

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JANUARY 7, 1957

FIVE CENTS

1956: Year Of Revolution

By GORDON HASKELL

The year 1956 will go down in history as the year in which the world movement and the empire built by Stalin began to disintegrate.

The re-election of Eisenhower in the United States, and even the British-French invasion of Egypt, will only be footnotes to the truly earth-shaking events which have been taking place in Russia and Eastern Europe.

The decay of the power of Stalinism as an ideology and a social system began, of course, long before February 1956. It began while Stalin, the dictator, was still alive, but was vastly accelerated by his death in March 1953. The struggle for the succession began to eat away at the one solid pillar which was still holding the system together: the terror and the blind obedience to the single master which was the guiding rule for all the regimes set up by Stalin and his colleagues, and for all the political movements which stood forth as their defenders and representatives throughout the world.

Once the element of uncertainty was introduced as to just who the master was, once differences of opinion were known to exist in the highest circles of the world movement in the Kremlin, the confusion and uncertainty of the ruling groups throughout Stalin's empire gave a chance to the seething discontent and the burning desire for democracy of all strata of Communist society to gain enough elbow-room in which to develop.

The 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union took place last February, just eleven months ago. Although the text of Khrushchev's famous speech of "revelations" about Stalin was not known at the time (it was a whole month before rumors about the speech began to circulate, and three months before the first full text was published), it was clear from the veiled remarks made by speakers at public sessions, and by the failure of a single leader to defend Stalin, that a major turn was at hand. An article written in LABOR ACTION while the Congress was still in session bore the heading "It's Stalin's Turn at the Guillotine." Actually, his historic image had already been drawn, quartered and thrown on the public dump by the authoritative leaders of the world Communist movement when the article was written.

For three months the leaders of the Communist Parties throughout the world were left, along with their followers, to guess uneasily at the meaning of the public speeches "downgrading" Stalin at the Congress. On June 4, the New York Times published a relatively complete text of Khrushchev's speech which was circulated throughout the world by the American government. The Communist Parties faced a global crisis like no other they had ever gone through, at least since the beginning of the '30s.

Inside Russia itself, voices were raised which sought to go beyond the conclusions drawn by Khrushchev from his speech. One foreign Communist leader after another issued statements expressing consternation at the failure of the Russian leaders to inform them of the contents of Khrushchev's speech; asking the Russian leaders "where were you" when Stalin's crimes were being committed; and even intimating that Khrushchev's revelations indicated basic flaws in the social structure of Russia.

On June 30, about a month after the text of Khrushchev's speech had been revealed to the world, the leadership of the Russian party sought to put the lid back on the boiling pot by a resolution of the Central Committee of the CPSU which set the permissible limits of interpretation on the meaning and implications of the speech. A series of delegations of leaders of various Communist Parties went to Moscow, and came back to their various countries to announce that they were "satisfied" with the "explanations" given them by the June 30 resolution and by the Russian leaders in person.

Poznan Triggered the Upheaval

But by then it was too late. On June 28 the uprising in Poznan, Poland, showed that the process which had forced the Russian leaders to seek to save themselves by blaming the past on one man, Stalin, and by turning the filler in a more "liberalized" direction, had gone beyond their ability to control it.

This process was nothing more nor less than a rising tide of rebellion against the most oppressive, totalitarian aspects of the system imposed on Russia and her satellites by their bureaucratic classes, and beyond that, of rebellion against their class rule as such. The Khrushchev leadership in Russia, Gomulka in Poland, and others in the other satellites, in all their different ways, were seeking to stem the tide by removing or promising to remove some of the most offensive and onerous aspects of the old regime. They sought to assure a rule of laws rather than of arbitrary frame-ups; to provide the safety-valve of discussion on a certain level; to permit a greater freedom of the expressions of grievance and possibility of redress against the excesses of bureaucratic arrogance and arbitrariness.

(Turn to last page)

The CP's Two Wings: What Divides Them?

... page 3

Dissecting the Theory Of the Subversive-List System

... page 6

What Happened at Kfar Kassem?

... page 2

Plekhanov's 100th Anniversary

... page 7

Eisenhower Plans Operation Overlord To Rule in Mideast

By PHILIP COBEN

On the first day of the bright new year, congressional leaders emerged from a White House conference with President Eisenhower "shaken and perturbed" . . . "with troubled faces and in silent mood" . . . "grave and anxious." They had just discussed "a presidential request of perhaps the greatest solemnity since the crisis of the Korean war . . . this new and admittedly risky policy . . . far-reaching proposals of grave implication."

Quite openly it was made clear that the proposal itself would not be put forward until "every assurance of massive congressional support" had been fixed up in advance. All of this we are told in the columns of the N. Y. Times.

The administration is getting ready to adopt a "Monroe Doctrine" for the Middle East by whose terms the United States will become the overlord of the area, policeman of the world. Eisenhower wants plenary powers from Congress "for his employment of U. S. military forces in whatever way and whenever he might deem it necessary," plus new resources in economic aid and political intervention.

The danger was declared to be "Communist aggression in the Middle East"—Russia's aim of "moving into the vacuum" created in the region by the rout of Western influence. To be sure, there can be no doubt that Moscow—where Khrushchev is telling his friends that "we are all Stalinists" when it comes to fighting "imperialism"—would be happy to move into anything it thought it could get away with. There is, however, reason to question whether the Russian danger is the only one involved.

But even this "Russian" basis for the new risky and far-reaching proposal exists only because the Western powers are still paying the bill for the assault on Egypt by Britain, France and Israel. It exists because the Western statesmen conceive of the "Russian danger" decisively in terms of military invasion such as they themselves pulled off in Suez. But since the main Russian danger is political, and since the Western capitals aid and abet this danger by their own policies, one can well ask how they propose to avert this danger by preparing to turn the Middle East into another Korea.

But it is not altogether clear that even in Eisenhower's mind the real expectation is an attack by Russian troops or airplanes. (Through the Dardanelles? via Cape Horn?) In accompanying press

stories, there are echoes of more tangible expectations.

In an article where we see "U. S. Oilmen Grim on Mideast Plans," a Times dispatch from Beirut says that Aramco's tycoons "have been worried by muttering in Arab circles about expropriating oil properties in the way that Pres. Gamal Abdel Nasser of Egypt took over the Universal Suez Canal Company."

Is this to be considered "Communist aggression" according to Washington's planned Operation Overlord?

Also, in accompanying dispatches we read not about any real fears that Russian bomber planes will appear somewhere south of the 40th Parallel, but rather that this or that government in Syria would mean that the country has "gone Communist." Would that be "Communist aggression" according to Operation Overlord?

James Reston, discussing the plan, says what Dulles is afraid of is "Communist domination . . . even of one or two countries." We found out in the case of Guatemala what Mr. Dulles considers "Communist domination" and how this gets equated with "Russian aggression." Is this the danger envisioned by Operation Overlord?

We further find in Reston's discussion that the "real danger, in the minds of many observers here [Washington], that war may break out" is over Jordan, Syria, Saudi Arabia and Iraq may try to partition that state; then Israel might try to seize part of it for herself. He asserts that the Eisenhower plan does not deal with this, but that is not at all quite certain and not altogether credible.

In short, while awaiting the heralded "Russian aggression," is Operation Overlord Washington's plan to knock everybody on the head and force them to toe the American line, with marines offshore to persuade the recalcitrant or stubborn?

Inter-Socialist Forum on Socialist Regroupment

Another inter-socialist discussion forum is scheduled in New York City for Friday, January 18, when Max Shachtman of the ISL and three other speakers will take up "Can the Left Unite? A Symposium on Socialist Regroupment."

Views will be given by Farrell Dobbs of the Socialist Workers Party, A. J.

Muste of the F.O.R., and J. T. McManus of the National Guardian in addition to Shachtman. The chairman will be Clifford McAvoy.

The subject, which has been widely discussed in many quarters, is sure to evoke a lively discussion. Place of the meeting is the Great Northern Hotel, 118 West 57 Street; contribution \$1.

The Kfar Kassem Massacre: What Really Happened There?

By AL FINDLEY

Before December 12, when David Ben-Gurion made his Knesset statement on the Kfar Kassem events, the people of Israel only knew that something terrible had taken place in the "Little Triangle" area inhabited by Israeli Arabs, near the Jordanian border, but exactly what no one knew. "The press had to speak out openly," says David Jewish Day of December 19. The censor did not permit it.

Rumors flew, and a few papers—*Al-Hamishmar* (Mapam), *Haaretz* (liberal), *Letzte Naies*, *Lebensfragen*, and others—denounced the incident as a crime and demanded that the government disclose the particulars.

The government pleaded security reasons for suppressing the facts until it was forced under public pressure to make its declaration and apology.

Flinker writes: "This silence was a mistake: such things cannot be kept quiet. The Communists from one side and Arab propagandists from the other side were not silent."

On December 12 Premier Ben-Gurion made an official declaration in the Knesset:

"The premier said that on Oct. 29, when Israel launched her attack on Egypt in the Sinai peninsula, a curfew was proclaimed in a chain of Arab villages. The curfew hours were 5 p.m. to 6 a.m. Villagers who returned from the fields after 5 p.m., unaware of the order, were shot and killed, the premier told the Knesset. The victims included men, women and children." (N. Y. Times, Dec. 13.)

Forty-eight Arabs had been killed, according to this report. The curfew, said the premier, had been imposed "to protect the lives of villagers."

The government had appointed an investigating commission, which recommended that the guilty be punished and compensation paid to these families ranging from \$555 to \$2775. The premier expressed his profound regrets, said that no compensation could make sufficient restitution for the crimes, declared that these and other Arab citizens are equal in Israel, and expressed his "profound concern that such an act was possible." The Knesset stood in solemn expression of public contrition for the act.

A demand by the Arab CP deputy Tufik Tubi for a full discussion of the event was not recognized.

Flinker writes that this, however, does not end the matter. The General Zionists (bourgeois conservative party) are demanding a parliamentary inquiry, and some political parties are calling for a public trial of the guilty.

DEMAND MORE DETAILS

Despite the N. Y. Times report of the 48 figure for the number killed, Flinker writes, "It is to be regretted that he [Ben-Gurion] did not report how many people were killed and how many were wounded." The dispatch to the N. Y. Herald Tribune by Monica Elston also said that "the prime minister's statement has not entirely satisfied the Israelis... in that no figures on the number of dead have been released for publication."

Flinker also refers to "villages" in the plural. A statement of the Israeli *Ichud* on Nov. 15 referred to "the events in the Arab villages of Kfar Kassem, Wadi Ara and other places."

Flinker concludes that the CP "will still have the opportunity (as a result of lack of official details) to exploit the Kassem tragedy for their own purposes." *Haaretz* of Dec. 19, in reporting the premier's Knesset statement, likewise notes the vagueness of the official report.

A pious hope is expressed by Flinker that in the near future there will be a trial of the guilty and that the Israel government will show it does not discriminate between Jew and non-Jew.

Within Israel itself, last month, strong condemnation came from the Jewish Labor Bund's monthly *Lebensfragen*: "It is clear from all reports that we are dealing here literally with a pogrom which the National Guard carried out against in-

nocent Arabs. It is important to emphasize that this happened not in the area of war operations, but not far from Petach-Tikvah (the oldest Jewish colony in old Palestine). Who could ever imagine that we would have Jewish pogromists—and in a Jewish State? What a shame, what moral degradation and decline for Jews."

The only detailed report of the event reaching this country is in a printed broadside issued by M. Stein's "Third Force" group in Israel. This broadside was plastered on the walls through Israel and, according to Stein, is the only published account; no paper, not even the Stalinist papers, gave the details.

The following is what the broadside says.

The crime was committed in the three Arab villages Tira, Taiba and Kfar Kassem. Kfar Kassem is the largest with a population of 2500 Arabs, workers in the neighboring stone quarries and orange groves. All the Israeli newspapers describe the villagers as quiet, peaceful and loyal to Israel. Kfar Kassem even has a branch of Mapai (the government party led by Ben-Gurion). Although these Arabs did not leave Israel during the 1948 flight, they are, like most other Israeli Arabs, treated as security risks and have been under a military administration for the last 8½ years. They cannot move without a permit from their localities even in case of emergency and they must live under a curfew.

The broadside relates the events of October 29 as follows.

ONE ACCOUNT

"An officer and two men of the Security Guard (border police) arrived in Tira in a jeep with two tanks following. The officer called the first Arab he met and gave him an order to tell all the other inhabitants of the village that the old curfew (under which the Arabs had lived for years) had been changed from 11 p.m. to 5 p.m. Whoever would be met on the streets after 5 p.m. would be shot.

"The officer looked at his watch and said: 'It is now 15 minutes before 5 o'clock.' When the Arab asked him how he could possibly inform all inhabitants of Tira of the change in 15 minutes, the officer said: 'Shut your mouth.'

"The order went into force. An old guard, named Namar Abd Il Mag'id, aged 70, who was too weak to run home and came a little late, was shot by the Guards and fell wounded. He cried out: 'I am an inhabitant of Tira. Here is my identification card.' Two of the security police came closer and shot him dead.

"In Taiba the new curfew was proclaimed in the same manner as in Tira. There were no loudspeakers and no posters.

"A boy of 11 went into the street and was captured by three security policemen. Two were of the opinion that since he was a child he should be spared, but the third insisted on execution and killed him in cold blood.

"The worst massacre occurred in Kfar Kassem (the largest village). There the curfew was proclaimed an hour earlier than in the other villages.

"The Mukhtar of Kassem informed as many villagers as he could of the change of the curfew, but many were away working too far from the village to be informed. Two military posts were stationed in the village; one near the Home of the Aged, near Rosh Ha'Ain. Many workers returned from their work on bicycles through this route. Every single one of them was massacred without warning. Some were killed in groups as they came from the fields.

"A second military unit was stationed near the school, where all the roads of the village cross. A truck with about 15 Arab men and women, who were work-

ing in the orange groves, approached the post. The driver, Abu Chilmy from Taiba, was grabbed by the security policemen by his neck and shot in the head several times. The women in the truck began to scream and fire was opened on them, too. Seven fell dead instantly. The others began to cry for mercy.

"The officer stopped the firing and got in touch with some superiors over his transmitter. After about 10 minutes talk, the officer gave the order to shoot the rest of the women. One woman, not a resident of Kfar Kassem, held her 2-months-old baby in her arms when she and the baby were shot.

"When the Mukhtar informed the inhabitants of the change of curfew, some children from the village ran to warn their parents who were working in the fields. When they returned they were shot with their parents in groups of five and ten. Those who were wounded were shot again until they were dead. Thus, among the dead were school children aged 8-10 who had gone to warn their parents.

"Altogether there were 49 dead and 13 wounded in Kfar Kassem alone on that day."

HOW WAS IT POSSIBLE?

This is the story as it was published in the "Third Force" broadside. Because of the government censor's blackout, there is no other available version of the appalling event, to confirm this one, or modify it, or correct it, or add to it.

The Kfar Kassem episode is not the only tragic occurrence. Norman Thomas in a letter to the N. Y. Times writes that "apparently reliable reports tell not only

of the massacre of Arabs for which Ben-Gurion publicly apologized, but for at least three other massacres in the Gaza-Sinai area of which little or nothing has been said by our press.

"The *Jerusalem Post*, edited by Gershon Agron, mayor of Jerusalem, moreover, reports the deportation of some 700 Arabs on Nov. 3 from the demilitarized zone on the Syrian border. There are, in other words, two sides to the stories of offenses against civilians."

The outrage in Israel raises, as Ben-Gurion suggests, the question how such an act was possible. It is true that war gives opportunities for cruelty, but only for cruelties and barbarisms that are a logical extension of the tendencies that exist in the social and political life of the country. The above outrages spring directly from the military rule over the Arabs in Israel. A major re-evaluation of this system is in order, even though it was only last March that a special Knesset committee reaffirmed the government policy of keeping 80-85 per cent of the Arab minority under military administration.

The outrage is understandable only as a result of the segregation, the fear, the mistrust, the hatred and second-class citizenship in which the Arab minority in Israel has been kept for the last 8½ years. Anyone interested in the prevention of such barbarities has to reconsider the entire treatment of Arabs in Israel.

One of the complaints of the Arabs in Israel is that individual crimes by Jews against Arabs in Israel have been leniently treated and that the criminals got off with minor penalties. The governments' course in not publicizing the names of the guilty in this crime can only lead to doubt that any real justice will be meted out. A secret army trial and punishment will not satisfy the demands of justice.

All participants should receive a public and open trial so that the people will be able to judge their guilt and see that justice is done. A further demand by the *Ichud* is that the government "not be aged 70, who was too weak to run home officers, but charge all those responsible notwithstanding rank or position."

No Boom Year Ahead For the Auto Economy

By JACK WILSON

Detroit, Dec. 30

One of the big difficulties in understanding either cars or the industry that builds them is the fact that auto manufacturers spent over \$300,000,000 for advertising yearly, and this expenditure has a blinding effect on editors and journalists. Biting the hand that feeds it is not an outstanding characteristic of the American press.

Furthermore, as the press has learned, the auto industry likes to be taken seriously, and its leaders expect all the attention that comes with success, American style. Increasingly, as a result, the pronouncements of the auto tycoons assume the halo of the gospel truth, especially in the field of economic prognostication.

Harlow Curtice, General Motors president, says that car sales in 1957 will increase from the 1956 figure of about 6 million to at least 6½ million and perhaps 7 million. A press that has been wined, dined, and made fat by GM advertising, gives it page-one play. Henry Ford II does almost as well, while L. L. Colbert of Chrysler comes in a poor third, as befitting the smallest of the Big Three.

In November and December of this year, the auto industry went through this routine again: predictions of great prospects, razzle-dazzle advertising, and a premiere for the 1957 models that made Hollywood's shows strictly carnival stuff. The auto show cost \$11,000,000, more money than "Gone With The Wind" made in its first 20 years.

It just wasn't news to newspapers that each week in the last six the auto industry was building 25,000 more cars than it was selling, in spite of the fantastic publicity and claims for the 1957 models. Nor does it seem like news that new car inventories have climbed to the 500,000 mark by January 1, 1957.

The facts of life, however, can not be long ignored, and the publication of a sober report by *Ward's Automotive Reports* this week broke the news on the real story of the auto industry. Since this service goes mainly to dealers, manufacturers, etc., it usually contains more than the one-sided picture contained in such publications as *Time* magazine.

"Auto manufacturers are encountering buyer resistance on the 1957 passenger cars," *Ward's* declares. "Overtime is being cut out—and in many plants overtime has been used to keep from rehiring the full work force of 1956, mainly to eliminate the costs of a second shift. Small cutbacks in January production schedules are expected in most if not all auto plants.

"To be remembered is the fact that downward adjustments thus far have been slight. The props have by no means been knocked from under improvement in the 1957 auto market over 1956, but some of the tremendous optimism may now have been sprinkled with necessary realism."

Giving the devil his due, and assuming that there is no further decrease in auto production, and that it does total 6,500,000 in 1957, just what does this mean to the auto workers?

More than 100,000 of them who never saw the inside of a plant for more than 3 months in 1956 are frozen out completely in 1957. Another 500,000 were unemployed for about two months during the major model change-overs. Michigan had a major unemployment problem that is by no means solved.

For 1957 the prospect is just as unhappy. The car industry can easily build 6½ million cars with its present reduced manpower.

Since very few major changes are expected in the auto for 1958, next fall those who are working will not obtain

(Continued on page 4)

The Fight Over the Draft Program:

THE CP'S TWO WINGS: WHAT DIVIDES THEM?

By H. W. BENSON

As the American Communist Party has wrestled with the impact of the 20th Congress, socialists have watched with interest and concern. Out of the first stage of debate came the Draft Program which became the focus of discussion as the February party convention approached.

It was obvious at the outset that it proposed sweeping tactical changes and viewed the party's recent past with a critical eye. But was it the beginning of a genuine change or was it a camouflage and cover for a continuation of the fundamental line of old?

When the program appeared, that question seemed hanging in mid-air; the socialist and labor public was accustomed to abrupt 180-degree turns in line which left things basically unchanged; they were scornful, too, of fake "discussions" that became nothing more than breast-beating, scape-goat-hunting sessions.

It soon became clear that the National Committee majority which had adopted the Draft Program was divided into at least two sharply divergent tendencies, each of which had voted for the same resolution but for vastly different aims. Since the program was an umbrella covering opposing policies, it could serve only as the starting point for debate; it became a convenient vehicle for raising the key questions, but it could not settle them.

If it quickly became evident that this was a real discussion, in every sense of the word, it was because one wing of the party seriously tried to face up to the party crisis. It saw the Draft Program as a spring board for a new attitude and a new movement; it maintained that the party would founder unless it became democratic—democratic in its inner regime and democratic in its conception of socialism; that it had to be genuinely based upon the interests of the working class and to reject the role of blind apologist.

A BEGINNING

It was this group that turned the discussion into a genuine one.

John Gates, editor of the *Daily Worker*, in "Time for a Change" (*Political Affairs*, November) called for a real turn: "This tragic situation cannot be cured by a few patches here and there as we have been doing for many years. It can only be solved by drastic and basic changes."

He rejected "uncritical acceptance of

Soviet mistakes." He pointed out that "the expansion of democracy is not automatic under socialism but must be fought for." He insisted upon inner-party democracy and "the right of dissent after policy has been adopted and while it is being carried out."

Gates is only one among many. They have only made a beginning but it is a serious beginning by people who know that trivialities and clever maneuvers are futile and that without a drastic reorientation they are doomed in the United States.

It was no accident that those who rose to the occasion centered around the *Daily Worker*. Here were the party's public propagandists, the men who faced the non-party public.

They sensed the mood of progressives and union militants who had become suspicious of the party and were deserting it after the 20th Congress. They were eager to drive the lessons home to the party and induce it to make a real turn.

But there are others—others for whom the draft program was not the beginning of a new era but a subtle maneuveristic device, with unruffled equanimity, they were willing to admit a multitude of errors—in the past—so long as they were not required to make a real turn in the future. They imagined that by repudiating the "crimes of Stalin" in his "later years" they could be absolved from the duty of drawing up a real balance-sheet.

They hoped to go on fundamentally as before, with new apologetics and cliches for the old. The working-class public, they hoped, would forgive or at least forget. They sought a "new look" but the old substance; old wine in new bottles.

THE SKILLED BUREAUCRAT

No one better represents this redecorated, wall-papered conservative wing than Eugene Dennis.

For a fleeting moment after the 20th Congress, it seemed as though the Khrushchev regime might tolerate, even encourage, a critical attitude by foreign Communist Parties toward limited aspects of Russian policy. The bureaucrat, skilled in the arts and crafts of old-line Stalinism, cultivated a sixth sense that enabled him to anticipate in advance what his higher-ups would appreciate. The successful Stalinist flunkey was one who required not direct orders but only subtle hints. Perhaps Eugene Dennis suspected that his new mentors might welcome a certain line of inquiry. At any rate, he wrote a rather mild note to *Pravda* suggesting that the rise of the "cult" of Stalin needed a deep Marxist explanation.

(Leave aside the pitiful mood of such a query: the most urgent demand put to those who shared power with Stalin is that they think up a cogent explanation for crimes they once concealed. It is as though a murderer's accomplice were called to task, not for killing, but for failing to lecture on the social causes of crime.)

Under the pressure of labor, liberal, socialist, and now Communist public opinion, Dennis mentioned the execution in the USSR of Jewish cultural leaders and the suppression of the Jewish language. *Pravda* reprinted his missive in full, with one deletion; it deliberately cut out all his references to the destruction of Jewish rights!

Months pass. Dennis defers, submissively and politely, to this disgraceful censorship and refuses to raise his voice.

Here is a man, then, who is ready upon command to call out stridently against murder, frame-ups, terror, and tyranny... for the past and upon orders from above. But in his breast stirs not the meagerest hint of audacity, not enough to protest against a mean act of censorship and suppression of the truth. Who will now take him seriously if he begins to speak of "independence"?

OPENED A PATH

A short history of the Dennis line is preserved in the *Daily Worker* for December 4. Joe Clark proves in pitiless detail that he never dared to utter a criticism until it came through Russian channels first: "Dennis evidently does not object to the *Daily Worker* criticizing anything said or done by Soviet Communists but only after the Soviet Communists have themselves made such criticism." With perfect accuracy Clark summarizes Dennis: "Dennis... assigns to the Soviet armed forces in Hungary the role which Marx considered fell to the working class."

Yet Dennis and Clark and Gates all support the Draft Program; it is hardly enough to clarify the party line-up. The real line of division lies elsewhere.

While Dennis voted for the Draft, it soon became obvious that he had far more in common with William Z. Foster, party chairman. For one passing, hesitating moment, Foster reluctantly voted for the Draft Program but after rapid calculation changed his mind and his vote. He is against—and properly so from his basically Stalinist point of view.

The Draft is heavily laden with old baggage. But there is little point to a microscopic word-by-word dissection of its political line. Apart from its exact contents it cleared the way for a searching criticism of the party line; it legitimized not only a consideration of secondary tactics and slogans but a new look at some of the most sacred party dogmas.

It opened a path for those who wanted fundamental changes; in particular, for a change in the relation between the party and the regime in the USSR.

That is exactly what those who hang on to the past cannot tolerate. They want not a real discussion but only the appearance of one.

They tolerate a genuine discussion with distaste and, doubtless, would suppress it if they could by bureaucratic machine methods. But since that is not possible in the present atmosphere, they try to smother it with other methods.

BEHIND THE DIVISION

Not every supporter of the Draft Program wants a fundamental break with Stalinism; but its opponents, open and not so open, rally round a still-Stalinist line, in politics and in method. The un-questioned leader and organizer of this tendency is Foster, an unreconstructed holdover from the Stalin era whose politics have not budged an inch despite routine disavowals of "Stalin's crimes" especially in "his later years."

The discussion takes place around the Draft, with amendments, supplements, addenda, and what not. But all this serves only as a convenient rallying ground for the battle between the two main tendencies and as a temporary shelter for those who vacillate between them. Convention action on the Draft cannot end the discussion; it only opens a new phase.

Those who have nothing better to do spend their time picking out "revisionist" flaws and "opportunist" deviations in it. In the end, they know no more about the depths of the divisions between the two main tendencies than they did at the beginning. To understand the real scope of the fight in the party, it is essential to turn not to the text of the

Draft Program but to the course of the discussion as a whole.

One group in the party takes form and looks for leadership to men like Gates and Steve Nelson. It is a distinctive tendency; that is, it leans in a certain direction. It is not of one mind on every question; its views are not consistently or fully developed; it has a distance to travel; but its direction is already marked out: toward democratic socialism. On the other side, a truly Stalinist wing clusters around Foster.

Democratic socialism or Stalinism: these are the two main poles. The party must ultimately choose between them. That and nothing less is at stake.

"RIGHT" AND "LEFT"

Foster denounces his opponents as "revisionists" when they propose to revise his monstrosities in the field of party policy. He accuses them, too, of representing a "right" wing.

Who is "right" and who is "left?" One can get lost wandering around the points of the political compass; but such direction signs give a rule-of-thumb guide to tendencies in the labor and socialist movement.

If we could find "pure" examples of right and left tendencies, (as we never can in practice) they would be distinguished approximately as follows: A Marxist "left" wing is one which leans toward the independence of the working class and for its establishment as a class organized in its own interests. A "right" wing leans just in the opposite direction, toward the subordination of the independent working-class or socialist movement to other social groupings or their representatives.

In the multitude of questions up for debate, a flood of tactical and strategic divergencies relate to the "American question." Foster has ample scope for his talents. Yet, despite grotesque contortions and outright distortions, no one of the Foster-Dennis camp has been able to demonstrate, or even seriously suggest, that their line represents the policy of independence in American politics, as against critics who propose to capitulate to it. In any case, party history refutes any such claim; no line of demarcation has appeared here.

CLASS ROOTS

But what does separate the two sides—clearly, unmistakably and admittedly—is their respective attitudes toward the USSR; and differing conceptions of the relationship of the party to it. Foster and Dennis are united in a determination to subordinate the movement in practice. Gates, Nelson, and the *Daily Worker* group, on the other hand, despite the vacillations of their politics, call for an attitude of critical independence from the USSR, and demand an end to serving as blind apologist for it.

Not that they follow out the full implications of their position. Ironically, both they and Foster insist in common that Russia is "socialist"; but the difference in tendency is there nonetheless.

The Gates wing moves toward independence; in that sense, compared to its rivals it is the "left" wing in this dispute.

However, the terms "right" and "left" can be misleading. It would be more accurate to say that the democratic socialist tendency is the working-class wing of the CP, while the Foster group is the "Russian" wing. Their incompatibility arises not simply from differences of opinion but from class roots: the former is groping for real roots in the American working class, while the latter is bound firmly to the bureaucracy of the Russian state.

NEW YORK
LABOR ACTION FORUM

Thursday, Jan. 10

**THE LIFE OF
A TRADE UNION**

A report on the Printers Union—functioning, union democracy, problems and issues, etc.

8:30 p.m. at L. A. Hall, 114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

Note that there will be no Labor Action Forum on Thursday, Jan. 17 because of the inter-socialist forum scheduled for Jan. 18—for which see announcement on page 1.

**STALINIST
RUSSIA**

A
**MARXIST
ANALYSIS**

By Tony Cliff

\$2.00

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

PRO & CON: DISCUSSION

Israel: 'Basically Defensive' Position?

To the Editor:

While I agree with most of what Hal Draper said about the Israeli attack on Egypt [LA, Nov. 12], I believe that he missed many important points, and in so doing gave a wrong quality to the discussion of this sector of the war.

Among the factors that a socialist must take into account are the following. (1) Both Israel and Egypt are in the present circumstances being used by rival imperialisms: Israel by the British and French, Egypt by Russia primarily, and now to some extent by the U. S. This is a classic example of divide-and-conquer.

(2) Israel's position is basically a defensive one. The main aim and object of the Israel government is to legitimize its armistice borders, which are larger than its UN-partition borders. This accounts for the fact that no Israel government made formal claim either to Gaza or Sinai, that even Beigin of Herut did not claim Sinai. The Israel government attempted to use both the Gaza and Sinai conquests to force a favorable (to them) peace by using these as bargaining points.

(3) The basic defensive position of Israel does not mean that any and all actions taken to defend it are wise or progressive. They can be stupid, reactionary and, above all else, self-defeating, leading not to defense of Israel but to its destruction. The attack on Egypt is in the latter category.

(4) Ben-Gurion foolishly allowed himself to be provoked by Arab deeds and lured by the French imperialist siren into an imperialist adventure of pulling French chestnuts out of the fire. Only France had nothing to lose. As events turned out, the only winner was Russia. Ben-Gurion was shedding Israeli blood for foreign imperialists.

(5) For the Arab rulers the fight against Israel was a continuation of the war of 1948. In that war we defended

Israel's right to self-determination.

(6) Nasser engaged in a self-defeating policy vis-a-vis Israel. Not only is it wrong to continue at war with Israel, call for its annihilation, but it is harmful to the Arab national interest and their just struggle against imperialism and colonialism.

Here is a small state engaged in a struggle against the British and French: Instead of mending his fences in his own backyard, the Near East; instead of making peace with Israel and, in exchange for its support in the Suez struggle, allowing its ships to go through the canal (*Al-Hamishmar* reported such a rumor—an obvious trial balloon on its part in the hope of getting such a deal) Nasser relies on an outside imperialist force to give him victory in Suez—i.e., Russia.

He continues the old policy of antagonism, border raids and new pacts of encirclement. The result: Israel is driven into the hands of Nasser's enemy.

The conclusion: Arab nationalism needs Israel for its own selfish interests as much as the Jews need the Arabs for their own interests.

(7) Draper pointed out that Israel was acting in its "own interests." He still refers to it as a "catspaw." There is a danger that the reader will conclude, with the Stalinists and Cannonites, that Israel is a "tool of imperialism," that her interests are tied in with imperialism.

The opposite is exactly true. Of all Levantine states, Israel is the only state to come into existence as a result of an armed struggle against imperialism. The Arab states Lebanon and Jordan are creations of imperialism. Syria, Iraq, Egypt, Saudi Arabia were given their independence by a combination of imperialist intrigue and popular struggle.

It is to Israel's interest to have free and independent Arab states with no ties to imperialism. Israeli politicians

believe that Israel can compete on an equal footing with such states. She cannot compete with Arab states backed by oil-inspired imperialist support. Unification of Arab states is another matter. For Israel, freedom of the present Arab states from imperialism is desirable. Israel hailed the expulsion of Glubb Pasha from Jordan. Nasser received a sympa-

thetic reception in Israel when he first came to power as the "Kemal Pasha" of Egypt.

Nasser and the Arab nationalists could have aroused the anti-British sentiment of the Israelis in their just struggle. Instead he created an enemy where a friend could be.

Neither Israel nor the Arab states will be free of dependence on foreign powers until they realize that only by settling their regional differences can they turn their faces to fight the outside enemy whether England, France, U. S. or Russia. Peace now is a prerequisite for success in Suez.

AL FINDLEY

December 24, 1956

REPLY

No Apologias for Israeli Regime's Policy

If I understand what he is saying, Comrade Findley is putting forward a political view, that Israel's position in the recent fracas was "basically defensive," together with some observations which tend to take a more sympathetic attitude toward the Israel government's adventure than we found it possible to take in LA. It would therefore not be enlightening to discuss it under the head of "missed" points or some "wrong quality" in the discussion.

LA cannot agree with his formulation about the "basically defensive" nature of the Israel government's position in the attack on Egypt.

(1) In the first place, there is naturally a question of exactly what this formulation means politically. If the Israel government's position is "basically defensive," then why not give it at least critical support? As I understand it, Findley gives no kind of support to the Israeli adventure in Egypt; though he does not take the chance to mention this in his letter. But he does call it "stupid, reactionary... self-defeating."

This combination of adjectives has a certain element of ambiguity. "Our side" in a war can act stupidly; hence we give it critical support. "Our side" in a war can even act self-defeatingly, because of mistakes; hence our support is critical support. "Our side" in a war can even take reactionary measures in the course of a conflict which as a whole is politically worthy of our basic support; hence we might refuse political support to a regime which is carrying on a conflict that is "basically defensive" and to which we have to give military support (Spanish civil war, for example).

If a government which is in a "basically (or historically) defensive" position in a war conflict takes an action which is not "wise," because it "foolishly allows itself to be provoked" by the enemy who is in a basically aggressive position, then this describes one kind of political analysis. Is this an accurate description of the situation in which Israel attacked Egypt? No, we don't think it is.

The ambiguity is heightened by Findley's point 5. Was this recent conflict "a continuation of the war of 1948?" But if it was correct to support Israel in that war, and this is a continuation, why not support Israel now too? Or is it a continuation only "for the Arab rulers"? In that case, what is it for Israel's rulers?

(2) But is Israel's position "basically defensive" in this conflict?

In his point 2, Findley seeks to deny that the Ben-Gurion regime has any expansionist ambitions. This is in flagrant contradiction with the publicly stated intention of the regime to hold on to the Sinai peninsula, until U. S. and UN pressure forced a reluctant reversal; even Zionist writers have openly discussed just what means the U. S. used to twist Ben-Gurion's arm.

It is not just a question of particular statements about Sinai (though even here Findley, I think, obscured the point through phrases like "formal claim" and "main aim").

In the background is the fact that the basic and historical aim of the Zionist state, for Israel's leaders, is precisely to "reclaim" not only the Israel of its present semi-accidental boundaries, but all of *Eretz Israel*, historic Palestine, which would require in the first place the swallowing up of Jordan. This is only one reason why the "basically defensive" formulation is incorrectly one-

sided. The reactionary Arab leaders are not the only ones who look forward to eliminating rival states in the area, while denying it.

(3) Or is the position "basically defensive" because of the Arab border provocations? I am disappointed in Findley's willingness to use such a misleading reference as in his point 4.

The "fedayeen" attacks did not begin till 1955. What happened for seven years before that? In the main the border raids in the post-1948 period came privately from the Palestine refugees who had been pushed across or kept across the border by the Israel government, and not from Arab government machinations. The 1953 Kibya massacre organized by Israeli troops was in answer to such harassment; followed by Khan Yuniss, etc. It was Israel which kept raising the ante in the border provocations. The "fedayeen" raids began in 1955 as a reactionary answer to reactionary policies. Before that, the Arab states were guilty of less provocative acts, but guilty also.

Both sides have their whitewashers in this dirty business (cf. Alfred Lilienthal for Cairo, for example), but Findley is not one of these. How can he write his letter as he does?

(4) Israel's policy is not and has not been anti-imperialist. Its UN votes on colonial questions have consistently been determined by its own narrow state considerations, not by anti-colonialism. It voted with the colonialists against discussing Algeria; it abstained on Cyprus; it voted for discussing Morocco. In each case the motivations were neither anti-colonial nor pro-colonial as such.

Findley's two pieces of evidence for Israeli "anti-imperialism" are strange. In point of fact, Israel hailed the ouster of Glubb because it got rid of the Arabs' only capable military organizer. It was sympathetic to Nasser only as long as it thought he was going to be absorbed with domestic reform. Again, such wild evidence for "anti-imperialism" can only give the impression that Comrade Findley leans toward whitewashing the Israel regime's position, and this does not do him justice.

The present Arab-Israel conflict is not simply a continuation of the 1948 war; any more than the 1948 war itself was simply a continuation of the preceding historical period (up to 1945) of Zionist's reactionary policy in seeking to take Palestine away from the Arabs under the umbrella of British imperialism. It must be analyzed concretely.

For Israel, the shameful attack of October 29 flowed as a continuation of its own reactionary policies, and should be given no kind of support or condonement whatsoever.

We should never get tired of repeating that it is the reactionary policies of the regime in Israel which threaten to make Israel a death-trap for the Jews, and a new act in the Jewish tragedy. Ben-Gurion is leading Israel's people on a road all of *eretz Israel*, historic Palestine, to ruin.

HAL DRAPER

LABOR ACTION • 17th YEAR

January 7, 1957 Vol. 21, No. 1

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

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

No Boom for Auto —

(Continued from page 2)

the overtime they got this November and December, while the 100,000 seniority workers who are out completely simply get lost as a statistic in the auto field.

For a more cheerful over-all outlook, we recommend the Dec. 30 issue of *Time* magazine. Readers of LABOR ACTION may recall what a rough year auto workers had in Michigan in 1956, until the new model production schedules gave the older seniority workers a break. Here is how *Time* saw 1956:

"Listening to the nation's strong, steady heartbeat, many businessmen and economists bravely stated that the U. S. has reached a new economic plateau, can eliminate the boom and bust cycle by the wise use of credit and the help of such built-in safeguards as social security, unemployment benefits, and the 'guaranteed annual wage.' In 1956, Michigan gave a heartening example of how these recession cushions work. When Detroit's automakers skimped on their model changes, brought out only face-lifted 1956 cars after 1955's record year, sales plummeted 20 per cent to 5,900,000 cars. As companies slashed production, unemployment in Michigan skyrocketed to 259,000, one out of every ten. And yet retail buying did not fall off. Searching for a reason, economists noted the auto industry's high pay levels (average weekly wage \$108.94) which permitted savings for just such a rainy day, and state unemployment compensation and the auto industry's guaranteed annual wage, which together made up a big chunk of the workers' full time pay. They could have added a fourth reason: a firm belief by Michiganders in the basic good health of the economy and the temporary nature of the layoffs. This persuaded workers to go on buying, and retailers to extend credit. As a result, many Michigan retailers sold as much as—or more than—they did in 1955."

Almost every statement in that paragraph is a half-truth or otherwise mis-

leading. Take the figure of the \$108.94 average weekly wage.

Due to the tremendous model changes, the skilled workers have been employed fantastic hours, and they averaged around \$10,000 this past year. Assembly-line workers, however, averaged a little over \$4000 gross pay. If you average four assembly-line workers with one skilled worker, you get an average wage of over \$100 a week, but this is misleading.

Since the GAW funds were small and credits not build up, payments on this score were for only brief periods, and did not reach the 100,000 who were laid off early in 1956 before the GAW went into effect.

As for retail credit: it is absolutely true that people continued to buy on credit, even though unemployed; they had no choice since they were paying on cars, homes, etc. The Credit Unions refinanced thousands of loans. Now the headache is about to come.

Even this over-all picture doesn't portray the painful costs of living in this so-called period of prosperity. What about the plants which shut down permanently, and put 54,000 seniority workers out in the streets with little hope of jobs because of their age? Where does that come in the statistics?

Nor does it show the continued process of new plants opening, old plants shutting down, and consequent lay-offs, a process that is evident now and will accelerate in 1957.

Nor does this show the steady erosion of employment as automation continues to gain.

In a word, there will be little peace and quiet in the auto industry in 1957 for its workers.

Nor does anyone, even the most optimistic spokesman, claim that the auto industry will push the American economy forward. Rather, the economy in 1957 is supposed to sustain the industry. And that is another question.

Gideonse Administration Meets Mounting Student Anger:

'Big Brother' at Brooklyn College

By J. S.

The long period of extreme apathy among students at Brooklyn College may finally be coming to an end. This semester a series of acts on the part of the Gideonse administration have aroused widespread resentment in the student body and led to some actions by the students to express their feelings about the repressive authoritarian atmosphere at the school.

The administration's actions have included the expulsion from school of a student who has long been a sharp critic of the undemocratic student government at Brooklyn, the censorship of the school literary magazine, threats against the student newspaper Kingsman, and a series of annoying, bureaucratic acts in regard to eating arrangements in the school cafeteria and enforcement of the no-smoking regulations.

At the heart of all of these problems lies the absence of genuine student government at Brooklyn College. The students resent administration control of matters which should be under the jurisdiction of a student council, or in some cases, of evenly-balanced student-faculty committees. In this lies the nub of the situation, for there is no student council at this school.

Instead there exists a farcical "club government" system, which does not even fairly represent the members of the various clubs. In addition, student votes do not count on the so-called "faculty-student committees" which do exist.

The case is not simply that insufficient power resides in the student government: the students not only have no control over their affairs; they lack any democratic institutions through which they can even express themselves.

"BIG SISTERS"

Student discontent was first aroused this term by two administrative actions: changes introduced into the cafeteria and the no-smoking campaign.

The administration, through some unknown inspiration, since it had no way of knowing what the students desired and never consulted them, replaced the large tables which the cafeteria has contained for many years with new smaller ones. This significantly reduced the seating capacity of the already pitifully inadequate cafeteria.

This was no problem to the administration, however. Newly hired cafeteria personnel, entitled "hostesses" but sarcastically referred to by the students as "Big Sisters," were instructed to chase students out of the cafeteria the moment they had swallowed their last morsels of food.

These hostesses, moreover, have been appointed to be the guardians of the

manners and morals of Brooklyn College students while they are engaged in eating their lunches in the cafeteria. They go around telling students to stop dawdling over their food, to eliminate the "horseplay" which students frequently engage in during their lunch hours, and in general act to "preserve decorum."

This "hostess" innovation is regarded by the students as annoying harassment, especially when it has been coupled with the rush-rush atmosphere now existing in the cafeteria. In view of the inadequate lounges contained by the school, the cafeteria has been used in the past as a place for socializing, spending time between classes, etc.

The students feel that the latest cafeteria innovations are the actions of an administration which is petty and bureaucratic, and which has the attitude that it knows what is best for the students, that there is no need to consult them.

A majority of the students might well have preferred the old cafeteria system, even if the tables did not look as nice, in view of the advantages it presented. Naturally, they were not asked their opinions, given this administration at Brooklyn College and the atmosphere it creates.

The current cafeteria regulations add to the general repressive atmosphere at the school, one reminiscent of a barracks, not of a democratic college campus.

BARRACKS ATMOSPHERE

Simultaneously, the administration began to utilize a new series of techniques for enforcing the no-smoking regulations, clamping down on students who smoked in the hallways between classes.

Restriction of smoking is of course a legitimate concern of all members of the college community. Many students wish to smoke; others are annoyed by it; in some places it is a hazard. Under reasonably democratic conditions, the students, faculty and administration could have worked out a solution to the problem.

At Brooklyn, however, Dean of Student Life Coulton decided that the college was going to enforce the regulations exactly as they now exist, and enforce them, moreover, by the constant repetition over the college public-address system of admonitions against smoking.

Thus it is that every hour, between classes, the public-address system blares out in thundering tones obnoxiously

worded warnings against smoking. The announcements by "Big Brother" — as Brooklyn students have dubbed the announcer — are extremely annoying and irritating. They add to the "barracks" atmosphere at the school.

DER FUROR

These two situations combined to produce widespread antagonism by the students. A group of students anonymously issued a mimeographed newspaper called "Mein Kampus," whose aim was to satirize life at Brooklyn College.

"Mein Kampus" called itself the organ of the "National Student Authoritarian Party" and poked fun at the latest actions of the administration by claiming that they did not go far enough. The following is a sample of the technique used, taken from its first issue:

"Students in Brooklyn College have been violating the laws of DECENCY and MORALITY. They have been SMOKING in the corridors. They have been DAWDLING over cups of coffee. They have been FRATERNIZING in the cafeteria.

"In spite of the corrective efforts of the MINISTRY of STUDENT LIFE and DEATH, these insulting abuses are continuing.

"The administration has taken stern measures. But they have not gone far enough.

"We cannot tolerate DEMOCRATIC FILTH on campus. The administration must be more active in stamping out the vestiges of HUMANISTIC DECAY."

The above is silly, perhaps, but was effective in portraying the atmosphere at BC. "Mein Kampus" created a big stir at Brooklyn, being avidly read and widely appreciated by the students. For the students realize that these two cases of administration repression are only petty manifestations of the over-all reality of life at Brooklyn College.

The "Mein Kampus" campaign was to be climaxed with a protest student boycott of the cafeteria. The boycott leaflet announced: "Protest administration rule of student affairs. Fight for student rights and student government": a fine summary of what is needed at BC.

Due to lack of organization, the boycott was unsuccessful. But the entire campaign had a general stimulating effect on the student body, so much so that more effective action may be taken over the more recent developments which have taken place just before the current Christmas vacation.

"DON'T BE SORDID"

Two of these concern the student literary magazine Landscapes and the school's only student newspaper, Kingsman.

When Landscapes was published last semester, Spring 1956, it contained two humorous cartoons which offended the ever-vigilant Dean Coulton. These cartoons were not obscene. Nevertheless the dean simply impounded the entire issue of the magazine and refused to allow its sale on campus. He was kind enough, however, to allow the magazine to be reprinted without the two cartoons and at student expense.

This term the dean and President Gideonse announced that, as a result of last term's events, and since in their opinion one of the stories was offensive to Catholics as a result of its portrayal of a priest, the dean would read and censor all copy submitted for this issue.

Following his perusal of the material, the dean ordered publication held up. He objected to the "tone" of the material, although there is apparently nothing obscene, scandalous or otherwise subversive in it. The dean explained that the "tone" indicated that "the students were greatly interested in disease, sex and sordid matters."

In short, the good dean has set himself up as a literary critic, but with certain powers usually denied the normal run-of-the-mill critic—the power to prevent publication.

The dean is clearly an opponent of realism in literature. What is needed in his opinion is a magazine chock-full of stories that portray the grandeur of Brooklyn College in this best of all possible worlds. To the unconvinced it might seem that the reasonable solution is for the dean to publish his own literary magazine and to let the foolish, "sordid" students who wish to write to express themselves in theirs.

KINGSMAN CHECKMATE

Meanwhile, a series of moves have been undertaken in regard to the student newspaper Kingsman.

Until 1950 Vanguard was the day-session newspaper at BC. In that year Vanguard, which had been highly critical of the administration, was suspended and replaced by Kingsman, which for a long period of time acted as an administration house organ. Since then, it has freed itself from this status and become a genuine student newspaper which is frequently critical of the actions of the Gideonse administration and has defended student rights.

In the last couple of weeks, various liberal members of the Kingsman staff have been called to confer with college officials and "rebuked" for anti-administration material in the paper. Simultaneously, a group of pro-administration students from Executive Council (the club government council) have petitioned for another newspaper to be called Veritas. What the outcome of this situation will be remains to be seen.

STEIER EXPELLED

The final incident in the recent series concerns Arthur Steier, a leader in the fight for student rights and genuine student government at Brooklyn College. (See Challenge for last October 15 for previous details on this case.)

After his second full-term suspension from school, Steier was given a brief, inadequate closed interview before the Faculty Committee on Orientation and Guidance. He got no bill of particulars and no opportunity to cross-examine his accusers. This interview, with the committee report on it, was used, without advance notice, as the basis for his expulsion from school at the December meeting of Faculty Council. Steier was given no opportunity to appear before the group or to prepare an answer to the charges, nor any other requisite of democratic process.

He has now been thrown out of school on the basis of his "antics," his "use of abusive language in letters addressed to college officers" and his alleged violation of a suspension that was unwarranted to begin with.

The whole case points up the lack of the most elementary safeguards for students in college disciplinary cases. It is an additional area in which democracy is non-existent at Brooklyn College.

GET ACQUAINTED!

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

- I want more information about the Young Socialist League and its ideas.
- I want to join the Young Socialist League.

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

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

SCHOOL (IF ANY).....TEL.....

The Crime of Being 'Socially Dangerous'

An Examination of the Subversive-List System

We begin publication below of some excerpts from the "Proposed Findings" submitted by the Independent Socialist League's attorneys, Joseph L. Rauh Jr. and Isaac Groner, following the hearing recently held by the Justice Department on the "subversive list" designation against which the ISL is fighting.

In October the government summed up its case in its own "Proposed Findings" (see LA Oct. 15). Now that both documents are in, the next step in the case will be marked when Trial Examiner Morrissey submits his own Findings to the Justice Department, following which the attorney general will render his verdict. As we have explained before, if the Justice Department decides in its own favor, as is not unexpected, it will finally be possible to take the case, and with it the whole issue of the subversive list, to the courts.

In the following publication of sections of the argument by attorneys Rauh and Groner, passages which are summarized rather than quoted are in brackets; technical reference citations and footnotes have been omitted; and paragraphing, boldface and subheads have been added to the text.

Preliminary Statement

The crime of being "socially dangerous," an offense against the State, is designated—but not defined—in the law of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. When indicting and prosecuting for this offense, Soviet Government lawyers seem free to present any and all the allegations they can think of, relating them to the crime by theories good for the particular case only.

They are restrained by none of the ordinary rules of evidence or proof; they can, as it were, throw all the mud they have against the defendant and his antecedents and his words without benefit of context, knowing that some of the mud will almost inevitably stick, and that any mud at all will almost inevitably be good enough for a conviction. The accused must present their defense without knowing whether there are any criteria for guilt or innocence, apart from automatic condemnation of whatever they did. No such standards will be prescribed in advance of their trial.

The organizations feel that they are in the position of such defendants, faced by prosecutors who are in the position of such prosecutors.

The organizations do not know what standards for judgment will be exercised in this proceeding. Despite repeated demands and entreaties by the organizations, the Government has deliberately refrained from informing them of the content of the terms, "Communist" and "seeking to overthrow the form of Government of the United States by force and violence," as they will be applied in the ultimate judgment as to whether these organizations were ever properly designated or can reasonably and fairly be permitted to remain on the "subversive list."

[Because no standards have been defined, continues the Statement, it is impossible to know what may be relevant or adequate to answer "the sling-all-the-mud-against-the-wall approach of the Government"; therefore we do not waive any rights to raise at any time the question of the constitutionality of the List and of the hearing procedures, the Examiner's bias, etc.]

The absence of standards for ultimate judgment makes it impossible for anyone to determine what is relevant and what other evidentiary rules to apply. There has been no narrowing of issues or contentions. The rules of this game were not even made up while it was being played; the rules will be announced, if ever, along with the result.

In such an administrative process, the Government can even pretend that the hearing has a different purpose and scope from what is genuinely involved; the Government can be confused and inconsistent in the direction of its proofs; and the Government can proceed under the most fallacious and unjust presumptions.

SUPREME COURT VS. THE LIST

1. *The purpose and scope of these proceedings.* It would be error to base any recommendations in this case on the assumption that the procedure and the hearing were gracious and perhaps unnecessary gestures offered by the Attorney General to appease his sensitivity to due process. The fact is that this proceeding results from the decision of the Supreme Court in *Anti-Fascist Committee v. McGrath*. Any Government positions which were repudiated in that case cannot be validly accepted here, at any stage.

While there were five separate opinions by the majority Justices in that case, all of them expressed the conclusion that the powers of the Government in the field of subversive organizations are limited, and are relative to the purposes—and the effects—of the Governmental action.

"The Executive Order contains no express or implied attempt to confer power on anyone to act arbitrarily or capriciously..." (opinion of Justice Burton, joined by Justice Douglas).

The List "effectively punishes many organizations and their members merely because of their political beliefs and utterances, and to this extent smacks of a evil type of censorship. This cannot be reconciled with the First Amendment..." (opinion of Justice Black).

"This designation imposes no legal sanction of these organizations other than that it serves as evidence in ridding the Government of persons reasonably suspected of disloyalty. It would be blindness, however, not to recognize that in the conditions of our time such designation drastically restricts the organizations, if it does not proscribe them... The Attorney General is certainly not immune from the historic requirements of fairness merely because he acts, however conscientiously, in the name of security" (opinion of Justice Frankfurter).

"The fact that one may not have legal right to get or keep a government post does not mean that he can be adjudged ineligible illegally" (opinion of Justice Jackson).

These are enough to show that the general approach which has characterized the Government in this proceeding has already been repudiated by a majority of the Supreme Court. Neither the Trial Examiner nor the Attorney General nor any of the parties hereto has any legal right to act as if the Government has absolute rights over its employees and with respect to subversive lists.

THE GOVERNMENT'S OBLIGATIONS

To start with the very first step, the Government is the Government; that distinguishes it from private employers and imposes special obligations upon it. A private employer could deliberately refuse to hire any Republican, Jew or Negro; and his actions would raise no legal or constitutional issues. The Government cannot constitutionally do the same.

The Supreme Court did not even pause to cite authority in declaring that "Congress may not enact a regulation providing that no Republican, Jew or Negro shall be appointed to a federal office, or that no federal employee shall attend Mass or take any active part in missionary work." None would deny such limitations on congressional power... *United Public Workers v. Mitchell*. These very words show that government employment is not "a privilege to be conferred or withheld at will."

The point should not be overlooked because it is elementary and obvious. If it is only the personal forbearance of the Attorney General that prevents his listing the Republican Party as "Communist" or "subversive" this is a government of men and not of laws. The point here is that the laws, the Constitution of the United States, forecloses any such action and insures its reversal should any Attorney General attempt it.

This would be true even if the use of the List were actually confined to evaluating the security of government employees, as the Government contended throughout the hearing. While this position in effect seems to concede the obvious truth that the actual uses of the List are highly relevant to a proceeding involving a listed organization, the Government consistently objected to a showing of other uses of the List, by governments as well as private individuals.

The fact is that the List is used in many different ways by many different government agencies and private individuals. The Trial Examiner did recognize this fact at one point, and held that judicial notice could be taken of other uses of the List. A number should here be listed, without any attempt at comprehensiveness, to dispel beyond doubt the recurrent Government plea that the uses of the List are limited to the solitary use of testing government employees.

HOW THE LIST IS USED

First, because it involved the leader of these very organizations, the Government has used the List as a basis for denying passports, only to be rebuffed by the Courts. *Shachtman v. Dulles*.

A second use by the Government which has been reversed by the Courts involved the so-called Gwinn Amendment, which required expulsion from public housing of any tenants who refused to certify that they did not belong to any organizations on the List.

An eviction order obtained thereunder was reversed in *Rudder v. United States*.

A third use which has been reversed by the Courts has been in connection with adoption proceedings. When a District Court in adoption proceedings gave as one ground for rejection the refusal of the applicants to sign the Gwinn Act certification, the Court of Appeals reversed. *In re Adoption of a Minor*.

Further, the List has been used by the Government to reflect against a defendant in a criminal trial, and this use too has been reversed by the Courts. *United States v. Remington*.

The List has been used also by the Defense Department, in denying employment in private industries with access to classified information. It has been used by State Governments, in dealing with their own employees. It has been used by Congress, in addition to the legislation noted above... forbidding the Veterans Administration from extending the benefits of the G.I. Bill of Rights to schools on the List.

In addition to effects which have shown themselves in formal proceedings, there is the very burdensome personal harassment to which individuals are subjected who have belonged to listed organizations. Members of these very organizations, for examples, have been subjected to personal harassment and abuse.

These are extremely serious consequences indeed. But these are only particularized consequences. The general pressure against freedom of thought and expression may well be an even more serious consequence.

The impact on free speech should not go unmentioned, even though there may be little point in discussing it fully at this stage. The results flowing from listing are obviously penalties for expressing certain views. Those views cannot possibly gain for themselves the same position as views not discriminated against by the Government, in the "free trade of ideas... the competition of the market," which Justice Holmes declared was the essence of the free speech protection of the First Amendment. *Abrams v. United States*

By his selections for the List the Attorney General directly affects the range and type of opinions which will in fact be expressed for the American reading and listening public. It may or may not be necessary or justifiable; but the impact of the List on free speech is a fact; and it is a fact which is contrary to basic principles of American constitutional democracy.

WEAK CASE

2. *Confusion and Inconsistency of Government Positions.* While the Trial Examiner and the Government both at times recognized the First Amendment to the extent of saying that evidence could not be received merely for the purpose of showing that the organizations had expressed criticism of our national policies, the fact is that much of the Government case, from its Statement of Grounds through its proof to its Proposed Findings, is concerned with nothing more than the organizations' criticisms of the United States Government.

All that the Government introduced from the organizations themselves were unexplained publications, almost entirely of the Workers Party which went out of existence in 1949. The Government produced only one live witness who had ever had anything to do with the organizations—and he had left the Workers Party practically simultaneously with its formation, back in May, 1940. This poverty of direct evidence is all the more remarkable because the Government has obviously had the organizations under the closest surveillance.

These examples could be multiplied, almost to infinity. One final illustration may help to spotlight the central issue in this case.

The Government directed a good deal of its proof to socialism; its history, content, theory and practice. But the Government stated that no part of its proof should be considered as extended to the Socialist Party of Norman Thomas in this country, or to the Labor Party in Great Britain—"Naturally," the Government was not attacking them. Actually, however, whether consciously or not, the Government was directing its proof against socialism. Government attacks on socialism affected the socialist groups presently tolerated by the Government as well as the organizations involved in this proceeding. The members of the Socialist Party who testified obviously thought so; they appear voluntarily on the side of the organizations.

What distinction does the Government see? It offered no standards which would reasonably explain how the dividing line was drawn, especially as to "communist." Its mere statement that it sees a distinction between the Socialists and the Independent Socialist League certainly does not mean that there is any real distinction; nor does it describe or define the distinction.

If the Socialist Party is just as "communist" as the Independent Socialist League and it is so obvious, as

(Turn to last page)

On Plekhanov's 100th Anniversary

FATHER OF THE RUSSIAN SOCIALIST MOVEMENT

By TONY CLIFF

A hundred years ago, on December 11, 1856, George Valentinovich Plekhanov, the father of Russian Marxism and precursor of the Russian workers' movement, was born.

The greatness of his historical contribution can be gauged only when set against the background of the anti-tsarist liberatory movement as it existed prior to his work.

For decades already, the heroic acts of individual terrorism directed against the tsar and his henchmen by the Populists (Narodniks) had captured the imagination of Western socialists. Herzen, one of the fore-runners of Populism, stated the belief of these fighters: "The man of the future in Russia is the peasant, just as in France it is the workers."

The peasants, argued the Populists, could pass straight into socialism without passing through the stage of capitalism, by basing themselves on the *mir*, the Russian village community. Under this system the land of the village, except for that on which the peasants' houses stood and the small plots which surrounded them, was the property of the whole village. Part was used as common pasture and the rest was divided into strips, a certain number of which were allotted to each family according to its size. From time to time the land was redivided among the peasants.

In the *mir* the Populists visualized the peasants as the standard-bearers of the future.

However, history mapped its path out differently. Before long it became clear that capitalism was developing in Russia, that a new class of wage-workers was coming into being, and that the *mir* was disintegrating.

As early as the end of 1878 and the beginning of 1879, large-scale workers' strikes and disturbances broke out in the centers of Russian industry, and Plekhanov, at the time a Populist, was forced to recognize that the working class, born of this developing capitalism, would play a part in the coming Russian revolution.

In a leading article in a Narodnik paper, *Zemlia i Volia*, on February 20, 1879, he candidly wrote: "The agitation of the factory workers which has continuously grown in strength and now occupies everybody's attention, compels us to deal earlier than we had calculated with the role which the town worker should play in this organization [the revolutionary battle organization of the people]. The question of the urban worker is one which life itself, independently, pushes forward and raises to an appropriate plane despite all the *a priori* theoretical resolutions of the revolutionary activists."

Plekhanov still believed that the revolution would be brought about by the peasants, but he thought that the workers would help them by initiating revolts in the towns and agitating in the villages. He was only a step from recognizing the decisive role that the working class would inevitably play in the revolution, concentrated as it was in large factories and living in big towns, compared with the subsidiary role to be played by the peasants, dispersed as they were in small villages and using individual methods of production.

TURNING-POINT IN RUSSIA

In *Socialism and the Political Struggle* (1883) he exposed the main fallacies of the Populists and counterposed to their ideas the principles of Marxism. The importance of its

new ideas prompted Lenin to compare this pamphlet with the *Communist Manifesto* for its effect on the Russian working-class movement.

The next year, in replying to the attack of the Populists, Plekhanov published another outstanding essay, entitled *Our Differences*, which Engels called a turning-point in the development of the revolutionary movement in Russia.

In these works and others that followed, Plekhanov applied the Marxist method to an analysis of Russian reality. Although he was not the creator of the theory of dialectical materialism or historical materialism and had not actually enriched them with new discoveries, he nevertheless carried out the important task of introducing them into Russian life, doing so in a series of brilliant works.

With great strength of expression, precision and beauty, lucidity of exposition and brilliance of style, Plekhanov naturalized Marxism in Russia. His works on philosophy and the cultural history of Russia, its art and literature, alone would have earned him a permanent and prominent place among the socialist classics.

Of Plekhanov's philosophical essays Lenin wrote: "It is impossible to become a real Communist without studying—really studying—all that Plekhanov has written on philosophy, as this is the best of the whole international literature of Marxism..."

ON THE PROLETARIAT'S SHOULDERS

But above all, the importance of Plekhanov's work for the future history of Russia was his conclusion that the key role in the struggle against tsarism would belong to the young Russian working class.

As he said at the foundation Congress of the Socialist International (1889): "The proletariat created through the disintegration of the village community will overthrow the autocracy... The Russian Revolution can only conquer as a workingman's revolution—there is no other possibility, nor can there be any."

Inspired by the same thoughts, Plekhanov's disciples, on founding the Russian Social-Democratic workers' Party (1898), declared:

"The farther east we go in Europe the weaker, more abject and more cowardly becomes the bourgeoisie, and the more its cultural and political tasks fall to the lot of the proletariat. On its strong shoulders the Russian working class must bear and will bear the task of winning political liberty. This is a necessary step, but only the first step toward the realization of the great historic mission of the proletariat, to the foundation of a social order in which there will be no place for the exploitation of man by man."

The overthrow of tsarist-absolutism would be effected neither by the peasants nor the cowardly bourgeoisie, but by the working class, said Plekhanov. How well history was to confirm this prognosis!

PEASANTS AND REVOLUTION

Breaking with the Populists, Plekhanov did not have any of their illusions about the socialist nature of the peasant. He knew that the peasant was a small capitalist attached to private property and individual production.

He wrote in 1891: "The proletariat and the *muzhik* are political antipodes. The historic role of the proletariat is as revolutionary as the historic role of the *muzhik* is conservative. The *muzhiks* have been the support of oriental despotism for thousands of years. In a comparatively short space of time, the proletariat has shaken the 'foundations' of West European society."

While Plekhanov was right in emphasizing the non-

socialist nature of the peasantry, he was wrong, as future events showed, not to point out the revolutionary, anti-tsarist and anti-feudal potentialities of this same class.

During the Russian revolution of 1917 the peasantry showed its progressive historical face, sweeping feudalism from the countryside in a revolutionary upheaval. Having accomplished this, it then showed its other historical face, wrapping itself round with conservatism and proving in time to be the bulwark of a new "oriental despotism."

It was by relying on the backward agricultural countryside, on the *muzhik*; against the worker, that the Stalinist bureaucracy rose to independence of workers' democratic control, and developed into an absolute autocracy.

WARNING FOR THE FUTURE

Considering the youthfulness and small size of the Russian working class and the backwardness of the country's productive forces, Plekhanov time and again warned that the revolution might lead to a seizure of power by socialists, who wanted to suppress economic inequality, before the material conditions necessary for social equality—wealth and abundance—were present. Where the productive forces are meager, economic and cultural progress is not possible except through the exploitation of the majority by a minority: equality would be equality of poverty and ignorance.

He wrote in 1883:

"After having seized power, the revolutionary socialist government must organize national production. It will then have (possibly) ... to seek an issue in the ideals of patriarchal and authoritative communism, by modernizing it only to the extent that the socialized production will be controlled by a 'socialist' caste, instead of by the 'Sons of the Sun' and their functionaries as in ancient Peru... Such Peruvian tutelage, further, would never succeed in initiating the Russian people into socialism. On the contrary, it would cause them to lose all ability to progress unless they returned to the same economic inequality, the suppression of which should have been the immediate object of the revolutionary government. And we say nothing of the play of international complications..." (*Socialism and the Political Struggle*.)

Thus Plekhanov clearly saw the dilemma of a socialist government in a backward country: either stagnation based on equality, or a new division of society into an exploiting and an exploited class.

The only path leading out of this blind alley was pointed to later by Lenin, Trotsky and other Russian Marxists. They sought a solution through the spreading of the revolution to more advanced countries.

Thus, for instance, Lenin said: "We always staked our play upon an international revolution and this was unconditionally right... we always emphasized... the fact that in one country it is impossible to accomplish such a work as a socialist revolution." (My emphasis.)

The course of history did not contradict Plekhanov's formulation of the alternatives facing a revolutionary socialist government in backward Russia. The Russian revolution, isolated by the defeat of the German, Austrian and Hungarian revolutions, led to the rise of a new tutelage, of an authoritarian, exploitive bureaucracy.

FROM THE SPARK...

Plekhanov suffered from one great weakness. Being a precursor of the actual Russian labor movement, he scarcely had the opportunity of addressing the masses of the workers, organizing them and leading their struggle. He thus lacked experience of the true capacity of an active revolutionary working class.

This weakness, wedded to a number of elements in Plekhanov's theory (his emphasis on the backwardness of the country, the smallness of its working class, the conservative nature of the *muzhik*) led him to compromise with the Russian liberal bourgeoisie. During the latter years of his life he opposed Bolshevism and supported Menshevism.

It would take us too far afield to follow Plekhanov's drift toward this compromise, which culminated in his wartime support of tsarism in 1914.

These blots, however, cannot cancel out Plekhanov's immortal contribution as the father of Russian Marxism, and consequently as the father of the great Russian Revolution.

Today, the working class of Russia, oppressed by an autocracy not less tyrannical than that of the tsar, can yet find a weapon of struggle in the Marxist works of Plekhanov.

Plekhanov's prophetic motto on his journal *Iskra* (Spark) was: "The spark lights the fire." The spark of revolutionary Marxism has already once lit the fire that burned the citadel of oppression. The same spark will do it again.

A basic pamphlet—

"SOCIALISM:
THE HOPE OF HUMANITY"

by Max Shachtman

Read it!

10 cents

Labor Action Book Service

114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

1956: Year of Revolution — —

(Continued from page 1)

The Poznan uprising showed for Poland what the June Days in 1953 had shown for East Germany: that the Communist regimes in the satellites, at least, have no popular base, and that the working class, whose representatives they claim to be above all other classes, are actually their most implacable enemies. It showed that the reforms adopted by the bureaucratic regimes in these countries was whetting the desire for real democracy rather than heading it off.

In reacting to the Poznan revolt, the Polish leadership showed that they either did not feel the ground firm enough under their feet to proceed to allow them to correct "mistaken" ideas by drowning the revolt in blood, or that they still believed the desire for democracy and socialism could be headed off by showing indulgence rather than ferocity.

But the head of steam kept on building up in Poland. By the middle of October it had assumed the form of mass demonstrations demanding the ousting of Russian troops and a complete cleansing and reorganization of the regime, and supporting the symbol and leadership of Gomulka.

In a series of events tense with drama, the Russian leadership rushed to Warsaw and sought to threaten and bully the Polish government into a capitulation to their demands. The storm in the country had risen to such a pitch, however, that the Polish leaders felt themselves strong enough to stand up to the Russian threats and ultimatums, and were finally able to convince them that the only course of safety for all was an agreement by which, at least temporarily, the Polish leaders would be granted pretty much a free hand to handle their internal problems as they see fit, while in exchange they would pledge renewed loyalty to Moscow.

For the moment, the solution seemed to work. The Polish people felt they had won a tremendous victory over the mighty Russian foe. They accepted Gomulka's promises of democratic reforms, or at least the idea that he should be given a chance to show what he could do.

HISTORY'S GREATEST FIGHT FOR FREEDOM

It seemed that the situation had been saved, for the moment at least. But actually, as in the case of the June 30 resolution of the Central Committee, it was too late.

For on October 23 the Hungarian revolution broke out, starting with demonstrations of solidarity with the Poles. In twelve historic days the Hungarian people went from peaceful demonstrations to pitched battles with the Russian occupation forces. They defeated the secret police, the only section of the Hungarian people which showed even a speck of loyalty to this "Peoples' Democracy." They overthrew the government, and brought into being a provisional regime which had begun to recognize full democratic rights, including the key right: the formation of opposition political parties. From a movement of protest, triggered originally by students and intellectuals, the revolution embraced the whole population, and brought the industrial workers to the head of the nation.

On November 4, the Russian leadership sealed the doom of Stalin as a world system by attacking the Hungarian revolution with a massive army of troops and tanks.

If their attack had succeeded in crushing the revolution in a couple of days and in installing a new "Popular Democratic" regime, the damage to Russian-style "Communism" might not have been so great. But the Hungarian people refused to bow before the overwhelming odds.

They fought as a united nation. Workers Councils, which had sprung up on a local basis in the early days, took on strength and began to develop a national organization.

Even after mass organized resistance had been crushed in Budapest in a battle which devastated the city, the workers continued a general strike for six weeks. The Kadar puppet regime, despite all pleas and promises, remained as helpless and isolated after a month as it had been on the first day. Only by sheer weight of arms and the gradual starvation of the population were the Russians able to dampen the fires of the Hungarian revolution.

Throughout the world, the Communist movement was thrown into crisis and dismay. The voices of protest and questioning had never died down after the Khrushchev revelations became public in June.

By the middle of November there were mass public resignations from the Communist Party in England, and a full-fledged struggle was dividing the American organization. In France, leading intellectual supporters of the party openly denounced it and the Russian leadership. In Italy, although the leadership was able to maintain its hold at the party congress and to come out in support of the Russian suppression of the Hungarian revolution, it was clear that the trade-union base of the party was in peril.

THE WORLD WILL NEVER BE THE SAME . . .

The biggest single factor which helped the Russians to get through the Hungarian crisis was the action of Britain and France in attacking Egypt over the Suez Canal issue. In the United Nations and through their world propaganda network, the Russian rulers sought to distract attention from their bloody work in Budapest by pointing the finger of blame at the criminal imperialist attack of Britain and France on Egypt.

Further, it became clear as the weeks went by that, far from being able to exploit the Hungarian revolution for their own ends, the American and other capitalist governments were afraid of this revolution, and of the danger that it might spread to Poland and East Germany.

By the closing days of 1956, the immediate danger that the whole Russian empire would disintegrate appeared to be staved off, for the moment at least. In Hungary, the government was whipping an exhausted people back to work. In Poland, though riots against the Russians and in support of the Hungarian people continued to take place on a sporadic basis, the Russians seemed to have had a certain success with their "Hungarian lesson" to the peoples of the rest of the satellites.

But that is all temporary and on the surface. After what has happened in Poland and above all in Hungary, the world will never look the same again as it did before 1956. Millions upon millions of militants in the world Communist movement have had their basic faith and confidence in Russia as the leading land of "socialism" shaken beyond all repair.

The whole world has been shown that the Russian system, like its counterparts in the satellites, rests on force and terror, and that the moment these are lifted even a little, the vast mass of the population is ready to fight for democracy and freedom.

This is the great and lasting lesson of 1956: there is and can be no such thing as a totalitarian regime in permanence in the modern world. The aspiration for freedom, for democracy, is inextinguishable, and in the advanced countries the working class remains the social class which alone is capable of leading the struggle for it.

Crime of Being 'Socially Dangerous' — —

(Continued from page 6)

we certainly agree, that listing the Socialist Party would be ludicrous, only one conclusion is possible. It is just as ridiculous to list these organizations which believe in socialism.

If clear standards were stated, this would become apparent. The Government would either admit that it is listing the organizations because they have socialist ideas, and its constitutional right to take such action could be clearly litigated. Or the Government would have to produce real proof that these organizations are something significantly different from the Socialists.

QUOTATION-MONGERING

3. The Outrageous Presumptions in the Government's Case. This record, and the Government's Proposed Findings, are in large measure devoted to something other than the views and positions of these organizations. The bulk of the Government's case is addressed to something else altogether, and is related to the organizations by no proof but by presumptions which cannot stand the scrutiny of reason and equity.

The most basic and outrageous of the presumptions is that the organizations can be held responsible for everything which was written by Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky. It defies the most elementary notions of fair trial to say that one man or organization can be held guilty and made the object of unfavorable government action, because of something written by a completely different man or organization.

Proving what A wrote cannot produce what X believes or what X does, under any non-Communist system of logic or evidence. In a democracy, a man cannot be condemned solely because of the ancestry of his ideas. Guilt is personal. Certainly there can be no guilt by ancestry of philosophical or political ideas, any more than by ancestry or inheritance of racial or religious ideas.

This fundamental of democracy is violated by automatically heaping selected portions of Marx on an organization merely because it calls itself Marxist. It seems un-American to automatically impute selected portions of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky, to an organization which declares only that it is based upon their general philosophy and honors their teaching and careers in general. The injustice is confounded by giving no consideration to the organizations' detailed explanations of how they understand, practice and advocate the philosophies of those Four.

The outcome is outrageous when the Government's case boils down to two propositions only: (1) Leninism equals communism and/or force and violence; and (2) the organizations equal Leninism. It bothers the Government not one whit that the Leninism in proposition

(1) is not the organizations'; and that the organizations' Leninism in (2) is evidently something quite different and definitely exclusive of force and violence.

EVIDENCE FROM THE PAST

The Government considered Marxism and Leninism an ever-fixed star which must eternally stay on one course. To the organizations, these concepts were fluid and changing. All the Four were busily engaged in pressing practical problems, particularly Lenin and Trotsky, and almost everything they wrote can be understood only in terms of the time and the issue which occupied them. Their own views had internal inconsistencies; and they changed with the passage of time.

The views of the organizations, and of Shachtman individually, changed with time, also. As he and the organizations are preoccupied with current political problems, the views which they express must be put in proper context, in their proper stage of development.

The Government never did anything like this. It was patently proceeding on the presumption that any word ever attributed to any of the organizations stayed as part of the evidence against them indefinitely. Such a presumption is out of tune with elementary recognition of the facts of life. Human individuals and human organizations inevitably change. There can be no presumption, in human experience and logic, that what was so in 1940 remains so in 1956. Especially is this true of a political organization, for the atmosphere and issues of 1940 have simply disappeared. The 1956 political scene is completely different.

For this simple fact that political organizations do change, which the Government so evidently fails to recognize, there is, happily Supreme Court authority. "At the time of affiliation, a group itself may be innocent, only later coming under the influence of those who would turn it toward illegitimate ends. Conversely, an organization formerly subversive and therefore designated as such may have subsequently freed itself from the influences which originally led to its listing." *Wieman v. Updegraff*.

Nevertheless, virtually all of the Government's case is in the relatively dim past. This is highlighted in this case by the organizational change from Workers Party to Independent Socialist League. These are separate entities in this proceeding. Almost no evidence was presented as to the Independent Socialist League, the only one of the three organizations still in existence.

The Government obviously had no witness who had ever been a member of the Independent Socialist League. In fact, the only witness produced by the Government who had ever been a member of any of these organizations, James Burnham, had been a member of the Workers Party for just about its initial month

only, back in 1940, and had attended only one meeting. He could not and did not testify to any conversations with Shachtman or any of the leaders or members of any of the organizations, in the past 16 years and more!

Moreover, even this last-ditch witness was obtained only on June 22, 1956. This was long after, not only long after the 1947 designation and the 1953 redesignation, but even long after the July 1955 commencement of the hearing and its originally scheduled resumption for April 1956. Burnham was obtained only because of the Government recognition that some witness would have to be secured.

This was the best the Government had; the only one it could muster to lend lip service to the charges of communism and force and violence.

FLESH-AND-BLOOD PROOF

It is shocking that this testimony by a non-expert, even if it were unscarred by the internal inconsistencies and the gross incredibility of the witness, may be considered as enough of a foundation to support the action taken by the Attorney General. No such testimony, to our knowledge, has ever been offered or accepted as an adequate showing of advocacy of force and violence.

In the recent Smith Act prosecutions of Communists, for example, the Government apparently had witnesses who had actually been a member of the organization for a number of years, and could personally testify as to the various interpretations and intentions involved. Only last month, the Supreme Court reversed such a conviction, when this testimony was said to have been perjured. "The testimony of Mazzei, at least, gave flesh-and-blood reality to the mass of Communist literature read to the jury to show advocacy of violence by the Communist Party." *Mesarosh v. United States*.

The Government apparently recognized that there could be no real proof, at least in a Federal Court, without flesh-and-blood testimony from within the organization.

In the *Mesarosh* case, *supra*, for example, the Solicitor General stated that without the testimony which he now believed tainted, there would have been no conviction. No lesser test of proof should be used in a proceeding administered for and by the Attorney General of the United States. He, after all, "is the representative not of an ordinary party to a controversy, but of a sovereignty whose obligation to govern impartially is as compelling as its obligation to govern all at all..." *Berger v. United States*.

The Government considered itself freed of the necessity to tie its proof to the Independent Socialist League or the other organizations by some genuine evidence, only because there were no standards established for the entire proceeding. This matter of standards is basic.