

New Hoax Tried in Sobell Case

By C. R. Hubbard

NOV. 26 — The attempt of Robert Morris, Council for the Senate Internal Security subcommittee, to explain the Soviet Sputniks with new "revelations" from David Greenglass, alleged "atom spy" whose 1951 testimony led to the execution of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg and the imprisonment of Morton Sobell, now serving a 30-year term in Alcatraz, did not meet with much success. The new charges of the theft of satellite secrets by the "Rosenberg spy ring," were reported in the press, but with few exceptions, treated skeptically.

"Automation Age" Topic Of Forum

NEW YORK—Unusually lively discussion is expected at the Conference on "America's Future in the Age of Automation and Atomic Energy" sponsored by the American Forum for Socialist Education to be held Dec. 7, 10 A.M. and 3:30 P.M., at the Great Northern Hotel, 118 W. 57 St., New York City. There will be panels on Socialism and Democracy; Youth Problems, Trade Union Problems, Cultural Problems and Political Action.

A paper prepared for the conference by Carl Dreher, engineer and author, will be discussed by Dave Dellinger, co-director of Libertarian Press; Frederick L. Schuman of Williams College; Steve Nelson, Chairman of the Communist Party of Western Pennsylvania; Farrell Dobbs, National Secretary, Socialist Workers Party; Murray Kempton, columnist; John L. Lewine, author; with Russell Johnson of the American Friends Service Committee as moderator.

On Friday evening December 6, at 8:30 P.M., also at the Great Northern Hotel, a reception will be held to honor A. J. Muste "for his work in furthering political discussion on the basis of non-exclusion." Scheduled to make brief remarks at the reception are Roger Baldwin, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, Russell Johnson, Sidney Lens, John T. McManus, Tim Wohlforth and A. J. Muste.

"Spy" Hoax Victims



MORTON SOBELL, witch-hunt victim in Alcatraz and his wife HELEN SOBELL, who is fighting for his release.

THE MILITANT

PUBLISHED WEEKLY IN THE INTERESTS OF THE WORKING PEOPLE

Vol. XXI - No. 48

NEW YORK, N. Y., MONDAY, DECEMBER 2, 1957

PRICE 10c

U.S. Rulers Suffer "Jitters" Over Crisis At Home, Abroad

War Danger

Why American Capitalism Needs A War Economy

By Myra T. Weiss

The international arms race that has dominated all mankind since the end of World War II entered a new stage with the race in the missile field. The U.S. explosion of the first atom bomb gave the prospect of war an unbelievable new horror. Now the missile development puts the delivery of these terror weapons on an automatic, push-button basis.

As long as the arms race continues, the triggering of a world war is a constant danger. It therefore becomes even more urgent than before to probe the source of the war danger in order to end this threat to human existence.

11-YEAR OUTLAY

First, what does the war drive mean for the U.S. economy? In the years 1946 through 1956 the "defense" program cost the American people at least \$39 billion. This amount does not include the vastly expanded spending on international items like foreign economic aid, informational and propaganda services, domestic expenditures like road construction, increased "security" costs, civil defense, etc.—all of which are really part of the "defense" budget.

To pay for past wars the government in this same period also spent in round figures, \$60 billion on veterans and \$64 billion in interest on the public debt. Therefore in these eleven years, past wars and the preparation of a new one cost the U.S. government a total of \$463 billion. Now Eisenhower proposes that the American people tighten their belts for even bigger military budgets.

The staggering sum of close to half a trillion dollars in an eleven-year period gives some idea of the effect of the military program on the economy of the nation. Few serious economists would quarrel with the statement that U.S. post-war capitalist expansion was made possible by this government subsidization. Without this support, the economy would have collapsed.

Reformists, Stalinists and liberals, however, claim that capitalist industry could be "stimulated" just as well by government expenditures for other than war preparation. Instead

The conservative N.Y. Herald Tribune, in a Nov. 23 editorial, even emitted a groan about people who can explain Soviet progress only through spy stories. The new "revelations" of Greenglass were characterized as "one view." The Tribune editors then commented, sarcastically, "What secrets were these? If some carbon copies of them are still left in the Defense Department files, maybe they could be dusted out from the cobwebs and put into action. This is certainly useful information that we had these secrets."

The Nov. 22 N.Y. Times reported the Greenglass claims that the Rosenbergs stole U.S. "secrets on earth satellites, atom-powered planes and anti-missile weapons." Then the Times added that Morris "would not say when the information was stolen, nor would he identify the agent from whom Rosenberg got his information. . . ."

Meanwhile, the head of the U.S. satellite observation system, Dr. Fred L. Whipple, insisted that the "Soviet Union had passed the United States on its own—without the aid of spies and saboteurs," according to the Nov. 24 New York Times. Certainly spies could not steal what the U.S. did not possess.

Greenglass' present claims were not even made at the trial of the Rosenbergs and Sobell in 1951. That Greenglass "remembers" these "facts" only after the Soviet Union has taken the lead in missile and satellite development and six years after the trial, doesn't make them any the more credible.

But if Greenglass' current allegations evoke disbelief, why should greater credence be given to his original accusations against the Rosenbergs and Sobell?

Robert Morris followed up the announcement of new "spy" (Continued on page 2)



It costs about \$10 million to stage a single test of a long-range rocket missile like "The Corporal," shown above in inaugural parade in Washington last January. The huge cost of developing such rockets was in Commerce Secretary Weeks' mind when he recently said the country must shift to "less butter and more guns."

Kremlin Bolsters Soviet-Bloc Rule at Moscow Conference

By John Thayer

The top leaders of the Soviet orbit countries and of Communist Parties in the capitalist countries, who went to Moscow for the 40th Anniversary celebration of the October Revolution, stayed on for two weeks of conferences. This appears to have been the biggest and longest session of CP leaders from all over the world since the days of the Communist International, liquidated during the war by Stalin as a friendly gesture to the "democratic" imperialist countries.

For some months there had been rumors of some move by Moscow to reconstruct an organization to coordinate and control the political lines of the various East European countries and of the Communist Parties throughout the world, all of them considerably shaken up by the 20th Congress and the events following, particularly the Hungarian Revolution. It was said that revival of the Cominform, dissolved shortly after

the 20th Congress, was being considered. Now, however, it is clear that an intermediate form has been decided upon for the present at least.

The conferences were wider in scope than the Cominform had been. One conference embraced every country in the Soviet orbit in Europe and Asia. The other was world-wide, embracing Communist Parties both in the Soviet orbit and in the capitalist countries. Though no permanent organizational structure has been set up, a formal political line has been enunciated and agreed to.

Public reports of the conference were restricted to the issuing of two documents. The first document to be released was that unanimously adopted by representatives of the Soviet orbit countries of Europe (USSR, Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary, East Germany, Poland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia) and of Asia (China, North Viet Nam, North Korea). Technically it was not a document agreed to

by the governments of those countries but by the heads of the Communist Parties of those countries.

The second document released the next day was a manifesto signed by representatives of 64 Communist Parties. The American CP was not among the signatories inasmuch as the witch hunt in the U.S. makes it illegal for their members to go abroad. Consequently there were no representatives of the American CP at the Moscow anniversary celebration or at the conferences which followed.

Study of the documents reveals that they do not set forth (Continued on page 2)

An Interview With Dr. Otto Nathan See Page 4

Facing Balky Allies, Mideast, Shaky Economy

By Art Preis

America's ruling class, seemingly so confident a few months ago, now is gripped by a mood of crisis. The daily press continuously speaks of Wall Street's and the government's "jitters."

These "jitters" followed the first Soviet Sputnik, which marked an end to the clear-cut U.S. military lead. But it would be wrong to attribute the tremors of America's financial, political and military leaders to any real fear of Soviet armed aggression. "Loss of American prestige," "unstable allies," "growing lack of confidence in the U.S. economy" are the type of concerns more and more expressed by business and political commentators.

In a recent speech, Vice President Nixon complained that the Soviet Union has opened "a massive non-military offensive aimed at the overthrow of all free governments." This same fear of a "non-military" advance by the Soviet Union is stated more explicitly in a recent N.Y. Times editorial. Citing the Kremlin's own dread of mass uprisings, particularly since the East German, Polish and Hungarian revolts, the Nov. 8 Times writes off any revolutionary threat from the Soviet leaders:

"Consequently, the Kremlin rulers no longer appeal to the masses for a revolution from below. Rather, they now propagate a revolution from above by bribing or subverting ruling politicians, military leaders and a few intellectuals. . . . And this is the threat now confronting the democratic world."

WHY THEY HATE AMERICA'S RULERS

But how can the still-poor Soviet Union compete with the wealthy U.S. in bribery and subversion? Why, this country has already spent scores of billions in economic and military aid to foreign rulers. It has given lavish hand-outs on a scale that beggars anything the Soviet Union could afford. Yet, the American ruling class is beset by the cold fear of isolation, of unfaithful allies, of worldwide hatred.

This hatred was described in the Nov. 19 N.Y. Post by Dr. Ernest Dichter, president of the Institute for Motivational Research, Inc., following his recent international tour. Interviewed by Mike Wallace, Dr. Dichter said that America's reputation abroad "couldn't be any worse" and "everywhere I went I met anti-Americanism in virulent forms."

This "appalling deterioration" of U.S. prestige, said Dr. Dichter, is rooted in the fact that while "we still talk idealism. . . we have ceased to practice it in many ways. . . We talk freedom, but we back up dictatorships like Franco's." Asked by Wallace if he thought "that in the world's eyes we're hypocrites, a split personality," Dr. Dichter replied, "Absolutely."

In short, the common people everywhere mistrust the protestations of selflessness from America's ruling Big Business class. "You get nothing for nothing in this world — and damn little of that," goes the old saying. And U.S. imperialism offers even less. As Dr. Dichter conceded, " . . . We give the wrong way. We give grudgingly, condescendingly. We give with political strings attached. . . ."

"LESS BUTTER, MORE GUNS"

The continuing Mideast crisis, the crisis of the NATO military alliance brought about by French objection to the shipment of a few rifles by the U.S. and England to Tunisia, the hand-wringing and outcries and mutual recriminations about "permitting" Soviet scientists to get a satellite aloft "first" — these reflect, in reality, the inability of U.S. imperialism to stabilize its domination internationally. The revolutionary masses — particularly in the anti-imperialist undeveloped lands — are finished with any form of imperialism.

And yet, the internal needs of the U.S. profit economy keep pressing for solution by outward expansion. All the scores of billions spent and invested abroad in the past decade, all the hundreds of billions poured into war expenditures, all the "built-in stabilizers" of grudging social reforms have failed to assure a stable and steady development to U.S. capitalism.

Sputnik. . . Arms Race. . . Mideast. . . NATO Conflict. . . Little Rock. . . Stock Market Break. . . These are the headlines of our time. They are the symptoms of a profound inner malady of U.S. and world capitalism. When Commerce Secretary Sinclair Weeks said we must prepare for a shift to "less butter and more guns," he was not only plagiarizing the Nazi slogan, he was reciting the only program possible under capitalism.

South's Employers Use Racism to Block Unions

By Henry Gitano

Southern employers are attempting to maintain the low-wage, open-shop South, by pitting white against Negro, while labor's officialdom slumbers in massive silence.

Benjamin D. Segal in the Nov. 11 New Leader reports how "racism" stymies unions in the South." He gives the example of the Bay Springs, Miss. Northern Electric Products Corporation (Neco) where two days prior to an NLRB election, the owners, Ed and Sam Russell, injected racism. The union lost 291 to 86, although this past summer, a majority of Neco workers signed cards saying they were interested in forming an IUE local.

ANTI-NEGRO RANTING

Prior to the balloting, Ed Russell called the workers into the plant lobby, where he shouted that the union was "nigger loving" and its president, James Carey, was a "nigger lover." Russell brandished the evidence: a copy of the June 4 Jackson (Miss.) Daily News, with a huge four-column photo showing Carey dancing with a young Negro wo-

man. Ed Russell also sent three letters to each worker and made speeches, linking the IUE with activities on behalf of the Negro struggle for equality.

In Jackson, Miss. a similar racist attempt by the management of the Vickers plant proved ineffectual when a majority voted for the IUE anyway. But in Bay Springs and at the Raleigh, N. C. Westinghouse plant the IUE feels that racism was the fatal factor. At Westinghouse, the plant manager told white workers that Negroes would get their jobs if the union won.

Inside a New Albany, Miss. furniture plant, a company foreman posted pictures of Negroes at a union convention. Alongside was a crudely lettered poster: "Do you want niggers representing you? Then vote 'No' today!!!" The Upholsterers International Union, AFL-CIO, attributed its defeat partly to White Citizens Council activities. Segal points to a pattern — these are not isolated cases. "Charles Gillman, AFL-CIO director in the Alabama-Georgia-Florida area, reports that White Citizens Councils try to get union members to serve on their

executive boards and then attempt to sell them on the idea that union money is being spent on race integration. . . Gillman said, adding: 'It's getting so that in some places the white man won't talk to the Negro and the Negro won't talk to the white man, though they are on the same job.'"

In some instances, racism is causing defections from the unions. Because of a convention mandate calling for the abolition of segregation in its organization, the American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, lost the white Atlanta local with 1,500 members. White Chattanooga teachers are also reorganizing on an independent basis to maintain segregation.

But despite earlier fears, Southern defections are the exception. The Southern Regional Council found that most Southern members do not get "riled up" over, although they oppose, the adoption of policies relating to segregation by their national unions. Many realize that outside the mainstream of organized labor there is no place to go.

One of the most active would-

be splitters of the Southern labor movement is Adell Somerset's United Southern Employees Association (USEA). In Rock Hill, S.C., Somerset's attacks on the Textile Workers at Klan meetings, and promotion of his own "union" resulted in the "near collapse of the hooded order in York County" (Rock Hill area) according to one news report. Segal relates that most of the Klansmen belonged to the Textile Workers Union. Somerset's attacks on the TWU so outraged these particular KKKers that it nearly erupted in violence and "membership is estimated to have dropped from 175 members to less than a dozen."

Last year at an auto workers educational institute in North Carolina, several racist-minded leaders from Birmingham, Ala., walked out because discrimination was openly discussed. Nevertheless these same local officers helped defeat a White Citizens Council-inspired secession movement.

Segal outlines the treacherous role of the Arkansas AFL-CIO Council in the Little Rock crisis. The Council deplored mob violence and supported grad-

ual integration. "Then, only a few hours after the violence which occurred when the Guardsmen withdrew, race hatred became the dominant factor governing union positions. . . . When a number of community, church and civic leaders later called for a day of prayer, labor was silent. Further reports indicated that, in at least one area of the state containing a large proportion of Negroes, union members were joining WCC's as never before." In Little Rock itself, the WCC slate in the recent elections drew heavy support from working-class areas.

BANK ON TIME

The Nov. 10 New York Times reported that John Edelman, Washington representative of the Textile Workers Union, complained that the issue of integration is injected by the employers before nearly every NLRB election. Edelman said this was a big factor in cancelling an organizing drive against a chain of textile mills in the South. Al Kissler, AFL-CIO organizer, said that unions had no ready answer to the bosses' racist appeal, though they hope

that time will lessen its effectiveness.

What profound bankruptcy and abject capitulation before the whole rotten Southern ruling class! The AFL-CIO's subservience to the Democratic Party prevents organized labor from fighting its worst enemies in the Solid South, which sends Democratic racists and labor haters to Congress. Elmo Roper, well-known public opinion researcher, estimates the loss of wages due to discrimination at roughly \$30 billion annually.

But labor is more powerful than those who profit from racism, and organized labor must face its responsibilities. Labor must isolate and render ineffective the racists in the white working class. An energetic campaign with battalions of organizers must make a beginning for the South's unionization by combatting the cancer of race prejudice which keeps white and Negro from uniting for their mutual interests. The fight for equal rights cannot be sidestepped in the Southern organizing drive; it must be met head on.

The Marxists In Britain

By Peter Fryer
Special London Correspondent

[In three previous articles (Oct. 28, Nov. 4 and Nov. 25 Militant), Peter Fryer has analyzed recent developments in the British radical movement. This is the conclusion of the series.]

And now to sum up. In the midst of all the confusion of resignations and declarations, expulsions and polemics, one fact stands out: that rich possibilities now exist for rearing, training and educating a strong and influential Marxist movement in Britain. The streams are flowing together: Communists disillusioned with Stalinism; Bevanites disillusioned with Bevan; trade unionists who see the need for militant and principled leadership, political as well as economic, if the Tory offensive is to be beaten back. From Communist Party, Labor Party and workshop floor alike there is coming forward the advance guard of a new Marxist leadership. The task is to forge this precious cadre, to weave these streams together in one sturdy movement, to assimilate into a harmonious team, these different backgrounds and experiences, to raise the ideological level of these workers who want to be communists.

APPARENT CONFUSION

The Marxist alternative to Stalinism in Britain still has, as it seems to me, one foot in the past, even as the other foot is poised for an enormous forward stride. The ex-Communist Party member is bewildered and dismayed by the multiplicity of groups, each claiming to be more r-r-revolutionary than its competitors, each bawling its lungs hoarse selling literature at the entrance to public meetings, each carrying the banner of "real" Marxism. His immediate reaction is to ask why on earth these groups are not united. As soon as he begins to separate the sheep from the goats, however, he realizes that a purely organizational solution to what is a fundamental political problem would not advance the cause of Marxism very far.

The fact must be faced that some of these groups are in reality no more than vestigial remnants of a stage in the history of the British Trotskyist movement that quite evidently is over and done with. No ex-Communist Party member, who shares in the moral responsibility for the persecution and vilification of the Trotskyists in past years (even if he never participated in the beatings-up) can point a finger of scorn at these groups for their sectarianism, their dogmatism, their unwillingness to learn, their insistence that every syllable in their journals shall be scrubbed till it is doc-

... Try New "Spy Hoax"

(Continued from page 1)

revelations with a proposal to release both Greenglass and Harry Gold (the other government witness in the Rosenberg-Sobell trial) from prison as a reward for "cooperation." Morris proposed that a committee be formed to seek their release.

Did Greenglass agree to make new charges against the Rosenbergs in the hope that such "cooperation" would earn him his release from prison? And if he would manufacture new "spy" charges now in order to win his release, is it not possible that he agreed to manufacture the original charges in order to gain lenient treatment? (Greenglass was first put under FBI scrutiny for stealing uranium ore while employed as a mechanic on the atom bomb project.) Certainly, the fact that Greenglass' wife though implicated in his 1951 spy story, was never arrested let alone jailed for her part in the "conspiracy," raises the question of a deal between the prosecution and the witness.

UNRELIABLE 'EVIDENCE'

Once more we must take a look at the nature of "accomplice" testimony. The conviction of the Rosenbergs and Morton Sobell in 1951 would not have been possible under rules of evidence in a New York state court. Something more weighty than the testimony of an accomplice who has something to gain from the kind of testimony he gives is required. The U.S. Constitution forbids conviction in treason cases on the basis of such unreliable testimony. Actually, Sobell and the Rosenbergs were not tried on spy charges, but under the federal "conspiracy" laws, which allow conviction on evidence that would be held insufficient in any other kind of case.

Why Khrushchev Cut Down Zhukov

By George Lavan
(Third of a series of three)

Khrushchev's victory over Marshal Zhukov in the recent Kremlin power struggle is a demonstration of the superiority of the party over the military machine within the Soviet bureaucracy.

The party apparatus permeates all sections of Soviet society, including rival sections of the bureaucracy. In Stalin's day this was true also of the secret police, which because of its additional advantage of possessing the means of coercion, was even more powerful than the party.

AS EAGER TO LEARN AS TEACH

But there are Trotskyists and "Trotskyists" in quotation marks. The Marxist who is seeking a movement soon learns that. And he comes to the genuine Trotskyist movement with all the ardor of a thirsty man who finds a stream of clear water. Here are Marxists who have kept traditions alive—without turning them into dogma. Who do not use the fact that Trotsky was right on so many issues as an excuse for any new Great Man theory. Who, above all, are as eager to learn from the new adherents they are winning as they are willing and able to teach them something. Whose approach to people, therefore, is improving all the time, since it takes into account the conditioned-reflex prejudices and misunderstandings that come from years of believing in lies.

Examine the past year's issues of Labour Review, for instance, and you see how the new Marxist movement is sprouting forth in Britain out of a soil made fertile by what are essentially Trotskyist ideas and analyses. Four out of five of the contributors to these first six issues are either members of the Communist Party (these write under pen-names) or were in the party until quite recently.

On the editorial board, whose meetings I have attended since last March, I have met only two other persons who were Trotskyists before 1955. The old and new go forward together on Labour Review, their common task the creative application and consequent enrichment of Marxism. And so strong is this combination that Labour Review, without a single tremor, could open its columns to a long, detailed and closely-argued attack on Trotskyism, which a member of the editorial board (himself a member of the Communist Party!) answered in the same issue. This kind of fundamental discussion is unknown in the Communist Party, which has nipped the tender buds of discussion that appeared for a brief period a year or so ago.

"We are not afraid of discussion," a leading British Trotskyist said to me a little time ago. "We are sure we have the right answers and the better arguments. That is not the same thing as saying we know all the answers! We are learning all the time—in the process of building a movement."


LABEL LOSES TERROR

And in this process of building a movement the "label" of Trotskyism is losing its terrors. There are many who think that as the Trotskyist analysis comes to be recognized as the only valid Marxist analysis, the word Trotskyist will tend to fall into disuse (just as one uses 'Leninist' rarely, and 'Engelsist' not at all). Be that as it may, the Trotskyists' willingness (a) to enter into serious debate and (b) to learn, is making a steady impact.

I have no dramatic successes to record. But it is a sober fact that the Marxists whose activity is conducted inside the Labor Party are the only organization whose work in relation to the Communist Party crisis has been consistent and serious, and the only organization which has won new members as a result. Most of these new members are militant workers, many of them with splendid records on the job. Their contribution to the new Marxist movement in Britain is no less valuable than that of the smaller number of historians, economists, journalists etc. who are grouped round Labour Review.

I use the word "new" without any intention of denigrating the past. The comrades who stuck to their principles when the rest of us were dazzled and misled by Stalinism laid a solid foundation. There was the helping hand a year ago. The hand had books in it. Now we and they are starting to build together on the foundation, so that there can be more helping hands, more books, more journals, more activity, and the growth and consolidation of a well-equipped revolutionary leadership.

Are They Still Pals?



Tito, Khrushchev and Bulganin are shown here at 1955 conference in Yugoslavia. At that time, ties were renewed as the Kremlin bureaucrats apologized for "Stalin's errors." Since then, relations have warmed and cooled on two occasions. At a recent Moscow Conference, the Yugoslavs refused to sign statement of Soviet-bloc countries. (See story, page one.)

the bureaucracy as a whole, the party rather than the military is more suited to rule. For continuance of bureaucratic rule in the USSR means much more today than settling the inner disputes and controlling the various factions of the bureaucracy for their overall benefit. It means first and foremost keeping the regime afloat on the rising tide of mass discontent and the stormy times ahead. Flexibility, a quality military bureaucracies are not noted for, is a requisite.

The party occupies a more strategic position than the military in relation to the population as a whole. The network of party functionaries and units penetrates all layers of the population. Not only do these endeavor, upon directives from the top, to steer, deflect or curb the masses, they are also an invaluable means of constantly taking the political pulse of the population, thus permitting the Kremlin to adjust policy accordingly.

Under the best of circumstances the military is a force to be reckoned with. What made Zhukov an even more dangerous rival was his mass popularity, as compared to that of Khrushchev and other Kremlin figures, and his deliberate campaign to increase it by identifying himself with the demand for further de-Stalinization.

It is one thing for the heads of the regime to court public support. To the extent that they succeed they temporarily strengthen the regime or abate the dangers to it. (Of course in the long run the increasingly obvious need of the regime for public approval along with concessions to the people encourage the latter, build its self-confidence and hastens the ultimate day of its direct political intervention.) But for a faction of the bureaucracy that is not dominant to attempt to build up support in a bid for power is a far different matter. In such a case the masses are being called on—even though in a limited manner—to act against the dominant section of the bureaucracy. If they do engage in such an action will they not stop? Might they not continue on and do away with the whole bureaucratic regime including that section which had summoned them for the limited aim of redressing the balance in the inner-bureaucratic struggle? Or, even if they could be controlled in the limited action, would not the experience and precedent prepare them to come onto the political arena unsummoned if the new regime, after a period of trial, failed to satisfy their expectations?

It is beyond question that many elements of the bureaucracy must have regarded Zhukov's courting of the unprecedented ovation on Red Navy Day and his speech in Leningrad calling for further de-Stalinization, in a tone of familiarity used by Soviet bureaucrats before factory workers, as sheer adventurism. Was not this military hero, grown politically important overnight without any experience in that art, not playing the role of the sorcerer's apprentice who would conjure up forces which he would be unable to control?

Zhukov's popularity is a relative and contradictory phenomenon. The military is probably the least hated section of the bureaucracy since it plays no direct role in the economic oppression of the Soviet masses and since the secret police, not it, bears the onus for repression. During the war the leading generals achieved a genuine popularity with the masses. This was an expression of the attitude of the masses to the Soviet Union. They hate the bureaucratic regime but wish to defend the country's economic base against the restoration of capitalism. Stalin and his entourage were hated as the leaders of the bureaucratic rulers while the generals were popular as defenders of the country and its economy against the Nazi invaders. The popularity of Zhukov, the most successful general, increased after the war because he was persecuted by Stalin.

SOLDIERS HATE PRUSSIAN SETUP
That is but one side of the picture, however. Because of its privileges and luxuries in the midst of the general impoverishment of the common people and because of its excessive and arbitrary powers over the ranks, the military bureaucracy can have no real popularity with the masses. The gulf between soldier and officer is tremendous on pay, food, housing, clothing, etc., etc. Formalizing the inferior social position of the men to the officers' corps is the whole reactionary rigmarole of "military courtesy" and Prussian discipline, restored by Stalin as far back as 1935. The same hatred on the part of the enlisted men at the officers' exaltation and their own degradation as is found in capitalist armies, exists in the Red Army and Navy. Probably more since it is not forgotten that the Revolution had once done away with it all and introduced a military system of social equality and democracy.

As the educational and cultural level of the conscripted

soldiers has increased so no doubt has their resentment. In the campaign against "rotten elements" (those who soon after the 20th Congress desired to carry de-Stalinization beyond the official limits) in the armed forces, Zhukov and Timoshenko denounced "false democratization" and the tendency of young officers to forego compulsion and try, instead, to convince the troops. In an address to officers of the Polish Army, Zhukov hammered on this same theme lest "the struggle against the cult of personality should degenerate into a negation of authority in general."

HUNGARY

Certainly Soviet workers and students who sympathized with the Hungarian Revolution must have been disillusioned with Zhukov's crushing of it. So Zhukov's popularity must be considered a relative thing—the sort masses, unable to exercise free choice, give to a supposedly "lesser evil."

The Soviet working class has not yet burst the political strait-jacket into which Stalin forced it. They have loosened it here and torn it there, but they have yet to emerge as a free force on the Soviet scene. Until they are able to form their own groups and take actions in

which they produced leaders of their own choosing — which may not happen until the actual beginning of a political revolution—the desire to get a foot in the political door by according a relative popularity to one or another rival in the inter-bureaucratic fights will remain strong.

STABILIZATION FOR NOW

Khrushchev's triumph over Zhukov, however, finally marks the unification of command in the Kremlin and hence a political stabilization of the bureaucracy's rule for the present conjuncture. While it lasts, no "lesser evil" figures will be permitted to emerge. Thus the Soviet masses, temporarily arrested in their leftward development by the smashing of the Hungarian Revolution but not driven back past the gains of the 20th Congress' de-Stalinization, probably have before them a period of developing their own inner forces until they can themselves break the bureaucracy's stabilization. This might take the form either of a direct assault or the exertion of such pressures on the regime that Khrushchev's domination is shattered and the bureaucracy's faction struggle resumes under much more auspicious circumstances for mass intervention.

...Needed War Economy

(Continued from page 1)

of foreign military aid, they propose an industrial development program, for non-industrialized countries. Instead of instruments of destruction they propose spending at home for the welfare of the people—specifically for schools, housing, hospitals, dams and for adequate unemployment and old-age pensions.

Posed abstractly, this might seem possible. But it is no accident that the U.S. government has failed to engage in that kind of "pump-priming" on a serious scale.

No one can contest the need of undeveloped countries for industrial development. Non-industrialized nations are forced into economic dependence on the advanced countries, for their role in world economy is limited primarily to supplying raw materials for the industrial machines of the imperialist countries. To even permit, let alone aid the industrial development of the non-industrial segment of world economy to any significant extent would have unsettling effects on the economy of the imperialist powers. It would cut off the principal source of cheap raw materials. And industrial power that does not represent a mere extension of that of the imperialist nation would only serve as unwanted competition.

CONFLICT WITH PROFITS
At home, the capitalist class would never permit "welfare" spending to the tune of half a trillion dollars over an eleven-year span. For this would undermine its profits irremediably. Take housing for instance. As Art Preis wrote in his pamphlet, "Welfare State" or Socialism, "What would happen to the exorbitant profits of the construction and real estate interests, to the landlords' high rents for tenements, if there were enough decent homes for everybody?" One could also ask, what would happen to the profits of the medical trust if the government built enough hospital and research facilities to take care of everybody's health needs? Or what would happen to the monopoly profits of the utilities if the government satisfied all the demand for electric power?

The greatest need the American people have yet experienced for massive government spending for their welfare was during the depression of the 1930's. Slums, malnutrition and shabby clothing were common ailments in the United States, the richest of the capitalist powers. As the Roosevelt Administration conceded, one-third of the nation was ill-housed, ill-clothed, ill-fed.

GOVT DESTROYS FOOD
Yet the U.S. government never undertook production of decent homes (except for token slum clearance), good food and warm clothes, not to speak of less essential commodities, for this would have interfered with the system of the private production of these goods for profit. Instead of producing what the people needed, the government destroyed food or paid for its non-production in order to boost prices, thus assuring a profit and therefore an incentive for capitalist production. In order to prevent complete demoralization of the unemployed millions, relief was supplemented by work projects, but never for the production of essentials. The New Deal policies flowed from the nature of a capitalist gov-

ernment. They proved that a state really concerned with social welfare and a capitalist state are mutually exclusive. A genuine welfare state can only exist within a socialist society.

The American economy pulled out of the depression only by means of government outlays for World War II. Big Business reaped a golden harvest and kept on amassing fortunes because of the cold-war military budget after 1946. The simple truth is that American Big Business today absolutely requires a war machine not only to serve its world-wide predatory aims but as the only way at its disposal to buoy the economy.

It is otherwise with the Soviet planned economy. Full use of productive power and continued expansion are possible there without an arms budget. As a matter of fact, an end to the arms race would result in a more rapid expansion of that industry which could be devoted to consumer goods.

WILL SOVIETS CATCH UP

The Soviet rate of economic growth is higher than that of the U.S. This is a source of anxiety to the ruling circles in the U.S. For it poses the question of whether the Soviet economy can catch up with the American in the next period. Addressing himself to this question, Harry Schwartz, New York Times analyst cited the following as a factor:

"First, will the Soviet Union have to continue spending vast amounts on arms production in the future as in the past? President Eisenhower's intimation of greater United States military spending, in his speech last week, undoubtedly will exert pressure on Moscow to keep up its own large effort in the arms race, thus diverting resources otherwise usable for capital investment."

Here we see the Soviet military budget listed as an obstacle to the economic goals of Soviet planned economy. And this is not a Marxist speaking but a pro-capitalist expert on Soviet affairs. If Schwartz observation is correct, then the U.S. military budget, in addition to preparing for war, serves two needs of the capitalist class: (1) To sustain the American economy and (2) to slow the Soviet Union's economic growth.

... The Moscow Conference

(Continued from page 1)

a new political line. They are compendiums of the political positions on the important internal and international problems that the Soviet leaders have been proclaiming for some time. However, the tone, the emphasis given certain points and the ambiguities in the documents have a political significance.

The declaration of the 12 Soviet-orbit countries begins by counterposing the growth of their strength to the waning of imperialist power. Over 950 million people, a third of mankind now live in the Soviet orbit. Another 700 million have thrown off the colonial yoke and won national independence. In addition to these losses, the imperialist countries are rent by class antagonisms. Imperialist war plans and their NATO, Middle East and SEATO military alliances are castigated and their failure predicted. The same note of confidence in the Soviet ability to defeat imperialist attack that has marked the post-Sputnik diplomacy and statements of the Kremlin runs through the document. Added is a bold note of confidence about the ultimate triumph of socialism in the capitalist countries.

COVER UP OWN CRISIS

No mention of "contradictions" within the Soviet bloc, such as was heard at the time of the Polish defiance and Hungarian uprising, appears in the document. Instead the tense social, political and national relationships inside the Soviet orbit are brazenly ignored as follows: "In the Socialist states the broad masses of the working people enjoy genuine freedom and democratic rights. People's power insures political unity of the masses, equality and friendship among the nations..." Similarly the Hungarian Revolution is passed off as an "imperialist plan" that was defeated.

The section on theory shows that the vaunted "political unity of the masses" is more a wish than a fact. For political deviations are bitterly assailed. These are described as "dogmatism" (the bureaucracy's code name for unregenerate Stalin-

ism) and "revisionism" (the term applied to tendencies demanding further de-Stalinization). The burden of the attack is, of course, on the "revisionists," indicating that they are by far the greater danger to the regimes in the Soviet orbit.

POLAND-USSR RELATIONS

The area of greatest ambiguity is that dealing with the relations between the various countries. Since one of the feathers in Khrushchev's cap was the assent of Poland's Gomulka to the document, this ambiguity reflects the unresolved and deadlocked relationship between the USSR and Poland. The formulation gives theoretical satisfaction to both parties. The absolute equality of the nations of the Soviet bloc is proclaimed, but, as Orwell put it, the USSR is more equal than the others, since it is "the first and mightiest Socialist power."

The Yugoslav delegation did not sign this document ostensibly because this section was unsatisfactory to it. However, the dry and political principle has as little meaning for the Titoist bureaucracy as it does for Khrushchev—both are practitioners of empirical, power politics, for which theory is not a guide but a grab bag into which one reaches for an appropriate formula after a course of action has already been decided on. The document's formula would have been just as satisfactory to Tito as it was to Gomulka, if the former had not felt that signing would jeopardize financial and military aid from the U.S.

AIMS AT STALINIZATION

Issuance of the documents signals that Khrushchev, having stabilized the power fight inside the Kremlin bureaucracy, is now taking steps to stabilize the situation within the Soviet bloc and among the Communist Parties throughout the world. Holding such conferences is a step toward restoring a working discipline. The documents give them all a single comprehensive political line.

In discussing the struggle for socialism in the capitalist countries, the documents introduce

a note of "militancy" interspersed with the old class-colaborationist formulas. The CP chiefs hope that this together with the Soviet sputnik achievements will reinvigorate the cadres of the parties in the capitalist countries.

The scientific successes, they hope, will establish confidence that the Khrushchev leadership is advancing the USSR to socialism and is therefore a fit international leadership. References to the class-struggle in the capitalist world are for the most part muted. The genuine desire of fighting for socialism in their own countries and able on that account to win influence in the mass movement.

However, the design of the Kremlin overlords is not to further the revolutionary aspirations of the CP cadres but to use them in a pressure game for arriving at a status quo deal with imperialism. It is for this purpose that the Kremlin has been anxious to reassert unshakable political control over the world Communist movement.

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

Achievement of "peaceful co-existence" is the "most important world-wide task of the day," the document proclaims. This also is the main theme of the second document, signed by 64 Communist parties, which

Introductory Offer!
A 3-Month Subscription
To The Militant Only 50 Cents

The Militant
116 University Place
New York 3, N. Y.

Name

Street

City

State

Zone

New York Bazaar

The New York School of Social Science announces that its Annual Christmas Bazaar will be held Saturday, December 14, at 116 University Place.

All our friends are urged to contribute their white elephants such as precious stones, jewelry, electric appliances, end tables, last year's fur coat (mink, chinchilla, beaver or rabbit will be accepted), books, records, objects of art. Solicit those trades people you regularly do business with for a contribution of food, clothing, wine, candy, furniture, etc. If you can't bring in the merchandise, call AL 5-7852 and arrange for a pickup.

Subscription 88 per year: \$1.50 for 6 months, Foreign: \$2.00 per year; \$2.50 for 6 months, Canadian: \$3.50 per year; \$1.75 for 6 months. Bundle Orders: 5 or more copies to each in U.S., 75 each in foreign countries.

THE MILITANT

Published Weekly in the interests of the Working People THE MILITANT PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION 115 University Pl., N. Y. 3, N. Y. Phone: AL 5-7466 Editor: DANIEL ROBERTS Business Manager: FRANCES JAMES

Signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent The Militant's policies. These are expressed in its editorials. Entered as second class matter March 7, 1944 at the Post Office at New York, N.Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.

Vol. 21 - No. 48 Monday, December 2, 1957

"Democracy" in Okinawa

One of the myths assiduously propagated by America's big-business press is that imperialism on the part of modern capitalist countries is a thing of the past. Direct colonial rule, as that of France in Algeria, is explained as a vestige of 19th Century imperialism. Though U.S. imperialism has long preferred indirect rule of its economic vassal states, it has in the past engaged in direct colonial rule and, indeed, last week furnished the world with a current example on the island of Okinawa which it looted from Japan at the end of the war.

By order of Lieutenant General James E. Moore, High Commissioner and military commander of the U.S.-occupied island, the rules of municipal government in Naha, Okinawa's capital, were revised to remove its elected mayor, Kamejiro Senaga, from office.

Making up rules as he went along, Moore decreed that henceforth anyone convicted of a felony could not hold office. This was designed to bar Senaga's reelection on Jan. 12. Senaga had been imprisoned by the Japanese militarists prior to World War II for his "anti-government activities" and he was imprisoned again by U.S. authorities in 1952 for "harboring a fugitive."

Senaga was elected by the Japanese people of this island in protest against

the national oppression which the U.S. occupation force represents. His election was hailed by organized labor in Japan proper.

He had the backing of a United Front party composed of Communist Party adherents and Socialists. But the military authorities swung their weight in the election and succeeded in placing 24 pro-Americans on the 30-man assembly.

The American brass then opened a drive to get rid of Senaga. All public work in the city was brought to a standstill when the bank controlled by the U.S. authorities refused to make customary advances to the city. The Americans then loudly denounced Senaga for having brought administration of Naha to a stop.

Last June, the assembly, by a two-thirds vote, decided to remove Senaga. But in new elections in August, the United Front doubled its strength in the assembly. Under the rules, this nullified the removal proceedings. Whereupon Moore changed the rules.

The American action is evoking sharp protest throughout Japan. The Socialist Party branded it an "action that denied the self-government of the Okinawans and trampled on their democratic rights."

We believe that organized labor in this country ought to join in the protest.

The True Source of Corruption

Senator John L. McClellan, chief labor prober and Senatorial advocate of a national "right to slave" law, clamored against union corruption before the Arkansas Chamber of Commerce in Little Rock, Nov. 20. "There is a grave danger that in a few years our cherished free enterprise system will be supplanted by a racketeering, dictatorial-controlled gangsterism economy, unless some present trends can be reversed and a clean-up operation performed by corrective legislation," he said.

What McClellan is saying is that corruption in American society originates in the labor movement and that the unions are on the verge of corrupting his "cherished free enterprise system." The truth is exactly the opposite: Corruption stems from the capitalist class.

No, Senator McClellan, it is not the labor movement that threatens to engulf free enterprise with corruption. It is the capitalist class that has corrupted, either directly or indirectly, almost the entire labor officialdom.

The workers will have to combat the corrupting influence of the capitalist class over their leadership in order to clean up the labor movement. When they do, McClellan and his kind will also be swept aside.

foods and inferior drugs on the market. Then, all kinds of restraints must be applied to advertisers to prevent the more flagrant lies used to bamboozle consumers. Even so, one has only to spend a few hours with a television or radio set to understand the volume of corruption in the advertising racket.

There is no area of life untouched by the corruption that flows from profit-greed. Look at the hypocritical, lying and corrupt politicians this system breeds. What is flimsier, more unsubstantial than the campaign promise of a capitalist politician? Men and women like McClellan sit in the highest representative bodies of the land only because they know how to curry favor with the profiteers and political machines in the "free enterprise" system.

These lines, by Peter Fryer, appear in the editor's introduction to a special issue of the British Independent socialist weekly, The Newsletter, published on the 40th anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution. The issue contains special features and 26 separate articles by as many socialist writers on different aspects of the Russian Revolution from 1917 to the present.

In these articles the Revolution emerges as the living force

Soviets--Reality and Caricature

[The following article, "The Soviets - Reality and Caricature," by George Cunvin, is reprinted from the special, Nov. 7, issue of Peter Fryer's The Newsletter devoted to the 40th Anniversary of the Russian Revolution. (See review, this page.) George Cunvin has been an active member of the British Labor Party for 22 years. - Editor.]



LENIN

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics - it was no accident that this was the title given to the State which emerged from the October Revolution. In this name was summed up the program of an epoch - the transitional period between the end of capitalism and the beginnings of a new form of society - socialism.

This transitional period was characterized by Marxists as the "dictatorship of the proletariat" which, in plain English, simply means the rule of the working class.

For many years before the Russian Revolution of 1917, socialists had engaged in long academic discussions about the form of government which would bring about the transformation of the social order.

Ever since Marx it has been generally accepted that this task would fall to the workers as a class; but how would the working class organize its State when it achieved power?

Only in the Paris Commune of 1871 did the world catch a fleeting glimpse of what workers' power would look like.

THE WORKERS' DIRECT MOUTHPIECES

Then came the 1905 revolution in tsarist Russia, a revolution in which the political parties of the Russian workers played the leading role. But for the task of organizing and guiding the revolution, a new type of organization came into existence - councils of working men, or soviets, to give them their Russian name.

These soviets were not political parties or trade unions but consisted of elected representatives of the workers at the point of production. They were the direct mouthpieces of the men at the workshop bench or the coal face, in daily contact with their workmates, able to respond instantaneously to every nuance of a rapidly changing political situation.

With the March 1917 revolution, soviets once again emerged spontaneously as the expression of the workers' will. Soviets of workers' deputies, soviets of peasants and of soldiers.

"All power to the soviets!" became the slogan of the Bolsheviks and this was the program which gave it victory in November 1917. That victory would have been impossible without the soviets. They welded the alliance of the workers and peasants against the exploiters.

They played a central role in the civil war; helped the work of the Military Revolutionary Committee; mobilized the draft-

ees; conducted a struggle against deserters; collected foodstuffs, raw materials, supplies.

Above all, the soviets developed the initiative and creative abilities of the people.

REACTING DURING FIRST YEARS In the first years of the Revolution, soviet democracy was a real and living thing. When the constitution of the young Soviet Republic stated that "Russia declares itself to be a republic of workers, soldiers' and peasants' delegates, all power, both central and local, is vested in these soviets" it meant exactly what it said.

In 1922, Bukharin and Preobrazhensky could still write in their "ABC of Communism": "To an ever greater extent the masses of the people, the workers and poor peasants, come to participate in the joint labors of the soviets, the trade unions, and the factory committees. This is going on everywhere. In the country towns and in the villages people who never did anything of the kind before are now actively participating in the work of administration and in the building of a new life. In this way the soviet power secures the widest self-government for the various localities and at the same time summons the broad masses of the people to participate in the work of government."

Many visitors to the Soviet Union during that period confirm this graphic picture of a genuine and developing workers' democracy in action. "But even then the germs of degeneration were at work. At the best it was no easy task to transform "every cook into an administrator" (Lenin).

The flower of the Russian working class had been decimated in the civil war. Its vanguard - the finest in the world - was swamped in a sea of backwardness and illiteracy. This was fertile soil for the rising bureaucracy to sink its roots into.

REVOLUTION ISOLATED Only the extension of revolution to the advanced industrial

countries of the West could have stopped the process. But the Revolution was confined within the frontiers of the former tsarist empire.

With the rise of the bureaucracy the role of the soviets began to decline. In the early soviets the right of recall was fundamental to the proper functioning of soviet democracy. If a delegate fulfilled his duties badly, if he no longer represented the views of those who elected him, he could be, and frequently was, recalled.

With the advent of Stalinism and the disappearance of freedom of discussion and the right to criticize in the Communist Party and in the trade unions, only those who found favor with the all-powerful secretariat could hope to be elected to the soviets. The right of recall remained only on paper.

The original constitution of the Russian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic states: "The All-Russian Congress of Soviets is the supreme authority. . . and must meet at least twice a year."

It did so even during the perilous days of Civil War! But after the general secretary usurped all power this clause became a dead letter.

SOVIET REPUBLIC WITHOUT SOVIETS

Years passed - and what years - without the soviets being summoned, until finally they were replaced, in the Stalin Constitution of 1936, with a spurious form of parliamentarism. Today the Soviet Union can truly be described as a soviet republic without soviets.

In the early days the best worker-delegates to the soviets were drawn into the task of administering the State. Under Stalinism, the administrative apparatus became more and more separated from the people and transformed into an instrument of the ruling caste.

The Soviet State, as it emerged from October, was the ideal instrument for translating into practice Engels' vision of the State "withering away." But this required that the material conditions for the expansion of culture should be to hand.

In the conditions prevailing in Russia at the end of the civil war this was impossible. Within limits the rise of a bureaucracy was inevitable, but a healthy soviet democracy could have exercised effective control over the bureaucracy and prevented its worst excesses. It was precisely because soviet democracy threatened its privileges that the bureaucracy had to crush the soviets.

The same ruthless terror which smashed the opposition in the CPSU and tore the living heart out of Bolshevism ensured "mon-

olithic unity" in the soviets. Only the caricature remained.

HUNGARIAN EVENTS Today we still talk and write of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics even though the traditional forms of soviet rule have long disappeared. Recent events in Hungary once again demonstrated that in a revolutionary situation the working class intuitively throws up workers' councils as instruments of struggle and for wielding power after victory.

The soviet form of government is, so far, the only one which has proved capable of abolishing capitalism and laying the foundations of a socialist society.

Half a century of parliamentary socialism in Scandinavia has left capitalism practically intact, complete with monarchy and the rule of finance-capital. Within a week of the establishment of soviet power, capitalism disappeared from the Russian scene, never to return. These historic facts speak for themselves.

When they finally come to grips with the bureaucracy, the Russian workers will no doubt re-establish these organs of working class democracy which served them so well in three revolutions, and will once again give reality to the proud name their country bears.



TROTSKY, WAR MINISTER-1923

The Record of Forty Years

"Bourgeois and proletarian, white man and African, intellectual and Philistine, bureaucrat and revolutionary; all live today in the shadow of October. It dominates our time like a volcano destined yet again by its eruption to shake and reshape the world, to topple rulers and bring empires crashing to ruin."

These lines, by Peter Fryer, appear in the editor's introduction to a special issue of the British Independent socialist weekly, The Newsletter, published on the 40th anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution. The issue contains special features and 26 separate articles by as many socialist writers on different aspects of the Russian Revolution from 1917 to the present.

In these articles the Revolution emerges as the living force

it is. The fact that many of the fundamental problems involved in the present regroupment discussion in the United States are dealt with in this symposium reveals anew that a critical study of the Russian Revolution must be undertaken by anyone seriously interested in socialist politics. Such a study will be stimulated and aided by this special issue of the Newsletter. Included, in addition to the articles, are a chronology, a suggested reading list and "Who's Who" sketches of leaders of the Revolution.

The articles range from a description of how the Bolsheviks took power in Petrograd in October, 1917 to a criticism of present-day Soviet architecture. A partial list of titles: "Honest, Realistic, Disciplined, Democratic; That was Lenin's Bolshevik Party." "Why and

How the Bureaucracy Arose." "The Bolshevik Resistance to Stalinism (1923-1928)." "The Red Army: Mirror of Soviet Society." "Theories and Practice of Soviet Psychologists." "Heroes, Cult and Spectacle on the Soviet Screen." "Unsolved Problems of Kolkhoz Agriculture." "The Giant Strides of Russia's Planned Industry."

The contributors include Prof. Hyman Levy, British author of many popular books on science and dialectical materialism, Joseph Hansen, editor of the International Socialist Review, Joseph Clarke, recently resigned from the foreign editor's desk of the New York Daily Worker and Tony Guthrie, "the name under which a prominent member of the British Communist Party writes for the Newsletter."

The articles face big issues head on. An example of the results is this quote from Robert Hunter's article on purges and frame-up trials: "Before a policy of principle, all the torturing explanations why Magnitogorsk should be balanced against the execution of a Kameney, Stalinvaros against the annihilation of Rajk, are seen as the weaknesses of little men who do not know that people rise above defeats, renew their hopes, and above all need, not illusions, but the truth."

"The cult of the individual is based on the self-cult of many individuals forming an elite, guardians of arcane secrets, directors of the people's will, builders of socialism, guides of the arts and sciences, and recipients of higher fancies."

Another article tells, through extensive quotes, how the Revolution was presented in 1917 to the readers of the Yorkshire Post - whose "readership of Yorkshire business men need somehow to get some facts about the world, and yet keep their illusions intact."

The optimism for the socialist future of humanity, expressed in this issue of the Newsletter, flows from a critical study of the Bolshevik Revolution - with no illusions needed.

— Fred Halstead

1917 - 1957 A special edition of Peter Fryer's The Newsletter honoring the 40th Anniversary of the Russian Revolution. 40 pages 30 cents

Order from: The Militant 116 University Place New York 3, N.Y.

Which Edition of Trib Are We to Believe?

Last week we reported that a world poll sponsored by the New York Herald Tribune found that almost 60% of the people throughout the world believe that H-bomb explosions are endangering the health of future generations. Reporting this finding Nov. 17, the director of the poll, Elmo Wilson, railed against the fact that so many people rejected the contention of U.S. government "experts" that the H-tests do not constitute a hazard. He bitterly complained that "educated" people are as concerned as "laborers" about the danger.

However, Mr. Wilson and the Herald Tribune editors apparently felt that this view of the poll would not sit well with the readers of their European edition. This is effectively demonstrated in a letter to the New York Post Nov. 20. The writer, Allen Klein, contrasts the version of Wilson's article that appeared in the New York edition of the Herald Tribune with the one appearing in Paris.

Following is the text of Mr. Klein's letter, which appeared under the caption, "Which Trib do You Read?" "The U.S. edition of the Herald Tribune evidently does not know what the European edition is doing and vice versa."

"The past week end both editions ran an article based on a global poll by the paper's 'World Poll' as written by its director, Elmo Wilson. Charts and answers in both editions told that great numbers of people everywhere, the great majority, feared the results of H-bomb test fallout to unborn generations."

Beyond that it seemed that two different people had written both articles.

"In the New York edition: 'All over the world tremendous numbers of people believe, in spite of expert opinion to the contrary, that continued H-bomb explosions are a danger to those yet unborn.' In the Paris edition, the phrase, 'in spite of expert scientific opinion to the contrary,' was eliminated.

"In the New York edition: 'The attitude of the majority is plainly a reflection of misinformation.' In the Paris edition: 'The attitude of the majority is not a reflection of ignorance, misinformation or hysteria.' Missing from the overseas paper was the domestic sentence, 'It is well to remember, though, that even educated people have misconceptions about radiation.'"

"In the Paris edition: 'The fact that government officials and scientists have contradicted each other on this matter has the average man on the anxious seat. Many reputable scientists have said with very little qualification that H-bomb testing is dangerous in the extreme.'"

A Conference on America's Future In the Age of Automation and Atomic Energy Saturday, December 7 from 10 A.M. to 5 P.M.

OPENING SESSION, 10-11 A.M. A. J. MUSTE, presiding. FRANK BELLO, science editor, Fortune. JACK CYPIN, social scientist and co-author of "The Robot Revolution." DR. CARL DREHER, engineer and author of the new book "Automation: What It Is, How It Works, and Who Can Use It." Dr. Dreher's paper will be read.

MORNING PANELS, 11 A.M.—1 P.M. 1. Trade Union Problems Moderator: SIDNEY LENS, Chicago trade unionist and secretary of AFSE.

Panelists: Trade unionists and labor writers including: BERT COCHRAN, FRED FINE, STEPHEN GRATMAN, TOM KERRY, RUSS NIXON and SAM POLLOCK. 2. Youth Problems Moderator: SHELDON WEEKS, youth secretary, American Friends Service Committee, New York City.

Panelists: EARL DURHAM, national youth secretary, Communist Party; MICHAEL HARRINGTON, national chairman, Young Socialist League; NINA LANDAU, recent visitor to China, student at University of Wisconsin; DAVID McREYNOLDS; TONY RAMIREZ, member of F.O.R. youth group; TIM WOHLFORTH, managing editor, Young Socialist. 3. Cultural Problems Moderator: DR. STRINGFELLOW BARR, noted publicist and former president of St. John's College.

Panelists: JOHN DICKINSON, writer; EVE MERRIAM, poet; DR. OTTO NATHAN, economist; HARVEY SWADOS, novelist, author of "On the Line"; ROBERT WRIGHT, chairman, Social Action Committee, Union Theological Seminary. AFTERNOON PANELS, 2:30-5 P.M. 1. Socialism and Democracy Moderator: RUSSELL JOHNSON, director of the Peace Section, New England Region, American Friends Service Committee.

Panelists: HERBERT APTEHEKER, editor, Political Affairs; DAVE DELLINGER, the Libertarian Press; FARRELL DOBBS, national secretary, Socialist Workers Party; MURRAY KEMPTON, newspaper columnist; JOHN L. LEWINE, educator; STEVE NELSON, chairman, Communist Party of Western Pennsylvania; DR. FREDERICK L. SCHUMAN, historian, professor at Williams College. 2. Political Action Moderator: CONRAD LYNN, civil rights attorney.

Panelists: JAMES ARONSON, editor, National Guardian; DR. ALBERT BLUMBERG, member of the State Committee, Communist Party of New York; JOYCE COWLEY, SWP candidate for Mayor of New York, 1957; TYRELL WILSON, veteran socialist; MILTON ZASLOW, secretary, Committee for Socialist Unity.

CLOSING SESSION, 5-5:30 P.M. Address by A. J. MUSTE.

Sponsored by: American Forum -- For Socialist Education at the GREAT NORTHERN HOTEL 118 W. 57th ST., NEW YORK CITY Registration Fee: \$1.00

World Events

TESTING - ONE, TWO - TESTING! The U.S. government quietly paid \$600,000 into a fund for rural development in Egypt and released 25% of Egyptian funds frozen in the U.S. when Egypt nationalized the Suez Canal. The Wall Street Journal, Nov. 21, reports that U.S. diplomats "will closely watch Egypt's reaction" to see if it will be received "as a sign of U.S. friendship."

AT LEAST 90% OF THE CUBAN POPULATION supports, in one way or another, the armed rebellion led by Fidel Castro against dictator Batista, according to an on-the-spot report in the New York Herald Tribune of Nov. 24 and 25. The rebel army is only 2,000 strong, but "for anyone to rout them from the mountains would require a full-scale operation such as the United States used in Okinawa in World War II. Nothing short of that could drive them out." (Batista has no visible capacity to employ a similar fire power in Cuba.)

CEYLONESE WORKERS are engaged in a new, militant round of strikes. Last week, a three-day shipping workers' strike and railway workers' strike was followed by a walk-out of postal and telegraph workers. Then a large group of shipyard workers struck. The government has turned a deaf ear to these workers who are for the most part employed in nationalized industry. The Harbor Workers Union is threatening a new strike and an appeal for a general strike to compel the government to negotiate. The leadership of many of the striking workers has been reported as Trotskyist. On the other hand, the Associated Press, Nov. 25, reports that the Communist Party has "been trying to hold down the strike movement lest it topple Ceylon's

government which is friendly to the Soviet Union."

TUNISIA'S PURCHASE OF ARMS from the United States and Britain has caused a rift between France and her imperialist allies. Tunisia announced she would buy arms for her small army on the open market after France had stopped shipments because of Tunisian sympathy with the Algerian revolution. Rather than have Tunisia buy guns from Egypt or the Soviet block, the U.S. and Britain sold her about 1,000 small arms Nov. 14 in spite of French protests.

AFTER THE NOV. FRENCH GENERAL STRIKE of a million civil service workers, the government has moved to put workers back on their jobs under military discipline. (In France railroads, buses, and most utilities are nationalized.) French workers are expected to raise a "howl of protest," says the Christian Science Monitor.

INDONESIA'S request to negotiate with the Netherlands over the fate of Western New Guinea (which is still under Dutch domination) has received backing in the UN from most of the Asian-African bloc of nations.

Buffalo MILITANT FORUM "Is the Cold War Getting Hotter?"

Hear: MURRY WEISS Associate Editor, the Militant Sun., Dec. 8 - 7:30 P.M. 831 Main Street

Wades Sell Home to Protect Children; Braden Case Ends

By William Bundy

Mr. and Mrs. Andrew E. Wade IV announced, Nov. 18, that they have sold their home in a Louisville, Ky. suburb because they and their two children cannot count on adequate police protection against racists. The family will continue to live in the Louisville ghetto for Negroes. Three weeks earlier, the frame-up case against Carl Braden was officially closed with the return to Braden of books and letters seized in 1954 as "evidence."

THE TROUBLE BEGAN

The case began in 1954 when the Wades were unable to find a suitable house. (In ten years 18,000 new homes had been built for whites but only 300 for Negroes.) They sought help from Carl and Anne Braden, a white newspaperman and his

wife, who bought the suburban house and resold it to the Wades. To protect the home from racist terror the Wades and Bradens appealed for help and got it from many Louisville citizens, Negro and white. Among these were three white trade unionists: Vernon Bown, a Teamster; Lewis Lubka, an IUE-CIO shop steward; and LaRue Spiker, a shop steward in the Grain Millers Union. Another who helped was Louise Gilbert, a white social worker.

Just after midnight on June 27, 1954, the house was half-destroyed by a dynamite blast, but the Wades escaped injury. In spite of the fact that the racists who had harassed the Wades were widely known, the police did nothing. After several weeks a state Grand Jury began an investigation which was turned into an attack on Wade's white friends. Bown was accused of bombing the house and was indicted under an old and unused "sedition" law. The Bradens, Lubka, Spiker, Gilbert and Bown's 79-year-old roommate, J. O. Ford, were also indicted on "sedition" charges.

Bown demanded immediate trial on the bombing charge but the prosecution ignored the bombing and tried Carl Braden for "sedition." Braden, who had

been active in labor and civil rights circles for years was convicted, Dec. 13, 1954, sentenced to 15 years in prison, and forced to spend seven months in jail before he could raise a \$40,000 bond to be free pending appeal. Braden's conviction was reversed in the higher courts and the other cases were subsequently dropped. The Emergency Civil Liberties Committee and many liberal, labor and church groups participated in a nationwide defense effort. Five major court rulings resulted from the Wade-Braden case.

The Wades' house lay in ruins for three years as a result of court suits over the ownership. The Wades finally gained ownership last spring, and borrowed money paid off mortgages and repaired it. In announcing that they had sold the house, the Wades said they have lost \$1,500 on the deal.

Said Andrew Wade: "My wife does not feel that the county police will provide adequate protection to her and our two little girls. . . . It is a miracle that she did not lose our youngest child when the house was blown up before." The county police, who have jurisdiction over the suburb, have failed to this day to arrest or convict the dynamiters.

VOLUME XXI

MONDAY, DEC. 2, 1957

NUMBER 48

Dr. Otto Nathan Wins Acquittal

They Faced Racist Terror



ANDREW WADE IV, CHARLOTTE WADE, and their daughters. After a three-year struggle to live in a Louisville suburb — during which they and their friends faced bombings and frame-ups — they have sold their house to protect their children from violence. (See story, this page.)


Noted Educator Tells Militant Why He Risked Jail to Defy House Committee

By Harry Ring

NEW YORK, Nov. 25 — This afternoon I sat with Dr. Otto Nathan in his study discussing the victory that he has just scored for civil liberties — the reversal last Friday of his conviction for contempt of Congress, a conviction that might have carried a one-year prison term with it.

Every available inch of space in his study is crammed from floor to ceiling with well worn books. On the wall over his desk is a photograph of the late Albert Einstein. Otto Nathan was his close friend and is the executor of his estate. He is a noted professor of economics who has taught in the major universities here and abroad. Seated in his study, a soft-spoken, courteous man, he seems to fit completely the traditional picture of the scholar.

But Otto Nathan is as much a courageous man of action as he is a man of ideas. This became quickly apparent as he explained why and how he deliberately risked imprisonment to defy the witch-hunting House Un-American Activities Committee.



DR. OTTO NATHAN

Dr. Nathan refused to reply on the grounds that they violated his Constitutional right of the free speech and association as guaranteed by the First Amendment.

This angered the witch hunters. But they went into a complete rage when Dr. Nathan refused to permit them to examine his hard-won passport. "I told them that I would be glad to read its contents to them and some one could look over my shoulder while I read it," he recalled with a chuckle, "but I wasn't letting it out of my hands."

CITED FOR USING RIGHT

"That was when they moved to cite me for contempt. But they must have got cold feet on the point, because when the citation and indictment were handed down they were based only on my invoking the First Amendment."

The motion to cite Dr. Nathan for contempt of Congress was adopted by unanimous vote of the House of Representatives. Last April, Federal District Judge Edward Curran found him guilty as charged. It was the

same Judge Curran who was compelled to reverse his decision last week.

Curran "reluctantly" granted a motion for acquittal on the basis of the Supreme Court decision of last June in the Watkins case which, he conceded, would apply in Dr. Nathan's case. Watkins, a UAW organizer, had also been convicted of contempt of Congress after invoking the First Amendment against the House Committee. The high court ruled he had not been properly advised by the committee as to the purpose of its investigation and the pertinency of the questions he had refused to answer.

Bitterly assailing the Supreme Court stand, Judge Curran branded it "wrong" and "false" and declared he was directing the acquittal of Dr. Nathan only because "I cannot substitute my judgment for that of the Supreme Court."

What do you think of Curran's statement, I asked Dr. Nathan. "It is highly disturbing," he answered quietly. "It lends support to those who want to take legislative action to counteract the Watkins decision."

Returning to the hearing itself, I asked Dr. Nathan why he had invoked the First rather than the Fifth Amendment. While the Supreme Court has now afforded a limited measure of protection to First Amendment witnesses at Congressional committee hearings, it upheld the penalizing of such witnesses at that time. On the other hand the right to the legal defense afforded by the Fifth Amendment had been pretty well established by then, despite the McCarthyite smear against those who invoked it.

"No, I couldn't do that," Dr. Nathan said. "Some of my friends advised me to. But that was out of the question for me. I had made up my mind long before that if I was ever subpoenaed I would use the First. It's the best way to fight for civil liberties. The Fifth Amendment gives self-protection against these committees and strengthens civil liberties in that it makes things more difficult for the witch-hunters and paralyzes their investigations. But when you invoke the First Amendment, you are clearly posing the right of free speech and association."

"Yes, it's true," he continued. "There were only adverse decisions up till then on the use of the First. The Hollywood Ten, Josephson, the Barski group and others went to jail for using it. It was likely that it would mean jail for me, too. But what could I do?"

CLEAR-CUT RULING NEEDED

How do you feel about it now? Do you consider the decision in your case a complete victory, I asked. "Certainly, every defeat of the Un-American Committee is a victory," he replied. "And I'm relieved it's over with. But I cannot consider it a full victory until we have a clear-cut decision enforcing unqualified rights under the First Amendment."

Have you suffered professionally as a result of your opposition to the witch hunt, I asked this 64-year-old fighter for civil liberties who is also a life-long independent socialist and outspoken proponent of Marxist theory.

"Yes," he said, "I have faced grave professional difficulties. Usually it's not something that you can pin down. A contract with a university expires. You have a good record, but the contract isn't renewed. Sometimes they tell you frankly why, but even when they don't you know that it's because of your political opinions."

As we wound up the interview, I asked Dr. Nathan how he felt about the national campaign just launched by the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee to get Congress to abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee. "I'm all in favor of it," he replied. "I certainly hope that many people will rally behind the ECLC in its campaign to abolish the committee. It's extremely necessary for civil liberties."

Xmas Book Bargains

(Use this ad as your order form)

GIANT IN CHAINS by Barrows Dunham. Marxist account of the meaning and history of philosophy. In popular style, not professional jargon. Intensely interesting and witty book. (Originally \$3.75) \$1.50 (plus 15c mailing charge) ()

TRAITOR OR PATRIOT? The Life and Death of Sir Roger Casement. By Denis Gwynn. Story of the man who became a humanitarian hero by his exposure of imperialist exploitation of colonial people in Belgium, Congo and South America and who was hanged by British during World War I for his efforts in behalf of Irish revolution. Originally \$3.50. Now \$1.25 (plus 15c) ()

THE STORY OF MY LIFE by Clarence Darrow. Famous lawyer and the story of the many labor cases he defended (paper covers) \$1.45 (plus 10c) ()

THE SOCIAL HISTORY OF ART by Arnold Hauser. Famous and expensive work now available in paper covers. Vol. I \$1.25 (plus 10c) () Vol. II \$1.25 (plus 10c) ()

THE THREEPENNY NOVEL by Bertolt Brecht. Not the play but a full-length novel with the same period as background. Bitingly humorous allegory on capitalist society and its ethics. (paper) \$1.75 (plus 10c) ()

TWO PLAYS: CAUCASIAN CHALK CIRCLE AND GOOD WOMAN OF SETZUAN by Bertolt Brecht. Among the most remarkable dramas of our period. (paper) \$1.45 (plus 10c) ()

CAPTAIN DREYFUS — The Story of a Mass Hysteria, by Nicolas Hazon. The famous anti-Semitic frame-up. By analogy it throws much light on the rise of McCarthyism in the U.S. (paper) \$1.45 (plus 10c) ()

MAIN CURRENTS IN AMERICAN THOUGHT by Irving L. Richardson. Required reading for all students of American culture. (paper) Vol. I The Colonial Mind: 1620-1860. \$1.45 (plus 10c) () Vol. II The Romantic Revolution in America: 1860-1860. \$1.45 (plus 10c) ()

BLACK ANGER by Wulf Sachs. True account by a Viennese refugee doctor of his psycho-analysis of a Negro worker in South Africa, and how the patient finds his own therapy as a leader in the heroic bus boycott in Johannesburg. (paper) \$1.75 (plus 10c) ()

THE SHAME OF THE CITIES by Lincoln Steffens. The famous "muckraking" classic available in paper covers. Shows the integral connection between business and crime that still explains political corruption. \$1.25 (plus 10c) ()

Books by Leon Trotsky
HISTORY OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION. The three volumes complete in one. \$12.50 (plus 25c) ()

LITERATURE AND REVOLUTION. \$3.75 (plus 15c) ()
THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL AFTER LENIN (cloth) \$4.00 (plus 15c) () (paper) \$2.50 (plus 15c) ()
STALIN. A biography. \$6.00 (plus 15c) ()
THE PERMANENT REVOLUTION \$3.50 (plus 15c) ()
THE FIRST FIVE YEARS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL. Vol. 1 (cloth) \$3.50 (plus 15c) () Vol. 2 (paper) \$3.00 (plus 15c) ()

THE REVOLUTION BE-TRAYED \$3.00 (plus 15c) () (paper) \$2.00 (plus 15c) ()
IN DEFENSE OF MARXISM (cloth) \$2.75 (plus 15c) ()

WHITE COLLAR—The American Middle Classes by C. Wright Mills. America's leading sociologist studies the political, economic and cultural position of middle class. (paper) \$1.75 (plus 10c) ()

THADDEUS STEVENS by Ralph K. Rusk. Magnificent biography of the great figure of Radical Reconstruction. (Originally \$6.00) \$2.00 (plus 15c) ()

KARL LIEBKNECHT by Karl W. Meyer. Only biography of the great German revolutionist in English. \$3.25 (plus 15c) ()

THE ROOTS OF AMERICAN COMMUNISM by Theodore Draper. Valuable for its painstaking research into early history of American Communist Party. \$3.75 (plus 20c) ()

THE NEGRO FAMILY IN THE U.S. by E. Franklin Frazier. A sociological classic. (Originally \$5.00) \$1.95 (plus 15c) ()

BLACK BOURGEOISIE by E. Franklin Frazier. A scathing study and indictment. (Originally \$4.00) \$3.50 (plus 15c) ()

THE STRUGGLE FOR A PROLETARIAN PARTY by James P. Cannon (cloth) \$2.75 (plus 15c) () (paper) \$2.00 (plus 15c) ()

HISTORY OF AMERICAN PROLETARIANISM by James P. Cannon (cloth) \$2.75 (plus 15c) () (paper) \$2.00 (plus 15c) ()

THE ECONOMIC BASIS OF POLITICS by Charles Beard (paper) \$1.25 (plus 10c) ()

THE STRANGE CAREER OF JIM CROW by C. Vann Woodward (paper) \$1.50 (plus 10c) ()

AUTOMATION AND SOCIAL PROGRESS by S. Lilley. (Originally \$3.75) \$3.25 (plus 15c) ()

RUSSIA 20 YEARS AFTER by Victor Serge. A veteran of the October Revolution and Stalin's prisons draws the balance sheet of a revolution betrayed. (cloth) \$3.50 ()

THE LONG DUSK by Victor Serge. A novel, anti-fascist and anti-Stalinist refugees caught in France by Nazi invasion. The beginnings of resistance movement. (Originally \$2.75) \$1.00 (plus 15c) ()

By Marx and Engels
CAPITAL by Karl Marx () Vol. I \$2.00 (plus 15c) () Vol. II \$1.75 (plus 15c) () Both for \$3.50 (plus 25c) ()

HISTORY OF ECONOMIC THEORIES by Karl Marx (Vol. 4 of Capital) \$3.00 (plus 15c) ()

MARX-ENGELS SELECTED CORRESPONDENCE \$1.50 (plus 15c) ()

MARX AND ENGELS ON BRITAIN \$2.00 (plus 15c) ()

THE HOLY FAMILY by Marx and Engels. \$1.35 (plus 15c) ()

DIALECTICS OF NATURE by Frederick Engels \$1.50 (plus 15c) ()

KARL MARX AND THE CLOSE OF HIS SYSTEM by Boris Bakewell with a reply by Rudolph Hilferding \$3.50 (plus 15c) ()

THE LOGIC OF MARXISM by William F. Ward. (mimeographed) \$1.00 (plus 15c) ()

THE DEVELOPMENT OF CAPITALISM IN RUSSIA by V. I. Lenin. \$1.75 (plus 15c) ()

WHAT IS ECONOMIC? By Rosa Luxemburg (mimeographed, stiff covers). The only English translation. \$1.00 (plus 15c) ()

THE FOUNDATIONS OF CHRISTIANITY by Karl Kautsky. A Marxist classic. (Originally \$5.00) \$3.00 (plus 15c) ()

CAPITALISM AND SOCIALISM ON TRIAL by Fritz Sternberg. (Originally \$7.00) \$2.50 (plus 15c) ()

THE JEWISH QUESTION—A MARXIST INTERPRETATION by A. Leon. Excellent history and analysis. (cloth) \$1.50 (plus 15c) () (paper) \$1.00 (plus 15c) ()

Letters from Readers

On Churches Role

Editor:
I believe in a higher power. For want of a better name, call it God. But I never felt led to join a church and I never fit in one either. They haven't done anything except help keep the people in ignorance. They speak against slums and war but never do anything about it. Instead they preach pie in the sky—Thank God for what you haven't got in the way of decent housing, food or clothes. The churches also help educate people to conformity. That is to think alike and think what you're told. I've been out getting subscriptions for the Militant. Hope they have come in by now.

Mrs. L. T. Texas

From Mississippi

Editor:
I am forwarding letters to you from a friend in Mississippi. R. C. Chicago

(The letters follow.—Ed.)

Dear Friend:

Life as always has its compensations and drawbacks and if we stop and look we can always find something that needs being done. If we had a real labor leader now, we could let loose a barrage on the Rosenberg-Sobell witchhunt.

Since we have such a wonderful counter-spy ring (the best in the world) just how did the Soviet Union get so far ahead on our stolen secrets? I see where old Senator Martin Dies is heading a citizens Council speaking through Mississippi favoring the segregationists and fighting the NAACP. I'd like to know why his work is not un-American?

Did you see that the Grand Dragon of the KKK in Mobile, Ala., has resigned because he can't get enough support from the citizens? The articles in the Militant on the Southern moderates were wonderful. If only they were more widely read and circulated by more people in the South. A party to fight the States Righters already has the potential following that would swallow both parties in the south. Just kill the poll tax and register the Negro and you have a new South.

Damp weather has me down now but I am still much better and much encouraged by events.

Sorry you are experiencing

Calendar Of Events

New York
Sunday, Dec. 8, 8 P.M. — "Inflation and other Current Problems of U.S. Capitalism." Speaker: David Miller. 116 University Place (near Union Square). Auspices: Militant Labor Forum. Contribution 50c.

Chicago
Friday, Dec. 6, 8:15 P.M. — Hear Howard Packer on "Sputnik, Science and Socialism." Militant Labor Forum, 777 West Adams St.

some of the problems that we out-of-work people have to face. Down here they run circles hiring and laying off to reduce union strength on the job. I have seen at times nine out of 23 men in a department that were on their trial period, and always a few days before their trial period was up they were laid off and a new person was hired the next week. They save money that way by working men on the minimum wage, and they have less vacation to pay off. Also, it costs nothing to hire and lay off because it is chargeable as operational expenses for learners. So they get credit on their income tax and get the work done too.

Arkansas is the hot spot now on integration. The radio is very open on reporting the news now, even the local station not in the chain.

H. J. Miss.

Disagrees With Us

Editor:
It is my belief that the so-called Workers Councils in Hungary were not composed in the majority of class-conscious workers, but of Roman Catholics in sympathy with the Vatican and therefore opposed to the current government which was then Communist. This belief is based on the fact that the chief supporters of the enemies of Communism in our country were Roman Catholics or McCarthyites. The Militant advertises that rebellion in Hungary as a revolution, which was an error, as it was a counter-revolution. Doing that was playing into the hands of capitalism.

Joseph Manlet Cleveland, Ohio

Letter to Faubus

Editor:
Following is the text of a letter that I wrote to Gov. Faubus of Arkansas:

"You may be a hero to a few Ku Klux bigots and white supremacists desirous of retarding education for both white and colored children for the purpose of furnishing a source of cheap labor in your 'Right to Work (scab) Law' Southern States.

But the fact is, this sort of debacle of using bayonets to stop American children from entering class rooms in Little Rock has jeopardized the 'already shaken' integrity of the United States far more throughout the world than the ridiculous antics of that other demagogue and political opportunist, the late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy.

Chester M. Cadle Cleveland, Ohio

Questions For the Left

By Sidney Lens
Introduction by A. J. Muste. Comments by John Dickinson, Tim Woforth, Stephen Grattan, Farrell Dobbs, Conrad Lynn, Albert E. Blumberg. Published by American Forum — For Socialist Education 29 pages 25 cents
Order from: PIONEER PUBLISHERS 116 University Place New York 3, N. Y.

Pioneer Publishers

116 University Place

New York 3, N. Y.