

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JUNE 4, 1956

FIVE CENTS

## N.Y. Garden Rally Greet Southern Negro Heroes

New York, May 24

Seventeen thousand people gathered at Madison Square Garden here tonight to rally for Negro rights and greet heroic Southern Negro fighters against Jim Crow—Aatherine Lucy, Gus Courts, Mrs. Rosa Parks, E. D. Nixon, and others.

The rally, organized by the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters and the national office of the NAACP, and endorsed by many trade unions, impressively demonstrated the determination of the Negro people to end segregation and discrimination now.

The meeting rose to its highest points of enthusiastic response not only in salutory ovations to the Southern Negro visitors like Miss Lucy, but also at two or three points in the speeches when:

(1) Dr. T. R. M. Howard, Mississippi Negro leader, in what was perhaps the best speech of the evening, eloquently and bitingly contrasted the government's talk of helping democracy abroad while not lifting a finger to help bring about democracy at home.

(2) Gus Courts, the Belzoni store-keeper who was shot by racists for trying to vote, related how he had told the terrorists who came to frighten him into removing his name from the voters' list the day after the Rev. Lee was killed: "No, I guess I'll just be like he was; I'll die a hero too."

(3) Rep. Adam Clayton Powell, after tearing into Eisenhower and incidentally remarking that there was no significant difference between the Republicans and Democrats, wound up with a call on A. Philip Randolph (who was chairman of the meeting) to lead a new March on Washington if nothing was done.

But there was no other central focus given to the rally.

(Continued on page 3)

CLASSIC BY WHITE HOUSE AIDE PYLE ON CAPITALIST UNEMPLOYMENT:

## 'The Right to Suffer Is One Of the Joys of a Free Economy'

### Reuther's Economics Failed to Reckon With These 'Joys'

By JACK WILSON

Detroit, May 27

On the American scene it is a common occurrence for a salesman to oversell a product in his enthusiasm to make a sale, so that the customer is dissatisfied when his second look does not correspond with the original description. This is the situation in which Walter Reuther, UAW president, finds himself in the current crisis in the auto industry; his exciting comments about the 1955 wage contract package, which included the modified Guaranteed Annual Wage, have bounced back.

There is no denying the fact that the letdown and disappointment among auto workers today at the limitations and glaring inadequacies of the 1955 contract "victories" are both widespread and understandable. Nor is this situation helped by the fact that the daily newspapers and radio commentaries are pouring salt on the wounds of the UAW ranks.

It was bad enough that the bulk of the auto workers laid off before May 2 are not eligible for many of the benefits of the so-called Supplemental Unemployment Plan. It turns out that the funds are so low there simply is not any possibility that subsequently laid-off auto workers can take home 65 per cent of their pay for four weeks, and then 60 per cent for the next 22 weeks, when the late summer model shutdowns take place. The trust funds are hopelessly inadequate. They have less than 25 per cent of the amount needed in them.

(Turn to last page)

By GORDON HASKELL

A prominent spokesman of the Eisenhower administration has made his bid to join "bird dog" Wilson in that special niche which he shares with Herbert Hoover in the hearts of all American workers who have suffered through a period of serious unemployment.

Howard Pyle, a presidential aid, told a group of Detroit reporters who asked him about the massive unemployment in the auto industry: "The right to suffer is one of the joys of a free economy, just as the right to prosper is."

This was a true expression of the

### THE "APPARATUS" IS SACRED

The Russian press is re-emphasizing its warnings to any misguided souls who think that the new anti-Stalin talk in Moscow gives them the right of genuine criticism or opposition. In the party organ *Partinaya Zhizn*, a leading article of May 28 threatened:

"The party cannot reconcile itself with those who hinder our creative work, who try to use democracy and the weapon of criticism in order to sow a lack of confidence, discord and opposition among the masses to the leaders."

It endorsed the kind of "criticism" that has been allowed so far, namely, the kind that echoes the leaders, and added: "But criticism has nothing to do with attempts, under the guise of struggle with shortcomings, to weaken the apparatus, to undermine confidence in this apparatus and confidence in certain workers of the apparatus."

The "apparatus" means the bureaucracy which runs this new exploitive class society. Nothing could be clearer than this warning. The article is quoted in a N. Y. Times dispatch filed from Moscow, hence presumably an accurate report.

callous disregard for the fate of the unemployed which is characteristic of capitalist employers, and which, in the nature of things, permeates a government which they dominate as directly as they do this one. Such expressions just flow naturally from their lips, and when they are forced to make apologies, as both Wilson and Pyle did, it is quite clear that what speaks is not their convictions but political expediency.

As soon as Pyle's statement hit the press, Walter Reuther dispatched an outraged telegram to the White House. His protest was echoed by other labor leaders and the incident was pounced on gleefully by the Democrats as welcome campaign ammunition.

It can be expected that the unemployed workers and the unions in Detroit and elsewhere will take the occasion to make their feelings known in a number of ways similar to the distribution of dog food following Secretary of Defense Wilson's famous comparison of the unemployed to canines.

Reuther and the other labor leaders are deeply concerned with the problem of unemployment. In addition to the human tragedy involved for the workers, to which they are sensitive, periodic mass unemployment puts a heavy strain on the labor movement in many ways. Workers who are terrorized by the prospect of lengthy layoffs are usually in no mood to fight for strict enforcement of contracts. And if the down-turn spreads to many industries and shows any degree of durability, a serious union-busting drive on the part of the employers becomes a real possibility.

### THEY DEFEND CAPITALISM

Both Pyle's callousness and Reuther's outrage are genuine reflections of the social roles of the capitalist political administrator and the union leader.

But if one gets down to the different question of logical consistency, it must be said that Pyle's statement, however brutally put, is a more logical comment on unemployment from the point of view of a supporter and defender of the capitalist system than is Reuther's attack on it. And after all, these days Reuther and the labor movement as a whole have become as staunch ideological defenders of capitalism as the Republicans they oppose.

True, the labor leaders defend a capitalism whose impact on the workers is softened by the intervention of the government. They seek to increase government intervention in the area of unemployment compensation, subsidy of weak industries via tariffs and by other means, and the allocation of military contracts. They seek to blunt the effect of the operations of the system by such programs as the Guaranteed Annual Wage and the shorter work-week. They are the ardent

(Turn to last page)

## I. F. Stone, Back from Russia, Rips Regime

By HAL DRAPER

The current issue of *I. F. Stone's Weekly* (May 28) is devoted to a withering blast, by the well-known journalist who edits it, against the idea that the new Moscow leadership has broken with Stalinism.

At least up to now, Stone has been in many respects a Stalinoid politically, though critical of the Russian regime and the Communist Party. He now goes far beyond previous criticisms, and in fact outdistances some anti-Stalinists in the clarity of his attack on the nature of the present Khrushchev regime.

Moreover, this turn on his part is the direct result of his recent visit to Russia. His report on this visit has appeared in four issues of his *Weekly*, beginning May 7. The current article is his summary of his visit.

As we have noted before (see for example "The Strange Case of I. F. Stone," *LA*, Nov. 8, 1954), Stone has long been

an anomaly in Stalinoid circles. Mainly this is so because he has put honest and talented reporting first and Stalinoid politics second, though both have coexisted for years. Now he was faced with the problem of honestly reporting his reaction to Russia.

"The way home from Moscow has been agony for me," he begins.

"All sorts of advice has poured in on me from my friends, and from what I know my friends would say. All the inhibitions of expediency have been urged upon me, the inhibitions of the most worthy expediency—the fight for world peace. But I hate the morass into which one wanders when one begins to withhold the truth because the consequences might be bad—this is, indeed, the morass on which the Russian Communist state is built. I am not wise enough, and perhaps no one else is either, to know how much truth may wisely be given the public with our eyedroppers. I am only a re-

porter and one does not go to Moscow every day. This is what I think, not what I believe may wisely be told the reader. It may be wrong but it is not synthetic.

"I feel like a swimmer underwater who must rise to the surface or his lungs will burst. Whatever the consequences, I have to say what I really feel after seeing the Soviet Union and carefully studying the statements of its leading officials. *This is not a good society and it is not led by honest men.*" (Italics in original.)

The touchstone, he emphasizes, is democracy—the right to think freely, to speak freely, to oppose the regime, to fight for justice regardless of who is in the way, to organize political minorities; individual rights: "These questions are not yet even being discussed in Russia," he writes.

It is this which, plainly, led him to his decisive break. "I don't care how many

(Turn to last page)

# Stalinists Gained from Carnegie Hall Symposium

By GORDON HASKELL

New York, May 28

The American Stalinist movement, plunged into a first-rate crisis by the exposure of the nature of the Moscow regime at the 20th Congress of the Russian Communist Party, made a small but no doubt appreciated gain in New York City last night. And the most regrettable aspect of it was that they did not really have to work for this small success, but were handed it on a silver platter, not by John Foster Dulles, their usual benefactor, but by the well-meaning pacifist and anti-Stalinist group, the Fellowship of Reconciliation.

The event which gave the Stalinist leaders a breather from the headlong retreat in which they have been engaged was a symposium on "America's Road to Democracy and World Peace" attended by close to 2000 people at Carnegie Hall. Held under the auspices of the F.O.R., the speakers were Eugene Dennis, general secretary of the Communist Party; W. E. B. DuBois, well-known Stalinist fellow-traveler; Norman Thomas; and A. J. Muste. Moderator was Roger N. Baldwin of American Civil Liberties Union fame.

The Stalinist success at this meeting was not at all the product of the relative brilliance of the Stalinist speakers; nor was it due to the fact that the audience was composed 75-80 per cent of their supporters. It resulted rather from the fact that the nature of this meeting gave them a chance to do exactly what they have been trying to do for the past several months: turn the attention of their own ranks and their sympathizing public away from the demoralizing consequences of the 20th Congress' revelations, and toward

F.O.R. is ready "at this time" to consider a united front with the Stalinists, his remarks were cast in a tone so mild and conditional that the Stalinists present can be excused for making the mistake of believing that it is only a matter of time and more blandishments before they have him and his co-thinkers in their united-front bag.

Since he felt himself constrained to stick to the announced subject of the evening, his attack was centered on the injustices and faults of American capitalism, while referring only in passing and in generalities to the equal or greater crimes of Stalinism.

Norman Thomas, on the other hand, brushed the direct topic of the evening aside with a general reference to his known positions on Jim Crow, disarmament and the like, and launched into a scatter-gun attack on Stalinism.

In addition to being diffuse, however, his effectiveness was reduced to a minimum by the fact that he dwelt not on the character of Russian "socialist" society, as "revealed" (to the Stalinists, at least) by the 20th Congress, but primarily on the perfidy of the Stalinists in various united fronts in the '20s and '30s, and on the standard social-democratic quotations from the works of Lenin and old Communist Party resolutions and manuals from the same period.

Such an approach might be calculated to re-inforce the convictions of his own adherents but they could not possibly affect the Stalinist ranks where they are hurting today. Quite the contrary.

Both Dennis and DuBois were able to put on an act of pained innocence which, in the circumstances, was quite effective. Dennis deplored the past mistakes, and the "violations of Soviet legality" in Russia, and offered the hand of unity and cooperation in the face of Thomas' attack.

## NOT DRIVEN HOME

Let us be clear on this: Thomas was highly critical of the Communist Party, especially its past. But he unwittingly did more to restore and preserve the shattered morale of CP members and their attachment to their party than any CP leader could have accomplished in the same time. The CP is desperately trying to give the illusion of authenticity to its current inner discussion, which is a fake and a fraud. This Thomas gave to them.

One speech is not enough, he repeated in answer to Dennis' protestations of democracy, you must prove your good faith. There is more rejoicing, he said, over one Communist sinner who returns to the camp of civil liberties than over a hundred civil-libertarians who have always remained true to democracy.

Followers of the CP who are beginning to suspect that it is totally bankrupt could only think: perhaps *this time* there is a genuine turn; perhaps *this time* there is a genuine discussion and a genuine attempt by our leaders to find the democratic way. But it is not true.

When the CP defended the Moscow Trials and Stalin's personal terror, they lied, they distorted, they framed up the truth. And now that they repudiate Stalin and talk of democracy, they lie and distort no less.

**This lesson was not driven home at this "debate." Quite the contrary.**

The whole program was arranged in such a way as to make it easy on the Stalinists. Questions from the floor had to be handed up in writing. Dennis did not read a single one that was handed him, but simply informed the audience that a number of them dealt with Russia and the revelations of the 20th Congress.

Roger Baldwin, the moderator, called on all participants to stick to the question, and in general displayed a marked warmth toward the Stalinist speakers which was absent in his treatment of their opponents.

Needless to say, Dennis made no reference to the questions asked him in the issue of LABOR ACTION which had been distributed to the audience at the door, despite a challenge from the floor to do so.

The intention of A. J. Muste and Norman Thomas who arranged this symposium was to hold a public discussion with Stalinist leaders in the interest of setting a civil-libertarian example of free public debate with Stalinists who are being persecuted by the American government. The publicity of the Fellowship of Reconciliation on the meeting

(Continued on page 3)

## LONDON LETTER

# Anti-Conscription Policy Makes Headway in the BLP

By OWEN ROBERTS

London, May 18

Last night 55 Laborite Members of Parliament, including Aneurin Bevan and former Minister of Defense Emanuel Shinwell, issued a declaration which stated that the time had come for Britain to reduce its expenditure on armaments and to call a halt to military conscription.

The peg upon which the 55 Laborites hung this declaration was the recent announcement by the Russian government that it intends to reduce the size of its armed forces during the next twelve-months. The MPs welcomed this Russian announcement and said that these steps "taken in conjunction with the whole development of post-Stalin Soviet policy, have created a new situation of vital importance to the future of mankind."

"They make it clear," continues the statement, "that the challenge of Communism is economic, social and political, not military, and that the Soviet Union wants peace as much as any country in the world."

"We believe the time has now come for this country to end conscription, to cut the defense budget and release for productive employment the men, materials and machinery engaged in preparing for war, on a scale sufficient to enable us to pay our way in the world, preserve our standard of living and play our part in international economic cooperation."

"We should also revise our 'cold war' aims so as to make them consistent with European and Asian settlements, based on peaceful coexistence and the United Nations."

"Such action would meet our urgent economic needs and recognize that our first line of defense is our standard of living and our ability to help others."

"It would also enable Britain to give a lead in the Disarmament Commission of the United Nations and at a new Four Power conference, and so rise to the opportunity the Soviet initiative has given to all in every country who want peace."

## HERALD SPEAKS UP

This statement, which is more or less a reiteration of the original Bevanite thesis developed during the 1951 period of the Labor Party, leaves much room for debate, particularly with regard to its implied "peaceful coexistence" illusions. But the important thing is the way in which it has been received by the

Labor movement in Britain—particularly by the leadership of the right.

The general feeling may be judged from the editorial in today's *Daily Herald*, the official daily of the Labor movement which consistently voices the views of the right wing.

Although not specifically mentioning the statement by the 55 MPs the *Herald* editorial devoted itself to demanding that the government abolish conscription. And in support of its argument it quoted none other than Aneurin Bevan when he said: "If you want to bring the cost of living down you must take young men away from the army and put them at work in industry and on the land." Commented the *Herald*: "This is one hundred per cent correct," and then proceeded to demand an immediate end to conscription.

## STALINISTS AT THE TAIL

In taking this attitude the *Herald* is running way ahead of the official Labor Party line, which is still to support conscription but at the same time demand an investigation into ways and means of reducing it. The *Herald*, in company with the best elements of the left wing of the Labor Party, is also outstripping the British Stalinists, who manage to oppose almost every aspect of the Tory government's overseas policy and yet at the same time support the military conscription which makes this policy possible.

At the congress of the British CP a few months ago, as reported in a previous London Letter, there was a strong demand from the floor that the CP should oppose conscription. This was re-grounded that conscription made for a assisted by the Stalinist leadership on the grounds that conscription made for a democratic army and that to demand the abolition of conscription at the present time would be getting out of step with the very large number of Labor organizations which were demanding a reduction in the period of service.

This argument was bitterly described by one CP delegate as "opportunism." Just how correct he was is now shown when the Stalinist party is stranded further out on the right than the *Daily Herald*. It is more than likely that during the next few months the Labor Party official line will switch to one of outright opposition to conscription—in which case the Stalinists will once again have to do some pretty hard running before they can catch up with even the Labor right wing.

# Egyptian Strike Wave Shows Discontent with Nasser Regime

Egyptian labor has moved into class action for the first time since 1952.

On May 20, 13,000 railroad workers, employed in the zone of the Suez Canal, struck for one hour to protest against the worsening of their living conditions.

Three weeks earlier, 8,000 longshoremen and a thousand city transport workers struck in Alexandria for higher wages.

In Alexandria, the government intervened to raise all wages by 7.5 piastres (20 cents); when the railroad strike broke out, however, it arrested 24 leaders of whom only 14 have been released.

**These are the first independent actions by Egyptian labor since the military junta came to power in 1952.**

At the time, there were 490 unions in existence, representing about 150,000 workers (20 per cent of all industrial and transport workers). Of these, just over a hundred were controlled by several rival Stalinist groups, and were affiliated to the World Federation of Trade Unions. The rest were controlled partly by the Wafd, partly by the Labor Party (both liberal bourgeois parties) and others were independent.

When the officers' junta took power, all trade unions were declared incorporated into a national trade-union body set up by the government. The strike movement that followed the collapse of the Farouk regime was brutally suppressed; the leader of the textile workers' strike at Kafr-el-Dawar, Mustapha Khamis, was hanged, along with another worker.

They were the first and, for a long

time, the only opponents the regime considered as dangerous enough to kill. The leaders of the old trade-union movement, such as Mohammed Shata, Ahmed Taha, Mohammed Ali Amer, were interned in the concentration camp of El Kharga, where they still are now.

Strikes were declared illegal, and the trade unions became transmission belts of government control over the working class. Their function became to mobilize the workers for demonstrations of support to the junta. This control was tightened even more after Nasser's elimination of General Naguib in April 1954.

The present strikes indicate that this hold is now weakening. They are an act of open defiance to the government and to its "trade-union" organization. They may herald the return of the Egyptian labor movement to the political scene of the Middle East.

A NEW PAMPHLET, JUST PUBLISHED IN ENGLAND

Russia from Stalin to Khrushchev

by TONY CLIFF

22 pages

15 cents

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

## LA Distribution

Over a thousand copies of last week's LABOR ACTION, which concentrated material on the Communist Party crisis, were distributed Sunday night at the Carnegie Hall meeting here reported.

As a result, the N.Y. Times' news account, noting the distribution, singled out for mention our challenge to the CP to debate an Independent Socialist, "ignored by the Communists for three weeks."

On May 4 the New York ISL had sent a letter to the New York State organization of the CP, challenging them to "debate the respective views of our organizations." Nothing has been heard from the Stalinists.

the "positive" program of a new Popular Front with socialists and anyone else who can be prevailed on to adopt the Stalinist program for "peace."

The wording of the topic, the fact that the meeting was arranged as a discussion or symposium rather than a debate, all played right into their hands. The efforts of Muste and Thomas to draw clear lines of distinction between themselves and the Stalinists, and to use the occasion to demonstrate the fact that a united front with them is not possible, were, in the circumstances, none too effective.

The line of both Stalinist speakers was exactly what could have been expected. While vaguely referring to unspecified "mistakes" of the past, or even admitting that they had been wrong in not supporting the Kutcher case, they simply denounced capitalism and beat their breasts for peace. Both of them referred repeatedly to the "one third of the world which is socialist" and the necessity of getting along with it whether one likes "socialism" or not. Though their speeches were larded with the usual Stalinist half-truths, lies and distortions, they were presented in a tone of reasonable, conciliatory, almost apologetic humility.

## STALINISTS DEMAGOGIC

All they want, they pleaded, is to work as humble toilers in the vineyard of the struggle for racial equality, civil liberties and peace. And isn't it clear, friends, that we will be more effective if we work together than if we waste our time on mutual recriminations about regrettable misunderstandings or even mistakes of the past . . . ?

A. J. Muste, speaking for the Fellowship of Reconciliation, centered his remarks on a general anti-militarist, libertarian, pacifist position. Although he made it clear that neither he nor the

# Gov't Shovels Quotes into ISL's Washington Hearing

By ALBERT GATES

Washington, May 25

Dr. G. T. Robinson, the government's expert on Leninism, concluded his testimony on the morning of the third day. He had denied that there were important differences among scholars on interpretation of Lenin and this was contradicted by quotations from Bertram D. Wolfe's *Three Who Made a Revolution*, whom Robinson had previously acknowledged as an outstanding authority and scholar on Lenin and the Russian Revolution.

Dr. Robinson had further testified that anyone who opposed the present Stalinist state in Russia in all its manifestations, or who opposed the Stalinist seizure of power in Czechoslovakia, were "in those respects not Leninist." Since he is their expert witness, the government must rely upon his testimony.

When the third day's session opened, ISL Counsel Joseph L. Rauh inquired if the witness had talked to the government since the close of the session on Tuesday. He had, for 10-15 minutes.

Thereafter the professor continued to read from the *Selected Works of Lenin* and established, perhaps unwittingly, that Lenin did "contradict," or change, positions during the many years that he wrote on revolutionary questions.

In a somewhat longer discussion of the arms which the Bolsheviks had in the revolution, Rauh asked the witness what the legal position had been in Russia with respect to holding arms:

"You are familiar with the legal situation? Was it legal to bear and hold arms for a civilian in Russia at that time?"

"I don't know," said the expert.

"You know what the legal position in the United States is with respect to civilians holding arms?"

"I believe," Dr. Robinson replied, "you have to have permission."

Then Rauh went on: "Do you know of any organization in the United States that has the position in the United States that Lenin's organization had in Russia in that period?"

The professor said he didn't understand the question clearly—whether it meant doctrine, political policy position, support or strength. When the matter of time was settled, the following answer was given:

"I don't recall. I certainly don't know from any direct observation. I don't recall having received the impression, even from casually reading and in fields where I don't pretend to be an expert, that any organization exists in the United States which has a program resembling the doctrine, program and type of organization resembling that of Lenin in 1917."

Rauh then asked the witness to compare the strength of the Kerensky government in Russia in 1917 with the government in the United States. After some discussion of definition, the answer, of course, had to establish the enormous differences between the two countries in favor of the strength and stability of the government of the United States.

With the conclusion of Dr. Robinson's testimony, the government proceeded

## Stalinists Gained —

(Continued from page 2)

dwelt heavily on the theme of giving the persecuted Stalinists a platform from which to express their views.

LABOR ACTION, of course, is uncompromisingly for full democratic rights for the Stalinists. But fighting for their democratic rights should not be confused with giving them a hand-up with their propaganda.

There may be those whose passion for civil liberties was strengthened by this event. But its major political effect was to give the Stalinist leaders a chance to bolster their shaken following with the feeling that even if they are going through their own blackest ideological hour, there is more which unites them with respected and respectable currents of democratic opinion in this country than that which divides them; and that those who insist on criticizing the "negative" aspects of Stalinism are dwelling in the past rather than in the present or future.

Needless to say, the alleged eagerness of the Stalinist leaders for a public confrontation of different opinions has not yet led them to accept the Independent Socialist League's challenge to a debate on the meaning of the 20th Congress.

with its case by the introduction of exhibits, which lasted through Thursday and the end of the session for the week. During this time, about two dozen such exhibits were presented, only a little more than half of them being introduced in evidence because of a conflict between counsel for the organizations and the government over the character of the exhibits.

It happened that on one of the exhibits presented by the government, a piece of paper was stapled over a small area of the document. Rauh demanded to know what was under the piece of paper so that he could see the whole of the document before admitting its authenticity.

The government refused on the ground that whatever was written under the stapled paper (either a number or a name) had nothing to do with the document but was government information and that it would not agree to divulge that information to Rauh or his clients. Rauh, however, insisted on having the whole document on the ground that since he was unable to see the covered-up part, he could not tell whether it did or did not have anything to do with the document and therefore would not assent to its authenticity.

It became quite clear that the government would not disclose this information and Rauh's objection was sustained for the time being by Hearing Examiner Morrissey. At this point, the government introduced another series of documents similarly situated for identification only. All of them were objected to by Rauh until all the information on them would be disclosed.

Unless the hearing examiner revises his decision as a result of any legal point cited by the government, the government will have to identify the documents by witnesses before they can be accepted in evidence.

In general, during this session, whenever the government introduced a document or an issue of LABOR ACTION for the purpose of putting a single statement or ad in the record, Rauh called attention of the examiner also to other items contained in the exhibit.

### RAUH DEMANDS FILE

Two other noteworthy developments took place. One concerned the statement "Stalinism Is Not Socialism" which was issued in 1949 under the joint signatures of the Socialist Party, Harry Fleischman, National Secretary; the Independent Socialist League, Max Shachtman, national secretary; and August Claessens, secretary of the Social Democratic Federation.

It was later learned that in 1950 not only was this statement translated in Taipei and Hong Kong newspapers but leaflets bearing it in translation were dropped over Shanghai and Canton—by American planes, through the State Department, so far as information goes.

Rauh demanded that the government produce the file on this leaflet-drop, in order to show that by the action the government "was treating the organization at that time as a democratic socialist organization." Government attorney Madrix objected that "the burden is on him [Rauh] to make inquiry to the State Department or the Defense Department."

Rauh replied: "It is my understanding that the government, when it has information favorable to the other side, is obligated to produce it. . . . I am willing to write up what I believe on the basis of hearsay were the facts. If, however, they refuse to stipulate?"

The question rested there for the moment. A second heated dispute broke out over an education-outline *ABC of Marxism* by Paul Temple, which was later revised and a number of its formulations corrected.

Before introducing this, the government had introduced a *Party Builder* (Workers Party publication) of July 1946, containing news of a number of assignments made by the Political Committee. One of these had been an assignment to Hal Draper to revise and bring up to date Temple's *ABC of Marxism*. When therefore the government introduced the *ABC* (original edition), Rauh demanded that it now introduce the revised edition which had been put out in accord with the instructions of the Political Committee, and which it was with-

holding. The government said it did not know of it.

"The government is holding back the true copy of this document which they hold in their possession," said Rauh. Madrix insisted that he didn't understand. However, Rauh reminded the hearing that the government itself had previously introduced an exhibit which showed the instruction to revise the *ABC*.

Another government attorney, Moss, who apparently had worked on the documentation, stated that he had never seen any other edition. Although the examiner overruled Rauh's objection to receiving into evidence the unrevised *ABC*, he said that "You may of course introduce the revised edition at any time you see fit, Mr. Rauh."

## Fifth Day: More Exhibits

Washington, May 28

The fifth day of the hearing continued with the government reading selections from Leon Trotsky.

Since Dr. Geroid T. Robinson, the government's "expert" witness on Leninism and "Soviet Communism," did not qualify himself as such "expert" on Trotskyism, government attorneys Moss and Stubbs read sections from Trotsky's *History of the Russian Revolution*, *The First Five Years of the Communist International*, *Lessons of October*, *Whither France* and *In Defense of Terrorism*.

The purpose of these readings, as in the case of Dr. Robinson's voluminous readings from the *Selected Works of Lenin*, was to establish the Bolshevik leaders' position on the many problems relating to the developing Russian Revolution and the post-revolution period, in order then, by association, to attribute these positions to the organizations involved in the hearing.

This has given the hearing a strange aspect. Actually it appeared as though the Russian Revolution and other events were being tried over again, 20 to 35 years afterward.

To all of these readings, Attorney Rauh objected on the ground that none of them had anything directly to do with the organizations or their political programs and activities, nor had the government yet, on the fifth day of hearing, connected up the material to either the Workers Party, Socialist Youth League or Independent Socialist League.

In the afternoon, the government continued to introduce exhibits, most of them LABOR ACTIONS of various years.

Last week, when the government sought to introduce exhibits that did not disclose everything on them, the examiner sustained the objections made by Rauh that he could not agree to the acceptance of such exhibits unless the whole of them were shown to him. This time, on two such exhibits, the examiner permitted their receipt into evidence, with the explanation, when confronted with his contradictory action, that the government did not have the original and that a year ago a stipulation had been entered into by Rauh and government attorneys for the use of photostatic copies.

Rauh pointed out that the stipulation had to do with original documents and the use of photostats of such originals. But in the cases above referred to, we were dealing with photostats of originals which were not produced and on which something was missing or not fully disclosed. Yet, the Examiner, who had previously ruled against admissibility, now reversed himself.

The examiner held to his ruling, however, and the session went on to the end

(Continued on page 4)

# Garden Rally — —

(Continued from page 1)

Another outstanding characteristic of the rally was its constant link-up of the Negro fight with the cause of progressive labor.

The fact that the labor movement was actively concerned with the rights of Negroes and that it was participating to the full in this meeting was abundantly evident. Slogans calling for the end of Jim Crow under the signatures of various unions hung in many parts of the Garden and special sections had been reserved for members of particular unions.

Speaker after speaker, particularly Randolph, made it clear that the fight of the Negro people was of vital importance to the union movement and pointed out that the Southern racists are the common enemy of the Negroes and labor.

ILGWU Vice-President Zimmerman brought the greetings of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union to the rally and detailed the pro-civil-rights position of his union. He spoke of the organization of the Labor Committee on Civil Rights and announced its backing of the movements fighting for democracy and equality.

## SWIPES AT DEMOS

Despite the fact that most of the speakers were pro-Democratic Party liberals, and that Mrs. Roosevelt (who was also on the program) is "officially" associated with that party, speaker after speaker pointed out that both parties have failed to aid the Negroes in the struggle for civil rights, and speaker after speaker insisted that it was the duty of both parties to adopt strong civil-rights planks at their conventions and demanded that they really show signs of implementing such programs.

Said Randolph:

"Because of the long history of utter failure and refusal on the part of both the Republican and Democratic Parties to initiate and fight for federal civil-rights legislation in Congress, we believe that Negroes should remain politically uncommitted before the coming presidential election in order that neither the Democrats or Republicans may feel that they can take the Negro votes for granted."

And Wilkins, NAACP secretary:

"We believe that both the Republican and the Democratic Parties must adopt strong civil-rights planks in their platforms at the national conventions this summer, including not merely a statement on the Supreme Court ruling, but a declaration of intention to implement it. . . ."

"We say again that both parties must act, for it is the Democratic officeholders in the Deep South states who have defied the Supreme Court and it is the Republicans in Washington who have sat by and done little or nothing toward implementation."

Beginning with the statement in the opening speech by Benjamin F. McLaurin, "We are struggling for freedom now, and I said now," speaker after speaker made it clear that the Negroes are determined to fight on until full equality is won and are not ready to be put off with half-way measures or be taken in by talk of moderation.

Each such expression from the platform was followed by a resounding response from the thousands present in the Garden, bearing witness to the accuracy of those statements. It was remarks attacking "moderation" and "gradualism" that kindled the enthusiasm of the audience.

About 6,000 copies of LABOR ACTION were distributed to the incoming crowd at this Madison Square Garden rally. They were the issue of May 21, headlined "Rally to Support Negro Fight." The papers were eagerly taken, and the supply was exhausted by 7:30 p.m.

**LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE**  
114 West 14 Street, New York City  
specializes in books and pamphlets on the Labor and Socialist movement, Marxism, etc., and can supply books of all publishers.  
Send for our free book list.

The standard biography  
**KARL MARX**  
by  
**Franz Mehring**  
\$3.50  
Labor Action Book Service  
114 West 14 Street, New York City

# Washington Hearing—Peruvian SP Leader Tells Of Fight Against Dictator

(Continued from page 3)

with a long reading from various issues of LABOR ACTION.

It is difficult to say at this writing how long the government will take with its case. Up to now they have produced one witness who took two and a half days of the hearing, and another two and a half days have been taken up with reading from books and documents.

## 6th Day: Socialism and Violence

Washington, May 29

Although most of the 6th day of the hearing was consumed by the introduction of exhibits into evidence by the government, taken from materials issued by the organizations, three important matters came up.

At the beginning of the session, ISL Attorney Rauh proposed that the government enter into a stipulation with the attorneys for the organizations on the facts in the document referred to in our earlier reports entitled "Stalinism Is Not Socialism."

The government refused to enter into any stipulation on this document on the ground that it had no knowledge of the leaflet, either of its origin or what was done with it, and insisted that the job of obtaining any information about the leaflet from any government body should fall upon counsel for the organizations.

A large number of exhibits which had been previously marked for identification were now offered into evidence by the Government. These were the documents which had writings covered over, to which Rauh had earlier objected.

In order to effect the introduction of these documents, the government attorneys, apparently after consultation with the Department, removed the coverings. They thereby revealed that many of the documents were received in Washington by the Justice Department through persons in its employ or acting in its behalf in New York. One such document had marked on it, "Received from confidential mailbox N. Y. FBI."

Rauh then raised the question of the surveillance of the organization as indicated by the dates of documents going back ten years or more. Such collection of materials preceded and postdated the establishment of the Attorney General's List.

One interesting reading during the hearing was from the document "Under the Banner of Marxism" by Max Shachtman. The government read several unsubstantial quotations from the document, which was a reply to the resignation statement of Ernest Erber. The section quoted dealt with Erber's rejection of Lenin's theory of the state because it was "simplistic, crude and static."

But here is the part, important to the case, in view of the government's charges, which Rauh read into the record:

"Or maybe it is directed against us here? Maybe he wants us to give a solemn pledge not to resort to armed insurrection against 'a state that rests on political democracy?' Very well, we do not hesitate to give our pledge to Citizen Pompous Muddlehead, and therewith to state once more our credo:

"We do not and will not call for armed insurrection to overthrow a 'democratic state,' a 'state that rests on political democracy.' It is an oath. The political infants who led the early communist movement in this country and who had little in common with Marx and Lenin—they issued such calls and advocated such a course. We—never! Not yesterday, not today, not tomorrow. We are not for violence in principle any more than we are for parliamentarism in principle. If anything, our principles call for an abhorrence of violence, open or concealed, with which the ruling classes impose their exploitation upon the masses. We are not putschists because we are not bureaucrats—and in every putschist, who has no confidence in the people, is concealed a bureaucrat, who has contempt for the people. Overthrow the bourgeois state by armed insurrection! Who, we? Not today and not tomorrow, and not if we had a hundred times as many members as we have now!"

Rauh then read two concluding paragraphs of this section as follows:

"We, followers of Marx and Lenin, want to make sure that on the day the thermometer boils over—not today, not tomorrow, but on that day—the laborers . . . as well as the capitalists will know what to do! We want to make sure that on that day, the laborers not only have enough votes in their hands,

but enough power to enforce their will. Is that the folly of viewing 'the workers' road to power as culminating in an armed insurrection against a state that rests on political democracy?' Not at all! Erber is just repeating the dribble of the social-democrats. What we Marxists call for is the good common sense of the workers' road to power culminating in the armed dispersal—if the stubborn bourgeoisie insists on it—of the state which no longer enjoys authority among the workers, which no longer has the confidence or support of the people, which, therefore, no longer 'rests on political democracy' in the real sense of the term. It is with this view that we want to imbue every socialist militant, every vanguard fighter, every worker whom we can reach with our voice and pen.

"That, stated for the hundredth time, is our credo. Take note of it, O Pompous Muddlehead! Take note of it, all workers! Take note of it, too, Mr. Public Prosecutor!"

Upon the completion of this reading, government attorney Maddrix then insisted on reading the several paragraphs which appeared between these quotations which referred to Engels' remark that "universal suffrage is the best lever for a proletarian movement at the present time" and "universal suffrage is the gauge of the maturity of the working class," and then went on to read:

"The bourgeois state, bourgeois democracy, still has the confidence and support of the overwhelming majority of the people including the working-class people. They think bourgeois democracy can solve all their basic problems. We Marxists do not. We believe that such a solution requires a working-class democracy, the rule of the proletariat, which develops into a more extensive and even more genuine democracy, the rule of all the people, which in turn develops into the end of all rule (democracy is a form of rulership) by dissolving into the classless society of socialism and communism. The workers do not share our beliefs. Can we even dream of imposing our views, the views of a tiny minority, by merely wishing or by decree, let alone by armed insurrection? . . .

" . . . If the bourgeoisie and the bourgeois state bows to the democratic will of the people so much the better! As we wrote before, nobody would be more delighted than we and with us the whole working class. Up to now, however, history has been very frugal with examples of such bowing to the democratic will of the revolutionary people. But if there is nevertheless one chance in a thousand of that happening, then it is possible *only* if the working class confronts the bourgeoisie not with votes alone (the boiling thermometer) but with serried class strength, with organized power. Such power is nothing else but *potential violence*, that is, violence that can be summoned the minute the democratically rejected bourgeoisie tries to perpetuate its domination over the people by the use of armed force."

The government also introduced a mimeographed pamphlet called "The Labor Party Question," containing resolutions of 1938 and 1944. The quotations read into the record established the fact that for us socialists the establishment of an independent labor party would be "a great historical advance by the U. S. working class" and we would champion it "with the aim of raising labor to the position of ruler of the country in a workers government."

In the introduction of *Socialism—the Hope of Humanity*, a speech delivered by Max Shachtman, as Workers Party candidate for mayor of New York City in 1948, the government read a section affirming the "revolutionary socialist" character of the Workers Party.

It then took special pains to point out to the hearing examiner the reprint of a famous cartoon by Carlo which was reprinted in the pamphlet from LABOR ACTION and drawn after the dropping of the first atom bomb. The cartoon depicted man's evolution from the cave through modern society back to the cave, and was captioned, "We Must Destroy Capitalism Before It Destroys Us."

Attorney Rauh exploded at this point to the effect that such a commentary upon atomic warfare had little relevance to the hearing, but the exhibit was admitted.

**Read the  
NEW INTERNATIONAL  
America's leading Marxist review**

The following article was written for LABOR ACTION by the president of the Socialist Party of Peru, Dr. Luciano Castillo. It is of special interest since the Peruvian general election which it discusses is scheduled for this coming week after we go to press.—ED.

By Dr. LUCIANO CASTILLO

Lima, Peru

On October 27, 1948, as a result of a coup d'état by the military forces, General Manuel A. Odría came to power and has governed since with the backing of the extreme right in Peru.

This regime has established a dictatorship on the basis of an "Internal Security of the Republic" law, which legalized the present dictatorship and put the constitution in limbo. Two political parties have been outlawed, the APRA [nationalist party founded by Haya de la Torre] and the Communists. During the entire period of this government, all manifestations of the democratic forces of Peru have also been suppressed.

The Socialist Party has been the only political force that has confronted the government with organized and determined opposition. Their members of Parliament—Dr. Luciano Castillo (president of the party) in the Senate, and Ricardo Caceres Cherras and Victor Zavala in the House of Deputies have severely and with considerable documentation criticized the political officials of the government in the economic, social and international field.

The government has announced general elections for June 3. With this in mind there has also begun a small amount of political agitation. The various political forces have begun to appeal with more energy.

### APRA'S ROLE

There has appeared on the political scene at this time the National Coalition, an organization of a group of landowners and industrialists, the Christian-Democratic Party, organized by the small and middle bourgeoisie with emphasis on Catholicism, and of course the Socialist Party.

Under these circumstances APRA has emerged with two newspapers; these newspapers are being circulated and distributed without any political resistance by the government. The public position of APRA is called to attention because in this critical moment, while the democratic forces are struggling against the existing dictatorship, the APRA newspapers are asking for "the pacification of the national spirit" and the "elevation of politics."

Their words and language do not express any real censure or actual opposition to the existing government. They indicate, on the contrary, that APRA hopes that the present regime will restore its legality and will permit the return of all its exiled members; this in fact has occurred already.

In addition it can be demonstrated by other facts, that APRA is actually fighting against the popular democratic forces battling the dictatorship. Concrete examples can be seen in Callao, Piura, and Trujillo, where there were previously popular demonstrations against the government. Here APRA has emerged with a nucleus of an organization which is frankly against these popular manifestations.

The popular story is that the APRA leaders who have just returned from abroad have made a pact with the present dictatorship in return for which they will allow their organization to be used in the fight against the government's opponents.

### RALLYING SUPPORT

The Socialist Party has carried on a campaign utilizing all the resources at its disposal against the dictatorship. This campaign has brought about a new level of political consciousness in the life of the country, an orientation typically social and democratic.

The leaders of the party, with their youth and labor sections, organized a mass meeting of students and workers last December 26. From the university, the crowd went into the streets and marched along the main avenues into the Plaza de Armas, on one side of which is located the Government Palace. There they heard vigorous speeches criticizing the regime.

This demonstration represented the first large popular demonstration which has occurred in the capital of the republic since the demonstration organized by the Socialist Party in 1950.

The Socialist Party has already initiated a popular mobilization in different regions of the republic throughout the country. One of the more recent ones was that of last January 29 in Huara, capital of the Department of Ancash.

A great demonstration was also scheduled in the city of Trujillo for February 19 and it was planned to hold a congress of the party in the capital from the 23rd to the 27th of February. But all these activities had to be postponed because, since February 16, the whole country has been under state of siege.

### REPRESSION

It was under these circumstances that a farcical insurrection by one military division took place in an area farthest away from Lima and isolated from it by lack of communications. This insurrection was used by the government to proceed against the political opposition, by jailing the leaders who were directing the popular movements.

Among those arrested were such leading members of the party as Dr. Luciano Castillo, Ricardo Caceres Cherras, Victor Zavala, Dr. Melquides Castillo, Dr. Teodomiro Sanchez Novoa and Dr. Hildebrando Castro Pozo. These imprisonments were carried out with violent means, by assaulting their homes in Lima and Piura, which are the strategic centers of Peruvian socialism.

In face of the pressure of the workers and of continental opinion, the dictator finally decided to liberate the imprisoned socialists, one after the other.

The Socialist Party will put up a candidate for the presidency of the republic and is running candidates for Parliament. They count on a big turnout of militant workers and peasants as well as numerous sympathizers. They ask for the sympathy and moral support of the progressive forces of all America, in particular of the democratic-socialist movements of our continent.

### FREE SPEECH NOTE

A Southerner spoke up for segregation at a meeting in New Jersey. It was Thomas R. Waring, editor of the Charleston (S. C.) *News and Courier*, author of a recent article entitled "The Southern Case Against Desegregation." He had been invited to participate in a symposium sponsored by Princeton University.

Another speaker was Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the NAACP. Wilkins raised a touchy point.

"Although our South Carolina panel member speaks freely here today," said Wilkins, "and elsewhere above the Potomac, it is not yet possible for a spokesman for desegregation to appear at any university or before any other general forum in the South."

Obviously, the Negro who fights against discrimination finds he must fight for democracy in general.

Get All Your Books from  
**LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE**  
114 West 14 Street, New York City



**LABOR  
ACTION**

June 4, 1956 Vol. 20, No. 23

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

Editor: HAL DRAPER

Associate Editors:  
GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL

Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

## Plus and Minus for Academic Freedom: AAUP Takes Firm Stand, SDA Retreats

The report of the special committee of the American Association of University Professors, "Academic Freedom and Tenure in the Quest for National Security" (AAUP Bulletin, Spring 1956), was substantially adopted by the annual AAUP Convention in St. Louis last month. Its passage has provoked interesting comment.

As previously reported in *Challenge*, the document of the special committee was far superior to almost any statement on the question made by a responsible academic group in years. It contained a few ambiguities, but in general it proposed the criterion of competence for hiring and firing, criticized many administrations which have capitulated to the witchhunt, and insisted that invoking the Fifth Amendment was not, in itself, grounds for dismissal.

Of particular importance was the fact that the AAUP Report was in direct opposition to those who have argued that the problem of academic freedom has been magnified out of all proportion by a few fanatical liberals and radicals.

Its opening sentence was forthright: "Like civil liberties in general, academic freedom and tenure in the United States have been more greatly imperiled since World War II than for many years before."

And a little later, dealing with the quantitative theory of freedom ("How many have actually lost their jobs?") the report pointed to the terrible anti-libertarian potential involved in the cases that have already taken place: "An appreciable number of recognized teachers and scholars or promising academic recruits have been wrongfully eliminated from their profession. Although the number excluded is relatively small compared to the total engaged in college and university teaching, many of the dismissals have followed a pattern which suggests that teachers elsewhere would have suffered the same fate had occasion arisen."

Thus, the report cited actual cases,

### THE AIM OF THE YSL

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

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

—From the Constitution of the YSL

EVERY WEEK—

### Young Socialist CHALLENGE

appears as a section in all regular issues of Labor Action. Published, and independently edited, by the Young Socialist League,

it is the only socialist youth weekly in the country. Don't miss it!

but more important, it recorded the toll that the times have taken on the principles of academic freedom.

### 'LIFE' YELLS FOR HOOK

At St. Louis, this analysis was confirmed by a convention majority of the AAUP. The delegates voted: no firing for refusal to take a loyalty oath; no firing for invoking the Fifth Amendment in refusing to discuss politics; the right to trial by a jury of academic peers when dismissal is in question; and a general statement of the competence criterion for hiring and firing.

In addition, eight universities were censured, the New York Board of Higher Education was brought under fire, repeal of the New York Feinberg Law was urged, and the government was asked to adopt a policy of granting passports to scholars freely.

All of this was, of course, too much for *Life* magazine. The Luce editorialists bridled at the thought that Communists and proponents of "other [sic] forms of revolutionary thought" should have a right to present their views.

*Life's* authority for its rejection of this proposition was "New York University's doughty logician Sidney Hook" who has pointed out that this is tantamount to "holding it necessary to employ bankrupts to study the laws of bankruptcy."

Hook's analogy is, of course, hardly compelling—what relation is there between the presentation of ideas and the activity of bankrupts? On second thought, however, one might well advocate that bankrupts study the laws of bankruptcy and write on them just as this same *Life* magazine found Willie Sutton's memoirs on jail-breaking a good story to print.

*Life* then moves on to attack the AAUP for its position on the Fifth Amendment, and to demand that the academic community write a code for itself. Its arguments here are familiar and routine, and don't bear repetition.

### APTHEKER'S EYEWASH

But a comment from the "other" side is worth consideration. It appeared in an article by Herbert Aptheker in the May 1956 issue of the Stalinist *Political Affairs*. Most of the article is a routine account of the developments within the AAUP. But toward the conclusion, Aptheker moves on to a point that has to be dealt with.

"It is further declared," he writes, "that Communists cherish academic freedom only for themselves and would destroy it if they had the power to do so. We Communists deny this and insist that we seek the fullest flowering of all human freedoms, and not least academic freedom."

The Twentieth Party Congress, however, made it clear that up until February 14, 1956, Stalin's personal views, or those of the regime, were the only accepted version of reality in Russia, i.e., hardly a full flowering of human freedom. And the same congress also showed that what we now have is a new truth imposed from above, and that teachers are free to sport the Khrushchevian image of reality, and only that.

The point that has to be made is that while defending the rights of Stalinists, and others who are not themselves for academic freedom (fascists, for instance), we don't blind ourselves to the nature of the positions of those whom we defend. Competence should be the criterion for Aptheker and anybody else, but that doesn't mean that anyone should swallow Aptheker's generalities on human freedom while intellectual tyranny continues in Russia.

That, it would seem, is the AAUP position—and it is a giant step forward for the American academic community.

## 'Compromise' at ADA Convention

By CARL JACKSON

For the last few years, Students for Democratic Action (SDA) has led in a vigorous debate inside of America's leading liberal organization, Americans for Democratic Action. The SDAers were fighting to stem the capitulation of liberalism in the important area of civil liberties and academic freedom.

Last year at the ADA Convention, the students, together with many civil-libertarian ADAers, waged an impressive floor fight for a position in favor of the right of members of the Communist Party to teach. This promising coalition lost by only a few votes, but gave every verbal indication that it would continue to try to convince the ADA rank and file and win this year.

At the ADA Convention this year, May 11-13, the SDA marched bravely in—on its knees.

The SDA recognized a few years ago that it was necessary to end the liberal capitulation to the witchhunt on the campus. For a time, it fought the efforts of ADA to speed up the retreat. Rhetorically at least, SDA continued to recognize that the necessity for a strong program on academic freedom (and civil liberties in general) had not been diminished by the partial silencing of Joe McCarthy. The witchhunt, they know, still remained deep in our social fabric, and the losses in the area of academic freedom had been great.

### YESTERDAY'S LINE

Some time ago, ADA adopted the following position:

"We have confidence in the will and the ability of those who are charged with the conduct of our educational institutions to exclude from teaching positions all persons who have surrendered their own freedom of thought to Communist or fascist control."

The ADA National Board announced that this meant that CP teachers should be fired automatically.

SDA began the struggle against this position from strength, but soon split down the middle. Under the aegis of its right wing, the student organization "voluntarily" gave ADA complete sovereignty in the area of academic freedom and agreed not to publicize its own position in defense of the rights of CPers.

The SDA internal stand, passed almost unanimously, was "The sole test for employment, dismissal and tenure of a teacher should be the test of academic competence. All determinations of the fitness of a teacher should be made by his faculty colleagues in accordance with academic due process, two cardinal principles of which are that the individual must be considered on an individual basis and that the burden of proving incompetence must always rest upon the accusers. Neither the social, economic, political, or religious opinions, nor the organizational affiliations, of a teacher should be in themselves considered sufficient evidence of disqualification for work in the academic profession."

### WATERING DOWN

One would think that the SDA delegates at this year's ADA Convention would have fought for this position, and would have compromised only when it was absolutely necessary and when the compromise did not vitiate the whole stand. Instead, the SDA caucus was urged by several members of the SDA leadership to support a "compromise" from the very start.

This proposal was to substitute the following for the ADA 1955 statement: "We believe that the educational authorities, in judging the competence of a teacher, should not adopt automatic cri-

teria of disqualification, but fairly judge each case on its individual merits. We do, however, recognize the critically important bearing of Communist Party membership upon such judgment."

Since the whole crux of the SDA position had been to fight against the weasellwordage of the ADA position, acceptance of the "compromise" was in complete contradiction to the SDA stand. The SDAers had sought a clear civil-libertarian program, and the wording of the motion gives sufficient indication of the fact that it does not commit ADA to anything like that.

Moreover, by bringing in party membership as an element, this position places the police-job of ascertaining membership upon a faculty, a group hardly qualified for the task.

Yet SDAers voted overwhelmingly to back this "compromise" in preference to all other proposals. This in spite of the fact that the 1955 SDA position came within 17 votes of passing in a total ADA Convention vote of 250!

This, also, in spite of the fact that the Association of American University Professors had moved toward the SDA position, and also despite the presence of many ADAers (more it seemed than last year) who were ready to take a stand.

### TODAY'S COLLAPSE

When the question reached the floor, the AAUP position was endorsed in one motion, and another would have based retention or dismissal on "teacher's tenure." When the new substitute for last year's position was brought to the floor, it was proposed as an amendment, thus weakening its already lukewarm effort at being principled.

The SDAers were only momentarily disconcerted—they soon threw their weight behind the amendment over the objections of the SDA Academic Freedom vice-chairman.

The AAUP and "teacher's tenure" motions received a substantial number of votes, but a coalition of the ADA right wing and the SDA put the amendment through! In effect, SDA had broken the back of the civil-libertarian coalition.

Particularly disturbing in all of this was the fact that many SDA left-wingers, including some of those who had been pushing for disaffiliation from ADA, thought that the compromise was a real step forward and that next year we'll get the whole thing. Behind this was an attitude of harmony, adjustment and capitulation.

This convention has made it clear that the SDA "left wing" has some serious thinking to do. It has to decide whether it is satisfied with rhetorical purity and practical capitulation. Unless the left wing realizes that its democratic theory has to be fought for, it will not move forward in SDA or ADA.

New York YSL's BOOK BAZAAR  
JUNE 15

Fri. eve. at 8:30

Bizarre bargains in books  
LABOR ACTION HALL  
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

# The Politics of a Stalinoid G. D. H. Cole's New Popular-Frontism

By MICHAEL HARRINGTON

G. D. H. Cole is probably one of the best-known intellectuals produced by the British social-democracy. His reputation is second only to that of Harold Laski. It rests upon a half century of writing and speaking, from the Guild Socialist theories of his early period, through the *Meaning of Marxism*, to his histories of socialist thought, and it continues today in the pages of the *New Statesman and Nation*.

It was in this weekly that Cole recently established a new claim to fame: as theoretician of the popular front, as the embodiment of the new Stalinoidism. Small wonder that Cole's article was gleefully picked up by the *Daily Worker* in America.

It begins: "Socialism and Communism have nothing in common." These are the opening words of a statement issued last month by the Bureau of the Socialist International. What nonsense they are!

The analysis which follows is in keeping with this straightforward start; it is a repetition of almost every last cliché in the library (and a large library it is) of the Stalinoid.

Before taking up Cole's specific statements, however, they must be placed in a context.

British Stalinism, i.e., the Communist Party, never succeeded in becoming a mass force. It could not do this because the Labor Party had the allegiance of the overwhelming majority of the British working class.

But at the same time British Stalinoidism has always been a phenomenon to reckon with. It won many intellectuals to its ideas, and it permeated even sections of the Labor Party. It makes a sharp distinction between organizational hostility to the British Communist Party and attitude toward Russia.

Thus it is that in England one finds a whole grouping of scholars—V. Gordon Childe, Christopher Hill, Rodney Hilton, and others—who write brilliant books, usually on the politics of the past and not of the present, and who always make their ceremonial bow to Moscow.

Here, for example, is Childe, a man of considerable brilliance. He concludes his discussion of Marxist theory in *History* with "One great statesman of today has successfully foreseen the course of world history . . ." [my emphasis]. "The reference is, of course, to Stalin, a thinker whose reputation was somewhat questioned by the Twentieth Party Congress. Incredible as it may seem, a writer as competent as Childe was capable of making remarks about Stalin like the one just quoted.

This is part of the British Stalinoid movement's curious structure: that it has attracted first-rate minds to a crude epigonism.

Indeed, Cole's own position is not a new thing. Immediately after World War II, he called Russia "socialist" in his *Intelligent Man's Guide to World Politics*. His attitude there was quite like that of *Sweezy's Monthly Review in America*: it is unfortunate that Russia is a totalitarian police state, socialism in the West will not develop with these unfortunate features, but it has a nationalized industry and therefore, as a consequence, is socialist.

### STALINOID FORMULA

However, the recent piece in the *New Statesman* goes beyond even this.

Socialists and Communists, Cole argues, share "the belief that the essential instruments of production ought to be collectively owned and used in the service of the whole society. . . . They are all against capitalism, that is, against private exploitation of the world's resources. . . ."

This equation of nationalization of industry and socialism is, of course, the theoretical bed-rock of almost all of the Stalinoid analyses. If Sweezy, Deutscher, Cole and the rest know nothing else, they know this: that there is nationalized property in Russia.

But then Cole takes his argument a step further. Socialists and Communists, he notes, agree that there must be "some sort of welfare state or society, in which the instruments of production are owned collectively and used in the service of the whole society. . . ."

which great attention is paid to providing the widest possible social and educational opportunities. . . ."

One finds this an amazing formula for that Stalinist society which has, from the bureaucratic top down, forced its people to forgo almost all of the benefits of their increasing productivity in the name of the policy of industrialization.

Yet Cole doesn't stop here. Communists and Socialists, he continues, are against the expropriation of unearned income; they both believe that "the main responsibility for the building of the new society rests on the working class, and that the organized working-class movement must supply the main driving force for its achievement."

Here we approach the center of Cole's thesis. The fact that there is not a single free organization of the working class in Stalinist society is not, for him, a contradiction of the assertion that the working class is building that society for welfare and against the expropriation of surplus value. For Cole, the unanimity of Stalinist society (which has not been destroyed by the Twentieth Party Congress, for all the workers, we are to assume, agree with the new line . . . or else why didn't they speak up?) is a function of its classlessness. Indeed, it is possible that the welfare of the Russian working class has been secured behind its back, since Cole sees no conflict between totalitarianism and socialism, only a temporary disequilibrium.

### WHO'S MASTER?

The crucial question is, of course: who controls? Under capitalism, political democracy, bourgeois democracy, is not an essential. All that is required is that capital have its freedom, and this can be accomplished under semi-feudal forms (Japan), under fascism (Germany), or under a parliamentary rule of the bourgeoisie. But precisely since socialism is an expression of the control of the overwhelming majority over the means of production, it requires democracy in its very essence; there is literally no other way for the working class to rule.

Franco, after all, has nationalized more of the Spanish economy than the Labor Party nationalized in the British economy, and he has Bismarckian "socialism" as a forerunner. Chiang, for that matter, has a tremendous concentration of nationalized property on Formosa, which is hardly a bastion of socialism.

In other words, Cole has completely missed the class nature of Stalinist society. He is able to do this by his equation of planning, nationalization, and anti-capitalism as socialism. And given this controlling abstraction, he can blithely ignore the actual reality of the life of the working class in Stalinist society; he can assert that the socialist and the Communist "agree" that the task of building socialism rests upon the working class.

But Cole goes on, this time into the deep waters which have already been fathomed by Isaac Deutscher. He asks: "what are Socialists expected to do where such instruments [the tradition of democracy] either do not exist at all, or fall a long way short of being usable to bring about fundamental social change?"

Two elements are involved here. The first is an assumption shared by the Stalinoid, the new Stalinist (who has moved on to a Stalinoid explanation in order to deal with the Twentieth Party Congress), and all of the bourgeois imperialists who have ever been: that it is sometimes necessary to have an undemocratic education of the stupid people while they are being prepared for democracy, that the people are incapable of leaping to that advanced consciousness represented by the French colonies or the Stalinist bureaucrats. Thus any

British imperialist of the Thirties on India (Churchill's rage as that "fakir" Gandhi entered the vice-regal palace); thus the Stalinoid socialist.

But the second element in Cole's question goes even deeper. What he is asking is, can socialism be created when the conditions for socialism don't exist?

The young Marx gave a fairly straightforward answer to this problem in the *German Ideology*: "And, on the other hand, this development of productive forces . . . is absolutely necessary as a practical premise; firstly, for the reason that without it only want is made general, and with want the struggle for necessities and all the old filthy business would necessarily be reproduced . . ." (my emphasis).

All the "old filthy business" is class society, and that is exactly what happened in Russia—the old filthy business.

Cole comes perilously close to realizing this. Why, he asks himself, didn't the Stalinists restore democracy once the objective conditions (capitalist encirclement, poverty, etc.) which led to totalitarianism were no longer present? (Another version of the same question: why, having been hard at the mission civilisatrice for so many years didn't the French colonialists give the Indochinese their freedom?)

The answer, of course, resides in the point that Cole misses—that what had happened in those years was not simply the nationalization of property, but the growth of a new ruling class basing itself upon its control of those nationalized means of production. And they are about as likely to give up as the French colonialists.

### A LUMPING

Still, there is hope. The Twentieth Party Congress, Cole feels opens up the possibility that these mistakes will be corrected.

Not, mind you, necessarily in the direction of parliamentary democracy: "I do not think that parliaments are necessarily superior to Soviets. . . ." We verge here on the brink of the incredible, for Cole is apparently under the impression that there are still soviets in Russia! That he looks to the Twentieth Party Congress as the possible beginning of a revival, not of parliamentary democracy, but of . . . soviet democracy! Even Isaac Deutscher

would tremble before such a perspective. Cole's conclusion? "friendly discussion between the . . . Socialist International and such bodies as Yugoslav Communists, the Nenni Socialists, and the Asian and African anti-imperialists. . . ." Not, mind you, discussion between the Communist Parties and the Socialists, but rather rapport between the socialists and the national-Stalinists, the Party-Stalinoids, the almost-Stalinists, and (lumped into this grouping for no apparent reason) the Asian African anti-imperialists.

Cole's second point is unexceptionable: that socialists and Stalinists should discuss on an individual level. That, of course, is the hope of every socialist, not so that "differences" can be somehow forgotten, but so that anti-Stalinism can be brought to the Stalinist.

This is not quite the Popular Front. Only almost. And Cole's article points, I think, to the one real basis for Popular-Frontism which the Stalinists may be able to exploit: the exhaustion of so many socialists, the growing tendency to repeat slogans about the working class without actually believing in the self-emancipatory power of the working class; the desire to have something to show, something concrete—like Russia.

### POLITICS OF DESPAIR

In Cole's case this element of disenchantment is on the surface. About two years ago, he wrote an article in the *New Statesman* describing himself as an "old man, near despair." The socialist idealism of his youth, its internationalism, its courage, was not apparent in the welfare state set up by the British Labor Party—and what was there to believe in now?

For these two years, this has been Cole's search, a seeking for a belief. But if Stalinism is socialism, then all has not been in vain; then the ideals of youth, deformed to be sure yet nevertheless there, are triumphing in one-third of the world.

In this situation, it is impossible not to feel sympathy for Cole, the man—but this must coexist with hostility for his ideas. Yet more than that, his own despair, most visible since it is the mood of an old man who has fought long and honorably, is a symbol of many other despairs.

These are the socialists who are the victims of the terrible defeats of the working class since the First World War; these are the socialists who may follow Cole's lead, who may give up their actual belief in the capacity of the workers for socialism and yet commit themselves to the world's most anti-socialist state in the name of . . . the working class! It is incredible that perhaps the "old filthy business" is now once again to attract its followers from among the ranks of the socialists, even at the moment when it is so decisively revealed for what it is.

## LETTER FROM A KIBBUTZ

Following is part of a letter which may be of interest to LABOR ACTION readers; it was received by a friend from a relative in Israel who is a member of Mapam living in a kibbutz.

The writer of the letter, it seems to me, places too much hope in the possibility that Mapam's leadership will reorient its generally pro-Russian attitude; also it is not true that Mapam has "consistently" fought for the rights of the Arab minority; but the letter has interesting points to make.

AL FINDLEY

Dear—:

. . . Despite the imminence of war between Israel and the Egyptian bloc, it is not inevitable. Granted that the bonapartist regime in Egypt will still hold sway over the population due to reinforced prestige as a result of the Czech arms pact, it falls to the government of Israel to initiate such an Arab policy, domestic and foreign, as can arouse a strong echo in favor of Israel in the neighboring Arab countries.

I entertain no illusions as to the probable policy and tactics of Ben-Gurion. However, from Mapam one must demand a program of struggle, despite its participation in the government coalition, to prevent war, to put a stop to mass reprisals, to end military rule in Arab districts, etc.

Ben-Gurion's latest piece of retaliating [against] the Egyptian mortar attacks on kibbutzim in the Negev with cannon fire on open cities like Gaza, Khan Yunis, Dir-el-Balah, etc. puts Israel in a precarious position from all aspects. It certainly enlarges the number of Arabs . . .

directly interested in vengeance against Israel. Our moral position before world opinion deteriorates indeed, despite the alibi of self-defense.

At Kibbutz Kisufim an Egyptian mortar shell razed a children's house barely three minutes after the children had been evacuated to a nearby shelter. In Gaza the authorities do not worry about air-raid shelters. This accounts for the difference in casualties.

Unfortunately Mapam stresses the need for "arms for Israel" as a primary factor in maintaining peace. True, it has consistently fought against military rule and suppression of the Arab minority. This explains the tremendous rise in the Arab vote for Mapam which gave an Arab candidate a seat in the Knesset. But on the question of the Arab refugees it is virtually silent. Yaari [Mapam leader], at the end of the war in 1948, conditioned the return of the refugees upon the conclusion of peace pacts among the belligerents for "otherwise it would be inviting the Fifth Column to undermine the State of Israel."

As a result of the 20th Stalinist Congress, Mapam has begun to emancipate itself from Stalinism not only on Jewish matters but also on "secular" socialist issues. At a recent plenum of Kibbutz Artzi, Yaari pledged "to maintain independence of organization and freedom of criticism."

It remains to be seen whether Mapam will not ride its tail in the peace movement. It still calls for security guarantees from the four great powers. Indeed Mapam needs several more blows to bring it to the Third Camp. . . .

# The Origins of Today's Algerian Liberation Movement

By A. GIACOMETTI

Paris

The war in Algeria is the last and most decisive battle for the North African nationalists, and it is the last stand of French colonialism in North Africa. On both sides, all available forces are mobilized, the last resources are tapped, as the struggle becomes more and more intense.

Far from suppressing social antagonisms, the military and political struggle has only sharpened them. For France, the Algerian war is pregnant with reaction: fascist bands are getting organized in Algeria and in France with the backing of the most reactionary sections of the French bourgeoisie, the Algerian colonialists and leading circles in the army.

Under the pressure of reaction, a coalition government of liberals and social-democrats has once more proven incapable of applying its own program, and has instead carried out the policy of its worst enemies. Popular resistance and protest, which had been disarmed by the belief that the "Left" government should be given the benefit of doubt, has again taken a sharp edge: soldiers refuse to leave, civilians are stopping military trains, workers call strikes against the Algerian war.

In the nationalist camp, a parallel process has taken place. In spite of the numerical and technical superiority of the repression forces, the nationalist movement has grown; it has grown to a point where it dominates the situation in Algeria not only politically but also militarily.

It has grown, however, under tremendous political pressures, which have intensified the process of differentiation in its midst.

In Tunisia and Morocco, the nationalist movement is not homogeneous either. But the class antagonisms which underlie the struggle of the Istiqlal Party (Morocco) against the Democratic Independence Party, as well as within the Istiqlal itself, or the struggle of the Neo-Destour against the coalition of Salah Ben Youssef (Tunisia), fully revealed themselves only after formal independence had been conquered.

## LEFT VANGUARD

In Algeria, different social causes have produced different political effects. The nationalist struggle has always been more clearly identified with the struggle for a social revolution. In Morocco and in Tunisia, a native bourgeoisie and land-owning class existed, which had founded and led the nationalist organizations. The content of the demand for independence was more formal, more of a compromise from the class point of view, than it could ever be in Algeria.

In Algeria, no native bourgeoisie exists to speak of; nor does there exist a significant class of peasant small-holders, as in Tunisia. Simplifying but little, one could say that the Algerian people consists of a class of common laborers, mostly employed in agriculture or unemployed, and of very poor peasants, who are exploited in their own country by a foreign ruling class which has steadfastly refused to acknowledge their existence in any other role than that of hired "hands."

While reformist solutions (autonomy and federation, etc.) had always been advocated by thin strata of intellectuals, professional people, Moslem priests, etc., they were never able to rally the support of the nationalist movement as a whole, even in its beginnings. Unlike Tunisia and Morocco, there existed in Algeria, since the 1920s, an organized proletarian current with an independent program and revolutionary aims.

The present conflict between the "Frontists" of the National Liberation Front (FLN) and the "Messalists" of the Algerian National Movement (MNA) reflect the conflict of contradictory social forces within the nationalist movement. The reason for the present split in the Algerian nationalist movement lies in its more advanced character.

To understand more clearly what is involved in the struggle between MNA and FLN a brief return to the origins of Algerian nationalism is called for.

## A STAR RISES

The first nationalist organization of a modern type in Algeria was founded in 1926 by industrial workers—the Etoile

Nord-Africaine (North African Star). Its leader Messali Hadj was an auto worker at Renault and a member of the French Communist Party since 1925.

The ENA started out as a defense organization of the Algerian workers in France, but rapidly spread to Algeria and became a party. Its program was revolutionary: the nationalization of banking, transport and industry.

In 1929 it was suppressed by a conservative government, and immediately reorganized under another name; in 1934-35 it was dissolved again, and its leaders were sentenced to long prison terms.

In 1934, when fascism threatened to take power in France, the main activity of the ENA was to fight fascist propaganda among the Algerian workers in France, alongside the Socialist Party. Daniel Guérin recalled in 1937:

"In September 1936, in the Lilas district, the workers had called a sit-down strike in a factory. Among them were North Africans whom agents of the special police services of the Rue Lecomte were inciting to break solidarity with their fellow workers and break the strike. I only had to send a message and a comrade from the 'Etoile' came to make a speech, in Arabic, to the North African strikers, convincing them to remain in the struggle at the side of their class brothers."

In 1933, the ENA raised for the first time the demand for an election of an Algerian Constituent Assembly, by universal suffrage, without distinction of race or religion. By 1936, Messali Hadj, in a speech before a meeting of 10,000 people in Algiers, demanded independence for Algeria.

The coming to power of the Popular Front temporarily stopped the persecution against the ENA, which had joined the Popular Front coalition. But soon the government, under the pressure of its bourgeois allies in the Radical Party, dropped its liberal course in the colonies.

In January 1937, the ENA was again dissolved. To replace it, Messali Hadj founded the "Parti du Peuple Algérien" in March 1937. Within weeks, Messali and several other leaders of the PPA were condemned to two years in prison.

## FORM MTL

At the outbreak of World War II, after a few months of freedom, the government imprisoned them again, and dissolved the PPA. When France collapsed, Messali refused to support the Vichy government and remained in prison. In 1942 he was pardoned.

In 1945, a year after the Liberation, the demands of the Algerian people were met with a bloody repression by the "National Front" government: 45,000 people were killed by the army under the orders of M. E. Naegelen, the social-democratic governor of Algeria.

Messali Hadj was sentenced to hard labor and deported to Tropical Africa; he was released only late in 1946.

The PPA re-emerged as the "Mouvement pour le Triomphe des Libertés Démocratiques" (MTLD) and sent five representatives to the National Assembly in Paris, in spite of Naegelen's falsification of the election returns, which has become a symbol of administrative dishonesty.

In 1946, after a meeting in Paris and a propaganda tour in Algeria on behalf of the MTLD, Messali was first expelled from France, then assigned a forced residence in various small towns in France. On March 29 this year, he was moved to Belle-Ile-en-Mer, an island in the Atlantic off the coast of Brittany, where he is held incommunicado.

The proletarian nationalist current has been the earliest and the strongest in Algerian nationalism, but it has not remained the only one. Since the early

1930s, there developed various kinds of national-reformist currents.

While the ENA had always linked the social struggles of the Algerian workers to the struggle for national independence, these latter subordinated the social struggle to other, more formal and far less radical demands. For Messali and his followers, social revolution and the conquest of national independence were inseparable, linked in a continuous process of interaction and interdependence. The national-reformist groups at first did not even consider national independence as a necessary goal; when they did, they viewed it under a narrowly juridical angle, leaving the social question untouched.

## THE RIGHT WING

The Moslem priests, or ulemas, had discovered in Islamic religion a doctrine and a justification for independence. Their leader, the sheikh Ben Badis, wrote in 1936:

"We have found in past history and in the present the fact that an Algerian Moslem nation arose and existed. . . . We say that this Algerian nation is not France, cannot be France and will not be France. . . . Algeria will be independent to a large extent, and then France will be able to count on her as one free nation can count on another free nation."

On a cultural and psychological level, the activity of the ulemas often converged with the political activity of the nationalist parties, and frequently prepared the penetration of the latter, especially in rural areas.

After the proletarian and the religious nationalists, a reformist-nationalist current arose during the war, under the leadership of Ferhat Abbas, a pharmacist from Setif.

As a student, he entered political life with a pro-French orientation and a program of assimilation. In 1936 he wrote against the nationalist idea of an Algerian nation: "Such a fatherland does not exist. . . . We are the children of a new world, created by French spirit and French effort."

In April 1938 he founded the "Union Populaire Algérienne," a pro-French and assimilationist organization. At the outbreak of the Second World War, he volunteered for the French army.

During the war, however, his political ideas underwent a change: in 1943 he published a "Manifesto to the Algerian People" in which he put forward the idea of an autonomous Algerian republic, united to France by federation. In 1944 he founded a new party, the "Amis du Manifeste et de la Liberté" (AML), which was dissolved along with the PPA in the repression of 1945. Ferhat Abbas was arrested, but an amnesty enabled him to re-enter public life in 1946. In April 1946 he organized the "Union Démocratique du Manifeste Algérien" (UDMA), still on a program of autonomy and federation.

In many ways, his program and his ideas could have been compared at this point with those of Bourguiba, leader of the Tunisian Neo-Destour, who once wrote that "in Tunisia, nobody can be more moderate than we are and still remain a patriot." For this reason, the reformist-nationalists in North Africa have often been lumped together by their opponents in the nationalist camp under the name of "Bourguibism."

Yet there are essential differences. In Tunisia, Bourguiba's gradualist program rallied absolutely everybody, except a handful of traditionalists from the Old Destour; the party which he led included all classes. The existence of a strong proletarian current within the Neo-Destour, represented by the UGTT, eventually drove the party much further in a socialist direction than its narrow, petty-bourgeois program would have indicated.

## QUISLINGS AND OPPRESSORS

In Algeria, the reformist current never was and could not be the mouthpiece for a whole nation, not even temporarily, but only represented a small group of assimilated intellectuals, functionaries, professional people; the masses had joined first the ENA, then the PPA, than the MTLD.

Thus, in Algeria, national-reformism was condemned to impotence from the start. If could have played a role had the French government followed a liberal and reformist policy, but no French govern-

ment was strong enough to impose such a policy on the lords of Algerian capitalism.

The political picture of Algeria should also include the small minority of assimilationist yes-men who remained faithful to their French masters until the insurrection had made their position untenable. They include the handful of native landowners who owe everything to the French occupation and therefore cannot refuse anything to the administration.

Finally, there is the case of the Algerian branches of the French Communist Party and Socialist Party. As in Morocco and Tunisia neither were able to gain any sort of following among the native workers, and remained the parties of a small working-class aristocracy composed of Europeans.

During the last few years, the SP generally stood for an assimilationist position; and the CP for a federalist solution comparable to the UDMA's. In their organizational practice, both parties had set up their Algerian departmental federations as if they had been an integral part of metropolitan France. The same is true for the local federations of Force Ouvrière (reformist trade-unions) and of the CGT (Stalinist-led), as well as of the Catholic trade-union federation CFTC.

What liberals or radicals may be found among Europeans in Algeria, who have shown active solidarity with the Algerian people, generally come from the French labor movement. The official parties, however, and most trade-unions have remained strongholds of European chauvinism, of assimilationism and strong supports of the administration.

As in France, the SP and FO found the greatest part of their supporters among civil servants, while the CP and CGT were strong among the skilled workers, railwaymen, etc.

Toward the proletarian nationalist movement, both parties showed nothing but hostility. While SP governments were consistently repressing it, the CP just as consistently sabotaged it in other ways.

## CP BETRAYAL

In 1935 already, Stalinist goon squads broke up meetings organized jointly by the ENA, the Trotskyists and the SP (actually the "Gauche Révolutionnaire" wing of the SP). In 1937 the CP supported the dissolution of the PPA, compounding the crime by equating it to Doriot's fascist "Parti Populaire Français." In 1944 and 1945, while the Algerian nationalist movement was fighting for its existence, the CP was distributing leaflets accusing Messali of being a "Hitlerite."

During the repression of 1945, Charles Tillon, then member of the CP Central Committee and Air Minister in the "National Front" government, ordered the air force to bomb the "areas of unrest," while the leaders of the Algerian CP (Kouci, Palomba) were demanding, in public meetings, the execution of the PPA leaders and even of Ferhat Abbas. The CP distributed more leaflets: "One detects in these manifestations the policy of Messali's men, with their slogan 'independence for Algeria.' This is the faithful expression of the watchwords from Berlin."

It is easy to see how the CP came to be completely isolated from the Algerian people. After the outbreak of the insurrection, the Stalinist policy became completely untenable and threatened to lead to the complete disappearance of the Algerian section of the CP. Consequently, the latter took a few measures to ensure its survival: in April 1955, it became organizationally independent, and began to follow a policy of cautious support to the FLN.

In September 1955 it was lucky enough to get itself suppressed by the administration. Its paper *Liberté* has appeared illegally since.

After several largely unsuccessful attempts to infiltrate the partisan units under FLN control, it decided to set up its own underground, to ensure a voice for itself in future negotiations. This organization, called the "Combatants de la Liberté," came into existence last April. The truckload of Sten guns which the Stalinist junior officer Maillot drove off with on April 4 was the nest egg, so to speak, of this new Stalinist underground.

Its perspectives, however, are very limited. The Algerian CP is congenitally weak, discredited and isolated, whether legal or illegal, and no Stalinist underground will be able to live down the deserved contempt in which the Algerian people hold the CP since 1944—especially not with the present policy of the CP.

Next week—André Giacometti tells the story of the political developments and conflicts inside the present Algerian nationalist movement.

# 'Joys of a Free Economy' — —

(Continued from page 1)

adherents of all kinds of unemployment-offsetting programs of public works and the like.

But the fact remains that as long as we have capitalism we have to have not only the standard "frictional" unemployment which is with us even at the height of every boom, but the periodic dips, either of a few industries at a time or of the economy in general, which in this era of the Permanent War Economy are known under the fancy title of "inven-

tory recessions" or "rolling readjustments."

Not even the most hard-bitten, dogmatic defender of America's "unique" capitalism can dream up a theoretical construction, let alone a practical program, which would rule out these recessions with their accompaniment of unemployment for hundreds of thousands or millions of workers from a disastrous period of a few weeks to the catastrophe of a few months. The most the unions and their political allies of the Fair Deal wing of the Democratic Party can hope to do is to ameliorate the condition of the unemployed during such periods, not to banish unemployment.

## THE PRICE WE PAY

It is not necessary for socialists to demonstrate the theoretical necessity of unemployment for capitalism. Every serious, pro-capitalist economic theoretician or analyst can demonstrate it, and does so when he does not simply take it for granted. Periodic mass unemployment, like extremes of wealth and poverty, can be softened and prevented from becoming politically explosive in a country like this which enjoys an aristocratic position with respect to the rest of the world, and supports a vast armament economy for the purpose of maintaining it; they cannot be eliminated.

Only a man who has never really suffered the anguish of enforced unemployment could refer to that kind of suffering as "one of the joys of a free economy." But if he had said that the suffering of the unemployed is the tragic price a society must pay in order to make possible the private accumulation of wealth which we see in capitalism, he would have expressed an incontrovertible truism about the system.

# Reuther's Economics — —

(Continued from page 1)

As we have said on other occasions, the fundamental fault is that the plan was projected with the optimistic outlook that the "dynamic qualities" of American capitalism would sustain a high level of employment. The advent of the current recession destroyed these hopes among UAW leaders and ranks.

In addition, the auto corporations have been taking full advantage of contract clauses giving them exclusive rights to manage their plants and direct their working forces to institute short work-weeks in spite of all protest of local unions and shop committees.

One of the major demands of the General Motors nation-wide council meeting held in Detroit this past week was to ask GM to guarantee 40-hour pay for those called in to work on any Monday. It remains to be seen how much this arrogant corporation concedes on this point.

But before getting into the political implications of the current auto crisis it should be said that the overselling of the GAW idea, or more exactly, of the actual gain in principle that the UAW achieved, has placed in jeopardy the entire future of the GAW; for a second important action of the GM Council was to place in the forefront of the 1958 negotiations a guaranteed 40-hour pay for a shorter work-week.

In the face of these difficulties it is understandable that local union regimes one after the other are being toppled from office in the current elections, especially in the Flint and Detroit areas.

## SQUEEZE-PLAY

The Reuther leadership unquestionably can survive this kind of setback, but what is bothering the UAW is the political capital that the Republican Party is making out of the auto workers' problems. To be sure, Howard Pyle, assistant to President Eisenhower, put his foot in his mouth in his classic "The right to suffer is one of the joys of a free economy." But this statement has been largely hushed up in the press.

In negotiations last week at GM—and the UAW is having a similar experience at Ford and Chrysler—the corporation executives have taken a hard-boiled class attitude. They have the UAW in a squeeze-play and they are making the most of it.

Any attempts to make the current contracts "living documents" and improve them at least in minor respects are coldly rejected by the corporations who are determined to use the occasion to destroy or weaken the confidence of the auto workers in their union.

"You signed the contract. You said it was a good one. Live up to it. We are living up to it."—This is the attitude of labor-relations directors to UAW negotiators, and it makes things very difficult for the union.

In response to these pressures UAW leaders are making their usual militant speeches at UAW gatherings like the GM Council. Walter Reuther, Leonard Woodcock and other spokesmen are superb in their sharp analyses of the Republican Party as the tool of big business and in describing how capitalism works, without of course denouncing it. But the faltering and the stumbling and the grave inadequacies of their entire program come when they end up with the solution that labor must support the Democratic Party, since in reality they don't have much faith in it either.

In the ten years that Walter Reuther has achieved his domination of the UAW, there never was an occasion where he has protested more over conditions and has been less effective in doing something about them than at the present time. For all the dilemmas and contradictions of the UAW policy have caught up with the union during the current auto recession.

Expressions of preference for and loyalty to the "free economy" of American capitalism have become essential parts of the ritual of virtually every American trade-union convention. Despite Reuther's early socialist training, and that of so many of his colleagues and administrative officers, the United Auto Workers' leadership has been swept along in the adulation of the system which has become so general during this decade and a half of the Permanent War Economy. When it comes to accepting the unemployment which is an inevitable characteristic of this system, however, they balk, regardless of what violence this does to economic logic.

It is all to their credit that they seek to resist the practical consequence of their ideological commitment to capitalism, and are perfectly willing to demand non- or even anti-capitalist measures when mass suffering is involved. Socialists to do the same kind of thing when they too demand all kinds of measures to alleviate the plight of the unemployed, even though their analysis tells them that such measures do not even begin to solve the problem.

The difference is that socialists are in a position to call a spade a spade, and to lay the blame for unemployment on the basic workings of the system. They can seek to really educate the workers to an understanding of why periodic unemployment is inevitable under capitalism, and hence to the idea that the only real and lasting cure is to abolish the system and run industry on the basis of social ownership and planning.

The labor defenders of capitalism have to lay the blame on the Republicans or some other political scapegoat. As long as they continue to do this they may accomplish much to help the unemployed. They will never abolish unemployment.

# Stone on Russia — —

(Continued from page 1)

tons of steel the Russians produce," he throws out, with an eye on his friends.

This society is good only for very limited types of bureaucrats, yesmen, cynics, but not for creative and honest men, he says. For the latter, "the USSR has been a hermetically sealed prison, stifling in its atmosphere of complete, rigid and low-level thought control." And he found that it still is.

He concludes with the view that, as regards helping the cause of peace and the interests of the Russian people themselves, "this process will not be helped by indulging in delusions, or by quickly forgiving and forgetting Stalinism in the belief that Russia has now fundamentally changed."

Certainly there have been changes. "But we will not help the Russian people by letting this crowd of leaders soft-soap us; in any free country, after similar revelations, a whole new set of men would have been swept into power as earnest of real change. Nor will we help ourselves, and our power to fight for a better world and a better society, by joining hands with the poor, deluded housebroken Communist Parties of the West. They remain Russian puppets; they will jump back through the hoops as soon as they get new orders. Their members cannot be freed from intellectual bondage until the parties themselves have disintegrated. Nothing has yet happened in Russia to justify co-operation abroad between the independent Left and the Communists." (End of article.)

## INDICTMENT

In a substantial section of the article, Stone indicts the Russian press from the standpoint of its role in the "stifling atmosphere": it is "matchless for turgidity and obscurity . . . written by uninspired hacks . . . repellent gibberish." . . . "It is indicative that a Communist intellectual . . . in Eastern Europe admitted to me that he 'couldn't live' without the N. Y. Times."

"If they want to make a clean break with the Stalinist past, they can best demonstrate it by telling their people what they are doing and why." But he shows that not the slightest step has been taken in this direction.

The Beria case is another major example for him. "Only persons rendered permanently idiotic by complete submergence in party-line literature" will

believe the foreign-agent charge against him. "This is how Stalin operated; he never met an opponent on the ground of honest discussion; first slander and then the firing squad were his answers. . . . Was not the treatment of Beria in the true Stalinist tradition?"

"I cite as another major example, the attack on Stalin himself. . . ."

"What one does see is that somehow the attack on Stalin has the same crass, crude air as Stalin's own attacks on his own victims. . . . But to blame the evils of Stalinism on Stalin is obviously inadequate. . . . To change it one, must do more than hang Stalin in effigy, or to defame him in self-serving panic as Khrushchev is doing."

(Incidentally, Stone quotes "a Communist" as telling him: "Multiply all you have read abroad by ten and you will get the dimensions of Khrushchev's revelations about Stalin.")

## KHRUSHCHEV WORSE

Stone gives short shrift to the "vague talk about 'collective leadership.'" He bitterly cites the Pravda editorial claiming that in spite of all the party policy has always been correct, and warning against "rotten elements" (who really want democracy).

"I came away from Russia with the strong conviction that Khrushchev is more crude and vulgar than Stalin, and will if given the chance take over completely." But the leaders "have intensified the ferment which began with Stalin's death and set in motion events whose momentum they may not be able to control."

So much for Stone's report. There is another section in which he records some thoughts on why all this happened. "It Started With Leninism" is the subhead and it is a short summary of some fairly standard thoughts along those lines.

However, Stone is modest in his claims here; he says: "I have been reading furiously in Russian history and a little in Russian law and in past Communist controversy in an effort to evaluate what I have seen. . . . My knowledge is inadequate, my ignorance is vast, my only credentials are that these conclusions represent what one man has seen and felt."

The question arises, where Stone goes from there. As mentioned, he presents a short essay in anti-Leninism, but at the same time still refers to Russia as "socialist," and indicates that in his next report, on Warsaw, he may have quite different things to say. The ferment of Stone's personal politics is undoubted, but the important thing is the value of his political reportage.

# The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Get Acquainted!

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

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

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

## HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE

# LABOR ACTION

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

Please enter my subscription:

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

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

Subscribe to LABOR ACTION—  
\$1 a year for Student Subs