

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

MAY 28, 1956

FIVE CENTS

NEW YORK PUBLIC MEETING

Friday, June 1, at 8:30 p.m.

Guide to the Discussion In the U.S. Communist Party

What They Admit and What They Hide

HEAR

GORDON HASKELL

Associate Editor, Labor Action

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

A Discussion with Communist Party Supporters:

RUSSIA UNDER STALIN'S DISCIPLES

By MAX SHACHTMAN

National Chairman, Independent Socialist League

TO ALL THE MEMBERS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY:
TO ALL THE MEMBERS OF THE LABOR YOUTH LEAGUE:

Your movement is in a crisis.

The flood of sensational disclosures about the crimes of Stalin has stained your movement with shame and dishonor in the eyes of the entire world. For a quarter of a century, all of you who were lied to, cheated, duped and degraded by a murdering maniac, Joseph Stalin, while the rest of the leaders stood by, themselves terror-stricken into obedience and complicity in the most appalling falsehoods and the most appalling political murders in modern history.

It is not the critics or enemies of your movement who say this. It is admitted now by the most prominent of these very leaders who were the unfaltering right hands of the maniac. Do you know of any other political movement that has ever had such a revolting and bloody record of crime laid bare by its own spokesmen? Think: has there ever been anything like it?

No wonder there is a crisis in your midst — there is confusion, bitterness and disgust, despair, disillusionment; and many quit the movement altogether. Burning questions flame in the minds of every honest and serious member. But the leaders, both here and in the Kremlin, do not have an honest and serious answer to offer.

We of the Independent Socialist League are addressing ourselves to you in this crisis not in order to

gloat over your difficulties or to abuse your ideals. Nothing is further from our intentions. Being the revolutionary socialists that we are, nothing could be further from our intentions.

Where the sickening disclosures from Moscow serve to discredit the name and hopes of socialism, that hurts all of us who honor the name and cherish those hopes. To the extent that your ideals are those of the working-class future, of freedom under socialism, they are our ideals as well. To the extent that the revelation of the horrors of Stalinism give courage and confidence to the capitalist foes of socialism, a gain has been recorded by our foes as well.

To the extent that a cloud has been thrown over the great revolution of 1917, it has darkened our own past and its traditions. For we of the Independent Socialist League have ever been champions and defenders of the October Revolution and the inspiring banner of peace, freedom and brotherhood that it unfurled. It is this banner that we want to see planted throughout a workers' world.

All this gives us more than a

right to speak with you about the crisis. It is our duty. It is your duty to hear us out and think, and to weigh carefully what is said by socialists interested only in moving closer and faster toward the kind of world that you in the ranks also hope to build.

Picture of a System

What is the full significance of the picture that Khrushchev and the other leaders of the Kremlin have drawn of the situation that prevailed for years and even decades in Russia? Directly or indirectly, this is what they have been saying since the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union:

● That all of the basic policies and decisions of the Russian party, and by virtue of that fact also of the Russian government, were determined and imposed for the last quarter of a century by one man, Joseph Stalin.

● That this one man established a reign of terror and intimidation not only inside the government and in the governing party and in the leadership of the party, but

(Continued on page 7)

INSIDE THIS ISSUE

ISL's Hearing in Washington	... page 3
The SP and Guy Mollet	... page 4
Democracy in the A.L.P.	... page 6
Returnee from a Czech Jail	... page 8
Washington in a Dither	... page 2

Some Questions for Eugene Dennis

SIR:

On May 4, your New York State organization received the following letter:

"On behalf of the Independent Socialist League, I challenge the Communist Party to debate the respective views of our organizations before the socialist, working-class and progressive world. The 20th Congress of the Russian Communist Party has raised questions that imperatively demand an answer. Are you prepared to test your line in public against a revolutionary socialist movement which, from its very inception, has consistently opposed both capitalism and Stalinism?"

For the
Independent Socialist League
BEN HALL

Three weeks have passed without a reply. Do you accept our challenge?

You, so ready for an amicable discussion of "America's Road to Peace and Democracy," should be compelled to reply to some simple questions. That is why we offer our challenge. If you ignore it, will it not be an admission that you cannot or will not answer or that you fear to try?

Among other things, you must tell your audience:

● What are your credentials? You defended the Stalin regime, calling it the most advanced democracy on earth. Now you admit that it acted like a police dictatorship. In short, you cannot tell the difference between democracy and dictatorship. Why should anyone believe you now?

● Perhaps you will solemnly promise now to maintain "democracy" (whatever that means to you). How do you explain that wherever your movement has seized power it has wiped out democratic rights?

● To clarify your position, answer this: Is there democracy in Russia now? If you claim that there is, how do you know? No organized opposition to the regime is permitted a legal existence.

● If you reply that oppositions are not "necessary," as some of your pitiful apologists maintain, were they necessary under Stalin?

● publicly demand the restoration of the right to organize free trade unions, to strike, to meet, to criticize the regime?

● When Stalin ruled, men were executed as "fascists," "spies," and "counter-revolutionaries." You applauded as each drop of blood was spilled. Now you suggest that the dead men were

Carnegie Hall Debate

On Sunday evening, May 27, at Carnegie Hall in New York, the Fellowship of Reconciliation is sponsoring an interesting debate-symposium on the subject of "America's Road to Democracy and World Peace." There will be four speakers: on one side, Norman Thomas and A. J. Muste; on the other, Eugene Dennis, general secretary of the Communist Party, and W. E. B. DuBois, author of Black Reconstruction, National Guardian contributor.

To Dennis and the Communist Party, the New York branch of the Independent Socialist League addresses the accompanying letter.

sincere socialists, victims of a horrible frame-up. In other words, you were

● You demand democratic rights in the U. S. and in our opinion you should have them. You denounce anti-democracy in Spain. What demands do you make upon the Russian regime or any other dominated by your own co-thinkers: Poland, Hungary, China, etc.? Why don't you incapable of differentiating between a socialist and a counter-revolutionary fascist. Who can trust you now?

● Do you believe Khrushchev's accusations against Stalin? Why? When Stalin was alive, you sycophantly did his every bidding. Now you just as sycophantly repudiate him at the command of those who rule Russia. In sum, you were 100 per cent apologists for Stalin when he wielded power. Have you not simply become 100 per cent apologists for the living ruling bureaucrats?

● For decades, Stalin and the men who now rule lied. You lied to defend these lies. You justified every assassination, every act of anti-Semitism, every political murder, every repression. With such a consistent record of sustained deception and perfidy, what possible honest contribution can you make to any discussion of peace and democracy?

● Is it not time for you, Mr. Dennis, to admit your utter political bankruptcy; to hope that workers, sincere democrats, and socialists will be merciful and forget you; and to allow the members of the Communist Party to find their own way to revolutionary, democratic socialism?

There are many more questions which you should have to answer. But these will have to do until we have the chance to meet you on the platform of open debate.

N.Y. Independent Socialist League

Russian Army Cut Throws Washington Into Usual Dither

By GORDON HASKELL

The rulers of Russia have announced a cut of 1,200,000 men in their armed forces. The reaction of American government spokesmen to this announcement is another illustration of why the United States cannot play in the same league with the Stalinists when it comes to political warfare.

The top prize for sheer boneheaded, numbwitted mishandling of the issue went, of course and as usual, to the top man in American foreign policy, the secretary of State. In a carefully prepared statement he managed to hail, to condemn and to declare the Stalinist action worthy of mention.

A reporter asked: "Mr. Secretary, isn't it a fair conclusion . . . that you would prefer to have the Soviet Union keep these men in their armed forces?"

Dulles replied: "Well, it's a fair conclusion that I would rather have them standing around doing guard duty than making atomic bombs."

Not for nothing has Adlai Stevenson dubbed John Foster Dulles "America's misguided missile."

Although Dulles always manages to put the position of the capitalist bloc of governments in the worst possible light, it would be a slander of the man to apply to him the old saw that he always manages to snatch defeat from the jaws of victory. The fundamental difficulty is not with Dulles, but with the basic position of American imperialism in this historic period.

America's hegemony in the capitalist world has been expressed by the NATO and SEATO military pacts. It is primarily through these that the United States has, on the one hand, subsidized the revival and stabilization of the capitalist world, and on the other, induced its junior and minor capitalist allies, dependencies and satellites to put forth strenuous and expensive efforts in the armaments race in which the capitalist and Stalinist war blocs have been engaged.

In addition to the carrot of the subsidies, the chief means by which the United States has been able to achieve what solidity its foreign policy has had has been through the stick of the threat of Stalinist military invasion. While trying to maintain for itself a virtual

monopoly (in the capitalist world) of the nuclear weapons of destruction and the machines for delivering them, it has pointed to the vast military manpower of Russia, China and the satellites as the justification for its demands on its allies for a powerful army in being in Europe. It was the vast land armies of Russia, "poised for an invasion" of Europe, which "justified" the inclusion of fascist Spain among the allies of the "free world," etc.

But what happens to this whole structure if the Stalinist military threat is reduced?

By what means can America rally support throughout the world for its policies, or, to put it better, what new policies can the United States adopt to keep its alliance, and hence its hegemony over its alliance, intact when it becomes obvious that for a whole period the Stalinists propose to further their cause by political means, and hence can drastically reduce their standing armies?

Dulles doesn't have the slightest idea.

The same can be said for those of his colleagues who are cleverer than he is. So, their reaction to the Stalinist move is to pretend that, at bottom, it has not been made.

POLITICAL OFFENSIVE

What else can explain the politically fantastic rejoinder that what the Russians are really doing, after all, is to make the demobilized soldiers available for productive purposes in their economy, and that this may turn out to be more important from the military point of view, in the long run, than keeping them in the unproductive army?

As one diplomat pointed out, America's allies in the cold war might react to this by deciding to "increase their military might" by the same method adopted by the Stalinists: a reduction of their military forces.

We would be the last to contend that this move by the Stalinists is an earnest of their determination to give up any resort to armed force to achieve their own imperialist objectives. They are no closer to being pacifists than they are to becoming democrats.

The point is that their action, for whatever economic-political-military reasons it may have been taken, fits into their political offensive on a world scale. It is designed to give color to what they have been telling the world about themselves, what they want the peoples of the world to believe: that they want peace, that they want a deal which will recognize their post-war political and military conquests and will stabilize the world, for the time being, on the basis of an acceptance of the reality of the joint division of the world with the Western imperialists.

WASHINGTON CAN'T

Third Camp socialists do not want to accept these conquests, for socialist reasons, any more than do the capitalist imperialists, including those who run the American government. What we contend, however, is that since they must not and cannot be reversed by another imperialist war, they must be undermined by a political offensive.

LABOR SCOPE

CRACK JIM CROW IN SOUTHERN OIL-REFINING

By BEN HALL

Segregation in the Southern oil-refining industry was cracked last month by the NAACP.

Its labor secretary, Herbert Hill, reported that 32 Negroes at the Magnolia Petroleum Company's refinery at Beaumont, Texas were promoted from the labor department into the "process mechanical division," a skilled department previously all-white. After filing grievances with the President's Committee on Government Contracts and after conferences with the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers Union, the NAACP induced the negotiation of new union contracts which eliminated separate seniority lists limiting Negroes to unskilled jobs in all-Negro labor departments.

Hill pointed out that if Negroes are denied training and promotion into skilled work, they would rapidly be eliminated from industries where unskilled labor is in sharp decline.

Discrimination is a prevalent practice in oil and chemical plants in Texas, Arkansas and Louisiana. O. A. Knight, president of the Oil Workers Union, pledged that no contract would be ratified by the union if it contained racially discriminatory provisions.

The melody of democracy sounds muted inside most unions in the United States. An exchange of correspondence between the Musicians Union of Great Britain and the American Federation of Musicians shows up the sharp contrast in attitude between organized labor in the two countries.

The background: In March, 35 musicians were subpoenaed to appear before the House Un-American Activities Committee in Los Angeles. Their union, the AFM, includes in its constitution a typically undemocratic clause barring "communists and other subversives" from membership. These musicians, then, were faced with loss of their jobs and possibly the end of their careers if they admitted that they were "communists" or even if they saw fit to refuse to testify.

Then this happened: A committee telegraphed the British Musicians Union requesting that it protest the hearings.

The British Musicians Union wrote to James C. Petrillo, president of the AFM, asking for information. After all they did not like to see fellow musicians victimized for their political opinions. It would appear that they take their democracy seriously.

Petrillo instantly wired back: "If they are not communists, they have nothing to worry about. If they are proved to be communists, they have good reason to

But an America which is imperialist herself, and which is tied in with imperialist allies, cannot mount such an offensive.

America and her allies do not come into the political battle with credentials which are acceptable to the only people who can fight this war of liberation, the masses who want to liberate themselves from Stalinism and all imperialism, but have not the slightest desire to thereby suffer the fate of a Cyprus, an Okinawa, an Algeria or a Korea.

If there were ever any doubt that this American government and these allies are incapable of waging political warfare against Stalinism, the events of the past week should have dispelled it.

On the one hand we have Dulles' (and the whole government's) reaction to the Stalinist announcement of a massive cut in its military manpower; on the other we have the spectacle of a "socialist" premier of France begging the murderous imperialists in the Kremlin to sanction and bless his murderous imperialist campaign in Algeria. Both of them have got just what they deserved!

We do not rejoice too much in their discomfiture, because it redounds, initially at least, not to the benefit of peace and freedom, but to the benefit of Stalinism. Such defeats will become victories for the aspirations for peace and freedom of the common people of the world only when the latter learn from them that they cannot afford to continue the Mollets and Dullesses and what they represent in office, but must organize themselves politically independently of them, and fight for that political power which alone will make it possible for France and the United States to become real factors for peace and freedom in the world.

worry, because in addition to the position in which they have placed themselves with their own government, they will lose their membership in the American Federation of Musicians."

The British union appeared so taken aback that in their reply, it quoted the full text of Petrillo's telegram as though to verify its authenticity. Nevertheless, it dispatched a gingerly but unmistakable rebuke of Petrillo:

"We are naturally hesitant to express opinions on events in another country, especially as we now understand from you that a purely political question arises. We were not aware that the Los Angeles musicians were alleged to be communists. As you know, we are a free trade union independent of the political color of our government. Like most musicians unions in Europe, we try to concentrate on the economic and professional interests of our members; and we do not interest ourselves in, or even inquire into, their beliefs, religious or political, beyond defending their right to think what they like.

"We must recognize of course that the unions in various countries cannot have the same policies; and it is extremely difficult in any country to understand the conditions existing in another. If we were to expel a member from our union and thus deprive him of his living on account of his opinions, we should be accused of persecution.

"There may very well be circumstances in your country, even though they might not be understood in Europe, that preclude your adopting toward minorities the liberal or tolerant attitude one would expect from the U.S.A."

Petrillo wasn't so stupid. He got the point. He realized that they understood too well his attitude toward inner-union democracy. He telegraphed again:

"The AFM like all other legitimate unions in this country is not interested in the private beliefs of any member. The communists, however, have made it a practice to try to take over the labor movement for their own political purposes in disregard of the welfare of the working people and in an effort to use the labor movement to overthrow our government.

This should be noted: Until the hearings in Los Angeles, Petrillo apparently had no information on the 35 musicians; no charges had been made against them and no proof of anti-union activities. Yet he is ready to expel them if he discovers only one fact, namely, that they are Communists.

It is that which the British properly cannot "understand" and which genuine democrats oppose.

Pressure on Reuther for Action to Shorten Work-Week

By JACK WILSON

Detroit, May 20

Unemployment in the auto industry keeps climbing toward the 200,000 mark—which means at least 140,000 in the Detroit area—and the pressure is on for someone to do something about it.

Time's Man of the Year, Harlow Curtice, president of General Motors, has his answer: More inflation by easing credit restrictions and changing the Federal Reserve Board's recent discount rate.

Having earned \$1.2 billion last year, GM sees nothing much wrong with the economic outlook except that only 5.8 million cars will be sold this year compared to 7.1 million last year.

The fact that auto installment credit rose another four billion last year, and now totals 14 billion, doesn't bother GM or Curtice: let's have more credit, they say. As for prices: 1957 models will cost more money.

What about overproduction last year? the practice of car bootlegging? the ruining of dealers? the excessive speedup in the plants, source of the fat profits of GM? Not a mention by Mr. Curtice. He likes capitalism and how it works. As for the rest of the country? What's good for General Motors is good for the country, unless you have subversive ideas, of course, and doubt the sacred, permanent and heavenly features of capitalism.

At the bottom of the heap, however, is the working class, once again suffering from insecurity, anxiety and joblessness. Besides the creeping unemployment, there is the further bad news that model-changeover shutdowns will be longer and greater this year than two years ago, when drastic changes were made in the cars.

With the auto industry staggering

through the rest of the 1956 model production schedules, small wonder that the business magazines now refer to a "rolling recession," and that a real dispute is taking place in ruling circles on what ought to be done.

As against Curtice's plea for more inflation—making the consumers bigger slaves of installment buying and hopeless debts—Wilfred M. Helms, vice-president of the Household Finance Corporation, says that the tight-money policy efforts of the Federal Reserve Board "represent a policy to see the economy through a new rolling recession, and to prevent a serious depression."

In the midst of this kind of crisis, the president of the UAW, Walter Reuther, made a gesture toward action, by asking the big auto firms to meet with the UAW, not to change the contracts but to discuss the problems.

In the Detroit area shops, the favorite crack is: "We got the 32-hour week. How about the 40-hour pay?" Never was the idea of the Guaranteed Annual Wage less popular, since the vast bulk of those now unemployed are not eligible for any of its payments, and the gap between the employed and unemployed stands to grow. For when model-changeover layoffs take place, those who have jobs will get more unemployment benefits, while those who need them the most will not get the supplemental payments from the companies.

Furthermore, there is a deep suspicion in the ranks that the policy of short work-weeks will continue; it saves the corporations money, since they won't have to pay any supplemental benefits any time a man works any part of the week in the shop.

For the UAW, the timing of when the

(Continued on page 4)

Report on the ISL Hearing in Washington

The Government's Prof Expertizes on Leninism

By ALBERT GATES

Washington, D. C., May 21

The hearing in the case of the Independent Socialist League's "listing" by the attorney general was resumed today before Hearing Examiner Edward Morrissey after a recess of nine months. With most preliminaries out of the way in the opening session of last July and August the hearing proceeded at once with the first government witness, Dr. Geroid T. Robinson, Seth Low professor of history at Columbia

The government's case was being handled by Robert Stubbs and T. Kirk Maddrix, the latter directing the examination of Dr. Robinson, who was called as an expert witness on the Russian Revolution and "Soviet Communism."

Attorneys Joseph L. Rauh and Isaac Groner appeared again as counsels for the ISL, Workers Party and Socialist Youth League, which were represented by Max Shachtman and Albert Gates, chairman and secretary respectively of the ISL.

Dr. Robinson's career was briefly cited for the record. He had been an officer in the First World War, then specialized in Russian studies and taught Russian history at Columbia University. In the Second World War, already an established "expert," he served the government in this capacity in the USSR Division of the Research and Analysis Branch of the Office of Strategic Services. Following the war he was instrumental in organizing, and was first director of the Russian Institute.

With this background it is clear that the government called Dr. Robinson in order to present through him what constitutes "Leninism" and "Soviet Communism," and then they will have to try to connect it up with the organizations.

The "expert" testimony consisted for the entire first day of voluminous readings by the professor from the writings of Lenin.

At the very beginning of the session, or shortly after Dr. Robinson began the first of his endless quotations, Rauh told the hearing examiner that "I don't want my silence to be a waiver of objection to any particular question." This comment was made preparatory to obtaining a clearer statement from the government attorneys on the purpose of producing Dr. Robinson in the first place.

The professor began his testimony with a brief biographical sketch of Lenin, how he became a socialist and revolutionary and finally the organizer and leader of the Bolshevik party—all of it quite remote from the ISL, its predecessors and the case.

However, when U.S. attorney Maddrix asked the witness to expound further on the question "Did Lenin have any theory respecting the various stages of history?" and the witness prepared to give a long answer, Rauh raised an important objection as to the purpose of the testimony, since the government had not established that the views cited by the professor were the views of the ISL.

"It seems to me," said Rauh, "that they are putting the cart before the horse. What is at issue is what we advocate. . . . It does not seem to me that any witness should be permitted to testify on Lenin's views except insofar as those views are brought home to our client."

NO TIE-UP

Admitting that the professor may be "well qualified in the theories of Lenin," it had not been shown that he had ever attended meetings of the organization, talked to its members or read its press, or even "knows who they are," Rauh said.

Maddrix argued that since the organizations stated they followed in the tradition of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky, the government had to establish what these were. They had called the professor for the purpose of establishing for the record the theories and practice of Lenin in order therefrom to establish their contention on the role of the organizations.

Examiner Morrissey then asked the government: "Do you hope to connect Leninism as gone into by the doctor to these designated organizations?"

Maddrix's reply was direct: "Oh, yes, these organizations are based on the fundamental teachings of Leninism. That is their excuse for existing. That is their lifeblood."

The government sought to establish this by setting down what Leninism was through the testimony of Dr. Robinson.

So far as the ISL is concerned, Rauh quickly established that Dr. Robinson, whatever his familiarity with the *Selected Works of Lenin*, from which he quoted voluminously, knew nothing whatever about the ISL. Rauh questioned him briefly as follows:

Q.—"Have you ever been to a meeting of the Independent Socialist League?"

A.—"I have not, No."

Q.—"Have you ever spoken or met somebody you know who was a member of the Independent Socialist League?"

A.—"I have not."

Q.—"Have you ever made a study of the writings of the Independent Socialist League?"

A.—"I have read some sections of his book [referring to Shachtman's *Fight for Socialism*]. I have forgotten the title. It is a red covered book of a few pages."

Q.—"Would you consider yourself an expert on the writings of the Independent Socialist League?"

A.—"Definitely not."

Q.—"Dr. Robinson, are you familiar with the Independent Socialist League's interpretation of Lenin's writings?"

A.—"I read one or two articles, I believe published under their auspices, and I read some portions of this book [see above]."

Q.—"Would you consider yourself an expert on the ISL interpretation of Lenin's writings?"

A.—"I disclaim that."

Rauh thereupon again raised objections to Dr. Robinson's testimony on the ground that it could have no bearing on the ISL, since he urged that the witness would agree that there are many interpretations of Lenin's theories. Morrissey in replying stated:

"I agree with you heartily, but they must tie these organizations with Leninism. I asked Mr. Maddrix if he didn't hope to connect it."

MADDRIX: "I said yes."

MORRISSEY: "For the present, Mr. Rauh, and based on the commitment, your objection will be overruled."

READING SESSION

From then on, for about an hour, Dr. Robinson, under the interrogation of Maddrix, read from articles contained in Lenin's *Selected Works*, particularly for the years between 1914 and 1917, articles referring to socialist policy in World War I and tsarist Russia.

Rauh once more raised the point that—"Not a single one of the quotations appear in any Independent Socialist League or Workers Party literature. You previously ruled that they would have to tie the material to us. How many quotations do we have to have without some connections tying them up? We can inform the examiner that not one of them appears in our literature. I don't see any purpose of proceeding."

The matter referred to by Rauh was material forty years old having reference to old and outlived events, as to problems peculiar to the time and place, none of them bearing upon the United States or the movements in the country. Morrissey emphasized:

"I again say, Mr. Rauh, I assume they might be able to connect it up. I am again saying, it will be necessary for them to connect it up."

The afternoon session was devoted almost entirely to continued reading by the witness from the writings of Lenin, such as *What Is to Be Done?*, *Can the Bolsheviks Maintain Power?*, and articles dealing directly with the revolution, the Constituent Assembly, before and after November 7, 1917.

None of the material had any reference to the ISL itself. Toward the end of the day, it was Groner this time who raised

objection to the government's manner of presentation. He stated:

"Mr. Examiner, we would like to renew our objection after a day of this testimony on the ground that it is so distant from any subject which is properly before this hearing that there could be no reasonable justification, if we can submit it in that way, for proceeding in this fashion."

"We had a ruling earlier in the day that the evidence submitted by this witness could be received subject to its being tied up to the organization in some way that wouldn't be too general."

Groner then asked that the government proceed to present some evidence relating to the organization, to show how the quotations from Lenin bore on them, if at all.

In reply, Maddrix quoted from the attorney general's Statement of Grounds that "continuously and at all times during their existence; the Workers Party, Independent Socialist League and Socialist Youth League have followed, relied on, advocated and praised the revolutionary Marxism as expounded by Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky."

What this meant to the organizations and how it was spelled out bore no relationship to the testimony of Dr. Robinson, which could just as well have been given in some classroom on his particular interpretation of certain of Lenin's writings.

This is exactly the point Groner made: the readings were Dr. Robinson's selections and interpretations.

"The issue," objected Groner, "is what these organizations have done, what they have said. . . . It is how they interpret the writings of Lenin and the other writings, the other theoretical documents which are involved, that is, how these or-

Second Day: Cross-Examination Heats It Up

Washington, D. C., May 22

The second day of the hearing brought the attorney general's case down from some of the higher and more abstract reaches of Dr. Robinson's testimony.

This government expert continued where he had closed the day before with another series of quotations from Lenin's *Selected Works*, dealing especially with the war question and violence.

At one point the government seemed about to go into the question of Trotskyism when ISL Attorney Rauh objected that the witness himself had refused to qualify himself as an expert on that subject. Dr. Robinson went back to Lenin quotations, working his way up to the Brest-Litovsk Treaty.

Rauh asked Hearing Examiner Morrissey: "May I inquire of the Government if we had anything to do with the peace of Brest-Litovsk?" But the quotations proceeded. By the end of the morning session, the government completed its direct examination of its expert.

Here the ISL attorneys proposed that cross-examination of Dr. Robinson be postponed till (as promised) the government had connected up his testimony with the organizations being heard. Otherwise, he pointed out, cross-examination could deal with nothing concretely referring to the case but only with hundreds of quotations none of which were relevant.

Maddrix objected to any postponement, asserting rather "Let them propound questions to him which will bring out whether or not his testimony substantiates what Leninism actually is," and once more admitting that Dr. Robinson knew nothing about the ISL itself.

Rauh replied that "it is not our job to prove that we do not interpret Lenin that way. . . . It is their job to prove that we interpret Leninism the way of Dr. Robinson."

CONSULTANT STATUS

But he agreed to cross-examine, and the examiner ruled it would proceed "with the express understanding that the Government will produce this witness at any time for further cross-examination."

Opening cross-examination revealed that Dr. Robinson appeared for the government after visits from government attorneys Alderman and Maddrix. He agreed to come, he said, when it was

This is an exclusive report on the first federal department hearing ever accorded by the attorney general's office to any organization on the notorious "subversive list."

After several years, notably as a result of pressure from the courts in the Shachtman Passport Case, the Department of Justice was finally compelled to grant this hearing to the Independent Socialist League (the case also including its predecessors, Workers Party and Socialist Youth League).

This hearing began in July in last year, but was suspended when ISL Attorney Rauh asked for the disqualification of the hearing examiner on grounds of bias. The reopening of the hearing was then stalled until now.

This ISL case is at present the spearhead of the fight against the "list" method of witchhunting.

organizations have acted with respect to them."

Examiner Morrissey stated that he would have preferred it had the government proceeded another way. But he could not determine the way they wanted to prove their case. He was in some dilemma when he asked "on what basis can they [Rauh and Groner] argue it is not relevant? On what basis can we make a proper ruling until you know what connection there will be?"

"I think that should be made part of the record," said Morrissey. "I again state as I said three or four times that it is going to be necessary to tie the organization in with that specifically. . . . I would not accept that as being adopted by your organization unless there was proof positive to show that they have adopted it."

When Groner expressed the opinion that the examiner might be misled into accepting the government's position that Dr. Robinson's testimony was definitive, Morrissey declared:

"They may do that but I still insist they will have to show that the organization has adopted it."

Thus ended the first day of the hearing. Dr. Robinson is still on the stand. For how long is not yet known since he has reached only the year 1917-18.

pointed out to him that it was his patriotic duty to do so.

He would have preferred that the government call other experts such as Merle Fainsod, Julius Toster or Bertram D. Wolfe.

However, he did agree and had some half-dozen meetings both in New York and Washington with the Department of Justice attorneys prior to the opening of the hearing. All this began about six or eight weeks ago. It was then that he became acquainted with the organizations involved for the very first time.

The afternoon session began with Rauh's continued cross-examination:

Q.—"I forgot to ask you, Dr. Robinson, before: What rate of compensation are you getting?"

A.—"For this service?"

Q.—"Yes, sir."

A.—"\$50 a day, plus \$9 for expenses while away from home."

Q.—"How many days have you spent on the case to date?"

A.—"It has come to 7, for which I received a check. Including two days of the hearing, I think it is six more."

Q.—"You are being paid at a consultant's rate, not the ordinary witness rate?"

A.—"I am not in a position to say. I don't know the government rates."

RAUH: "Maybe the government would confirm that this is the consultant rate, not the ordinary witness rate."

MORRISSEY: "I think that we can agree to that."

MADDRIX: "I won't agree to anything."

EXPERT ON EXPERTS

Somewhat later, however, Maddrix did say that the consultant rate was \$25 to \$50 a day and that Dr. Robinson was paid the \$50 rate. That must be another way of establishing his authority or "expertness."

Cross-examination went on then; Dr. Robinson was asked whether or not Lenin wrote contradictory things, or changed his position, and whether or not there were disagreements on interpretations of Lenin's views and writings.

He went on to answer a series of questions identifying Vernadsky, Radkey, David Shub, Wolfe, and Deutscher. He considered all of them scholars, wasn't quite sure of Shub, but felt them all to be authorities.

(Continued on page 5)

Will the SP Speak Up Against Mollet's Slaughter in Algeria?

This is about Guy Mollet, Algeria, and—an exchange of notes with the Socialist Party national office here.

In our May 7 issue we devoted two pages to documenting the disreputable role that is being played by the present caretaker of French imperialism, who is simultaneously the head of the French Socialist Party, Guy Mollet. It is obviously a situation that requires American socialists to speak out.

As premier, Mollet has dared to do what preceding bourgeois premiers were more hesitant about doing: jail critics of the "dirty war" against the Algerian freedom fighters, like Claude Bourdet; send an unprecedented number of troops to suppress them; step up the slaughter of the Algerian army that is fighting for national independence; move toward conscription for an all-out military effort.

Our reaction against the role of this "socialist" was not entirely unique. "What is a socialist government?" asked François Mauriac, the French Catholic writer. "Today we know it is a government that does dirty work of a kind that would not be tolerated if a right-wing government attempted to do it."

This bitter remark is unfair to socialism, but not to Mollet. It also illustrates the way in which anti-socialists utilize this heinous colonialism to which Mollet has subordinated the French SP.

Even the N. Y. Times correspondent from Paris could write: "On the Right, there is widespread belief that only a Socialist-led cabinet can muster a majority for the unpopular military meas-

ures that the Right approves." (April 23.)

The Paris right-wing *Figaro* praised Mollet for understanding that his "duty" was to give up his viewpoint as a Socialist and become "the head of the government of France."

Surely, no American socialist can ignore this infamy which M. Mollet is heaping on the name of socialism. Hence the Independent Socialist League took the initiative in writing to the Socialist Party of this country, proposing a declaration on Algeria.

The ISL letter is reproduced in column 4.) We are now in receipt of the following reply from the Socialist Party:

"DEAR ALBERT GATES:
"We have your letter of May 10th regarding the situation in North Africa.

"We have taken the occasion at various times to make known our sentiments directly to Guy Mollet.

"Fraternally yours

"HERMAN SINGER
"National Secretary"

IMPORTANT TEST

We are glad to know that the Socialist Party has made known its sentiments to Guy Mollet, but that does not precisely bear upon the question that was raised.

The question was: a public declaration which would make known a genuine socialist sentiment directly to the American people and to the people of the world, including Algeria.

There is a very big difference. And a very important test of democratic socialist behavior is involved.

Since Mollet's accession to the office

of chief executioner of the Algerian people, the Socialist Party USA has not had a word to say in its press in criticism of French imperialism's course in Algeria. Yet surely Socialist Party members must be worried by the fear that their socialism will be identified with this "socialism" of Mollet's which "does dirty work of a kind that would not be tolerated if a right-wing government attempted to do it."

This fear, which must disturb any democratic socialist, becomes redoubled when one reads in the *Socialist Call*—which is so silent about Algeria—a May Day greeting from Local New York of the Socialist Party, which urges readers to:

"Get on the Band Wagon!

"Statistics show that the Democratic Socialist Movement has more members throughout the free world than any other political group.

"Join the party of: Frank Zeidler, Aلسing Andersen, Hugh Gaitskell, U Nu, Norman Thomas, GUY MOLLET, David Ben-Gurion, Jasper McLevy, Samuel H. Friedman." (Caps added.)

TO SPEAK OUT

Our present interest in this assemblage of names is that the SP's New York local wants to be known as the Party of Guy Mollet; among others, and that it has selected his name as one of only five foreign socialists to be accorded this distinction.

Now we assume that Comrade Singer's letter meant that the SP's "sentiments," which had been made known "directly to Guy Mollet," were *critical* sentiments. But we do not believe that the Socialist Party should restrict itself to the private education of Guy Mollet on the socialist impropriety of slaughtering colonial peoples. . . .

We even permit ourselves to doubt whether the SP's conveyance of its no doubt-critical sentiments can be expected to modify M. Mollet's insistence on conveying his own sentiments to the Algerians via bombs and helicopters.

Those in an even more pessimistic mood may go so far as to question whether there is any utility in gravely discussing with a Mollet whether the massacre of a colonial resistance by an imperialist army is or is not conduct unbecoming a socialist.

But in any case, the only important aspect is quite a different thing: how to prevent Mollet's crimes from blackening not

Pressure—

(Continued from page 2)

GAW becomes effective couldn't be worse, in spite of all the brave statements of progress being made from union leaders.

To complicate matters for the UAW, the introduction of the 1957 models next fall will see a further impact of automation as new plants and new departments take over from antiquated production methods, and the unemployment crisis will become a permanent feature . . .

Actually, what confronts the UAW is a new over-all economic situation which it did not foresee in making its long-range GAW plans, and a shift in strategy becomes increasingly difficult to avoid.

Walter Reuther said early this year that he foresees a 32-hour week in ten years. The auto industry can now, in 11 months of production, produce 6,000,000 cars a year in a 32-hour week, utilizing its available work force. Meanwhile the UAW is tied down with three-year contracts that may well have to become "living documents" again as did the five-year contracts in 1953 under rank-and-file pressure.

UAW pleas for defense work in this area, are of course, a temporary expedient that can only retard but not stop the end of Studebaker-Packard and, soon thereafter, Hudson-Nash (known as American Motors). Meanwhile, the trend toward monopoly capitalism, as symbolized by General Motors, continues in the auto industry, in spite of the "indisputable fact" (as claimed by UAW theoreticians) that no Marxian theory has any validity whatsoever in this country.

ISL to SP

TO THE SOCIALIST PARTY

Dear Comrades:

The current situation in North Africa raises the question of French imperialist policy in a new way in view of the fact that the head of the present French Government is Guy Mollet, the leader of the French Socialist Party. From the point of view of socialism, we consider French policy a disaster, directed, as it is, against the colonial aspirations of the Algerian people.

The Socialist Party U. S. A. has not hesitated to condemn imperialism and imperialist attacks on colonial peoples throughout the world and to advocate and support the right of self-determination. All socialists adhere to these views and that is why you and we and other socialists have not hesitated to condemn and attack Stalinist imperialism and the Stalinist satellite regimes as a disgrace and discredit of the name of socialism.

We believe the activities of Guy Mollet and his government discredit and outrage the name of socialism and we therefore propose that you consider a joint declaration between yourself, the ISL, YSL, and any other socialist organization with whom it may be feasible to reach agreement for the purpose of protesting the action of Mollet and his government in Algeria.

Fraternally yours

ALBERT GATES, Secretary

only his own name—which is now certain to go down in history in infamy—but also from smearing and besmirching the name of socialism, which is unfortunately connected with his name.

For this, American socialists must speak out.

It would be deplorable if the Socialist Party should reply—to us or to its own members—that the case of Guy Mollet is a "family affair" and must not be mentioned in the hearing of strangers. It is not a family affair; it is an international scandal.

Even now, while we exchanged these notes with the Socialist Party, the leaders of the Communist Party are being challenged from all sides: "Why didn't YOU speak out about the crimes of Stalin, which you are now busily denouncing?" Here and there, Stalinist apologists reply: "Open criticism of our Leader would have weakened our cause . . ." or words to that effect.

So they identified themselves with the criminal Stalin.

To be sure, one cannot say that these Stalinists even "made known their sentiments directly" to the criminal, for at this point our analogy breaks down, since the CP is a totalitarian movement.

But the Socialist Party is not totalitarian. Why should it make it possible for the French executioner Mollet to be immune from merited denunciation by genuine socialists who want to show the world that Molletism is not socialism?

Is there a socialist in the Socialist Party who could live with equanimity under the slightest public ambiguity as to whether he supports the freedom of Algeria, or whether on the other hand he supports the bullets which are being shot against fighters for this freedom?

We of the Independent Socialist League earnestly renew our proposal for a joint socialist declaration on the Mollet government and the Algerian war, and urge the Socialist Party to reconsider its negative stand.

ISL FUND DRIVE

It Was Tough but We Made It

By GORDON HASKELL

(Fund Drive Director Albert Gates is in Washington, D. C. representing the ISL at the Justice Department hearing reported elsewhere in this issue.—ED.)

The 1956 Fund Drive has, for all practical purposes, gone over the top. As we go to press a total of \$9727.90 has been collected and reported, which makes up 97.2 per cent of our goal of \$10,000.

We are sure that the remaining 2.8 per cent will dribble in during the next few weeks, as it has all been promised us by people in whose word we have the utmost confidence.

The gratifying figures reached in the drive were made possible above all by the fact that New York, Chicago and the National Office, which among them account for 70 per cent of the total, came through with such flying colors. Both New York and Chicago had to really extend themselves, and we want to thank the drive directors in those cities as well as the many comrades who contributed so generously, for their efforts.

It has come to our attention that during this and past drives there has been some confusion over what the "National Office" quota signifies. One friend wrote asking how the National Office, which needs money so desperately, and whose personnel are so poorly and tardily paid, could give such a whopping sum in the drive.

She suggested that perhaps this is another example of the Biblical contention that those who have not, even the

little they have shall be taken from them.

Reasonable as such a speculation may appear to be from the title of this quotation, we would like to point out that although the functionaries contribute their mite, a contribution of such a size would run afoul of the folk observation that you can't wring blood from a turnip.

Actually, "National Office" covers all contributions to the drive that are received directly by the National Office and which are not attributable to any of the other listings in the drive. Funds sent directly to the office by individual readers of LABOR ACTION in response to our appeal fall into this category.

Although the success of the drive was made possible by the fulfillment of these large quotas, this does not mean that the efforts put forth here were proportionately any more strenuous or worthwhile than those put forth by our members and friends in the other units. We want particularly to mention the San Francisco Bay Area, Newark and Cleveland, that worked so hard to make their quotas in full.

Los Angeles and Detroit also merit honorable mention, the former because of its expanded quota, and the latter because it has done so well in the face of the layoffs and short weeks in the auto industry. We still hope that both these units, so close to 100 per cent, will manage to go over the top. Pittsburgh and Buffalo have also been bucking specially adverse circumstances, and we are sure that the comrades and friends there have done their maximum.

We cannot close this drive without a word about St. Louis, which has achieved 386 per cent of its original quota of \$25. It is not that the quota represented an under-estimation of the financial resources of our old comrade who holds the fort in St. Louis. We did underestimate his heart and devotion, and that of the staunch old socialists and libertarians on whom he was able to call and who responded so magnificently.

The fact that our 1956 Fund Drive has been concluded so successfully must be a source of gratification to every member of the ISL, and every sympathetic reader of LABOR ACTION. Without its successful conclusion, it would be impossible for us to continue to publish LABOR ACTION and *The New Internationalist* on the present basis.

We want to thank everyone who worked to gather in the contributions, and everyone who contributed. You have struck a real blow for socialism!

FUND DRIVE BOX SCORE

City	Quota	Paid	%
	\$10,000	\$9727.90	97.2
St. Louis	25	96.70	386.
Bay Area	400	465	116
New York	3,800	3884	102
Natl. Office	1,250	1268	101.4
Chicago	2,000	2016	100
Cleveland	150	150	100
Oregon	50	50	100
Reading	50	50	100
Newark	400	400	100
Los Angeles	650	636.45	94.8
Detroit	350	320.75	91.6
Streator	25	20	80
Philadelphia	200	158	79
Pittsburgh	200	130	65
Buffalo	150	85	56.6
Seattle	150	20	13.3
Indiana	100	0	0
Akron	25	0	0



May 28, 1956 Vol. 20, No. 22

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

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

YSL FUND DRIVE

Try to Go Over the Top

By MAX MARTIN

Receipts for the Young Socialist League's 1956 Fund Drive during the past four weeks have been maintaining the schedule set during the first part of the drive, which is also the schedule necessary for a successful completion of the fund appeal. To date a total of \$1195, or 81 per cent of our national quota of \$1475, has come in.

Top honors so far have been earned by the three units which have 100 per cent or over: Cleveland Area, Dayton Area and New York. The last in particular deserves commendation, for with the largest quota of any unit in the League, it is in first place with over 114 per cent of its quota already achieved. Moreover, the fund drive director assures us that more will be coming in.

Dayton Area and Cleveland Area, in second and third places respectively, are also to be congratulated for achieving their quotas in full.

Then come Pittsburgh, "At Large & National Office," and Los Angeles, in that order. All three are within striking distance of meeting their goals; they

WHAT'S THE SCORE ?

City	Quota	Paid	%
Total	\$1475	\$1195	81.0
New York	600	688.50	114.8
Dayton Area	25	25.50	102
Cleveland Area	25	25	100
Pittsburgh	50	35	70
At Lge. & N.O.	100	68	68
Los Angeles	150	101	67.3
Chicago	350	207	59.1
Albany	75	25	33.3
Berkeley	75	20	26.7
San Francisco	25	0	0

will certainly do so by the end of the drive.

Chicago, which is in seventh place, has been doing an excellent job considering the fact that it has a very high quota and is trying to meet it under difficult financial conditions for the comrades there. While the Chicago fund drive director originally doubted the ability of the unit to reach its goal, a recent letter informs us that the comrades in the Windy City will either make their quota or come very close to it.

UP THE GOAL

Albany, Berkeley and San Francisco are still far behind, although the Albany comrades assure us that they will achieve their quota by the end of the drive. The comrades of the two units in the Bay Area should also aim at meeting the quota.

At this point there can be little doubt that the YSL will succeed in raising the \$1475 quota which it set itself. And since this is so, it is incumbent upon all comrades and friends of the YSL to change their goal from one of meeting our quota to one of surpassing it during the three remaining weeks of the drive period.

The \$1475 goal which we set ourselves was by no means a liberal estimate of our financial needs; it was a minimum figure. The organization can urgently use funds far in excess of that figure.

Every unit of the YSL should aim at achieving 100 per cent of its quota; those who have already met it or are close to it should set themselves the task of going over. Challenge readers can aid by sending their contributions. Make your checks or money orders payable to Max Martin and send them to Young Socialist League, 3rd floor, 114 West 14 Street, New York.

Young Socialists and LYL To Plan Debate on Russia

The letter which follows is the latest item in the efforts of the Young Socialist League to secure a debate with the Labor Youth League. As the text indicates, the sequence involved was this:

On April 9 the YSL challenged the LYL to debate "The Meaning of the Twentieth Congress of the Russian Communist Party." The LYL replied on May 15, stating that it does not take a position on this topic but claiming that it is interested in debates on subjects of interest to young people who wish to learn about socialism. The LYL letter proposed that an appointment be arranged to discuss ways of doing this.

The YSL letter printed below is the letter confirming that appointment, which was arranged by telephone. The Berkeley unit of the YSL and other YSL Units are endeavoring to arrange debates with the LYL locally.—Ed.

May 19, 1956

Harvey D. Cohen
Labor Youth League

Dear Sir:

This is to confirm our telephone conversation of May 18.

In reply to our letter of April 9 challenging the Labor Youth League to a debate on "The Meaning of the Twentieth Congress of the Russian Communist Party," you replied on May 15 that the Labor Youth League does not take a position on this question but that you are interested in debate "on all subjects of interest to young people who want to learn about socialism." You also invited us to telephone you for an appointment to discuss "the ways in which this can be done."

As we informed you during our telephone conversation, we are also inter-

ested in such debate and discussion. We shall meet with you on Thursday, May 24 at 6 P.M. to pursue our proposal for a debate between the Young Socialist League and the Labor Youth League.

At this meeting we shall propose for your consideration the following as the subject for such a debate: "Is Russia a Socialist Society?" We inform you of our proposal in advance so that you may have the opportunity of consulting with your colleagues in advance of our meeting.

In our opinion this subject is of great interest to young people wishing to learn about socialism; it is a question which all socialists and students of socialism have to consider and decide. Russia, a country occupying one-sixth of the earth, is described as a socialist society by those who rule it and by many throughout the world. We, on the other hand, regard it as the antithesis of socialism, as a reactionary, exploitive class society.

A young person wishing to learn about socialism has to decide which of these views to adopt, for his analysis of the entire international situation, his estimation of the various parties and organizations purporting to stand for socialism, indeed, his very conception of socialism, are closely connected with his views on the nature of Russian society. Moreover, the Twentieth Congress of the Russian Communist Party raises this question afresh in the minds of those who consider themselves socialists and who wish to learn about socialism.

For these reasons we trust that you will see fit to accept our proposal on the subject for a debate between spokesmen for the Young Socialist League and the Labor Youth League.

YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE
MAX MARTIN, National Secretary

Prof Expertizes on Leninism—

(Continued from page 3)

As to Vernadsky:

Q.—"Are there any differences between your interpretations of Lenin and his?"

A.—"I know of none. I don't know if there may be. I have not examined his work in enough detail to be certain..."

Q.—"Would you consider Radkey a scholar?"

A.—"I do."

Q.—"Is there any disagreement between your position and Radkey's?"

A.—"I know of none. I recall none."

Q.—"Bertram D. Wolfe [considered as a scholar]?"

A.—"I do."

Dr. Robinson then went on to describe his sometime association with Wolfe in the Russian Institute, referring to his book *Three Who Made a Revolution*. When asked if he had any difference with Wolfe on the question of Lenin and Leninism, he said that they did not agree on the significance of Lenin's *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, Wolfe giving it little value, while he thought it integral to Lenin's "philosophy, strategy and tactics."

Q.—"So that the only matter of disagreement between you and Wolfe is this book in general philosophy?"

A.—"That is the only one I recall."

Up to now, the professor had sought to convey the idea that his interpretation of Lenin as an anti-democrat, one imbued with the need for violence, etc., etc., was the universally accepted view of scholars on which there were no differences of interpretation. Taking Wolfe's book, already referred to, and without naming the author, Rauh cited the following passage:

"But how then could the revolution be kept democratic? For Lenin, in those

days was a convinced democrat, and the problem of political freedom concerned him deeply."

Q.—"Do you agree with that interpretation of Lenin?"

Some rereading followed and then Dr. Robinson said:

A.—"I am sorry. I don't think it is placed chronologically. I don't know when 'those days' are."

Q.—"Those days' are 1905 to 1917. Do you agree with that statement?"

A.—"Unless there is very important and very careful qualifications, I disagree profoundly."

Q.—[Reading] "Not only in those days, but until he seized power in 1917. 'Not a single socialist,' he wrote for instance in 1914, 'unless he decides to pronounce the question of political freedom and democracy of no consequence to him, in which case, of course, he ceases to be a socialist. . . .' His writings are full of such earnest avowals, and there can be no doubt of their sincerity. Even in 1917, he countenanced a 'temporary' minority dictatorship in Russia only because he was convinced that the Russian example in the midst of the war would end the war on all fronts by worldwide revolution, thereby solving the problems of Russia's backwardness by a solution on a world scale."

Some colloquy followed this reading which the professor seemed to have difficulty in following. He then admitted that Lenin did favor reforms and democracy, but insisted it was only for the purpose of making easier the organization of a violent revolution.

Q.—"Do you agree with that [Wolfe's reference]?"

A.—"In the sharpest way, I disagree..."

Q.—"Then it would be fair to say that

you do strongly disagree with what I read?"

A.—"That is correct."

Q.—"I did ask you if you had any substantial disagreement with Bertram D. Wolfe?"

A.—"I testify that I recall none."

Q.—"Now if I told you this came from Bertram Wolfe's writings would you say that your earlier testimony had been erroneous?"

A.—"Yes."

Q.—"This is a sharp disagreement between you and Wolfe?"

A.—"Yes."

Q.—"So there can be sharp disagreements on Lenin's writings, can there be?"

A.—"This seems to be."

WHAT WOULD LENIN SAY?

There now followed, toward the close of the day, a very fine cross-examination bringing matters closer to reality. It began with the following question by Rauh:

Q.—"Dr. Robinson, could you take a current problem, any problem you choose, and indicate what you believe Lenin's views would be on such a problem?"

Maddrix objected strenuously to this question as beyond the scope of opinion and the ability of Dr. Robinson to answer:

"I don't know what Lenin, dead a long time, would have to say on a present-day problem. That shows the ridiculousness of the question."

MORRISSEY: "I would rather have counsel ask a direct question on a situation, then we can see whether or not it is."

Further colloquy followed, and the question was restated over the objection

of the government, and the witness answered:

"Yes. I think I can, yes."

Q.—"Will you state it?"

A.—"I think one current situation in which Lenin would take a deep interest if he were alive today and still following the philosophy, strategy and tactics of his lifetime would be, let us see—the methods that were used to upset a democratic government in Czechoslovakia..."

Q.—"So that if an organization took a position that that had been improper, it would be anti-Leninist in Czechoslovakia?"

A.—"I would say that if it took a position different from the one that I defined, it would be different from Lenin in that respect."

Following that, Rauh asked Dr. Robinson whether Russia of today was a Leninist state. He answered: "The Leninist position would be that this is a Communist government."

And if an organization opposed the present Russian state in all respects? Then, according to the government expert, it would not be Leninist in that respect either.

The session closed on this note, with cross-examination of Dr. Robinson to be continued at a somewhat warmer rate.

NEW YORK YSL
SOCIAL-EDUCATIONAL
George Post
C. W. MILLS' BOOK
"THE POWER ELITE"
Discussion . . . Refreshments . . .
SAT. EVENING, June 2
333 West 26 Street
Apt. 1-L (basement)

The Case of a Dissenter in an American Labor Party Club

How the ALP Cracks Down On Democratic Discussion

By GEORGE HANLEY

The American Labor Party of New York is today a shadow of its former self. It has been reduced to less than a dozen district clubs and its membership is rapidly declining. At present it purports to be a pressure group; in reality, its function is to attract radicals to, and recruit members for, the Communist Party.

Its internal regime is modeled after the Communist Party too—monolithic discipline, bureaucratic leadership, anti-democratic procedures, and, above all, no criticism.

This can best be detailed by giving an account of an individual case which this writer knows of personally. This is the case of Claire Spatz, an active ALP member who was recently "purged" from the party for presuming to raise unwelcome questions.

Claire Spatz had been an active member in good standing with the ALP since June 4, 1954. She was recognized in the Fourth Assembly District South club as one of its most active canvassers, who had contributed much to the club's prosperity in the way of finances, writing and art work.

The chairman of this ALP club, Sheila Kamm, directed all the activities of the club. She created the agenda; systematically discouraged debate on any controversial issue; held members who displayed signs of individualism up to ridicule and ostracism; and held the chairmanship for four years without permitting an election of officers to take place at any time. She was designated as candidate for Assembly from the district without even consulting the club executive board.

She had complete domination; her rule was absolute; her decisions were final. This was a typical American Labor Party club.

When the ALP lost its ballot status and its general membership began to decrease by leaps and bounds, Claire Spatz began to wonder if some alterations in ALP policy could not revive the organization and turn it into an effective pressure group. She attempted to introduce this idea to her local club and met with this response from Chairman Kamm: "If you don't like the policy of the American Labor Party, my only advice to you is to get the hell out of the American Labor Party and start your own political party!" Thus Spatz was denied any chance to express herself on a club level.

AUTHORITARIANISM

But she was resolved to make her convictions known, and so at the next State Committee meeting (September 12, 1955) she got up and raised a lone voice against the trend in ALP policy, and proposed some revisions. At this point, her thinking leaned to the right: in order to attract new members, the "ALP must scrap its self-righteous and dogmatic approach and adopt a more moderate and liberal position"; the ALP could be more effective if it would "reorganize its limited forces into a pressure group and abandon independent political action."

She also raised sharply the issue of internal democracy: "the rank-and-file membership has been discouraged from participation in policy discussions through the intimidation of leaders who equate 'disagreement' with 'disruption.'"

Immediately ALP authoritarianism began to assert itself: in the two following meetings of the district club, violent and slanderous attacks were made on her honesty and character ("FBI" . . . "Trotskyite" . . . etc.) while Chairman Kamm used her position to prevent her from making any attempt to defend herself.

It was obvious that the well-meaning Miss Spatz, in her theoretical naiveté and political immaturity (she was 19 years old at the time), had committed the supreme blunder: she had criticized the ALP! They weren't going to let her get away with it.

Consequently, she was ordered to surrender her keys to the club, to refrain from representing the ALP on any level, and not to "disrupt" future meetings by voicing opinions. The operation was concluded with this pointed comment by the chairman: "No more personalities are gonna come up in my club, even if we have to get a bouncer!"

Spatz, being barred from participation in the activities of this club, tried to seek membership elsewhere: she wrote to other ALP clubs, of the Labor Youth League, and to the Communist Party. No answer. She had undoubtedly been blacklisted in the whole Stalinist movement on the strength of the "iniquitous crime" of having exercised her right to free speech in the ALP.

COUNTERATTACK

But she wanted to do something about it. She organized several friends who were sympathetic to her case into a club which they called the "Labor Unity Committee," and having purchased the enrollment books for the 4th and 6th Assembly Districts, proceeded to mail out two leaflets, presenting her views, to the ALP enrollment of that area. Response was affirmative, and the club realized that its membership was being alienated. It hoped to save itself by discrediting the LUC and administering a verbal lynching to Miss Spatz.

To facilitate this goal, they sent an announcement, loaded with distortions and half-truths—to their membership, stating that "Miss Spatz has been formally charged under the by-laws of the ALP with bringing the party into disrepute and for betrayal of trust."

Now the fact is that the ALP has no "by-laws" other than the New York State Election Law, which contains no such proviso; and therefore, this ex-post-facto charge was wholly imaginative. Furthermore, they managed to see that Spatz received notice of her trial only one day prior to the appointment, not leaving her time to prepare a case.

Nevertheless, she went, and delivered an hour-long documented defense proving that constructive criticism was not "bringing the party into disrepute," nor was a statement of wellknown facts about ALP errors and inertia a "betrayal of trust."

The State Committee representative who attended this trial realized that there was no legal basis here for it, and ruled that the meeting continue not as a "trial" but as a "discussion among friends, progressives." Thereupon its character as a formal hearing was completely dropped.

For the benefit of the State Committee representative and several rank-and-file members who had dropped by, the club executive board (a mere four members) was obliged to vote unanimously to reinstate Claire Spatz as an active member of the club.

Here was where the Stalinist purge began.

PURGE AND FRAME-UP

At the next club meeting it was "discovered" that one of the members of the executive board had been out of town when the decision to reinstate Spatz was made; and (in violation of parliamentary law) Kamm reasoned that since one member had not been present, the club decision was negated and an entire new review of the case would have to be made—without Spatz being present!

Spatz was then thrown out of the club, without any opportunity to protest this arbitrary action by the chairman, which was made without a vote being taken or a quorum present or any outside witnesses in attendance.

The club could not risk a formal trial proceeding again, so they patiently delayed action on the issue for three months, until Spatz's membership card expired and she would not be eligible to act under Article 16 of the Election Law providing that "a member of a political committee may be removed by said committee [only] after a hearing upon written charges." Then they simply refused to renew her membership!

The State and County Committees, fearing bad publicity on this illegal and undemocratic purge, attempted to intervene on behalf of Miss Spatz. Club Chairman Kamm did not want to risk repudiation, and so, in typical Stalinist tradition, she employed the infamous technique of frame-up: she removed the club records from the clubhouse and stealthily replaced them a week later, telling the executive board that Spatz had burglarized them, made duplicates, and then returned them so as not to be caught with the goods.

For the objective observer, this would seem hardly plausible: if Spatz already possessed a membership list, as evidenced by her first mailing to the ALP enrollment, why should she steal the club records? And if she had taken them, why not destroy them rather than reveal herself as a thief?

But Kamm was a long-time leader in the ALP and Spatz had already been once "discredited," so it was not difficult to make the frame-up creditable. The State and County Committees were now hesitant to interfere, and decided to take no official position.

CP TAKES A HAND

Claire Spatz protested the entire handling of this case to the district club, to the State and County Committees, and to the other ALP club in the same district. She demanded that Chairman Kamm be formally censured, and that she herself be given a hearing and a chance to clear her name in the "progressive movement." The "Labor Unity Committee" challenged the ALP to "an open and public debate on the issue." All these requests were ignored.

The Labor Unity Committee continued to mail literature to the ALP enrollment, in an effort to present the truth and to bring pressure to bear for a hearing. The ALP would not comply, and due to a storm of indignation from sustaining members who refused to support the club until some democratic action was taken on the issue, the ALP club was actually forced to close down.

Friends of Claire Spatz who still hold membership in the ALP have tried to raise this case in their local clubs. This was met with the usual suppression by club chairmen, who refused to place the issue on the agenda. It is reported that in at least three clubs, chairmen have destroyed mail addressed to "Club Executive Board" from the LUC.

When a state representative attempted to bring up the question at a committee meeting, County Chairman Abrams blatantly declared: "It is a local problem," and would not even investigate the activities of Kamm.

The Communist Party itself intervened finally: it sent a representative who tried to cajole the LUC people into silence. This CP representative "advised" Claire Spatz that the only hope she had of getting back into the "progressive movement" was to (1) send a formal apology to the ALP, (2) mail an official retraction to the recipients of the LUC statements, refuting all her previous criticisms in their entirety, and (3) file a statement with the CP headquarters declaring her devotion to the movement and requesting an assignment.

Spatz asked, "Suppose I did all this, and the CP then decided to uphold my expulsion from the movement?"

"That would be unfortunate," the CP representative replied, "but the decision of the party is final."

"Even if the party is wrong?"

"Look, Claire," he said, "what's more important, you or the Movement?"

In short, the CP was asking her to submit to the trial-by-confession method which Stalin had used in the purge trials. By their reasoning, she was being given the "privilege" of martyring herself, through political suicide, in order to prove to the world that the party had not erred in purging her in the first place.

DOUBLETHINK

This case should lead to some thinking by ALP members on why the organization was so insistent on purging Claire Spatz. Here are some ideas.

It is the function of the CP and CP front groups to present the people with a favorable picture of the policies of the Kremlin. Any member who violates this tenet by trying to promote individual opinions automatically forfeits the terms of his membership.

Most of the rank and file accept this, because they are deluded by their bureaucratic leaders into thinking of the Soviet Union as a "Workers' State." In addition, from the moment one joins a Stalinist organization, he is taught that the worst crime a "Marxist" can commit is to criticize party policy or leadership, for this "would play into the hands of the enemy and might bring harm to the movement."

For this same reason, purged members who protest their expulsion (even if it is later discovered that they were unjustly charged) are not rehabilitated: it is all right for the party to betray and defame its most loyal adherents and to perform acts that contradict every doctrine of its professed ideology, but for a member to retaliate against injustice is criminal.

Here are three elements in the party's doublethink:

(1) *The party can do no wrong.* This myth is perpetuated by concealing all party mistakes. The CP has been virtually overwhelmed by the "re-evaluation of Stalin" at the 20th Congress of the CPSU, which forced the leaders to reveal themselves as tyrants, murderers, and counter-revolutionaries.

(2) *A critic is a "Trotskyite."* This is the notorious "Trotskyite hoax" used by the CP as a weapon against all critics. It goes this way: A Trotskyite is a person who endeavors to divide the Stalinist camp by means of disruption; criticism tends to have a disruptive effect; therefore, all critics are Trotskyites.

EVIL SYSTEM

The "Trotskyite hoax" (skipping for the moment their deceitful definition of a Trotskyite) is just an invention of the CP and its fellow travelers to stamp out all dissension and free opinion at its source. For example, at the time of her expulsion, as we have indicated, Claire Spatz, far from being a Trotskyist (as the ALP branded her), was on the contrary moving to the right. It is, by the way, ironic that in the light of the 20th Congress's new "popular front" policy, the ALP has adopted virtually every point in the program put forward at that time by Spatz.

(3) *Capitalist encirclement.* The CP claims that it is attacked on all sides by the bourgeoisie and its allies, and therefore cannot tolerate attacks from within. We would like, then, to ask these questions:

Can a movement for democracy stem from an essentially undemocratic origin? Is authoritarianism conducive to strength, or is it indicative of weakness, fear and self-destructive dogmatism? Isn't this exactly the same philosophy that condoned Stalin's mass blood purges in the 1930s, the slaughter of 5000 of his top officers, and the imprisonment or exile of thousands of intellectuals and political opponents?

This account of one individual's experience has been written up in the belief that this scurrilous system of slander, lies, and frame-up of comrades, as used by the Stalinist groups, is a subversion of the principles of socialist democracy for which all true Marxists strive; and in the hope that it will point the way to independent socialism.

The Military Mind

Now that the American military machine has been built up to the point where it will be able to meet any new "global war" as described by Admiral Radford and his fellow saber-rattlers before the Senate Armed Forces Committee (N. Y. Times, May 10), it appears that they are giving consideration to the possibility that all will not be tranquility on the home front.

The Pentagon recently announced that its various Army Areas will commence mandatory training for all army personnel in "Domestic Emergencies and Civil Disturbances," to be followed by a maneuver-like phase of "practical training."

To the military mind, "civil disturbances" cover "riots, strikes and interference with the structure of national defense," which suggests an all-inclusiveness that might affect just about every worker in the United States.

This follows by some six weeks similar announcement of a mandatory training program for all officers on Martial Law and its application in civil jurisdictions taken over by the military. Such courses and instruction were previously limited to the legal arm of the army.

Following recent disclosures by the Department of the Army that congressmen were failing to fill their quotas for appointment to West Point, because of seeming "disinterest," a new campaign is now under way to select material from the active establishment itself, so men may "rise from the ranks" to attend the institution which the professionals refer to as the "trade school on the Hudson."

The embryo Air Force Academy is still having trouble convincing qualified potentials that its program presents a highly sought career.

Russia Under Stalin's Disciples — —

(Continued from page 1)

throughout the country.

● That this one man established a cult of tyrannical personal dictatorship which compelled all around him—and that included every public personage in every public field—to bow and scrape before him, to sing his praises in the most extravagant form, and to build up the most incredible falsehoods about him and his rule.

● That this one man directed or approved of the perpetration of frame-ups of innocent people on the most monstrous of accusations and sent untold numbers to imprisonment, to concentration camps and even to their death.

● That among those framed up were thousands of the finest revolutionaries—authentic leaders of the revolution of 1917 itself, of the civil war in which the young Soviet Republic successfully defended itself from many-sided attack, and of the Communist International in the days when it was a truly revolutionary movement.

● That this one man was responsible for the deliberate and planned murder of thousands of his own comrades, and that among those innocent victims were most of the heads of the Russian army and five thousand of its officers.

● That this one man was responsible for the deliberate and planned murder of many foreign revolutionaries who had found refuge in Russia and many foreign supporters of Stalin himself, including outstanding figures like Bela Kun and the leaders of the Polish Communist Party.

● That this one man was responsible for a campaign of downright anti-Semitism in Russia, and that in the hideous purges for which he was generally responsible, practically all the leaders, spokesmen, artists, writers and representatives of the Jewish people in Russia were assassinated.

● That this one man was responsible for the "Titoist plot," which turns out to have been a forgery from start to finish, for there was no "Titoist plot" to begin with, and that therefore all those leaders in Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Albania, Rumania and Poland who "confessed" to participation in the "Titoist plot" were themselves the murdered victims of a real Stalinist plot.

● That this one man was responsible for the most extensive falsification of history in modern times, above all of the history of the revolution itself, of the Communist Party, of the Second World War, and of the role which he and others played in them.

A Conclusion

The meaning of this picture, which is only a part of the picture of a whole, should be clear. It means, first and foremost and above all, one thing—

All the stories told about Russia as the socialist fatherland, as the country of workers' rule, as the land of advanced workers' democracy—all these stories spread in every language of the world for the past twenty-five years or more—were outrageous falsehoods, disseminated by cold-blooded cynics convinced that their followers were dupes who could be led by the nose forever and anywhere, or else disseminated by ignoramuses of all sorts and varieties.

Does this conclusion seem to you

to be too harsh? But what other conclusion is possible if you want to face the dictates of facts which your own leaders now find it necessary to acknowledge?

How could there be a semblance of the rule of the working class if the working class did not enjoy the most elementary right to express itself, to criticize the regime, to modify it in any way, to replace it with one worthy of its confidence?

If people as prominent, as highly-placed, as powerful (at least in appearance) as Khrushchev did not dare open their mouths to tell the despot what was in their minds, let alone to criticize him, let alone to replace him with another leader, what do you think was the position of less prominent leaders of the ruling party?

If the leaders of the ruling party did not enjoy the most elementary of rights, what do you think was the position of the rank-and-file member of that party?

If the rank-and-file member of the party did not enjoy any rights, even though his party is the only one that is allowed to exist in the country, what do you think was the position of the ordinary worker or peasant in the country?

Who Has Power?

You know, from the daily experiences you have, from the experiences of life throughout the world of people like yourself, that if you do not have any rights, you do not have any power. You know, from all these experiences, that you can hardly even think of power until you acquire these rights. This simple principle applies with no less force to the situation in Russia under Stalin.

It is the present leaders who have admitted it: under Stalin, the workers and peasants as a whole had no power whatever, and the story about Russia as a state of the working class was an outrageous lie.

It is the present leaders who have admitted it: under Stalin, all members of the Communist Party as a whole had no power whatever, but had to bow slavishly to the dictates of a homicidal maniac who murdered their best leaders.

It is the present leaders who have admitted it: under Stalin, all the reports about decisions by legislative bodies, about decisions by Supreme Soviets, about decisions by courts of law, about decisions by the working masses, about decisions by congresses and by elections, were fictions and frauds.

None of these decisions meant a thing in reality. None of the bodies which seemed to make these decisions meant a thing in reality. To all practical intents and purposes, they did not exist. All the decisions were made by one single despot. All the other claims were a lie.

It is a bitter truth to have to admit to yourself, but it is the truth, and no progress can be made until it is faced squarely.

Different Now?

You have been told, and perhaps you are saying it to yourself:

"All this may have been true, but from now on it is going to be different. The new leaders of Russia are fearlessly admitting the mistakes of the past and are taking steps to correct them and prevent their recurrence."

If this were so, it would mean a

real step forward. But is it really so, or are you being flooded with a new series of falsehoods and deceptions?

In the first place, why should you take the word of the new leaders? What entitles them to your trust and confidence? Who are they, where were they and what were they doing during all the years of Stalin's hideous criminality?

Khrushchev, Bulganin, Mikoyan, Malenkov, Molotov, Kaganovich and all their present colleagues were Stalin's stoutest supporters; they were his most intransigent defenders and worshipers. They were the most unwavering executors of all his policies. In simple language that they do not like to hear, all the present leaders were direct conscious and deliberate accomplices of Stalin.

As Stalin's accomplices, they are not less guilty of the crimes which, together with him, they perpetrated against the people of the Soviet Union and the followers of the Communist Parties everywhere. Why should any thinking person have the slightest confidence in them or in their words?

They say that although they knew that Stalin was committing all these unspeakable crimes, they did not dare to speak up because he might have imprisoned or even murdered them, as he did so many others.

You rank-and-file militants, reflect on this admission by the Russian leaders.

Like the heads of your party, they call upon you and the working peoples throughout the world to fight without fear, and if necessary to die, for the great cause of social justice and freedom which the idea of socialism represents. Whoever flinches or shows his cowardice is removed from all posts of responsibility and, in flagrant cases, is driven out of the movement.

The Bureaucrats' Fear

But when the question of questions is put to these same leaders—"Where were you all that time?"—their only answer is: "We were afraid of our own hides. We were afraid to open our mouths against the greatest crimes ever committed in the name of socialism, because the despot might have killed us or put us in prison. We were afraid of our own hides, so we helped him perpetrate his crimes, we defended him against any and all criticism, even the most sincere. We hounded and persecuted anyone who failed to toady to Stalin and to us. We were disgusting cowards."

Does such an admission entitle them to the eminence of leadership, or to the merciless condemnation of every sincere socialist who has been outraged by them and their avowed deeds?

The truth is this: all these leaders represented the bosses who dominate the people of Russia, namely, the tremendous parasitic bureaucracy.

Did they really fear Stalin and his rule? They certainly did, but they feared more the rule of the masses, of the people, of the democratically organized workers and peasants—indefinitely more.

Under such rule, they would have their place, but not their same special privileges, both economic and political. And to prevent the rule of the masses, to keep the

workers and peasants in despotic subjection, they need a despot. That is the simple explanation of why, even though many of them hated Stalin, they needed him and served him so loyally. They needed his all-powerful tyranny and police rule in order to save them from the rule of the people.

And that is also why all the changes and promises they have made since the 20th Congress do not include the only change that would have meaning—the change from the regime of totalitarian power for the bureaucracy. That is why to this hour, despite all the concessions they are making to the Russian people, or even those concessions they may be forced to make in the future, there is no workers' democracy in the Soviet Union and therefore no workers' power.

The "new line" is a new deception.

What Rights?

The working masses in the Soviet Union still do not have the right to assemble freely in order to speak freely of their problems. They still do not have the right to organize freely into whatever unions or political or other social organizations they desire, in order to achieve the aims they have decided on after free discussion. They still do not have the right to publish any press which is not completely controlled by the self-confessed accomplices of a despot and his despotism.

What rights can working people enjoy if they are confined to voting for only one political organization, whose representatives do not even have any real power except what is conferred upon them by the leaders at the top who make all the decisions on all the questions of the day?

What rights have the working people when even members of the exclusively privileged party are not allowed to discuss the party line which has been imposed upon them from the top, let alone to make serious changes in the line?

What rights do you think the working people of the Soviet Union have when even members of this privileged party who question the official line are already being denounced by Khrushchev and his associates in the same language, the very same language, that Stalin used against all his opponents—"rotten elements," "bourgeois nationalists," and the like?

Socialism and Democracy

We of the Independent Socialist League take our fundamental position as socialists on the basic principle of Marxism which has been maintained intact by all true revolutionaries for the past hundred years, and which has had its validity confirmed by the Stalinist horrors that resulted from trampling on the principle, namely, that without full rights for the workers there cannot be any workers' democracy; and that without democracy and its fullest realization, as the immortal Lenin put it, there cannot be any socialism.

As long as the bureaucracy rules in Russia through its totalitarian party regime, and through the leaders of the party, there will not be and cannot be any workers' democracy, and all talk of socialism will be a lie.

(Turn to last page)

Russia Under Stalin's Disciples — —

(Continued from page 7)

Democracy would mean, in your party, that you not only discuss and decide, but that you do it on basis of full and free access to all the facts. It means that you do all deciding on who are to be the party leaders and what policy to pursue.

Democracy would mean, in Russia, that the workers and peasants not only discuss and decide freely, but that they have the fullest and most inviolable democratic means of doing so—the right to organize, to free speech, to free press, to free assembly, to free elections, to initiative and recall of their freely chosen representatives.

There is no democracy in your party, but only a pretence. There is no democracy in the Soviet Union, but only a fraud.

Are not the examples of the recent days of the "new line" and the "new leadership" enough to show this to be the case?

When and where did the membership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union discuss and decide the questions that Khrushchev and the others pronounce final judgments upon?

When did the membership decide, for example, that there is "more than one road to socialism"? When did the membership decide, for example, that there should be a reconciliation with Tito? When did the membership decide, for example, that the Cominform should be dissolved?

Were you consulted on that question? Did you help make that decision, or any other important decision for that matter?

Neither you nor the members of any other Communist Party, the Russian included, have such an elementary right. You have only the right to endorse decisions made by others, by the leaders, by the bureaucracy, by the agents of the Kremlin bureaucracy. Other rights you have none. Other rights the working people of Russia have none.

This bureaucracy, which is now really begging for your support, has announced that it is for democracy. Your own party leaders here in this country have just discovered that they are for democracy, too. In the Kremlin and among their spokesmen here, they are issuing an invitation to all workers' and liberal organizations, socialists, trade-unionists, democrats and the like, to join the Communist Parties throughout the world in a common front, to fight for democratic rights against all who infringe upon or violate them.

Here indeed is an opportunity! Here indeed is an opportunity for you in particular. You know with what suspicion and even hostility the proposals of your leaders are regarded by millions, inside and outside the working-class movement.

To End the Crisis

We for our part do not think a common front for democratic rights is impossible. Certainly, it is desirable. But surely you must agree that the proposal, when it comes from the leaders of the Kremlin, can have real force and attraction only if those who are to make up the common front not only fight for democracy where they are weak, but above all fight for it where they are strong.

In Russia, your leaders are not only strong, but they have all the power in their hands. Is it not plain to you that their call for a common front to fight for democracy in France or England or Germany or the United States will mean nothing if they use all the power of the state to deny that very democracy, those same democratic rights, to the working people of Russia?

That is why we appeal to you, the members of the Communist Party and the Labor Youth League:

Your party and league cannot move onto the right road and de-

velop as a truly communist movement until it frees itself from the domination and dictates of the Kremlin bureaucracy, to whom you represent instruments and not comrades in the fight for socialist liberty.

Only by declaring your independence from this bureaucracy can you freely reconsider the past, straighten out the line of the party, freely select a leadership worthy of that august role. Only by declaring this independence can you then freely associate your movement with authentic revolutionary socialist movements in all other countries so that working-class internationalism is again established in the world.

Your party and league cannot discharge their solemn responsibility to the long-suffering people and party members of Russia, whose anguish and torments the new leaders have now revealed, unless you take a prominent, fearless, open position of demanding the establishment of all democratic rights in Russia and all other lands ruled by the various Communist Parties of Europe and Asia.

That, and only that, is the road to overcome the crisis in your movement. That and only that is the way to restore the Communist Party to what it was in its early days—an authentic movement of revolutionary, Marxian, internationalist, working-class socialism.

That and only that is the way of demonstrating that socialists are the most consistent and uncompromising champions of democracy and that the greatest achievement of democracy is possible only through the fight for socialist victory.

Along that road, you will find in us not opponents, but comrades. And not in us alone, but in the hundreds of thousands and even millions who understand that there is no future for mankind until all its great aspirations have been brought to life in socialist democracy.

Oren Says Czechs Used Gestapo Methods

By AL FINDLEY

Mordecai Oren, leader of the pro-Stalinist Mapam party of Israel, was freed from a Czech prison on May 13. He was freed after serving about five years in jail, after being convicted in 1952 as a "spy" for Allied Intelligence and a secret agent for the World Jewish Congress and the Zionist movement, to subvert the Prague regime.

He had been tried and convicted as part of the larger Slansky purge in Czechoslovakia, a case that was filled with anti-Semitism. The Czech premier Siroky has admitted the anti-Semitic element: according to his admission, the trial contained anti-Semitic statements and failed to differentiate between anti-Semitism and anti-Zionism.

Arriving in Israel, Oren declared: "I have in my heart a sorrow and a protest against the signs of degeneration in the socialist countries. . . . I am not a victim of the regime but a victim of those who violate the regime."

He further declared: "My innocence has not been acknowledged. It has not been recognized that I am not a criminal but the victim of a crime. The error of the charges against other 'captives of Zion' and the constructive and progressive sections of the Zionist movement has not been admitted. . . . They forced me to confess to things that were never true, and they who did this have not themselves confessed as yet to the crime they committed against me. My freedom is therefore not complete."

Indeed, the Czech regime not only refused to confirm Oren's innocence, but also, on his release from prison, put him under an order of expulsion from the country. This is reported in a feature

story from Israel in the N. Y. *Jewish Morning Journal*.

Meir Yaari, leader of the Mapam, welcomed Oren and declared that the trial of Oren was inspired by anti-Semitism and was a second Dreyfus trial. He also stated that the Oren frameup was a cog in the wheel of the Slansky purge "fabricated by the Beria supporters." Yaari vowed not to be silent until Oren was fully rehabilitated.

Oren himself gave a fuller account of his arrest and treatment, on May 9 at his kibbutz, at a meeting of his organization. In a lengthy report he proclaimed that the only thing in his signed confession that was true was the section containing his name.

"All the other accusations in the papers that I signed were lies, lies that were concocted by those who degrade the socialist ideals and regimes."

Oren had gone to Czechoslovakia en route to Israel, returning from a Stalinist "peace congress" in Berlin. As a friend of the regime he says he tried to intervene for arrested "socialists"—presumably meaning socialist-Zionists. He was picked up on a train which was taking him to Vienna on his way to Israel.

The first pretext for his arrest was that his visa had expired. (This pretext served Mapam for months before they protested Oren's arrest.)

The account given by a JTA dispatch from Tel-Aviv says:

"The interrogation lasted day and night continuously without a break for three weeks. He was not allowed to sleep for the entire period. The inquisitors were changed every few hours, and Oren was given cigarettes and coffee to keep him awake.

"Oren related that since he realized that no one in Israel would know what had happened to him, he requested permission to write a letter to Israel. This request was denied. Finally a high official notified him that he would be permitted to write a letter home provided that in the letter he said he really was a traitor and begged forgiveness from the Czechoslovak people for the crimes he had committed.

"Unable to stand the suffering he consented to write such a letter with the hope that he would thereby notify the people in Israel that he was alive and that they would understand that the confession that he is a traitor was a falsehood.

"Indicating that they had victimized him in order to attack Zionism, Mapam and Jewry, Oren declared: 'If they really wanted to know the truth, they could have ended the interrogation in 22 minutes. They wanted the opposite of the truth, and that took them 22 months till they forced me to admit everything they wanted.'

"The tormenters achieved their ends through Gestapo methods—they gave him very little food, no water, and did not allow him to sleep, Oren declared.

"Finally came the secret military trial which was a complete farce. He was given no opportunity to defend himself and no witnesses were called. The lawyer who was appointed as his "defender" behaved just like a prosecuting attorney and demanded that Oren receive his just punishment.

"A greater farce was the epilogue of the trial. Oren had to pay his defending attorney 600 crowns for the wonderful way in which the latter had defended him."

The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Get Acquainted!

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

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

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE

LABOR ACTION

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

Please enter my subscription:

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

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE