

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

'SUBVERSION AND TURMOIL' IN FRANCO SPAIN

The Church and the 'Argentine Pattern'

... page 6

Spanish Youth Is In the Vanguard

... page 5

TITO MAKES A TURN TOWARD THE EAST

... page 3

FRANCE: THE NEW POPULAR-FRONTISM

... page 7

AUGUST 8, 1955

FIVE CENTS

WDL Forms Committee to Fight ISL Case As Hearing Recesses Over Issue of Bias

Press Charges Against Hearing Examiner After Brownell Replies to Rauh Telegram

By GORDON HASKELL

While the Independent Socialist League's hearing by the Department of Justice in its fight against the "subversive list" has been recessed for what may turn out to be several weeks, the fight outside the hearing room against the list made a great stride forward with the Workers Defense League announcement that a special committee of prominent individuals has been set up to rally support and gather funds for the case.

The recess in the ISL's hearing is a result of the motion made by its attorney in this proceeding, Joseph L. Rauh Jr., to disqualify Hearing Examiner Edward Morrissey. This motion had been made and denied on July 26, and had been appealed by Rauh to Attorney General Herbert Brownell on the same day. (See last week's LABOR ACTION.)

When the hearing resumed on August 1, Brownell had replied to Rauh's appeal in a letter in which he stated that if Rauh would file an "affidavit of personal bias or disqualification" within five days, Brownell would either consider the matter himself or appoint an "independent officer" of the Department of Justice to consider it. The letter also stipulated that the department's attorneys at the hearing would have five days in which to reply to any affidavit of disqualification Rauh might file. (Full text of letter on page 8.)

After consulting with the representatives of the ISL present at the hearing, Rauh formally accepted Brownell's procedure for handling the disqualification appeal. It was agreed by both sides that it would be pointless to continue the hearing before an examiner who might be disqualified after the hearing had ended. It was stipulated by attorneys for both sides that once the disqualification issue was settled, they would get together to agree on a date for resumption of the hearing.

GOVERNMENT'S EXHIBIT

The "posture" of the ISL's case, as lawyers like to say, is now this:

• After a day and a half of its hearing, the ISL has been met by a flat refusal by the government to define what it means by "communist" and "seek to overthrow the government by unconstitutional means" as these terms are used for the purpose of placing organizations on the "subversive list."

• The government has also refused to outline its theory of the case, that is, to indicate what type of evidence it will consider conclusive or sufficient to back up its loosely drawn "charges" or to demonstrate their relevance to the listing of organizations as "subversive."

• The hearing examiner has backed up the government's refusal to comply with the ISL's demands for definitions and a statement of the theory of their case, and has generally ruled in favor of the government automatically and without showing any regard for the merits of the ISL's attorney's motions.

In the course of the hearing, the gov-

ernment has so far presented only one piece of "evidence," Max Shachtman's book *The Fight for Socialism*. The particular passages from this book which the government's lawyers have read into the record, and which, therefore, one may imagine they believe particularly damaging to the ISL's case are as follows (p. 138-141):

"The Workers Party represents a long and rich tradition. It is proud of the fact that its principles and program are founded on the teachings of the greatest scientific thinkers and leaders of the in-

(Turn to last page)

The Workers Defense League has announced the formation of a special committee in connection with its support of the Independent Socialist League's fight against the "subversive list." The purpose of this committee will be to publicize the case of the ISL and the important civil liberties issues involved in it, and to gather moral and financial support from the widest possible sections of the labor and liberal movements for it.

To date, eight prominent individuals have responded to an invitation from Norman Thomas and Rowland Watts to join them on the WDL's special committee. Additional acceptances are expected in the near future.

James T. Farrell, noted American novelist and chairman of the American Committee for Cultural Freedom, has joined the committee. This is not the first time that Farrell has joined in the fight for civil liberties. He has been in this struggle for many years, especially in the fight against literary censorship.

One of the real veterans of

America's liberal movement, Waldo Frank, is also a member of the committee. The labor and liberal movement know him well as an outstanding libertarian who never shirked the fight. He is joined by Kermit Eby, of the University of Chicago, a man of high standing in the cause of intellectual freedom, formerly educational director of the CIO.

Meyer Schapiro, professor at Columbia University and noted art historian and critic, is another well-known member of the committee. He is joined by Lewis Coser and Irving Howe of Brandeis University, editors of *Dissent*.

We are happy to announce also that Nancy Macdonald, head of the Spanish Refugee Aid Committee, and Frances Grant, for many years active in democratic Latin American movements, have joined the committee.

MORE EXPECTED

This is an excellent beginning. As the committee gets its work under way, it is expected not only that a number of other prominent liberals will join it nationally, but that civil-libertarians on a local level will form local committees to assist in its work.

The formation of this committee of local committees, will give every supporter of the ISL or of its case an opportunity to participate actively in the struggle against the abomination of the attorney general's national political blacklist.

The least that every reader of LABOR ACTION can do is to send a generous financial contribution to the Workers Defense League at 112 East 19th Street, New York, N. Y.

But much more than money is needed if the labor and liberal movements are to gain a real understanding of the significance of the ISL's case in the struggle for civil liberties today. What is needed is the time and willingness to work of every civil-libertarian. To find out what you can do to strike a blow for freedom, write the WDL at the above address.

Shachtman Gets Passport

The State Department has notified Max Shachtman's attorney, Joseph L. Rauh Jr., that it is finally granting the moot passport to Shachtman. This is the last and definitive step in cinching the case which broke the Passport Division's arbitrary rule.

The noted Court of Appeals decision in the Shachtman case did not, of course, order the department to grant a passport. It merely crushed the position taken by the government in refusing to grant one. Formally, the specific issue of Shachtman's passport was supposed to go back to the lower court for action consistent with the new ruling.

The fact that the government has decided to give in has two points of importance.

Most immediately, it means that the government is not appealing the Court of Appeals decision to the higher court, the Supreme Court. The Shachtman ruling therefore stands unchallenged.

However, aside from this, the government's action has a certain relevance to the ISL's bigger case against the "subversive listing" by the attorney general, though there is no legal connection, naturally.

As mentioned, the Court of Appeals decision remanded the case back to the lower (district) court. Originally, the district court, upholding the government's contention that its power over passports was unreviewable, had dismissed the Shachtman complaint. This is the action that the Court of Appeals reversed.

Presumably, the government then had to go back to the district court and present evidence of the undesirability of a passport for Shachtman—evidence, that is, other than the mere fact that the ISL is "listed."

This is what the government decided not to do, when it granted Shachtman his passport.

Yet, at the same time that it was avoiding this "duty" of keeping a "subversive" from "harming U. S. interests" by travelling abroad—avoiding it by failing to present a case—this same government was engaged in trying to prove in a Washington hearing room the very thing that it refused to try to prove to a court.

To be sure, here are two different government agencies involved here: the State Department, which granted the passport, and the Justice Department, which has the "list." But presumably they are on speaking terms, since it was the latter which argued the former's case against Shachtman on the passport issue.

Even when challenged to do so by a court, the government steadfastly refuses to allow its system of blacklist-by-decree to be subjected to judicial review. It prefers to argue its case (when a hearing is extracted from it) before a "judge" whom it appoints itself, under rules which it invents itself and which it refuses even to divulge at the hearing, and in a proceeding where the decision rests in the hands of the same bureaucrats who committed the offense.

THE CASE OF THE MINE-MILL UNION—

This Is the Witchhunt-Way Of Beating the Stalinists

By BEN HALL

The Department of Justice (to use its technical title) moved this week to smash the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers Union, one of the unions expelled from the CIO for following the Stalinist line. The department is asking the Subversive Activities Control Board to declare the union "communist-infiltrated" under the Communist Control Act of 1954. If this move is successful, Mine Mill will lose its representation rights under the Taft-Hartley Law and will be plunged into a critical struggle for existence.

The union is now on strike against copper mills for demands no different from those raised by CIO unions in recent negotiations.

Attorney General Brownell declared that he sought to aid "rank and file members" get rid of Communist leaders. But in this case, the claim is a patent hypocrisy. His aim is to accomplish by pure state repression what no one could do by convincing the rank and file. Arbitrary government power is being substituted for democratic action of union members.

Not long ago, the CIO announced a great victory over Mine Mill in Colorado. Newspaper articles, special press releases, radio broadcasts and self-congratulatory letters told the world that the Stalinist-led union was virtually wiped out in the state. It seems that the official leadership of several key locals had voted to secede from Mine Mill and join the United Steelworkers (CIO). The celebration was noisy—but brief. NLRB elections followed some months later. The workers voted to stay in Mine Mill and repudiated the steel union. Through a regrettable oversight this news was never highlighted in the CIO press.

The CIO and AFL have every opportunity to convince the non-ferrous metal miners to throw out their leaders or join a new union. Their failure is no reason to short-circuit democracy by government ukase.

We have a typical example of the government would-be dictator at work. The law under which Brownell operates not only permits him to ignore the union membership; it allows him to dodge the exacting legal requirements of proving a criminal act.

Obviously he cannot convict the union officials under the Smith Act; if he had the evidence, he would try it. But having no criminal case that would stand up in court, he need only prove to the satisfaction of a committee of government appointees that there is "communist infiltration," a charge sufficiently airy and vague to pass right through the spongy minds of men assigned to political prosecution.

BRIDGES CASE

A case in point is the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union on the West Coast. Presumably this outfit would be in line for prosecution if the action against Mine Mill stands up. The government has just tried for the 6th time to deport Harry Bridges on the ground that he was a member of the Communist Party when he became a citizen. It failed and its case was just thrown out of court. Now that it has failed to produce hard legal evidence that will stand up in court, it may try to proceed before the Subversive Board where it can rely upon vague allegations as a substitute for proof.

Worst of all, if this action goes through without protest from organized labor, an evil precedent will be strengthened. This goes beyond government controls over unions in general. The state is arrogating the power to establish its own political qualifications for union leadership.

This lurking danger to all unions proves again that the task of defeating Stalinism inside the labor movement is the task of the workers themselves.

LABOR SCOPE

Curran's Stalinist Training Shows Up Once Again . . . CIO Blasts Beck . . . Chrysler Wanted to Fight GAW

By BEN HALL

Joe Curran learned a lot about Stalinist techniques after he became president of the National Maritime Union with the support of the Communist Party. And when he broke with the party he didn't discard what he had picked up.

Right out of *Pravda* comes his latest example of how to prepare a fellow official for the kill. M. Hedley Stone, union treasurer, is slated to be dumped.

Stone was always a fire and high water Curran man. Like almost all old-time NLU top officers he came out of the CP; he fought with Curran to break its hold; later he backed up the terror and police campaign that wiped out the group headed by former Vice-President Jack Lawrence. And only last year, he and Curran fought and defeated the opposition of two other old-time officials, Neal Hanley, former secretary, and Hubert Warner, former vice-president. Warner and Hanley had concentrated their fire on Stone while Curran backed him to the hilt.

But, it appears, Stone committed a fatal error. After backing Curran unswervingly for decades, he had the audacity to criticize a Curran-endorsed motion at a meeting of the union's National Council. At least, that seems to be the source of his trouble.

In his July 21 weekly column in the union's paper, *The Pilot*, Curran for no apparent reason becomes suddenly enamored of organizational efficiency and economy. Here is his own gingerly posing of the question:

"The 1955 NMU Convention will be able to make progress on instituting the kind of internal changes necessary to strengthen and streamline our organization. Our progress in this direction in past years was extremely slow because of the many factions existing in the union—the Mariners Club, Five-Pointers, Communists, Trotskyites and the Wobblies.

"As a result we were unable to eliminate some of the clauses in the Constitution which have a history in the days of Communist Party control, mainly to provide jobs and at the same time to

make the union's internal operation costly and complicated. I am referring to the fact that we are the only union in the United States with a separate treasurer and secretary. All other unions combine these jobs for greater efficiency, and, of course, for saving monies which can be utilized for other purposes."

By sheer coincidence, Stone holds one of the two posts to be merged, and rumor is that Curran will back not Stone but John B. MacDougal, secretary.

Another officer scheduled to go is Adrian Duffy, vice-president. And by pure Stalinist-devised coincidence comes a letter to the editor of the *Pilot* (in the same issue), presumably from a rank-and-filer, demanding the resignation of Stone and Duffy. "The word has been passed to this writer," he informs the *Pilot*, that Stone was guilty of some offense against the union. What was the offense? One reads the letter and it remains obscure.

What is not obscure is the obvious fact that Curran is activating his power machine in Stalinist fashion to destroy two men who have incurred his displeasure.

CIO Blasts Beck

Unions of the AFL and CIO are careful to avoid public criticism of one another, particularly by name. But the CIO Executive Board on July 21 leveled a stinging public denunciation at the Teamsters Union in a resolution which said: "The prospects of the new labor federation are being seriously jeopardized by the ruthless and unprincipled raiding tactics of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters."

The resolution reports a raid on Brewers Local 343 in St. Paul, Minnesota, "ordered from the top-level administration of the IBT," and it calls upon AFL Pres. George Meany and on all CIO and AFL unions to support the CIO position denouncing such raids. From this incident, we get a glimpse of what will be fought out inside the united federation.

Meanwhile, the leaders of the Teamsters Union show a tender solicitude for the welfare of their president, Dave Beck. The remarkable details are provided by A. H. Raskin in the *New York Times*.

In 1943 the union bought two homes for Dan Tobin, then president: a winter home in Miami and a summer home at a Massachusetts resort. Surely Dave Beck is entitled to the same consideration. Of course Beck, reputed to be a millionaire, had already built his own home in Seattle, complete with swimming pool, man-made waterfall, and motion-picture projection room, as befits a labor leader of his stature and type. He and his wife were reluctant to leave this cozy nest. It was a nice problem of diplomacy and protocol: how to buy Beck a home when he already had one, a little used but neat and serviceable.

The International Executive Board solved the problem with statesmanlike tact. The union bought Beck's home from him: it was a bargain, only \$160,000. And instead of running him out on the street, it turned the house back to him as a tenant, rent-free.

Men who can display such an inspiring example of teamwork in the leadership can hardly be expected to fall out over minor matters, like (say) racketeering, raiding or other incidental questions.

Tough Guy Chrysler

New light is shed on how close we came to a bitter auto strike, in the July issue of the *American Machinist*, published by McGraw-Hill for metal-working employers.

"Though it's strictly academic now," the magazine reports, "Chrysler's labor stand of two months ago remains interesting. The corporation was prepared to resist two demands even though such resistance meant taking a most costly strike. Chrysler was undercut on both issues."

One issue was GAW and the other was the union shop.

"While at first glance it does not seem possible that Chrysler would have risked a shutdown on the union-shop issue alone in its crucial 'recovery' year, qualified sources inside the company say Chrysler would definitely have gone to the mat with UAW had GM not capitulated."

(Continued on page 6)

STFEL WORKERS

IUE-CIO Shuts Down Westinghouse Plant

By JOE SENTNER

EAST PITTSBURGH, July 26—IUE-CIO Local 601 in East Pittsburgh, largest local in the Westinghouse chain, has had its first strike since the IUE took over the local.

The Westinghouse Corporation policy of "disciplinary action" was the cause of the strike. Disciplinary action amounts to giving time off to workers for defending their rights to discuss their grievances and problems. One of the ways in which workers discuss problems is to walk off and hold a meeting at the union hall. This is the usual case in which the company disciplines the workers.

One thousand or so workers in one division of the shop were given such a disciplinary layoff of a week for walking out in support of a section grievance. This was the longest disciplinary layoff ever given, and the local immediately closed the plant with a one-day demonstration. This happened on a Friday.

The following Monday was Memorial Day and a "paid" holiday under the contract. Although the IUE contract, unlike many other contracts, does not require that workers work before and after a holiday in order to be paid, the company has withheld holiday pay, forcing the union to take the case to court.

When the local called its one-day demonstration in support of the disciplined workers, the section bosses informed the workers that if they participated in the one-day demonstration they would all be given a disciplinary layoff. However, the company backed down from this position when they saw that it wasn't working. They must have realized that such a position would make it appear that the entire shop would be supporting the one thousand who were out! On the next working day, all of the people except the original thousand were permitted to return to work.

However, the company would not back down on the thousand still out. There-

fore, after the plant had worked for a few hours, a mass meeting was called, and everybody walked out to attend it. For this the people would have been disciplined before, but now the union was on the offensive for the first time in years, and the ranks responded.

At the mass meeting, held in a local football stadium, the Executive Board asked for permission of the membership to take whatever action the board deemed necessary. The vote was 7½ to 1 to give the board power to act.

The board voted to keep the plant shut down in support of the thousand who were off. Back grievances, of which there were plenty, were used to make the strike "legal."

RESISTANCE WAS NEEDED

The very fact that the plant was shut down was a victory for the union. Westinghouse has been acting in recent years as if Local 601 would never shut the plant down. They have been trampling on the contract right and left and treating the local as if it didn't exist. Collective bargaining had all but been destroyed.

Now the union leadership called a Stewards Council meeting to consider the strike which had been called by the Executive Board. A former leader of the UE proposed that the strike be put to another mass meeting. Since an earlier mass meeting had authorized the Executive Board to call the strike, this was virtually an invitation to the rank and file to vote against continuing the strike. The stewards booed the speaker down.

However, if the leadership had previously educated the membership as to Westinghouse's arrogant attitude in negotiations, the leadership would not have needed to fear members' thinking on this issue. Much of the IUE-CIO leadership has never prepared the people for any sort of struggle ever since the UE was ousted. Maybe they thought that the company's arrogance was something that

the Stalinists in the UE dreamed up for propaganda purposes. Now everyone knows differently.

Actually, what was at stake before the recent strike was collective bargaining itself. By demonstrating to management that Local 601 could shut down the plant, a halt has been called to the company's offensive.

PATCH UP PEACE

Nevertheless, the strike had to be settled on a rather shaky note. The strike was not over material gains, and the membership is not educated enough to realize fully that material gains are based on principles and on the contract. If the company can bust the contract, the material gains will never come. The company knows this. Therefore the intense desire of the company to do away with collective bargaining altogether.

The strike was settled temporarily by setting up a committee of two union and two company representatives to study the grievance procedure. The union proposed this settlement. The committee will have no power to change the present procedure and will issue a report in 30 days. As a matter of fact, the grievance system is good enough but as long as the company won't sit down and talk, no system will work.

The masthead of the local union paper says "An Informed Membership Is an Aggressive Membership." It's about time that the local leaders follow this. As this is written, not a leaflet has been distributed to the membership since the committee was set up.

YOU'RE INVITED

to speak your mind in the letter column of Labor Action. Our policy is to publish letters of general political interest, regardless of views. Keep them to 500 words.

Tito Makes a Turn Toward the East

By HAL DRAPER

In the last two weeks, Tito has openly moved away from his pro-Western foreign-policy orientation of the last four years, and in the direction of a point in-between the two rival war camps—a point where, he hopes, he can maintain useful and lucrative relations with both simultaneously.

For Tito, if for no one else, the meaning of coexistence is so concrete that it can even be heard to jingle.

Now no one has any doubt that Khrushchev's mission to Belgrade was far more successful for the Russians than the American press admitted at the time, or indeed even soon after. It is worthwhile pointing this out, not only in an "I told you so" vein, but also as an object-lesson in how the American press falsifies world events in its own specific (untotalitarian) way, since we have an interesting document to offer in exhibit.

It will be remembered that at the airport, right off the plane, Khrushchev launched into a speech in which he extended the glad hand of renewal of party-to-party, Communist-to-Communist friendly relations to the heretics. The Yugoslavs, as is their habit, pumped American correspondents full of the story that they wished to see spread out in the columns back here; and as is their habit, the American press corps mainly obliged, in the interests of international amity and good will for the State Department and its friends.

The story was: *This has been a terrible blunder by Khrushchev; Tito is furious; the Yugoslavs naturally are willing to normalize governmental relations with the repentant Russians—you can't blame us, can you?—but renewal of ideological relations and party ties? Horrors. Do you think we would stab you generous Americans in the back just because this clumsy bear jumps off the plane with outstretched arms? What do you take us for—Stalinists?*

From the N. Y. Times to the Post to the New Leader this song was sung. In spite of the fact that these were all eyewitness reports and were duly confirmed in the dispatches by incontrovertible descriptions of shadows, grimaces, and muscle-twitching on Tito's face as he listened to Khrushchev, we ventured in LABOR ACTION to ridicule this report as making no political sense and to explain why Khrushchev's tactics constituted bold political warfare on the part of the Russians.

By the time the conversations in Belgrade were over, it had become clear that the conference was thick indeed; but with the publication of the carefully worded joint statement, which emphasized governmental relations, the press again widely stressed the line which the Yugoslav press office wanted to see put out; the Titoists had rejected ideological relations; indeed staunchly refused even to leave the governmental level in their talks.

DOCUMENTING A LIE

This was a lie then, it now turns out; and the American reporters could have documented this by a week after the affair, if they had wanted to.

We have now before us the text of the editorial printed at that time in *Borba*, (Tito's *Pravda*), which already made crystal-clear that the two delegations had agreed on renewal of Communist Party relations. It does this by so many reiterations of the same idea, and even the same words, that there can be no doubt that it was a public announcement.

It takes off from the purposely ambiguous formula which had already been used in the official joint statement: collaboration of the "social organizations" of the two countries. This had been interpreted for the press story to mean cultural relations and such. Here it is explained directly as a means of "exchange of socialist experiences" and opinions. From here it goes on to make clear that the Russian totalitarian system was again being labeled "socialism" by the Titoists (this had already been done before the Russians arrived, as we disclosed in *LA* last month). It then repeats the idea of "exchanging socialist experiences" with the Russians just as "Our country has already established collaboration with many working-class and progressive movements in the world." The Yugoslavs "will continue to collaborate in the future also with all working-class movements, with the pro-

Since this article was written, the Times has reported Tito's open statement that party ties will be renewed with the Russian CP, and that this deal stems from the Belgrade conversations with Khrushchev—two things I set out to show here; if the article were written now, it would not need some of its argumentation.—H. D.

gressive and socialist movements and forces, without regard to ideological and political differences." This goes for Russia, too, it said specifically. And more of the same.

Therefore when, last month, *Pravda* came out with a lengthy editorial repeating the Khrushchev proposal for renewed Communist Party relations, the Kremlin was not shooting in the dark. The next day *Borba* reprinted this editorial in its entirety, and though it made no comment, the point was not lost.

Then it was for the first time that the N. Y. Times Belgrade correspondent, Raymond, admitted: "Most observers [here in Yugoslavia] . . . believe the Yugoslavs will reply to the Soviet bid. The consensus, based on conversations with Yugoslav officials prior to the latest proposal, is that relations between the Soviet and Yugoslav Communist Parties will be resumed." (But on a basis of "equality," of course, not master-and-satellite.)

BARGAINING

Why, at the time of the Belgrade conversations and after, were the Yugoslavs so anxious to conceal the direction of their policy with their planted press hand-outs, if it was all going to be blown up later anyway? At least one factor, the solid economic one, is as plain as a dollar bill, and it may even be sufficient.

The Yugoslavs have been frankly bargaining with both sides to see where they can get more, and at the expense of how many inches of political agreement.

Before Khrushchev came to Belgrade, the N. Y. Times reported:

"It would appear that the Yugoslav decision to meet with the Soviet leaders came after Washington had indicated Yugoslavia could not expect the required economic assistance from the United States.

"It is said here [Belgrade] that the negotiations conducted last winter in Washington by Svetozar Vukmanovic-Tempo, the vice-president in charge of economic affairs, almost broke up when the gap between Yugoslav demands and the amount Washington was prepared to grant could not be narrowed."

That does not mean the Yugoslavs looked to Moscow simply in a pique. Naturally what made possible the Yugoslav shift was the conviction that changes in Kremlin policy warranted renewal of relations.

WAITED FOR BIDS

It is to be presumed that, even at the time of the Khrushchev mission, the Yugoslavs still hoped that the U. S. would up its bid for Yugoslav "friendship" in view of the appearance of its competitor in the doorway, and loosen its purse-strings to avoid consummation of a Belgrade-Moscow deal.

That did not happen. Then Tito made a speech pretending to be indignant at proposed U. S. inspection controls, loudly declaiming that no one (meaning the U. S.) was going to push him around. The tone was truculent. A Yugoslav air force delegation went to Moscow to witness the Russian Aviation Day exhibition. A rumor was thoroughly spread about that Belgrade was making a deal to buy Russian MIG planes. So "unofficial" did the rumor get that the U. S. ambassador formally and publicly threatened the regime with a cut in aid if the deal were made.

Russia cancelled \$90 million in claims against Yugoslavia for commercial and military aid before the 1948 break, and Tito dropped his counter-claims. In his anti-American speech, Tito remarked that the Russians had shown "considera-

(Continued on page 4)

LONDON LETTER

'Dig, Die, Disperse'—or What?

By OWEN ROBERTS

LONDON, July 28—With fifty million people crowded onto a land space which is relatively smaller than a postage stamp stuck on the large parcel which makes up the earth, the population of Britain is somewhat cramped. It is also extremely vulnerable in the event of an air attack—particularly if such an attack is made with atomic or hydrogen bombs. This fact, generally recognized in the past, was heavily underscored last week when the Labor Party published a document on civil defense—a document which clearly indicated what the future has in store for Britain in the event of a third world war.

Last year several local councils controlled by the Labor Party decided to disband their civil defense committees, the most notable being the large Midlands industrial center of Coventry. This action was undertaken on purely a local basis and met with strong opposition from the party leadership, in particular from Herbert Morrison. But in spite of this attitude of the leadership, the resistance to civil defense continued to grow and the National Executive Committee, afraid of the outcome of such rebellion, decided last October to set up a special committee to conduct an investigation into the subject.

The committee was duly appointed and consisted of members of the NEC, the Parliamentary Labor Party and Labor representatives on local authorities. Among its members were Hugh Gaitskell, Herbert Morrison, Clement Attlee and Jack Cooper—members of the party right wing. It is this committee which last week made its report after it had been endorsed by the NEC and the Parliamentary Party.

Considering the composition of this committee it is pleasing to note the frankness with which they open the report.

"We have spent," they say, "three months studying death, destruction, and chaos on an unprecedented scale. We have been horrified at the suffering that could be caused if nuclear warfare were ever to break out. Cities and ports would be destroyed. Human suffering, on a scale never before envisaged, would be the inevitable aftermath. Civilization, as we know it today, would break down. Thousands of people would be killed instantly and many hundreds of thousands would be exposed to dangerous radioactive contamination, which might maim them for life."

ADVOCATE DISPERSAL

After this opening contribution of brutal frankness the committee is equally frank in stating its belief that in any future war nuclear weapons are certain to be used, a conclusion which it reaches on the basis of statements made by the Council of NATO, British Government Defense White Papers and speeches of Field Marshal Montgomery.

It quotes Montgomery as saying: "I want to make it quite clear that we at SHAPE are basing all our operational planning on using atomic and thermonuclear weapons in our defense. With us it is no longer: 'They may possibly be used.' It is very definitely: 'They will be used, if we are attacked.'"

These statements, say the committee, lead them to suppose that nuclear weapons will be used "in some circumstances without the consent of the governments concerned."

What means of defense does the committee see? It sums up the alternatives as: Die, Dig, Disperse.

The first is rejected because the committee cannot envisage people not taking any measures to protect themselves. The second—that of digging deep shelters—is likewise rejected because the provision of such shelters would be a physical impossibility. The committee comes down firm in support of a policy of dispersal.

Believing that the targets will be the large cities an industrial areas it advocates that the population of these areas be dispersed into the countryside. Not just the women, children, sick and the aged as in the last war—but whole families should be dispersed. This would mean, of course, that the industrial life of the country would come to a virtual standstill, but the committee considers that this does not matter, for any future war would be fought out of stocks—would be a "thirty day" war.

All of this is very nice, on paper. It falls down somewhat because it fails to follow the argument through to what happens after the "thirty day war" is ended. With the population of the industrial areas dispersed over the countryside, the cities and industrial centers smoldering wastes of radioactivity ruins

—what happens then? Can the population continue to live on stocks? Can they continue to live in the dispersal areas?

GOOD INTENTIONS

Perhaps it is the futility of it all that forced the committee to write these words into its report:

"Before continuing we feel that we must first digress from our original terms of reference and state quite categorically that the statesmen and politicians of all nations, not our country alone, must strive by every possible means to ensure that this horror is never unleashed upon humanity. Action must be taken both inside and outside the United Nations Organization. The fact that these terrible weapons exist on both sides of the Iron Curtain means that chaos and destruction, with consequent loss of life, that we have endeavored to describe would occur not only in this country but throughout the world if a third world war were ever to start. Indeed, we must insist that the Labor Party's policy for civil defense should be based first and foremost on the need to avoid war."

These sentiments, coming from a leadership which supports the British manufacture and use of the H-Bomb, the inflated arms program and the NATO military alliance, are rather strange. But we must not complain—perhaps the years of plugging by the left wing are beginning to have effect.

Report Dissects Army Draftee Policy

Widespread and flagrant miscarriages of justice in enforcement of army security regulations were revealed in a report submitted at the Pentagon by Norman Thomas, many-times Socialist Party presidential candidate and member of the national executive board of the Workers Defense League.

The report, prepared by Rowland Watts, the Workers Defense League's national secretary, is based on a nationwide investigation dealing with more than 100 cases in which draftees were accused of subversive action and associations. Watts and Kenneth M. Birkhead, national executive director of the American Veterans Committee, joined Thomas in presenting and discussing the report.

The army, through misapplication of the government employees security program under Executive Order 10450 to draftees—who are not properly government employees—has assumed the role of censor over the nation's youth by making pre-induction activities a major consideration in determining the character of discharges, the report shows. In one case a draftee was charged with an alleged organizational association at the age of eight.

The report particularly emphasizes the fact that the army's practices, in ways which are detailed, give the military unprecedented control of the nation's youth and the whole future of young people who pass through its mill, and suggests that the military are interested in establishing controls over all manpower.

Copies of the complete report are obtainable from the Workers Defense League, 112 East 19 Street, N. Y. C.

SUBSCRIBERS — ATTENTION!

Check your NAME—ADDRESS—CITY—ZONE—STATE appearing on the wrapper.

If there are any mistakes or if anything is left out, especially the ZONE NUMBER, cut out your name and address and mail it to us with the corrections clearly printed.

19-32

If the above number appears at the bottom of your address, your subscription expires with this issue.

RENEW NOW!

PRO and CON: DISCUSSION

WHY FIGHT JIM CROW IN ARMED FORCES?

To the Editor:

In the issue of LA dated July 11, we get a clarion call from Arden to rush off a lot of letters and things to support [Congressman] Powell in his efforts to tack an anti-segregation amendment on to a National Guard bill in Congress. This is an all too familiar matter to me. I can remember when a lot of people got excited about the attempt to "integrate" the armed forces around the time of the draft law of 1948. A. Philip Randolph raised a lot of hell on this issue, and I have no doubt that he was highly gratified when integrated units of the military establishment were allowed to fight and die for Western Democracy and Christian Civilization and Mr. Rhee a few years later. Who knows, it may well be that Mr. Randolph had a lot to do with bringing this blessing about? Thus, we can witness the spectacle of the NAACP, an organization largely composed of pacifists, striving to "democratize" the armed forces.

While the NAACP believes in both peace and imperialism, the question arises—What is LA's position on these questions? I have always assumed that LA was opposed to both of these, as a socialist must be. The socialist movement is not pacifist, but believes in fighting a class war on the part of the workers and in supporting revolutionary wars with progressive aims; and of course, we have no sympathy whatever with any of the objectives for which armed forces are maintained by imperialist powers, such as the U.S.

Let us review these purposes and objectives: To begin with, we are told by Engels that "the state is a body of armed men" and we know that these arms are wielded against the working class in any situation that appears to be getting out of hand. In other words, they are the brute force that the capitalist regime depends upon for support against revolutionary demands. Secondly, the armed forces exercise control over the empire, which in the case of the U.S. includes the greatest collection of military bases in a larger number of countries than any previous imperialist system has ever amassed. Of course, large segments of the empire are controlled directly through the great corporations, and the armed forces are only available as a threat in case of disorder. Finally, the armed forces represent the threat of U.S. military conquest of the rest of the world. This is not an entirely empty threat, for the Pentagon chiefs seem to take it rather seriously. In addition, as readers of LA and the NI know, the military establishment serves the purpose of propping up the Permanent War Economy, which it can only do by consuming a maximum amount of material and keeping a maximum number of un- and keeping a maximum number of men under arms—that is, it is a dumping of the over-age capitalist economy.

I only recount these obvious matters, well known to everyone who will read this, to point out the simple lesson that there is not a single purpose for which the armed forces (including the National Guard) will be used that we could support. There is only one slogan that we could properly raise in respect to these institutions, and that is "Drop dead!" Therefore, when we take it upon

ourselves to be concerned about the organization of the armed forces, and to attempt to increase their efficiency, and fighting ability it is obvious that people will believe that the socialists have some use for these armed forces, and want to improve and preserve them.

I am not a pacifist, and I do not want the socialist movement to adopt a pacifist viewpoint (however preferable it may be to many that might be found in the socialist movement) but neither do I want the socialist movement to adopt chauvinist and jingoist slogans. We must clearly distinguish between genuine improvements in the social order, such as removal of discrimination in the schools and in public transportation, and pseudo-improvements, such as this action of Powell, which merely greases the imperialistic mechanism, and does not represent a social improvement that is in line with our goals and our vision of a new society. It may well be difficult to explain this distinction to a supporter of the American Century who happens to be colored and has no objections to the uses of the armed forces—but we should not try to impress this sort of person by first throwing our socialist analysis of society away and then appealing to his race-consciousness with chauvinistic articles.

BURTON ROSEN

COMMENT

ABOUT SECTARIANISM & IMMEDIATE DEMANDS

The question our correspondent raises is: If you are against imperialism and the aims for which the army is used, then it is impermissible to raise any slogans with respect to it. Specifically, it is impermissible to oppose Jim Crow in the armed forces.

This is a classic type of sectarian position, with long roots in socialist sectarianism. Unfortunately, instead of trying to think through all of its consequences, Comrade Rosen confines his case virtually entirely to the thought that we must have nothing to say about immediate demands where we have principled grounds for more basic antagonism.

Before commenting on what we think is the central error of this whole sectarian approach, let's try out Rosen's approach in some other ways, in order to see what it implies.

If, for the grounds given by Rosen, including the "obvious matters" which he details, we are forbidden to fight Jim Crow in the army or navy, then surely the same prohibition applies also to other interests and demands for soldiers and servicemen. It would likewise be "jingoist" to advocate better pay for enlisted men; or GI-bill type benefits of any kind; or safeguards against arbitrary punishment, etc. by officers; or to fight against witchhunting in the army as in the Barry Miller case; or—well, any other problem (involving the armed forces) in the lives of the uprooted workers and farmers who are put into uniform.

If, before being put into uniform these same workers were working in an arms factory, would not Rosen be led to apply his same course of reasoning in opposition to raising any immediate demands in their interest?

As a matter of fact, in any factory, which is a capitalist enterprise, we are not concerned with reconciling the workers to the activities, aims, purposes, etc. of the profit-makers, are we? The classic-sectarian position of the DeLeonites is, therefore, that any fight for "reforms" (i.e., immediate demands like higher wages) can only work to reconcile the wage-slaves to their lot instead of revolting, and/or improve the efficiency of the exploiting apparatus by eliminating antagonism. They therefore declare there can be only one demand on capitalism, "Drop dead!" or, as they word it, "unconditional surrender," and no paltering about with "reformist trade-unions." Is this any different essentially from Rosen's course of thought, except for greater consistency?

For that matter, why raise demands like (for example) those we raised against recognition of Franco? After all, if the American imperialist government were really induced to break with Franco, would that not only serve to conceal its true character? (At this point throw in suitable quotations from Engels et al.) Would this not lead people to believe that, if only imperialism did break with Franco, we would support

it finally? Would this not make American imperialism more palatable to the other peoples who now are suspicious of it

We are trying to indicate how Rosen's approach typifies the sectarian method of analysis in virtually any field of socialist policy, and not only in the one instance that Rosen discusses.

What is wrong with it? In the case of the fight for immediate demands, including the immediate demand of abolishing Jim Crow in the armed forces, the fight itself is a prime force in the education and organization of the working class. It is not the wise preachments of smart socialists which, in the first place, impel the masses to higher stages of class-consciousness, but—in the first place—their own experiences and struggles, which they are pushed into by the evils of capitalist society and not by "outside agitators."

But what the sectarian mode of thought is really afraid of is—the danger of winning a demand. In its various forms the archetype of this reaction is the DeLeonite argument that, insofar as workers win an immediate demand, they are correspondingly satisfied with and reconciled to the system that exploits and oppresses them, instead of demanding that it drop dead instanter. So too, implicitly Rosen assumes that if we are "concerned about the organization of the armed forces," we thereby "attempt to increase their efficiency and fighting ability," and that "people will believe" that we "want to improve and preserve them."

This argument, seemingly so intransigent in its tone, rests unwittingly on a touching faith in capitalism.

A victory in a struggle for immediate demands does not, in either the long or short run, have the unilateral effect of diminishing struggle. On the contrary, its broader effect is to impel the victors to further demands; to increase their self-confidence in their own strength; to raise their belief in and understanding of the need to fight and rely on their own combativity; to give them heart; and

therefore to lead them to more struggle for further aims, without any self-limit, up to the bounds of the social system itself.

The class struggle cannot be satiated by victories. It is the liberal, not the socialist, whose faith in capitalism asserts that the system can by its concessions satisfy the appetites and needs and interests of the people. The socialist knows, as does the knowledgeable reactionary, that we have here one reason why class-conscious capitalists are not infrequently reluctant to grant concessions even when they can otherwise well afford them. In any case, this is the basic reason why the irrepressible class struggle of the workers inevitably leads outside the framework of the system.

It is true, naturally, that in the course of this class struggle which wins certain demands, certain abuses of the system are thereby eliminated—as sources of friction. This fact itself gives pause, however, only to the primitive pseudo-socialist notion that "the worse the better." To the Marxist socialist, however, the elimination of certain abuses of the system only ensures that the whole irrepressible struggle will have to be directed on a higher level, i. e., the class sets its sights higher.

The system cannot appease the continuous series of "immediate demands" which arises from the struggle, leading through victories as well as defeats, from the most elementary demands to (eventually) revolutionary transitional demands.

One last point, an historical one this time: History records that in the European socialist movement, the fight to support soldiers' demands, the struggle to direct socialists' attention to immediate demands against militarism in all its forms, including conditions in the army, is a struggle that has been characteristic of the revolutionary left (like Liebknecht, like the early CPs), and has been avoided and dreaded by reformists, social-patriots, compromisers and pro-imperialists, who had their own reasons for refusing to raise demands about the armed forces. This line-up which is so clearly defined in socialist history and was highlighted by Karl Liebknecht's anti-militarist struggle, is alone enough to speak volumes about Comrade Rosen's notions.—Ed.

Tito Makes a Turn — —

(Continued from page 3)

tion for our economic difficulties," which, translated, means that he is complaining that the U. S. has not done so.

In foreign policy, before all this, in connection with his swing through Asia and joint statements with Nehru, Tito had already reverted back to the neutralist line which he had had up to and through the year 1950 (i.e., for nearly two years after the break with the Cominform).

Does this, then, mean that Tito is in the process of going all the way back to the Stalinist war bloc, even though with more independence than he had in the pre-1948 era? Such a conclusion would be hasty at the best, assuming that American stupidity does not simply drive him back there. Above all, it would be a mistake to assume, in a mechanical fashion, that this MUST happen because of the fact that both Yugoslavia and Russia share the same social system.

The latter idea can be found put forward in one of its most naive versions in the article published May 29 in the N. Y. Times magazine by Harry Schwartz, the paper's specialist. This expert, who merits the label because of the care with which he follows the punctuation in Pravda and photo captions in Izvestia, assesses the two societies from the following viewpoint: "If both brands of communism are essentially the same, then . . . there should be no great difficulty in healing the rupture of 1948 . . ." even if gradually and some time in the future.

Essentially, this idea is the same as the pre-war notion of some people that, since Russia was a lone "workers state" in a besieging capitalist world, the looming war could be nothing but a united assault by the whole capitalist world against the "workers' state." As we know, though this was a strong factor in international politics (cf. Munich), it was only one, and as a matter of fact the Second World War turned out to be along different main lines, with Russia aligned with one half of the capitalist imperialist camp against the other half.

Mechanical deductions from the identity of social systems, therefore, are more risky, and no substitute for concrete appraisal of inter-imperialist antagonisms, especially for a small power

like Yugoslavia which is geographically in a crossfire.

But while the "identity of social systems" is no automatic determinant, it would be quite disrespectful of the facts to flout it as being inoperative altogether. The fact that Tito Yugoslavia is a national-Stalinist totalitarianism where capitalism has been abolished and which is afraid of giving any scope to the re-establishment of any capitalist influence, has at the least unceasingly kept it in a mutual state of uneasy suspicions with regard to the U. S., even in the short run. From the longer range view, Tito can have no doubt that if ever the American capitalist power were to succeed in crushing the Stalinist world in a war, his system could not last. In fact, if for any reason, even short of war, the Stalinist power were to be overthrown (including overthrow by a democratic workers' revolution), he could not last.

Titoism, as a small national-Stalinism, is driven into a balancing-act. In that it is not alone. There are many small non-Stalinist states that are also driven to try to balance. But the exact point at any moment where a given state will try to find its equilibrium, as among the pulls from the bigger powers of the two war blocs, may vary widely. At one of its first opportunities, Yugoslavia rushed to get closer to Russia in its track between the two war blocs. It may well have been pushed faster along this way by pro-Russian pressure from the ranks of the Yugoslav Communists, as many insist (though without evidence). The "identity of social systems" is one force among others, but it is a force.

The further evolution of Tito's foreign policy will also not depend on some ideological automatism of "birds of a feather." It will depend more on how much the Eisenhower administration is willing to take; on how long the Moscow tactic of the "new friendliness" lasts and how far it goes; in other words, on the extent to which the two giant protagonists of the cold war will give Tito enough elbow room to maneuver.

Subscribe to LABOR ACTION —
\$2 a year does it!



LABOR ACTION

August 8, 1955 Vol. 19, No. 32

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

As Anti-Franco Ferment Grows in Spain SPANISH YOUTH IS IN THE VANGUARD

The following report on Spanish youth versus Franco appeared in the July 15 issue of *Iberica*, a liberal anti-Franco monthly magazine published in New York whose board is headed by Norman Thomas and Salvador de Madariaga. The article was the magazine's regular column by its Madrid correspondent, on conditions in the country.—ED.

Madrid, June 1955

As we know, the great problem of any dictatorship lies in the formation of a devoted and disciplined youth movement to insure the continuity of the regime. In his attempts to solve this problem, Franco has shown himself to be an advanced pupil of his prototypes, Hitler and Mussolini.

In Spain today secondary education is regulated by official directives, and a course in Falangist doctrine is compulsory in all colleges. A special Falangist students' union, the *Sindicato Español Universitario* (SEU), includes all Spanish students within its ranks, and, as though this were not enough, the formation of *Milicias Universitarias* (Student militias) automatically converts all university students into army officers, thereby permitting a constant supervision over potentially "dangerous" student activities by subjecting each student to military discipline and the threat of court-martial.

Fortunately these measures have not had their intended effect upon the mentality of the new generations, as a brief analysis of the trends among the university students of 1955 will reveal.

FASCISTS WEAKEN

The SEU, which, as we have said, was originally conceived as a students' union, attained a certain prestige during its earlier years, thanks to the sincere and devoted efforts of some Old Guard Falangists. But these soon resigned or were purged, and its direction passed into the hands of a clique totally lacking in doctrine or character, except for a complete identification with official policy. Since then the SEU has lost not only its syndical nature, but even its significance as a students' organization.

Its political opportunism became only too evident upon the occasion of the Barcelona strikes in 1951. Obligated to take sides in the struggle between police and students, the SEU allied itself with the former, thereby openly betraying the purpose for which it had ostensibly been created. Since that time the prestige of

the SEU, not only in the University of Barcelona but in all the Spanish universities, has gone down to nothing.

Because of its compulsory nature all students still must be members of this syndicate, but less than 1 per cent participate in its activities. So small is this minority that, I have been told, the question of electing a *Delegado del Curso* or student delegate to the faculty, a position which traditionally went to a died-in-the-wool Falangist, has now become an awkward and embarrassing problem, since it is difficult to find one single student completely identified with the principles of the Falange. Usually the problem has to be resolved by the naming of a "neutral" student, or else by the importation of a true Falangist from another college.

The weakening of the Falange has accelerated notably during the last five years; having lost its effectiveness and its former strength, its influence over the students is now negligible. Whereas during the forties almost 50 per cent of the students would have worn the blue uniform of the Falange, this percentage has fallen off sharply since the beginning of the fifties.

Another symptom of the crisis within the Falange itself is in the large number of defections from among its administrative leaders. The number of "Old Shirts" (Old Guard Falangists) who have endeavored, by working through the labor syndicates to realize a revolutionary policy radically opposed to the social and political rigidity of the regime, must amount to several dozens. These individuals have abandoned official Falang-

ism to become politically oriented toward the left. One of these "Old Shirts" with whom I talked even discussed the possibilities of a proletarian revolution.

But quite aside from these individual defections one can state that, for all practical purposes, the doctrinal Falangism of the Old Guard Falangists is dead. The Falange continues to be affiliated with power, but its force is more apparent than real, and it is being fatally sacrificed.

VACUUM

In the meantime the vacuum created by its diminishing political influence upon the youth has not been filled. This situation renders the present moment highly propitious for all types of propaganda, both of the right and left.

In effect, one of the most outstanding characteristics of the present period is the apathy and indifference of the majority of students with respect to political matters. Although during the years immediately following the Civil War opinion was, in general, divided between Falangists and Monarchists, today the great mass of Spain's youth is largely non-political. But there is a minority which is growing every day, in which a democratic consciousness, tinged more or less with socialism, may be noted.

This non-political mass includes about 80 per cent of the students. In considering this proportion one should, however, take into account the social antecedents of the students themselves, who come in overwhelming preponderance from the more comfortably-off backgrounds and who are, for that reason, less affected by

the social rigidity of the regime. This percentage should not, therefore, be considered as an index of all Spanish youth but, rather, as a reflection of one sector of thought.

DEMOCRATIC MAJORITY

Also it should not be forgotten that the political indifference of the Spanish student is far more understandable than would be that of a French or American student, for example, who has all means at his disposal for forming his personal views about the world, and this in full spiritual independence. But here in Spain this is not the case, and the young person who achieves political convictions does so by overcoming all sorts of difficulties through the most devoted and tenacious efforts. It is not surprising therefore that a great apathetic and indecisive mass exists today; the same would be true in any other country under similar circumstances.

The active politically-minded minority of about 20 per cent to which we have alluded may be sub-divided into a small minority of adherents to the regime—Falangists or Monarchists—and a large democratic majority. A great number of university students of Madrid, Barcelona and Valencia profess republican ideas. The police already has uncovered various clandestine groups in these cities made up of young people whose average age ranges between twenty and twenty-three years.

The Francoist propaganda could hardly account for these as being "persons infected by the Marxist virus" during the

(Turn to last page)

'This Climate of Subversion and Turmoil'

Elsewhere on this page, we print an analysis of trends within the Spanish youth movement. From the same source, several other items reinforce the general conclusion that the Spanish youth are in motion.

This is important information from a country which has been living under a dictatorship for almost two decades. With regard to the youth, these reports are especially significant, for they show that there is still a critical spirit, albeit that of a minority, in a generation that has grown up without freedom. As *Iberica's* correspondent notes in the June 15 issue, "The youth of Spain, both within the Falange and without, are moving along paths that lead away from Francoism."

The Falange is the officially-sponsored fascist party backing the dictatorship.

In the May 19 issue of *Juventud*, a Falangist paper, D. Jose Gonzalez Paz, a member of the Falangist youth, wrote:

"There are times when it would seem that we are living in a demented society. No matter how hard we try, we can find no natural explanation for things. But at other times, it is all only too clear: the astounding cynicism, the most insolent

immorality, the most inhuman avarice, the most insupportable lack of cooperation toward the stability of Spain. Avarice, immorality, cynicism, lack of national vitality, all contribute to the hair-shirt which fetters the life of Spain today. All of this and much more is illustrated in the present situation of the Spanish cement industry, which we do not hesitate to term scandalous."

RADICALIZED YOUTH

An even more particularized discussion of this general state of disaffection among the youth was given in a speech by Sr. Elola, the chief of the *Frente de Juventudes Falangistas* (Falangist Youth Front). The talk was given in Ciudad Real (and *Iberica's* correspondent finds it significant that it was not made in Madrid).

Said the Falangist leader: "A state of confusion and alarms has been created which has a dangerous effect on our young members. There is no reason for this confusion and even less for despair. Those who are responsible for this climate of subversion and turmoil, even if they are acting in good faith, are mistaken in wishing to justify their loyalty to some revolutionary principles."

Elola said openly, that this talk was directed against those within the heart of the Falange itself "who are rebelling against the policy of the Falange."

Iberica's correspondent concludes: "The truth about the political trends among the youth of Spain is as follows: the Falange is without vigor and empty. The most active group within its ranks is tending toward a republican-syndicalist order, and another sector (and not the least important one) is entering the Communist orbit. A minority, to which Sr. Elola's speech was directed, remains orthodox, anti-monarchist and anti-clerical; from this group the small splinter group is evolving which adapts itself to a monarchist evolution."

In Spanish Morocco Too

In intellectual circles of Spanish Morocco a certain agitation is noticeable at present, in spite of the fact that political news seeps out with difficulty through the curtain of secrecy established by the Commissioner General, Sr. Garcia Valiño.

A young Moroccan student was imprisoned for having published an article demanding that the Spanish authorities fulfill their promises and give Moroccans the employments to which they thought they had the right to aspire. The editors of the periodical, published in the Arab language, were also arrested for not having denounced the student.

A demonstration of graduates of the Polytechnic School of Tetuan took place in front of the residence of the High Commissioner to protest these arrests. The Commissioner denounced the demonstration energetically, and would not receive the students. The students then declared a strike and the school was closed.

—*Iberica*

Last sessions
in the N. Y. YSL class

THE FUNDAMENTAL IDEAS OF SOCIALISM

WEDNESDAY EVE'S at 8:15

- (5) Aug. 10
How Socialists Work for Peace
- (6) Aug. 17
Democratic Socialism and the Future

All sessions will be held on consecutive Wednesday evenings at 273 Madison Street, Apt. 3A (Lower East Side), New York. Take D train to E. Broadway sta.

YSL CLASS • NEW YORK

THE NEXT SESSION IN THE CLASS Perspective on History & Revolution

TUESDAYS at 8 p.m.

IS

Aug. 9—ANNE RUSSELL

THE SPANISH REVOLUTION AND CIVIL WAR

Last two sessions:

Aug. 16—GORDON HASKELL
Revolution in Asia—I

Aug. 23—GORDON HASKELL
Revolution in Asia—II

114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

Is the Catholic Church Following The 'Argentine Pattern' in Franco Spain?

By HAL DRAPER

Is the Catholic hierarchy following the "Argentine pattern" in Franco Spain?

In the June 20 issue of LABOR ACTION, we reported the developing faction fight among the pro-monarchist and pro-Falangist supporters of the dictatorial regime, both factions going so far as to circulate illegal and clandestine leaflets and statements attacking each other and even criticizing Franco.

Now there emerges an important further step in this process of disintegration going on inside the cadres of the regime.

A July 24 dispatch date-lined from Madrid by a N. Y. Times correspondent with well-known pro-Franco sympathies, and ties with the Catholic hierarchy, Camille M. Cianfarra, reports on and quotes extensively from a clandestine pamphlet circulated by a prominent Spanish Catholic spokesman.

Its import is that, it appears, important Catholic elements in Spain are thinking in terms of what happened to Peron.

Author of the clandestine pamphlet is Rafael Calvo Serer, professor of modern history at Madrid University, who belongs to the militant Catholic organization Opus Dei ("God's work," the last two words of the society's long Latin name).

NEW FACE FOR CHURCH

Cianfarra's decription of Opus Dei is interesting: composed of lay intellectuals selected for militant Catholicism;

influence in Spain growing, especially in the cultural field; many members hold important government posts and university positions; organized in "all large Spanish towns," usually in student circles. Also: "In contrast to the practice of other orders, the great majority of the members do not disclose their affiliation with Opus Dei. They work quietly and unobtrusively to influence the shaping of policies."

(Since we have raised the tentative question of parallel with Argentina, we have here a militant political- and social-action Catholic spearhead organization which is politically different from but may play a role similar to the Christian-Democratic groups formed by Argentine priests prior to the cracking of Peron's power.)

But it is in the content of Prof. Serer's pamphlet that the most striking parallel with the Argentine events is suggested.

In our June 27 issue, we quoted a Latin American writer's cogent explanation for the Peron-church antagonism; the hierarchy, it was suggested, had infuriated Peron by taking steps which were designed to secure its own position against the time when its close identification with the dictator would be a handicap to its own influence over an enraged people.

The fact that the Argentine Catholic hierarchy's leadership had so long acted as Peron's partner in crime in all assaults against the freedom of the people would, it had cause to fear, cause any anti-Peron revolt to sweep also against the church. When the church took (even

timid) steps to put more distance between itself and the taint of the regime, and to present a different face to the people, if only through an "unofficial" group, Peron struck at its perfidy, perhaps only to drive it back into line, but with consequences which showed that his regime's underpinning was less firm than he thought.

Of all the nations in the world, it is in Spain that the relationship between a dictator and the hierarchy is closest to the Argentine picture.

Keeping this in mind, here is Cianfarra's summary of Serer's ideas in his pamphlet "Spain After the Treaties," in which the professor "draws a balance" of Franco's rule from the end of the civil war up to the U.S. treaty and Vatican concordat.

FEAR ANTI-CLERICALISM

First he pays tribute to the fascist dictator for having enforced "order and tranquility," eliminated the "class struggle," and undertaken a "number of grandiose public works." But—

"Specifically, Opus Dei acts on the premise," writes Cianfarra, "that a wave of anti-clericalism may sweep Spain after the end of Generalissimo Franco's personal rule, as it did in 1931, after the ousting of the monarchy and the establishment of the Republic."

And so Serer stresses that the following question must be faced:

"Will the present regime survive after Franco's death? The system that will follow will be exactly the same as the one existing today?"

"One must have the courage to reply, no," Professor Calvo Serer writes. "The present regime is a personal regime. Its only source of authority is that of the person who is at the head of the state. Since everything is concentrated at the summit of the political pyramid, the present institutions are a misnomer, because they are not responsible and creative organs but purely executive tools. Therefore, Generalissimo Franco's personal power must be replaced by a system of institutions that will ensure the continuance of the benefits attained under his leadership. The more so, because the total concentration of authority in one hand will inevitably cease."

"Today there is a general conviction that the sudden disappearance of Generalissimo Franco would be followed by anarchy," the pamphlet concludes. "But the perpetuation of the present state of affairs, which does not take into account what may happen later, is tantamount to merely delaying anarchy."

The "anarchy" of which the Catholic leader is afraid is, of course, any upheaval from below by the outraged people, who might take vengeance on all of Franco's partners in oppression. If Franco is to be gotten rid of, the wise men of Opus Dei would prefer to take care of the transition themselves, quietly, from the top down, by a palace coup perhaps, so as not to "stir up the animals."

"Like Peron, Franco is more than expendable if it is a question of saving the institutions which are behind Franco. The monarchist section of the Franco front is handy."

Bipartisan Drive On to Get Franco into NATO

A push is being made in Congress to get Franco Spain into the NATO military alliance, with bipartisan support. If it is not expected to go through this year, that is no thanks to the Republicans and Democrats who are doing their best. The big stumbling-block is convincing the other members of NATO, who realize better than Washington that inclusion of Hitler's only living ally would too blatantly advertise the reactionary-military character of the Western alliance.

The move was initiated in the Senate on May 24, when 14 senators sponsored a resolution calling on the State Department "to take all proper and necessary steps to bring about an invitation to Spain to become a party of the North Atlantic Treaty and a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization."

This is the natural outcome of the Eisenhower-Franco agreement on Span-

ish bases of last September 23. At that time, to be sure, government spokesmen vigorously denied that there was any intention to bring Spain into NATO. In Britain Anthony Nutting of the Foreign Office was even categorical, asserting "there could be no question of bringing Franco's Spain into NATO."

Special pressure in the U. S. is coming from the Pentagon, and also from the political action arms of the Catholic hierarchy in the country.

Among the most active sponsors of this pro-Franco proposal is Senator Mike Mansfield (Mont.), one of the Democratic senators who is looked upon as a party "expert" in foreign policy and even as a "liberal." On the GOP side, even more vigorous backing is being given by Sen. Wiley, McCarthy's senior in Wisconsin, who is ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Wiley visited Franco last summer.

FRANCO LOBBY AT WORK

On June 21 he presented another resolution, which he said was an improvement over the first one, to bring Spain in "at the earliest moment" and which, he says, "points up the fact that Spain and the U. S. are joined in an immensely significant agreement on bases for U. S. air and naval power in the defense of the West."

"Forget past differences and think of the future; Spain is our best ally in the fight of international communism; bringing Spain into NATO would serve the national interests of the U. S."—these are quotations from a speech by Wiley.

The line being taken by the Franco lobby in the U. S. is that which Franco himself unleashed in an interview published by U. S. News & World Report: "We now have the Iberian Defense Treaty with Portugal and the latter is, of course, in NATO. In effect we are in it through Portugal."

Thus the claim is made, not without foundation, that Franco already is virtual part of the military alliance setup of the Western war bloc, through the Portuguese pact and the U. S. bases agreement. In effect, the Franco lobby and the Wiley-Mansfield group are saying to their more finicky colleagues: Be consistent!

Secretary of State Dulles backs them up and has committed his own policy secretly to the same end, reports Iberica, the democratic anti-Franco magazine. "He recently said as much in private to a group of congressmen, and apparently is merely biding his time before saying

the same in public," stated its Washington correspondent, Bart Allan.

"Just why the State Department does not care to come out into the open as yet on this issue is revealed in other testimony given recently before the Senate's Foreign Relations Committee by Livingston T. Merchant, assistant secretary of state for European Affairs."

Merchant denied that the State Department was giving "active consideration" to the move, frankly explaining this by referring to objections "in certain quarters" of the NATO signatories, and stating "I do not think it would be propitious at the present time."

This formulation means that the State Department is discreetly for it. Admiral Radford, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, also supported it at the committee hearings.

Dulles is the same man who speechified at the San Francisco revival meeting with scriptural chestnuts like "Not by might, nor by power, but by my spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts."

PALADIN OF DEMOCRACY

The spirit of whitewashing the Spanish fascists was further exemplified in Washington when the U. S. Information Agency head, Streibert, was being questioned at a congressional committee hearing recently. The USIA was asking for a bigger appropriation for Spanish activities, and Sen. Ellender had his own variety of objections. Said Ellender, "You can't get what you want in the Spanish press. You know it's heavily censored."

Replied the man who is supposed to be in charge of spreading America's gospel of Democracy around the world: "The censorship primarily extends to military information. The press is not censored against world news, and in Spain, as in all foreign countries, we do get news of U. S. foreign policy, actions of Congress bearing on foreign matters, and statements of the [U. S.] administration."

This claim that Franco press censorship is primarily military (as Moscow claims also) is a ridiculous falsification in a world which well knows conditions in the Falangist police state; but Dulles' underlings have to rationalize in some way the formal inclusion of Spain in "the free world" for the purposes of their budgets.

On another front, the continued process of Western rehabilitation of the Franco labor. The occasion was the admission of Spain's delegation as observers at the in-

International Labor Organization.

From inside Underground Spain, a regime was bitterly denounced by Spanish open letter of violent denunciation came from the clandestine mine workers' union, made public by the bulletin of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions.

"Franco's totalitarian trade-union bosses are ringing the victory bells," begins the letter. "There is no doubt that this is a new triumph for the Franco regime in the international arena. . . ."

"For us Spanish workers, who are striving to shake off the oppression of one of the most abject tyrannies of our century, the complacency of the democracies of Europe and America (and particularly of the latter) toward Franco is morally much more painful than the murderous attacks launched on our towns and villages by Italian and German aviators. . . ."

"With the end of the Second World War and the destruction of the German and Italian dictatorships, the Spanish people were buoyed up with the tremendous hope of approaching liberation. But this hope has crumbled away to total disillusion. . . . Since then the Spanish people has felt itself more and more betrayed by a disloyalty whose culminating point was the infamous pact between Franco and the U.S.A. Even Soviet Russia has 'forgotten' to settle accounts with the Blue Division [the Franco armed force that fought with the Hitler army] . . . Franco has entered UNESCO by the front door; his entrance to the United Nations has been discreetly prepared by observers, and now, in the same way, to the I.L.O. . . ."

"Brothers of the free world, do not abandon us in our struggle!"

LABORSCOPE

(Continued from page 2)

Meanwhile, the next round in the fight for GAW takes place in the electrical industry where the IUE-CIO negotiates with General Electric. The union is already committed to a no-contract-no-work policy when its agreement expires on September 15, and it is asking every member to contribute a day's pay a month if a strike is called. High on the list of demands is the GAW.

But the company has already announced that it does not consider the auto settlements a pattern. "When our labor costs are higher," it said, "we are of course only inviting competitors to take orders and jobs that might otherwise be in our plants." Will GE force a strike? That remains to be seen.

At the same time, the National Association of Manufacturers is beating the drums for class warfare. The New York Times reports its recent emergency conference:

"Six hundred employers from all parts of the metropolitan area applauded yesterday efforts for a finish fight against union calls for a finish fight against union efforts to win unemployment wage guarantees. Speakers at a 'workshop' session . . . urged the industrialists to resist in legislative halls, at the bargaining table, and if necessary, on the strike front."

Three New Pamphlets by Leon Trotsky on the 1905 Revolution

"1905: Before and After" .25c
 "1905: Results and Perspectives" .25c
 "In Defense of Insurrection" .10c
All three for 50c.

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

THE NEW PUSH FOR POPULAR-FRONTISM IN FRENCH SOCIALISM

By ANDRE GIACOMETTI

PARIS, July 25—The recent congress of the French Socialist Party was dominated by the legislative elections which the party will have to face in less than a year. Even the major changes on the international scene were reflected in this congress mainly as issues of domestic policy.

The fast flow of international events has relieved the SP of the difficult problem of settling the question of EDC. The 17 expelled parliamentarians who had voted against EDC were readmitted into the party. The large federations of Pas-de-Calais and Nord, the very same which had been instrumental in purging the 17 rebels, took the initiative in welcoming them back to the fold. The "unity" of the party has thus been re-established, although the real issues have not been debated, and much resolved.

As was to be expected, no major changes occurred in the international orientation of the party. It remains committed to full support of NATO, WEU, etc. It calls for "disarmament by negotiation" and for the unconditional reunification of Germany.

On the colonial issue, a significant change of policy reflects the party's slow and painful adjustment to the Indochinese war and to the struggle of the North African peoples for independence.

Before the war, the SP's policy had been inspired by a misapplied, one-way "internationalism," which had led it to support a policy of assimilation in the colonies.

After 1945, the same disastrous policy was supported in practice, if not in theory. Today, the SP recognizes that the major problems in the colonies (or the "overseas territories," as it prefers to call them) are not economic and social but political, and that they call for political solutions.

In general, the party now supports a solution of loose federation, with special provisions made for each territory. In Tunisia, the SP calls for a speedy ratification and application of the conventions; in Morocco, it calls for the solution of the dynastic problem by the return of the sultan; in Tropical Africa, it advocates democratic representation by elected bodies disposing of real executive powers; in Algeria, it calls for economic reforms (mainly a tax reform—not a word about the land question) and for a reform of the Algerian Assembly.

These proposals do not go a long way. They are not much more progressive than those put forward today by the more advanced sections of the bourgeoisie, and they are inspired by the same anguished cry that if nothing is done "we" will lose "our" colonies. Nevertheless, they are a step forward inasmuch as they are the thin end of a wedge that can be driven much further by the party's left wing.

One Step Forward

The most important aspects of the congress were no doubt those where the party determined its line on domestic policy for the 1956 elections. For the first time since the end of the war, the SP decided "to go into the battle alone": alliances either with the CP or with the bourgeois parties were rejected in advance.

In anticipation of such a campaign, the program for domestic policy has been somewhat "hardened." Although keeping naturally well within the limits of a reformist program, the SP now calls for the nationalization of a number of basic industries, including steel, and for the development of workers' control of production.

Concerning the MRP and the conservative bourgeois parties, the domestic policy resolution denounces "the reactionary policy of the present majority, as well as the attitude of the MRP which has become its accomplice by sacrificing the interests of the workers to its clerical concerns." Concerning the CP, the congress resolved to "reject all offers of united action . . . the application and duration of which are determined by Russia's foreign policy, to which the Communist Party remains unconditionally subjected."

No resolution was adopted attacking the "Mendésist" currents in so many words; yet the increase of militancy on social questions, even if it remains largely verbal, makes an alliance with the liberal bourgeoisie unlikely. The temper of the congress, in this respect, is perhaps best reflected in a motion put forward by the majority of the Seine federation, which stated that "certain tendencies within reaction and capitalism, conscious of the anger of the people and of the abyss into which our country is being pushed, also attempt to create so-called left coalitions. We call upon the entire working class to block these maneuvers of the parties and the men of the bourgeoisie."

Even though it is not the product of a clear perception of the tasks ahead, but is the result of a stalemate between conflicting forces within the party, the determination of the SP to "go it alone" is unquestionably a positive development. Much of the party may have taken this step in spite of itself, but the left wing could well turn it to its advantage and make it the starting point of a policy of socialist independence.

In its effort to do so, it is likely to meet strong resistance, within the party and outside of it, from people who should be closest to it. Since everybody on the left is agreed that alliances with bourgeois parties are to be

rejected in any event, the source of confusion is, here again, the question of the Popular Front, that is, of relations with the Stalinists.

Already at the congress, the section of the left wing which supports the policies of the "New Left" (led by Lucien Weitz and Jean Riès) put forward a motion favoring collaboration with the CP. The SP's rejection of such collaboration also roused the ire of Claude Bourdet in *France-Observateur*. His arguments should be examined closely, since they are common in circles that should be won over to an independent socialist policy.

In short, the argument is this: There are two possible majorities in the Assembly: a "Popular Front" majority, based on the SP and the CP, with miscellaneous support from bourgeois liberals; or else some right-wing combination, either "old-fashioned" without Mendès-France or "modern" with Mendès-France. If the reactionary trend of French politics is to be reversed, the argument proceeds, only a "Popular Front" government can do it. Only such a government can liberate the colonies, raise the living standard of the working class, follow an independent foreign policy, etc.

There are two variations of this argument: the above, which is put forward by the New Left, and the version advocating a united SP-CP government, put forward by the (Trotskyist) PCI. This latter version assumes that such a "class government" would be carried to power by a militant mass movement, and would apply a more radical program than the traditional type of "Popular Front" government which also includes bourgeois elements. Eventually the workers would see that even this program is not radical enough and that the SP and CP leaders are betraying them, so they would make the revolution and kick the SP-CP government out.

Role of the CP

Underlying both versions is, of course, the assumption that the CP is in some sense a progressive organization. We have explained often enough why, in our view, this is not so.

We have also predicted that the irreconcilable interests of the bureaucratic leadership of the CP and of its working-class base would eventually clash and lead to a crisis of this organization. This prediction has been fully borne out by the facts: the roots of the current crisis in the CP are to be sought in this conflict.

And now we ask: What is this government that would be based on the CP and the SP? What would be its real program, not the one its anticipating supporters from the New Left (version 1) or from the PCI (version 2) would like it to have?

Let us examine the role of the CP which, in the imagination of its supporters, should be the dynamic element of this "Popular Front" to come.

What evidence is there to suggest that it would support the liberation of the colonies?

Right now, in the whole of North Africa, the Stalinist movements are bitterly opposing the nationalist parties and their struggle for liberation. In France, the CP's theory that Algeria is not yet a nation has served as a rationale for its systematic struggle against the nationalist MTLD. The motivation, here as always, is the fear of any progressive mass movement it can't control.

This fear also exists in France. The current strike wave, which led to violent outbreaks in shipbuilding (St. Nazaire and Nantes), in steel (Homecourt, Commentary), and in auto (Citroen in Paris) is one which is taking place outside of CP and CGT control—in fact, outside of any bureaucratic control. As the crisis in the CP is deepening, it is less and less in a position to take control of such movements. Nor will it support any developments that endanger its hold on its base, on the CGT or on what little influence it has left in the colonies. On the contrary: as it weakens, the CP will be driven more and more to oppose such movements in practice, while supporting them verbally—the sabotage of the August strikes in 1953 were a typical example of this process.

Nobody in the New Left, and much less in the PCI, has the naiveté to assume that the reactionary stranglehold on French politics could be broken otherwise than by the impact of a mass movement of major proportions. Yet, theoretical insight as well as practical experience shows that the CP can be "dynamic" only in the face of a government inspired by crassest social reaction and at a time when the working class itself is passive. When the working class is in motion, the CP can only be a brake and an obstacle to progressive developments: the governments of 1936 and of 1945 are classical examples in this respect.

No Alliance with Stalinists

In view of these facts, the pretension of some elements in the New Left to "harness the CP to a policy of socialist independence" is a tragic sign of political indigence.

Not only can the CP maintain its strength only against a government of reaction, but the reverse is also true: its very existence as the representative party of the working class favors and strengthens bourgeois reaction, by "freezing" the militant energies of the workers it represents.

The folly of wanting to set the social forces in motion with the help of the CP is illustrated by the case of Italy. There we have in Nenni's PSI the type of

"New Left" Gilles Martinet would like to see in France. Has its alliance with the CP broken the deadlock in Italian politics? Far from it; it is one of the causes of this deadlock. It has prevented the rise of a militant socialist movement; it has aggravated the paralysis of the CGIL (trade-union federation); it has made any alliance with the left wing of Christian-Democracy impossible. The PSI will become an active factor in politics only when it breaks its ties with the CP and forms a front of socialist independence with the PSDI (Saragat socialists), the USI (Independent Socialist Union) and Unità Popolare, as the USI has been advocating for over a year now.

If additional proof were needed, let us consider the countries where the labor movement is NOT stagnating. Which are the countries where bourgeois reaction does NOT have a stranglehold on political life? In Western Europe we have England and Germany, i.e., countries where a socialist proletariat finds the possibility, within the looser framework of social-democratic parties and unions, to engage in independent struggles.

In France, the movement that came nearest to these struggles was, of course, the August strikes, and it had to be fought also against the leadership of the CP. Because it had not yet created its own leadership, the French working class was deprived of the gains this strike could have produced. In Italy, where the CP is strongest, the working class has remained passive, and its efforts have been wasted, on the trade-union as well as on the political level.

Wherever the CP is strong, its crisis has spread to the trade-union movement: the French CGT leadership is losing influence in its own unions, the Italian CGIL is suffering one defeat after another, which could have been avoided by the existence within it of a socialist opposition led by an independent PSI.

It is true that a hypothetical "Popular Front" government could break away from the subservience to U. S. policy that has characterized French foreign policy since the end of the war. This is a field where the interests of the Stalinist bureaucracy and of the French working class coincide—but only for a fleeting moment.

For after the break, what? Only an "active neutrality," based on a policy of socialist independence, could provide a solid and progressive alternative to the present policy. A "Popular Front" government could not pursue such a policy. By its nature, it would be the political expression of a stalemate between Russian and U. S. influences, and therefore remain passive and impotent.

For all these reasons, we reject an alliance in France between the CP and the socialist labor movement. Having rejected such an alliance (versions 1 and 2) we must look for a genuinely progressive solution.

In the Assembly, no important progressive coalitions are possible at the present time. In the country, the forces that will impose a progressive solution are present, but as yet disorganized and not fully conscious of their own aims. They are present in the four media trade-union groups (CGT, FO, CFTC and Autonomous), in the CP, in the SP and in the independent left. The problem before independent socialists is to help to accelerate the crystallization of these forces that will lead to a new political expression of the working class.

A Task for the Left

As far as the CP is concerned, the task is clear: its influence over the working-class, and over the CGT in particular, must be broken. Its current crisis and the appearance of a "Martyist" left (following André Marty) within it have contributed to create a favorable situation for the growth of socialist consciousness.

In the case of the SP, the power of its heavy-handed bureaucracy, based on the large, right-wing federations, must be neutralized. In order to do this, it is necessary to keep the party as much as possible on an independent course. In this task, the left wing is aided by the conflict of tendencies within the party, to whom an independent position may appear, at the present time, as a neutral middle ground. Also the SP has discovered that opposition pays, specifically in the shape of an advance in the recent cantonal elections and, for the first time since 1946, a slight increase in membership.

In each of the non-Stalinist trade-unions, there are minorities that all share, in various ways, an aspiration to greater militancy and independence. The urgent task is to coordinate their efforts, and to elaborate a common political platform.

The New Left could occupy a key position in this process of coordination. Along with its weaknesses, it has a few very important advantages which are common to new organizations. For one thing, it is not burdened by an iron-fisted bureaucracy; for another, it is not closely identified with any particular tradition, being a coalition of tendencies with widely divergent backgrounds. Therefore it would lend itself very well as a coordinating center of a much wider "New Left" which could also include or influence the SP left wing, oppositional tendencies in the CP and the CGT, the trade-union minorities, minor formations like the PCI, etc.

Whether it will so act or not is unfortunately far from certain. In order to be a link, an organization has to know what it is linking and for what purpose. This is not clear at the present time, and as we pointed out before, the New Left has been content to be all things to all men.

For the strong Stalinist element within it, it is a bridge from the CP to the middle class; for others, it is a bridge between the SP and the CP; for a few, it is a future proletarian party of socialist independence. Yet even those have so far lacked the courage to break with the chimera of the "Popular Front." This break, however, is the necessary condition for any clarification that would clear the way for the French working class to finally take its destinies in its own hands.

But is such a policy not rather a long-term proposition? It probably is. But so is socialism, and the pioneers of the French labor movement did not feel that it was their most urgent task to form the next government. Although the problems before the French left may seem more pressing today, they cannot be solved in a progressive sense outside the framework of an independent socialist policy.

Press Charges in ISL Case — —

(Continued from page 1)

ternational working class, Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, V. I. Lenin and Leon Trotsky. Marx and Engels laid the foundations of the scientific socialist movement a hundred years ago. Their analysis of capitalist society has never been successfully refuted. The principles they set forth for the working class struggle to achieve socialism have passed the most critical tests a hundred times over. Lenin and Trotsky applied the analysis of Marx and Engels to modern capitalism, strengthened the fundamental principles of scientific socialism, and successfully applied them in the great Russian Bolshevik Revolution.

"The Workers Party is called a Marxist, or Leninist, or Trotskyist, or Bolshevik party. These names are quite applicable. They merely signify that the Workers Party stands firmly on the basic principles of the greatest teachers in the history of the working class.

"(The name 'Bolshevik' is used by the capitalist press like the word 'red'—to scare little children. In itself, 'Bolshevik' is simply a Russian word meaning 'a member of the majority.' It was the name given to those who supported the majority in the split that took place in the Russian socialist movement in 1903. Politically, of course, it means a socialist who stands solidly for the principles of Karl Marx, and of Lenin, who was the leader of the majority in the split.)

PARTY HISTORY

"The Workers Party was formed as an independent organization in 1940. But its roots reach much further back. Many of its members and leaders belonged to the Communist Party from its earliest years, when it was still a revolutionary socialist movement standing on the principles of Marx and Lenin. These members continued to defend the same principles as put forward by Leon Trotsky and other Russian revolutionists after the death of Lenin and the beginning of the decline of the Russian Revolution. For upholding these views, they were expelled from the party by the leadership which followed the policies and instructions of the Stalinist bureaucracy. The formation of a separate organization, generally called the Trotskyist group, followed. This group won to itself many working class militants, including those of the American Workers Party, who merged with it in 1934, and many members of the Socialist Party and the Young People's Socialist League, who joined in 1936.

"In 1939, with the outbreak of the war, a sharp dispute took place in the Trotskyist movement, organized under the name of the Socialist Workers Party. Many members opposed the policy of supporting Stalinist Russia in the war, on the ground that it was part and parcel of one of the imperialist camps, was itself engaged in imperialist conquest and therefore should not be supported by the working class and revolutionary socialists. The bureaucratism prevailing in the party was also opposed by these members. The dispute came to a head in 1940, when the leaders and members of the opposition were arbitrarily ousted from the party by the bureaucratic majority, thus precipitating an open split. The result was the formation of the Workers Party on a national scale.

"As a Marxist organization, the Workers Party champions the idea of *revolutionary workers' power as the road to socialism.*

"The word 'revolution' brings forth a storm of abuse from the capitalist class. Revolution? Why, that means violence, bloodshed, killing, destruction! No, anything you want in the world—but not revolution!

WHAT IS REVOLUTION?

"Its indignation at revolution and violence is the height of hypocrisy. In the first place, the capitalist class came to power in society and destroyed feudalism in a number of modern countries by means of a revolution, and not a very peaceful one. What its spokesmen mean, of course, is that a revolution that brought it to power was a good, progressive, respectable revolution; whereas a revolution that *relieves it of its power* is the very work of the devil. In the second place, the capitalist class could not exist for a minute without the violence that it exercises against the masses. Its exploitation of the masses is based on the forcible maintenance of its property by the armed state machinery. Its exploitation of millions of backward, colonial peoples is maintained by the most gruesome violence. And periodically, it plunges innocent millions all over the world into the most violent wars until the surface of the earth is covered with bloody and shattered corpses. A fine picture it presents, whining piously about revolution and violence!

"What is a social revolution? It is the replacement of one ruling class by another. History is filled with such revolutions and in almost every case they made possible the progress of society. The socialist revolution is simply the overthrow of capitalist despotism and the establishment of workers' rule.

"Will this overthrow, this revolution, be accomplished by violence or can it be achieved peaceably? Reform socialists say that socialism can be established by the workers gaining a majority of the votes for their candidates to public office. Once they have been elected in sufficient number, they will adopt laws introducing socialism little by little and painlessly. These are not genuine socialists, but utopian reformists. They create illusions that are fatal to the working class.

"The Workers Party holds a radically different point of view. It is of course in favor of the workers participating in elections to all public offices and trying to win the largest number of votes for the socialist program. But it knows the nature of the capitalist class and its long, brutal history, some of which is known to every worker."

SECOND EXHIBIT

The government then sought to skip a number of paragraphs, and jump to the following excerpt (p. 142-3):

"The revolutionary socialists are not bloodthirsty maniacs, as the capitalist slanderers would have workers believe. They analyze society and politics scientifically. They understand what the ruling class will try to do. They know that history proves that no privileged class has ever been removed from domination without the bitterest resistance. They therefore warn the workers and prepare them, so that when the time comes for the workers to take power, it will be done with a minimum of violence, a minimum of bloodshed, a minimum of disorder and destruction. A socialist would indeed have to be insane to want bloodshed and destruction when his aim is an orderly society!

"The Workers Party therefore differs from the other parties in its conception of the road to workers' power and socialism."

WHAT THEY SKIPPED

At this point, Attorney Rauh jumped up, denounced the government lawyers for trying to pull a "cheesy trick," and demanded that the government be forced to read the passages it had sought to omit from the quotation into the record. As far as this observer can recall, this was the only motion on which Hearing Examiner Morrissey sustained the ISL's attorney in a day and a half of sessions in which dozens of motions were made. The government was thus compelled also to read the following into the record (p. 141-2), as the passage which links the two quoted above:

"When the workers ask for a modest raise in wages, the capitalists fight against it as hard as they can. When workers strike for the most modest improvement in their conditions, the capitalists do not hesitate to use violence against them, in the form of the armed forces of their government or of hired thugs and strikebreakers.

"If that is how the capitalists act when only a little fraction of their profits is at stake, how will they act if all their social power is in peril? It stands to reason, and bloody experiences in many countries confirm it, that the capitalists will not hold back from every conceivable form of violence against the working class when it is about to take power and even after it has taken it. They do not care about who has the majority. They are concerned only with the preservation of their profits and power. If the armed forces of the government are not enough to suppress the workers by violence, they will arm their private bands, the fascists, to do that job for them. They are the source from which violence and bloodshed are threatened.

"The Workers Party therefore says: If the violence and shedding of blood are to be averted or reduced to the tiniest proportions when the workers have the support of the people and are ready to take power, they must be so well trained, so well organized, so well equipped with a bold program and a bold, firm leadership, as to make the violent attacks of capitalist reaction hopeless from the very outset. If the workers realize in advance that the reactionaries will try to cheat them out of victory by force and violence and by suppressing democratic rights; and if the workers are determined in advance to defend these rights and to deal firmly with the reactionaries—violence will be reduced to zero, or next to zero.

"But suppose the workers are completely unprepared for the violence of the capitalist reactionaries and fascists, because they are doped with illusions about how meekly they will submit to the will of the people. Suppose the workers believe that everything will be perfectly all right as soon as they show that they have fifty-one per cent of the votes, and that the capitalist beast of prey thinks more of democracy than he does of his loot and power. The beast would then catch them unawares. It would drown them in a sea of blood, as it did once in Finland, and again in Hungary, Italy, Germany, Austria and Spain. It is the ideas of the reformists that lead the defenseless, unprepared workers to a blood bath and defeat."

WHAT'S IT PROVE?

The importance of the inclusion of the paragraphs quoted above as an integral part of the whole passage is clear. In these passages Comrade Shachtman had emphasized that from long experience revolutionary socialists realize that unless the working class is prepared in advance to defend its democratic political victory against the force and violence of the bourgeois minority which may seek to rob it of the fruits of its victory, both the workers' movement and democracy itself may be crushed; that the workers must be prepared to defend democracy and eventually their democratically won governmental power against force and violence.

Even without the deletion which the government attorneys were compelled to read into the record, it is difficult to say at the present time just what they hope to prove by the passages they quoted. This exhibit was introduced without any explanation of what it is supposed to prove.

Attorney Rauh protested its acceptance by the hearing examiner as an exhibit not on the ground that it fails to represent the views of the ISL correctly (the ISL is proud of the views expressed in the quoted passages, he said), but on the ground that since the government has failed to define its terms or to state its theory of the case, there is no way for the hearing examiner to judge the

relevance of these passages, if any, to the inclusion of the ISL on the "subversive list."

Some time will now elapse before the hearing is resumed. No one can tell whether the attorney general will seek to correct the legally damaging record of the hearing as it now stands by appointing a new examiner and instructing him and his attorneys to conform to the minimum procedural requirements of a fair and impartial hearing. But what is evident is that a long, stubborn and costly fight lies ahead for the ISL and for all who feel that a basic civil-liberties issue is involved in its fight against the "subversive list."

The hearing is recessed, but the fight itself cannot be recessed. Everyone who supports the principle of the ISL's struggle should utilize the coming weeks to spread the news of the case to wider circles and to gain their moral and financial support. The new committee set up by the WDL for this purpose will give supporters of the case widened opportunities in which to do this. They must and will be used to the full.

Young Socialist CHALLENGE

(Continued from page 5)

years of the Republic. All of these young people are products of the regime's educational centers, and their attitude indubitably reveals the evolution of the middle classes.

Many of these politically awakened students maintain contact with labor and farmer circles, and, should the opportunity arise, would collaborate effectively with them.

REVEAL COURAGE

In spite of the shackles of the censor, this new democratic consciousness manages to express itself occasionally in print. We have read professions of anti-totalitarian faith of extraordinary courage in the student review *Alcalá*, and in the youth reviews of Barcelona such as *Laye* and *El Ciervo*. The former, a predominantly lay publication, incurred the ire of the Director General of the Press because of its independence; but before being banned it published one last issue with the famous phrase of Garcilaso, "Sufriendo aquello que decir no puedo" ("Suffering from that of which I may not speak") printed on its cover, edged in black as though in mourning. The other review, *El Ciervo*, is published by a group of Christian-Democrats, and has termed the present situation in Spain "putrefied peace." *El Ciervo* sallied forth in defense of Unamuno against the Bishop of the Canaries, and, in its unrelenting attack on McCarthyism, it indirectly achieved a sharp criticism of the Franco regime.

When one considers the difficulties of organization, the practical impossibility of effecting any overt propaganda which is not that of the regime and the complete lack of economic aid from the exterior, one can not but admit that the qualities of resolution and courage revealed by these youth groups are promising.

Read the
NEW INTERNATIONAL
America's leading Marxist review

A New Collection!

MARX AND ENGELS ON BRITAIN

Contains the whole of Engels' *Condition of the Working Class in England* in addition to dozens of their articles and letters. 538 pages—fully indexed—hard-cover—fine binding—but only \$2.50! All orders must be accompanied by payment.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

Letter from Attorney General

OFFICE OF THE
ATTORNEY GENERAL
Washington, D. C.

July 30, 1955

MESSRS. JOSEPH E. RAUH, JR.
AND ISAAC M. GRONER
1631 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C.

In the Matter of the Designation of Workers Party, Independent Socialist League, Socialist Youth League Pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450.

Dear Sirs:

This is to acknowledge your telegram to me of July 26, 1955, with respect to the above-captioned matter.

I do not consider it appropriate to discuss with you, through a representative or otherwise, whether amendment of Executive Order No. 10450 is contemplated. I, therefore, must reject your request for such a discussion.

Your telegram "respectfully requests" that I remove Mr. Edward M. Morrissey as hearing examiner in this matter. If you file with me, in good faith and within five days (excluding Saturdays and Sundays) of the receipt of this letter, an

affidavit of personal bias or disqualification of Mr. Morrissey, I shall determine the matter. You may if you wish, file a memorandum in support of the affidavit at the same time you file the affidavit. In the event you file the affidavit, I shall extend a similar length of time from its receipt by this Department to the attorneys conducting the proceeding for the Department to file a memorandum in opposition if they care to do so. During the course of the consideration of the affidavit, if you decide to file it, I shall determine whether it is appropriate for me to investigate personally any charges contained therein, and also whether it is appropriate to do so through an independent officer of the Department of Justice, and whether a hearing or consultation with you is necessary.

I am sending copies of this letter to Mr. Waterman and Mr. Morrissey and requesting that it be made a part of the record in the proceeding. I suggest that you discuss with them whether the hearing should proceed pending disposition of the question of disqualification or whether it should be continued until that time.

/s/ HERBERT BROWNELL, JR.
Attorney General