 on.

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

Independent Socialist Press
114 West 14 Street, New York City

A Tourist-Eye Glimpse of East Germany & Czechoslovakia

The following is an account we have received from a Canadian tourist who recently visited East Germany and Czechoslovakia. (He could not visit Poland because Polish authorities refused him a visa.) While it is strictly a tourist's passing glimpse, we thought it might be interesting to LABOR ACTION readers.—ED.

By WILLIAM WORDELL

A pleasant, heavily armed teen-age soldier greeted me as I drove up to the East German frontier post. After courteous and lengthy treatment by a visa official, 2 registrars, a cashier, a luggage and foreign currency checker, a parking attendant and another armed soldier, I entered East Germany equipped with a transit visa to West Berlin.

I encountered no difficulties in driving back and forth between the Western and Eastern sectors of Berlin, crossing at the recognized border points. Berliners daily cross the boundaries primarily by subway or elevated.

One of the World War II legacies inherited by Berliners was a tremendous number of bombed-out ruins in both sectors. In the western sector, new construction and reconstruction of housing units and business and public buildings have proceeded at a fast pace. In the eastern sector, in sharp contrast, building and reconstruction moves at a tortoise pace with the exception of Stalin Allee and some historic, cultural and sports buildings. Typical housing in the working-class sections of West Berlin was superior to that found in East Berlin.

Shopping in East Berlin is an interesting though sometimes startling experience. The major department stores in East Berlin are located in Alexander Platz. In the largest of these stores I was followed by an armed soldier when I decided to buy some rubbers as it was pouring rain outside. The sales clerk was called aside by my trailing companion. After a hasty conversation, the clerk turned to me and demanded my visa. Upon seeing the East German visa, he smiled at the soldier and closed the sale.

Although I had no more military assistance in my shopping tour, I discovered that everyone, East Berliners and foreigners alike, are required to show their identification papers every time they make a purchase from a bottle of milk to an overcoat.

I spent a great deal of time checking the quality and prices of all types of goods offered East Berliners. In general, quality was very inferior compared to

West German goods, except for luxury goods such as cameras and china which are exported to the West and must, therefore, compete. (This type of article with resale value in the West cannot be purchased by Westerners.)

The following table will give an idea of the price level, based on an average workers' wage of 77 East marks per week and a 48-hour week. The first column lists selected food items, the second column gives the price of each, and the third gives the work-time necessary to earn that amount.

	E. Marks	Work-time (hrs.)
Eggs (dz.)	5.40	3.55
Coffee (lb.)	30.87	19.3
Margarine (lb.)	1.82	1.13
Lemons (lb.)	2.28	1.45
Milk (qt.)	1.06	0.67
Good pork (lb.)	5.08	3.18

Basic food items still rationed in the eastern sector include meat, fish, potatoes, butter and milk. Some of these staples are not always available, thus forcing East Berliners to purchase necessary food items in West Berlin with West marks.

The official rate of exchange between the two currencies, as established by the East German government, is one for one. However, on the free market in West Berlin, the rate of exchange is over four East marks for one West mark. (In West Berlin one U.S. dollar is worth about 4.2 West marks or about 17 East marks.) To cut down on black market transactions, the East Berlin government does not permit West Berliners to purchase goods in East Berlin.

Communist-authorized books were sold at subsidized prices at the International Book Store in Alexander Platz where I tried unsuccessfully to purchase a copy of Khrushchev's famous speech on Stalin. (Many of Stalin's works were offered for sale.) Upon leaving this store, I was besieged by a swarm of young beggars clad in rags.

RULING-CLASS ROW

In contrast to such poverty is Stalin Allee, termed "Germany's first socialist street" by the East German Travel Bureau. TV antennas sprout from the tops of well-constructed, conservatively designed, well-lit Stalin Allee, which extends in such fashion for a distance of about five blocks. Specialty shops and restaurants occupy the first floors of these highly desirable apartment houses. Overlooking this magnificent street stands a statue of Stalin with his back to a miserable slum which is much more representative of how the East Berlin masses live.

Among the plush restaurants catering to the Stalin Allee class are two outstanding ones, ironically named Budapest and Warsaw. Expensively decorated in a sedate, bourgeois style, both were filled with the upper-income groups of East Berlin who make up the new ruling class. There were present a number of Russian officers. The occasional worker or peasant who entered for a cup of coffee or a glass of beer was obviously out of place.

The upper class savored the food, which was prepared to gourmet standards, and glasses clinked continuously. A fine three-course dinner including a glass of wine, for two, costs about 32 to 40 East marks, roughly a half week's pay for an industrial worker. These restaurants offer a proliferation of choice from an extensive menu of 15 pages or more, including the choicest cuts of steak and exclusive champagnes. Tips were gratefully accepted by waiters and hat-check girls alike.

Before leaving Berlin, I applied at the East German Ministry of Foreign Affairs to have my transit visa changed to a regular travel visa so that I could break up the Prague trip with an overnight stay in Dresden, East Germany. (This regular travel visa had been promised me in a letter from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.)

The security check at the entrance of the Foreign Ministry building included two policemen and two officials who examined my passport and visa. They gave me a building entry permit, which was stamped with the time and the office I wished to visit as well as my name and citizenship.

An official directed me to a waiting room where I joined about 10 other people. While waiting, I was fascinated by the activities of the bureaucrats whose offices opened onto the waiting room. The sound of a key unlocking a door would announce the entry of an official in the waiting room. After hastily relocking his door, he would cross the waiting room, unlocking a door to another office, enter and relock it. Soon he would reappear, reversing the process. This fantastic scene was replayed several times, each time with a different key actor.

In my interview with a Foreign Ministry official I was told firmly that this decision fell under the jurisdiction of the central office of the East German Travel Bureau. The official signed and stamped the time on my entry permit, which now served as an exit permit.

RUN-AROUND

I went to the East German Travel Bureau. The following is the gist of the conversation I had with one of the managers of the Bureau:

WORDELL: I was directed here by an official of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. I would like to have a visa which would permit me to stay overnight in Dresden.

MANAGER: The hotels in Dresden are filled.

W: How about Leipzig?

M: The hotels are filled there also. W: I want to visit Dresden or Leipzig very much and I am very willing to stop at a guest house. I don't have to stay at a hotel.

M: Well, really the hotels aren't filled, but you need a police permit for overnight.

W: Will you issue the police permit?
M: This office cannot do that. That is a matter for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

W: Now wait a minute. I wrote to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and this Travel Bureau before leaving on this trip and I received this letter from the Foreign Ministry in which it is stated I may have a travel visa for a week. The Foreign Ministry sent me here and I think I should get the permit.

M: We cannot make this decision. It is for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to decide. I shall accompany you to the ministry to help expedite matters.

After both the Travel Bureau official and myself were subjected to the aforementioned security treatment, we went

to the office of a top official in the Foreign Ministry. He told us that it was not his decision, but belonged to the Travel Bureau. Regarding my letter from the Foreign Ministry stating that I could have a visa for a week, the Foreign Affairs bureaucrat stated irrelevantly that they had lost my letter to them.

Finally, the two bureaucrats had a fierce argument with the Travel Bureau girl defending my right to the visa. The dispute was terminated by the Foreign Affairs Ministry official when he declared categorically that they would not issue me the police permit for the overnight in Dresden.

The following conversation took place between the Travel Bureau manager and me after we had departed from the Foreign Affairs Ministry.

WORDELL: I know that I'm getting the bureaucratic run-around and I don't like it at all. I received a letter and a tourist brochure welcoming me to a German Democratic Republic holiday and now look at the treatment I get.

MANAGERS: I am very sorry and I regret what has happened.

W: I don't think this is the way to encourage tourist trade.

M: I have to do this every day to people. It is a very depressing and discouraging part of my job. I hope you have a nice trip to Prague even if you can't stay overnight in Dresden. I am sorry.

ALL QUIET IN PRAGUE

Prague, once considered beautiful and gay, is now dull and drab. Some personal acquaintances, in the privacy of their home, told me there was a great deal of sympathy among the Czechs for the Hungarian Revolution.

I was told that the estimated average weekly wages for industrial workers in Prague is about 275 crowns while plant managers earn perhaps twice that amount plus bonuses of unknown amount. Here is a table of selected food items with the Czech price in crowns and the number of hours of work-time necessary to earn this amount, based on an average weekly wage of 275 crowns and a 48-hour work-week:

	Crowns	Work-Time (hrs.)
Hamburger (lb.)	9.64	1.68
Coffee (lb.)	79.50	14.40
Good pork (lb.)	10.9	1.91
Boiled ham (lb.)	24.6	4.32

Czechoslovak crowns are exchanged at three different rates: (1) official—7 to the U.S. dollar; (2) tourist—21 to the U.S. dollar; and (3) free markets outside Czechoslovakia—38 to the U.S. dollar.

Both Czech and East German villagers live in real poverty in deteriorated housing despite the fact that the farm land is apparently fertile and extensively tilled.

Today in the Czechoslovakian countryside there are still some religious crosses; in Prague I saw people attending church. The Stalin symbols still remain in both countries in the form of statues but his divinity has faded away.

In Czechoslovakia red stars adorn all aspects of economic life from buses to buildings and from fields to factories. Banners and barns in town and village continuously scream the superiority of "socialism" and the Soviet Union while condemning the Hungarian "counter-revolution" and Western imperialism in Egypt.

No public manifestation of opposition to either regime was noticed. There is no freedom of dissent allowed and private individuals are not permitted to receive newspapers through the mails from the West. No non-Communist publications were available on the newsstands. No free unions or strikes are permitted.

A basic means of precluding any opposition to the governments is the presence of great numbers of police and soldiers. This is especially true of East Germany where, in addition to over 20 Russian divisions, there are tremendous numbers of armed police and soldiers observable everywhere. They play a vital "protective" role in this "worker's paradise."

The Czech military also plays a "protective" role, although there are no Soviet soldiers and fewer Czechoslovakian soldiers and police were noticed. As I crossed the border into Austria Czechoslovakian soldiers were investigating the high barbed-wire fence which divides the two countries, thus ensuring that Czechoslovakian citizens may be "protected" from traveling to Austria.

Notes on Gomulka's Poland

Here is a news item in the organ of the Norwegian Labor Party, *Arbeiderbladet*, for March 23, which was not picked up in this country:

"Poland is on the way back to Stalinism, claims the Polish journalist Mieczyslaw Endler, who Friday requested the Swedish authorities for asylum after a reporting job in Sweden. Every single day Poland takes another step back to the old dictatorship, Stalinists win back their power positions, and the liberal and democratic elements in the Communist Party are pushed aside, asserts Endler.

"Nevertheless the Hungarian tragedy cannot recur in Poland because the Polish people number three times as many as the Hungarian and because the Polish army with its 600,000 men is absolutely hostile to the Soviet, announces Endler in a couple of newspaper interviews. No Stalinists can be found among the higher officers' positions in Poland. Should the Soviet provoke an open fight in Poland, it is likely that a rebellion will follow in East Germany and the Soviet leaders wish to avoid that above all."

Evidently, Endler is quite optimistic. Why didn't he stay and do his bit . . . ? If he had an answer for that, it is not the item we received.

We see by a news item in the Paris *Le Monde* for Jan. 29 that Gozdzik, the outstanding workers' (Zeran auto works) leader who emerged from the revolutionary October days, was frozen out of the parliament by the Gomulka leadership, which appealed for a straight vote for the top of the ballot.

Gozdzik's name was among those on the list for Warsaw's 3rd sector, but 7th on the list when only six were to be elected. That meant that no one could vote for him except by crossing out one of the top names, in violation of Gomulka's appeals and pressure.

Le Monde correspondent Féron reports that in the university and student section of this district, 7 out of ten voters used the booth to mark their ballot (as against an average of 1 out of ten elsewhere) and indicates they may well have been protesting for Gozdzik, who however received only 5 per cent of the ballot in the whole district.

In any case, the elimination of Gozdzik is commentary on Gomulka's relation to the revolutionary workers of Zeran who were at the heart of the October upheaval.

Labor Needs Code — —

(Continued from page 1)

least are reacting in this way to the Senate hearings. Republican Senator Ives has already predicted that the hearings will set back the union movement for "a generation" or "twenty years." AFL-CIO Secy.-Treas. Schnitzer is quoted as saying that the labor movement will be able to do no organizing for at least a year while it cleans up the mess in its own house, but that it will then emerge stronger as a result of the cleansing.

There are times for dramatic struggles, and times for a more quiet, plodding kind of work. Only a four-flusher like Beck thinks he can cover his tracks by promising a vast organizing campaign for the Teamsters. In the months ahead he and his boys will have a lot more to worry about than organizing the unorganized (or those already organized by other unions) into the Teamsters.

Nevertheless, every thoughtful unionist should ask himself whether this is really the time for the labor movement to lie low. Is there really any reason to believe that such a strategy will soften the attacks of the anti-labor forces in the country? Are they not more likely to be encouraged by feeling that they have the labor movement on the run?

In addition, the problems facing the unions will not hold still till they have settled with the issue of corruption. The advances of automation; the continuing speed-up; the rising cost of living; the political and economic problems facing all workers, both organized and unorganized, in the country—all cry out for sound programs and concerted action by the whole labor movement.

WHEN LABOR MARCHES

Finally, the struggle against corruption itself, if it is to be successful, requires a labor movement which is on the march.

After all, why is it that corruption and racketeering have settled themselves most firmly either in unions which have been more or less on the stagnant edges of the labor movement for a long time or during the relatively easy years of prosperity? The answer is that in unions where the members are engaged in a fight for their interests, it is far from easy to saddle them with the yoke of arrogant bureaucracy which must precede the degeneration and corruption we have seen in the Teamsters and elsewhere.

The problem is not at all to seek to offset, by some kind of artificial or phony militancy, the impact of the facts about corruption in the labor movement which will be brought out as the hearings continue. The problem is that neither the issues facing the workers nor their enemies will wait while the union movement sets its house in order.

If a healthier labor movement is to emerge from this crisis, it has got to fight for the interests of its members and all workers in both the economic and political spheres, or it will lose out heavily where it counts most, in the loyalty and support of its own members.

TOO SMUG?

This brings us back to the second major issue raised by the Senate investigation. What can the labor movement as a whole do to end once and for all the dominance and control in whole sections of it of leaders who regard it simply as a means for personal wealth and power?

The April 5 issue of *U.S. News & World Report* has a series of interviews with union leaders and others on the general subject of "How Unions Can Avoid Rackets." A wide variety of views are expressed on a wide variety of subjects by a number of respected and respectable labor leaders. Many of the questions and answers deal with such subjects as proper auditing procedures for various types of union funds.

One of the most striking things about most of the interviews, however, is that when asked about internal union democracy, most of the leaders express the view that in their own unions democracy for the membership is in a flourishing state, and a good number of them blame the membership for failing to take advantage of the democratic opportunities they have at their disposal.

Now, every experienced unionist knows that there is a large degree of apathy on the part of the membership of most unions a good deal of the time. In every

"clean" union, the officers plead with the members to be more active, to attend meetings more regularly, and the like.

But even if we leave out of account those unions which never hold meetings, or those in which the authority of the officers is regularly upheld not by majority sentiment but by goon squads, the fact remains that there are few unions indeed in which an effective, organized opposition to the incumbent leadership is treated as a normal aspect of democracy rather than a treasonous conspiracy.

LOOKING THE OTHER WAY

The practice of union "democracy" in the Teamsters' Union has been infamous in the labor movement for a long time. Experienced unionists in just about every major city in the country can cite chapter and verse on locals put under receivership for the sole offense of standing up to the international leadership on one issue or another on which the local membership sought to exercise constitutional rights.

On most occasions, the rest of the union movement just looked the other way. No one raised his voice to denounce these practices as contrary to the best interests and traditions of the labor movement.

Only when Beck's raiding practices began to hurt a whole series of other unions were the Teamsters denounced publicly by name, and then only by their biggest and strongest opponents. In the meantime, Beck sat on the highest councils of the labor movement, while the local leaderships and rank-and-file members who had been ousted or worked over by his thugs sought redress in vain.

In far too many unions, even where the strong-arm tactics used in the Teamsters are frowned upon, the membership has been encouraged to participate and act only at the beck and call of the leadership. Any initiative of their own has been regarded as a dangerous infringement on the "rights" of the leadership, and slapped down accordingly.

This attitude by the union leadership has tended to prevail even in situations where rank-and-file initiative and struggle against their leaders was clearly in the interests of the union movement as a whole. The best example of this is in the struggle conducted in the CIO against Communist domination of some of its unions in the '30s and '40s.

INSTRUCTIVE PRECEDENT

This example from history is specially appropriate, as IUE President James Carey has pointed to the CIO's handling of the Communists as an example of the way the labor movement should handle the racketeers in the present situation.

In the interview in the *U.S. News & World Report* mentioned above, Carey was asked: "What about the expulsion of the Teamsters from the AFL-CIO?"

Answer: "I don't think that simple expulsion is the answer to this problem. I think that the membership of the Teamsters deserve better leadership and they deserve to be assisted in getting the kind of dedicated leadership that a union needs and deserves...."

"I think neither political corruption in the form of the Communists or the racketeering—the corruption that exists there—may be dealt with just on the simple business of expulsion, any more than just forcing the resignation of racketeers is efficient.

"I think you have to give them the full penalty of the law. Then you have to displace them. And you have to do that and still provide the membership with a union that's democratic in nature and that can serve their interests. I would go beyond just suspension and expulsion, just as we had to do in the CIO when we expelled the Communist-controlled unions.

"We expelled the UE and we set up the IUE. And it's our job to put the Communists, when they invade the unions' ranks, out of business, and it's our job, too, to put the racketeers out of the labor movement."

This is not the place to trace the whole history of how the Communists were handled by the CIO. In the years since the Communist-dominated unions were expelled, a number of them have collapsed and been absorbed by AFL-CIO unions. In the electrical industry, it has taken almost a decade of bitter inter-union struggle to establish the clear as-

pendancy of the IUE. In other fields, the ousted unions have held their own and the AFL-CIO has been able to do nothing about it.

The success of the IUE, however, is directly attributable to the fact that a powerful opposition movement to the Stalinists grew up and maintained itself inside the old UE while it was still in the CIO. For years this movement sought support from the CIO leadership in their struggle, and got precious little of it. From time to time, oppositions to the Stalinists grew up in other unions.

In the United Automobile Workers, the Reuther leadership was able to wrest control of the union from the Communist clique, again with little or no support from Philip Murray and the rest of the CIO leadership of the time. It was thus that the auto workers were spared the years of inter-union warfare which the electrical workers have had to fight through.

BUREAUCRATIC MIND

Why didn't the CIO leadership support these movements when they were opposition movements to established leaderships inside the Communist-controlled unions? Why, in the electrical field, did they begin to support the struggle only after they had set up the IUE as a rival to the expelled UE? Why did the AFL try to do the same thing with the International Longshoremen's Association, with the sorry results we have seen?

There is only one over-all explanation. Much as the union leadership would like to have the movement rid of Communist or racketeer control, they are very reluctant to encourage rank-and-file movements of revolt against established leaderships for any purpose. This kind of thing sets precedents and can encourage moods which they view with distaste or alarm. Rather than encourage all-out membership struggles for union democracy and union control, they seek to set up another "official leadership" to fight the old one.

Jurisdictional struggles, dangerous as they are to the interests of the workers, are a far more acceptable and familiar operation to them than democratic membership upheavals. For the fact remains: many a "clean" and "respectable" union leadership is as determined to maintain its bureaucratic hold on its union by bureaucratic means as were the Communists in their prime or as are the racketeers today.

TO SET THE STANDARD

In the Teamsters' union today, and in many others which will come under the Senate committee's spotlight in the months ahead, there are and always have been large elements of the membership and local leadership who are ready to fight, even against great odds, for militant, democratic unionism. What they need is not any governmental regulation of union affairs, with all the dangers attendant on it, but a strong, open and effective backing by the rest of the labor movement to their struggle.

The resistance against giving such backing, and hence the search for some other way (including government supervision or regulation) of throwing the racketeers out of the labor movement comes from the most conservative sections of the union leadership. As in all fights for progress in the labor movement, the lead must be taken by the most advanced, militant and democratic unions, or it will not be taken at all.

The AFL-CIO has promulgated a set of rules for ethical practices in the labor movement. It is proceeding slowly to enforce them. What is needed, side by side with these, is a set of rules for democratic procedures in the labor movement. The violation of such rules by the leadership of any union could then be cause for investigation, exposure and action by the labor movement.

It will be far more difficult to get the AFL-CIO to adopt a truly democratic set of rules than was the case with "ethical practices." That should not deter unions like the UAW and others from going on record for such rules now, and pressing the rest of the labor movement to adopt them. Such an action would begin to set a tone and a standard which could encourage and inspire militant and democratic unionists throughout the labor movement to rally to the cause of union democracy.

The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Get Acquainted!

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

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

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE

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

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

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE