Right to Strike Emphasized by Mao

(Second of Two Articles)

By ALAN WINNINGTON

PEKING.—Most Socialists believe that the strike weapon is only for use against capitalists. Under Socialism, why should workers strike against their own state, their own factory control?

It's logical if you believe that Socialism automatically settles all the conflicts.

But in fact such a view is dogmatic and unrealistic. It entirely overlooks the fact that in any society progress is made by discovering and resolving conflicts.

Under Socialism the people produce, but they don't directly govern. They are liable to see matters from a short-term, sectional, personal viewpoint.

Their representatives, or leaders, however well they do their job, must be prone to look at things from the standpoint of the whole rather than the part, long-range rather than immediate interests. They are thus likely to become bureaucratic and out of touch with the people.

Although the main thing is to settle things in a democratic manner and overcome bureaucracy. Mao Tse-tung takes the view that the right of the people to strike, demonstrate and take political action is an absolute right.

Such things should not be quelled and the leaders penalized. On the contrary, they ought to be regarded as a salutary lesson and strike leaders regarded as pepole who can lead.

Similarly in the field of ideas. China has come straight from feudalism and semi-colonial capitalism. More than 500 million Chinese are petty farmers, little manufacturers, traders, capitalists. In spite of the terrific changes in their ideas in the past few years, they are saturated in the ideas of their own classes.

It would be fantastic to imagine that the expression of such ideas can be stopped by edict, nor would that be of advantage to anyone.

If Communist theory is to advance it can only do so in the process of contention with other ideas. To suppress those other ideas would lead to the stagnation of Communist theory and the sharpening of conflicts.

This is the thinking behind the revival of the ancient Chinese ideal: "Let 100 flowers blossom together and 100 schools of thought contend" (let the arts, sciences and philosophies develop in free contention).

There is hot debate in every field: What is beauty? Is there such a thing as Socialist realism in art? Is it really necessary to reform the Chinese language?

What is good and what bad about idealist philosophy? How should Morgan and Michurin be evaluated in genetics?

There are some Communists who do not welcome these things.

Fears are being expressed that unlimited freedom of expression and popular action could give the recently defeated enemy opportunities of causing unheavals and chaos.

In the analogy of the "100 flowers," they want to prevent the weeds from growing. One local Communist Party issued a directive: "Quote struggle for fragrant flowers and suppress the weeds." This directive was classified by a leading Communist as itself a "poisonous weed."

Communist Party papers have been severely criticized for dragging their heels over this campaign and even for making alterations in the texts and titles of writings of which the editors disapprove.

COMPETITION

The Communist Party says: "Among the flowers there will be weeds. Why worry? This is common in farming. You never have flowers or grain without weeds.

"But you must learn to distinguish. Let them grow together and the people will be able to tell which is which. You can't prohibit weeds. Flowers flourish in competition with weeds and we must develop our theories in free competition."

The Chinese Communist Party leaders are determined to put an end to settling questions by slogans, by the blind transposing of foreign experiences, the dogmatic statement of principles, and by non-democratic methods.

MAO TSE-TUNG

But there is still a good deal of resistance to break.

And they state firmly that these policies are put forward to suit the situation in China. They do not regard them as able to be applied universally. Thirty years of struggle in China has created a quite different situation from that existing in other countries.

Nevertheless, though the Chinese Communist Party leaders don't say it, it is very clear that much of these methods can be applied elsewhere.

At the present stage, everyone is being encouraged to state differences, conflicts and problems. From all this material, the main problems will emerge, and the business of solving them in a democratic way will be the next step.

While this goes on, the Communist Party, helped by the other parties, will be finding out its own main faults and putting them right, getting rid of "lordly airs," and restoring the links with the people that have become somewhat stretched of late.

Already about 180,000 provincial government officials have gone back to work in their own localities. High party officials are leading the way to work alongside the workers and find on-the-spot solutions to problems while doing real manual work.

PROSPECT

There will be, as always, mistakes. There will be too much of this or that. Maybe some people will start strikes merely because they are misled by Kuomintang old-hands, or simply for the experience of it. That is not likely. It is well-known here that workers don't strike for trivial reasons.

What will come out of it is a lot of experience and still closer relations between the people and their representatives.

Contention and democracy, supervision of the leaders by the led, criticism to create still deeper unity—these are the means to be used in China to overcome inexperience and solve the problems of building Socialism and sharing the national product.

Gains Cited in Defence of Non-Citizens

By ABNER GREEN

(Executive Secretary, American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born)

During the past month, the United States Supreme Court decisions in the cases of George Witkovich of Chicago and Antonia Sentner of St. Louis hold great significance to the fight to re-establish the democratic and constitutional rights of non-citizens

With the end of the Second World War, the Justice Department launched an intensive drive on the rights of the foreign born. This McCarthyite attack culminated in the enactment of the Walter-McCarran Law in 1952. In addition to its racist and discriminatory immigration provisions and its attempt to create two classes of citizenship, the Walter-McCarran Law established the basis for police-state treatment of the rights and liberties of 3,000,000 non-citizens in the United States.

In March 1952, in the midst of McCarthyite hysteria, the Supreme Court sanctioned the Justice Department's denial of bail in deportation proceeding in the Carlson case. This provision was incorporated in the Walter-McCarran Law. The 1952 Law provided also for the deportation of non-citizens for membership in the Communist Party and the constitutionality of this provision was sustained by the Supreme Court in 1953 in the Galvan case.

Deportation laws, however, had been a part of United States law since the early 1900's. The Walter-McCarran Law developed new and dangerous departures in the treatment of deportees for the first time in the history of the country, For some time the Justice Department had complained of the fact that many non-citizens, after being ordered deported, could not be deported since no country would accept them as deportees after they had spent most of their lives in this country.

The Justice Department met this situation by trying to harass and terrorize deportees to the point where they would find living in this country intolerable and find some other country in which to live. At the same time, the Justice Department aimed to use the Law to impose police-state conditions of living upon deportees as long as they remained in this country.

This was to be achieved by use of the Law's Suprevisory Parole conditions. Non-citizens were ordered to report in person once a week, give information under oath as to their associations and activities, disassociate from the labor and progressive movement, As a result of opposition, the weekly reporting was later changed to monthly reporting.

The Justice Department maintained that the Walter Mc-Carran Law gave it the right to prevent a non-citizen who had been ordered deported from continuing to engage in the beliefs, activities or associations for which he or she had been ordered deported. This was the heart of the police-state structure of the Law. An essential part of the harassment was the threat of one-year jail sentences for violations of and of the Supervisory Parole conditions.

In 1953, court action was started in New York in the cases of Claudia Jones, Betty Gannett and Alexander Bittelman, challenging the Supervisory Parole orders served on them. In 1954, 11 more non-citizens joined in the challenge and these 14 cases came to be known as the **Nukk** case. In 1954, Mrs. Antonia Sentner started a similar action in St. Louis.

In 1955, the three-Judge court in New York held in the **Nukk** case that the action was premature and that there was no substantial issue involved. The three-Judge court in St. Louis decided to hold up argument in the Sentner case until decision in the Nukk case. In October 1955, the U.S. Supreme Court reversed the three-Judge court in the Nukk case and sent the case back for argument and decision. While the three-Judge court in New York never got around to holding a new hearing on the Nukk case, the St. Louis court, as a result of the October 1955 decision by the Supreme Court, decided to go ahead on the Sentner case and heard oral argument in January 1956.

Immediately following the October 1955 Supreme Court decision, however, the Justice Department indicted George Witkovich and James Keller in Chicago for refusing to answer questions in a Supervisory Parole interview in 1953. On May 10, 1956, Federal District Court Judge Sullivan threw out the Witkovic indictment on the ground that the only power the Justice Department had over a non-citizen ordered deported was to be informed of his availability in the event travel documents were obtained for him and the Justice Department therefore did not have the right to ask Witkovich questions concerning his politics, beliefs, activities or associations. The Justice Department appealed Judge Sullivan's decision and the Supreme Court agreed to hear the appeal. (Keller's case was stayed until final decision in Witkovich.)

Then, on October 4, 1956, the three-Judge court in St. Louis, while holding that non-citizens could be ordered to report in person under Supervisory Parole, held similarly to Judge Sullivan that the only power the Justice Department had was to be informed of the deportee's availability. The St. Louis court, at the same time, ruled that the Attorney General had no right to order Mrs. Sentner not associate with, or support, the Communist Party or its affiliates or any individual suspected of being a Communist. The Justice Department appealed this decision also.

On April 29, the Supreme Court in a 6 to 2 decision, upheld Judge Sullivan in the Witkovich case. On May 20, the Supreme Court upheld the St. Louis three-judge court in the Sentner case. On May 22, the Federal District Court in Chicago

(Continued on Page 5)