

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

SEPTEMBER 19, 1955

FIVE CENTS

SPOTLIGHT

French Reservists Mutiny

Four hundred members of the French Air Force reserve, called up for duty in North Africa, have mutinied and refused to board the train which was to take them from Paris to Marseilles.

The reservists had been gathered at the *Gare de Lyon* in Paris two hours before train-time. They shouted "We don't want to go; let the civilians go with us," and "Morocco for the Moroccans," and resisted efforts of Air Force police to shove them into the train.

Later the Air Ministry denied that leaders of the resisting reservists had been arrested, and stated that the whole group had been flown to Morocco. The Ministry said that "a few hot-heads" had pulled the emergency cords on the train, and that was the only reason the reservists had not been entrained and shipped off as per schedule.

Just what the "hot-heads" were hot about, the Ministry refrained from stating.

Bulgarians Arrested

A Reuters dispatch from Vienna claims that fifty army officers have been arrested by the Bulgarian Stalinist government for advocating a close military alliance with Yugoslavia.

It may be recalled that shortly before Giorgi Dimitrov died under suspicious circumstances in Moscow, he had fallen into disfavor for advocating close Bulgarian-Yugoslav ties, aimed at an eventual Balkan federation. Dimitrov, former head of the Communist International, and first Stalinist prime minister of

Bulgaria, was denounced for this proposal even though it was made long before Tito broke with Moscow. It is evident that the Kremlin regarded the possibility of a Balkan federation as a potential danger to the unquestioned domination of the Balkan satellites by Moscow.

The idea of a Balkan, or alternatively, a Danubian federation, has always found support in some Bulgarian political circles both under the old monarchy and under Stalinist rule. If the story of the arrests in Sofia and the reason for them is accurate, it would appear that the resurrection of the idea of an alliance with Tito is a direct result of the "reconciliation" between Moscow and Belgrade highlighted by the recent visit of the top Russian Stalinists to Marshal Tito.

There may be a "thaw" behind the iron curtain. But anyone who loosens his muffler with the idea that the time has come to take a few deep breaths of free air may find it has been quickly replaced by a halter.

What's in a Headline?

A headline in the September 13 New York Times made us sit up and take notice. Standing next to a picture of Professor Sidney Hook of New York University, the headline read: "World is Warned on Security Lure—Social Scientists in Milan Told Sacrificing Freedoms Will Not Assure Survival."

Sidney Hook has become famous in recent years for his defense of the "security" witchhunt in this country; for his

(Continued on page 4)

Left Wing Puts Up Stiff Fight At British Trade Union Congress

... page 3

IRA Raids and Irish Partition

... page 4

YSL Convention Shows Gains

... page 5

Att'y Gen'l's New Step in 'Subversive List' Hearing:

Brownell Decides to Retain Biased Judge on ISL Case

Attorney General Herbert Brownell Jr. has issued a "Memorandum and Order" denying the Independent Socialist League's appeal for the disqualification of Hearing Examiner Edward M. Morrissey on grounds of personal prejudice and bias in the Department of Justice hearing on the inclusion of the ISL on the "subversive list."

Brownell argued that the ISL's attorneys, Joseph L. Rauh Jr. and Isaac N. Groner, had failed to prove "personal bias and prejudice" in the restricted sense these terms have in legal proceedings. In his "Memorandum and Order" he went on to recognize, however, that the ISL's attorneys had, in addition to claiming bias and prejudice by the examiner, attacked the whole manner in which the hearing was being conducted.

"The memorandum filed by counsel for the organizations," Brownell wrote, "shows that basically they are of the view that the organizations cannot be afforded what they consider a fair hearing unless the rulings they requested are granted, and that dissatisfaction with the effect of the rulings of the examiner rather than his bias or hostility is the real basis for their complaint. No position is taken here on the correctness or incorrectness of the rulings. They will ultimately be reviewed at the proper time in an orderly manner. . . ."

In effect, what Brownell appears to be saying is that even if the rulings make a fair hearing impossible, nothing will be done about it at the present time. The ISL and its attorneys will be put to the expense and effort of going through with a hearing which is conducted in such a way as to preclude a fair and impartial finding. After it is all over, if the attorney general agrees that the rulings were

For the full text of Attorney General Brownell's "Memorandum and Order," turn to page 8.

"incorrect," the organizations, which have been waiting for eight years for a hearing, might be compelled to go through with the whole business again under "correct" rulings.

Brownell's reference to this matter is in response to the memorandum filed by Rauh and Groner with their affidavit of personal bias and prejudice. In this memorandum they had written:

"What is at stake here is . . . the fundamental question of the type of hearing to be accorded the organizations. . . . If all the Attorney General means when he states publicly that he will grant hearings to designated organizations is that the government will put into the record all the material it considers relevant and then the organizations can do likewise, all without standards of judgment, clear charges, rules of relevancy, etc., then there can be no fair hearing whether or not the examiner is disqualified. We have no doubt that if this is the type of hearing

(Turn to last page)

The Stage is Set for a Major Political Crisis as

NEW STRIKE WAVE ROCKS FRANCE

By ANDRE GIACOMETTI

PARIS, Sept. 5—In recent months, a series of strikes have broken out in the French metal industry. These strikes have introduced new elements into the pattern of labor action that began to take shape in August 1953. They are symptoms of a social climate, tactical experiments and steps toward independent working-class action. To be fully understood, their significance should be considered within the social context of the last few years.

Since the end of the war, the French labor movement has gone through several stages, slowly but steadily acquiring greater freedom of action. The revolutionary wave that followed the collapse of fascism was largely channelled into the Stalinist organizations. Under Stalinist leadership, it was diverted from its original aims and finally broken. The collaboration of Russia with the Western bourgeoisie and the participation of the French Communist Party in the government from 1944 to 1947 compelled the Stalinists to oppose the workers' demands with slogans such as: "The general strike is the class weapon of the trusts" or "First produce, then demand," and with physical violence when the slogans failed to convince.

In 1947 the growing tension between the United States and Russia made it impossible for the French bourgeoisie and for its Stalinist allies to continue col-

laboration. The shattering of the government coalition opened the aggressive phase of the cold war in France. To meet increasing government pressure, the CP used its control over the mass-organizations to launch a series of violent political strikes, which became an integral part of the Stalinist offensive internationally.

Within a short time, this policy led to a widespread passive resistance by the workers, who felt that the struggles initiated by the Stalinist bureaucracy under its own program did not concern them. However, an alternative leadership did not emerge. The labor movement was still too disorganized from the war to rise to a sufficiently clear consciousness of its role and to overcome the polarization in its midst between pro-Russian and pro-U. S. bureaucracies. The *Force Ouvrier* split was nothing more than a by-product of the polarization, and therefore could not lead to a genuine revival of the labor movement. Any assertion of independent class aims, such as attempted by the Confederation of Autonomous Unions, had to remain limited in a thoroughly unfavorable social and political climate. On the political level analogous attempts, such as the RDR², ended in confusion and failure.

Instead, the reaction against the Stalinist bureaucracy took the form of a general withdrawal from the political and trade-union movement. The drop in influence and membership hit both the CP and the CGT, but it hit the political movement hardest. Those remaining in the organizations became increasingly passive. The low point of Stalinist influence was reached in 1952, when CP and CGT³ proved incapable of mo-

bilizing the bulk of their cadres in the Paris region against "Ridgway la peste." The last of the great political demonstrations ended in a complete fiasco.

The reformist organizations were not spared by the anti-bureaucratic reaction. On the contrary. The decline of the Socialist Party was much sharper than the loss of strength of the Stalinist party, and FO would have certainly collapsed without the iron lung of massive AFL-CIO subsidies.

Quite naturally, no large-scale struggles were possible in this period. Not that there were no reasons to strike. Living standards dropped along with the decline in real wages, and exploitation on the job was continuously intensified by speed-up, higher norms, etc. But any improvement could only be obtained by nation-wide and industry-wide action, i.e., by general strikes. This kind of action could not remain confined to the economic level. It would have meant a showdown with the government. In the thick of the cold war, the working-class was not prepared for such a showdown. On the one hand, FO and CFTC⁴ were bound to take a pro-government attitude. On the other hand, even on the local level, the absence of any alternative leadership to the CP would cause all strikes to be diverted to the political benefit of the CP alone and to be integrated into the international propaganda struggle of Stalinism. As a result, the strikes in this period remained local, limited and largely ineffective. They reflected the ambivalent and reserved attitude of the workers toward their unions: they would strike but then, instead of supporting

(Continued on page 8)

Bureaucratic Meddling or Gangster Control?

Dock Workers Strike Against Gov't Board

By BEN HALL

New York docks were shut down by a strike of longshoremen that began on September 7 and spread until virtually all cargo movement halted. The International Longshoremen's Association officially did not call the strike; it began without a public signal from above, but there is no doubt that ILA top officials were inhibited only by the terms of an old injunction that forbade them from interfering with the function of the Waterfront Commission. Dock workers have struck many times; their struggles usually began from below and continued against the will of their racketeering leaders or forced them to come along. This is the first time in recent years that the top ILA officials seem so firmly at the helm. Yet, this is the same unpurged leadership that was expelled from the AFL; the same group of gangs that was repudiated by almost half the port's workers when the ILA squeaked through an NLRB election by a narrow 150 votes.

The ILA machine was on the run. If it now emerges, at least momentarily, in solid control it is the fruit of a 2-year rule by the Waterfront Commission.

The strike is presumably not official, it has no official demands. But it is clearly an outbreak against the Commission. This 2-man body was set up by the New York and New Jersey governments to control the piers; to dominate hiring; to register and police longshoremen, denying or granting the right to work as it saw fit. It was an attempt to handle racketeering by imposing arbitrary governmental domination. It failed to end racketeering. It succeeded in driving longshoremen back to their racketeering officials.

Joseph Weintraub, one of the two commissioners, announced: "I believe the mass of the longshoremen wants no part of this illegal strike. If free to choose, the men would go back to work." He and other apologists for the Commission ascribe the strike to terrorism and the response of the work-

ers to fear. It was reported, too, that at a local meeting in Newark, when one worker asked "What are the principles for which we are going out," the first reply was a punch in the nose. Then, Teddy Gleason, ILA official, said: "Now I'll answer the question. The principles are these: you go home and you don't work. We don't want you guys asking questions."

But the mass of longshoremen rally to the strike. The New York Times reported that the men "attended mass meetings, wildly cheered their leaders and called vociferously on the Waterfront Commission to mend its ways. . . . At other meetings, Captain Bradley [ILA president] was unquestionably a hero. . . . The attitude of the rank and file union man during . . . two meetings and at another one in Brooklyn, appeared to refute the conviction of the Waterfront Commission that the average longshoreman was opposed to the strike."

The Commission, so far, has issued work permits to 31,000 men. It has denied them to 634 men who presumably had criminal records. Another 815 men received only temporary permits. But, while hundreds of men are thrown out of work presumably to keep criminals off the waterfront, the real ILA leaders and racketeers need no permits. They are entrenched in union machinery and are

not dislodged by government decree. But the ordinary worker begins to feel uneasy at the intrusion of government bureaucrats. The Commission makes its public display of sanctimonious zeal. The gangs continue.

As the recent crisis mounted, Stanley Levey wrote in the New York Times: "Longshoremen resent the supervision of the agency's representatives whom they regard as outsiders and spies; they dislike the formality and impersonality of the commission's hiring centers; they are enraged by subpoenas and official procedures and they are suspicious of the legal papers and language that attend so many commission doings. They regard the agency and its officials as aloof, remote and lacking in social-consciousness. Some of them believe the body to be anti-union and out to 'bust' the ILA."

BLIND ALLEY

Everyone who is aware of the facts of life knows how quickly government controls tend to degenerate into arbitrary officiousness; how maddening and infuriating the cold working of state bureaucrats can become. We need know little more to understand the fury of the ordinary longshoreman who comes up against the wall of red tape, and to sympathize with his determination to free himself from such supervision. Yet, not one prominent person shows concern for his grievances. The courts reply to the strike by a simple injunction: an ultimatum to return to work by 4 P.M. on September 12. New York Governor Harriman refuses to meet with an ILA committee to discuss grievances against the Commission. New Jersey Governor Meyner, in turning down a simple request for a hearing, announced that he would not "knuckle under to any group" by meeting with them.

Rank and file longshoremen have been driven to a blind alley. Everything has conspired to turn the issue of the strike into these alternatives: control of the piers and of hiring by racketeers of the ILA or by government bureaucrats of the Waterfront Commission. While the ranks are hostile to government controls, a sentiment that should be shared by democrats, the press and politicians admonish them to bow to the Commission. The government snoop is proffered as the only alternative to the corrupt officials. No wonder they cling to the evil they have!

GANG MOTIVES

If the ranks are goaded by a justified hatred of spies and dossierers and a resentment against second-class citizenship status, the top ILA rulers are motivated by different considerations. The gangs, too, are engaged in a war against the Waterfront Commission. They are eager to control the piers and to dominate hiring in order to make the rackets safe; safe, not only from the Commission but, above all, from the rival AFL union, the International Brotherhood of Longshoremen, which almost drove them off the piers a year ago. For the first time, ILA officials sought and won a closed shop after the fight with the IBL, not as a measure to defend unionism from employers but to protect racketeering from those in the AFL who would move against it.

The ILA machine would be doomed but for its links with powerful forces inside the AFL. It just concluded a long term mutual assistance pact with the Teamsters Union. Dave Beck negotiated to take them directly under his protective wing as an International Brotherhood of Teamsters affiliate. But the plan fell through when George Meany, AFL president, hinted that he would take steps to expell the Teamsters from the Federation if such a deal were concluded. The "pact" was a device for escaping AFL sanctions. At one strike rally, Anthony Anastasia, Brooklyn ILA boss, reported the pact to his men and said: "Some day, Dack Beck will be the leader of the labor movement in the United States."

Longshoremen went on strike because they want equal status and freedom from control by government bureaus. Tragically, their fight has thrown them into the arms of racketeering leaders outside the AFL and into an alliance with the most backward sections within it.

New York longshoremen imperatively need leadership from the labor movement in a fight for unionism free of both racketeering and government interference.

ARGENTINA

Peron Still Faces Civil War Threat

By JUAN REY

SANTIAGO, Sept. 7—A new blow has been aimed against Juan Domingo Peron: a bomb thrown from an unidentified auto exploded at the window of Peron's office in the government house, this time without effect.

But the attempt signifies that, after the civil war and the fight between the army and navy, the situation has not returned to normal and the crisis has deepened. Following the armed struggle, the people went out into the streets, publicly demonstrating their antagonism to the "tyrant." The Peronist dictatorship faces open civil resistance and the danger of a new civil war. Therefore Peron is driven to use extraordinary methods, because the situation he is in demands it.

The general demand of the Argentine people is that Peron abdicate the presidency as the prerequisite for internal peace. This is not only the demand of the opposition, but is also the cry set up by the man in the street—of course, the anti-Peronist man in the street. How has Juan Domingo answered this popular demand of the martyred Argentine people?

He "put his fate" in the hands of the Peronist CGT (the union federation), and of course the pretorian guard which leads the CGT rejected his resignation, declaring a "strike" as its act of solidarity with the dictator. In his melodramatic letter to the CGT, Peron declared civil war against the opposition and called for mass terror and individual terror against his adversaries:

"Whoever acts against authority shall be put to death by every Argentinian. The order to the Peronists is: answer violence with multifarious violence. We must establish peace and order at any price. We must re-establish it by

persuasion or, on the other hand, by clubs."

This is the way the "president of all Argentinians" spoke to his countrymen and fellow citizens. Thus speaks the despotic leader to his oppressed people. Workers and freemen can hear how this criminal in power orders murder.

CRISIS DEEPENING

Does Peron's demagogy over his "resignation" and his demand for blood mean the defeat of the opposition and the victory of Juan Domingo in the civil war? Does it mean the end of the crisis? Does it signify that the army, which saved the situation for him, now absolutely controls the situation, and has given the power back to Peron and the Peronists? Does it mean that the soldiers have returned to their barracks, abandoning the streets and the country to the Peronist murderers? Does it mean that Peron has reconquered absolute control and that he is now master of the situation?

This writer thinks that all of these developments—the face of "resignation," the melodramatic letter to the CGT, the demand for blood, the intimations of a night of the long knives—are proofs of a deepening crisis, of increasing antagonisms, and of probability of continued civil war in Argentina. These evidences betray the tyrant's fear and terror, before his own people, before the resistance of the opposition, and before the bombs thrown at his offices.

For it is not at all certain that the army and navy will continue to support Peron's course of terror and murder. If the situation comes to the point where the masses of the people cannot continue to live in the old way, and the tops of society cannot continue to govern by the old methods, and the spirit of revolt permeates the old strata of generals, ministers

and bishops, as was the case in the last Argentine rebellion, then this armed rebellion may burst out again in the present situation, but at a higher and better prepared level.

On the other hand, the strength of the CGT, the Peronist party, etc. is very doubtful, as was demonstrated last July and August. The pretorians were not there when their "Beloved Leader" was in mortal danger.

Was this due to the demand of the army, or to their own incapacity to fight, or to the pressure of the neutral and anti-Peronist workers? I think the most important of these factors was the position of the working class. Therefore there is serious grounds for believing that in the future too the fighting forces of the Peronist pretorians will continue to be indecisive for the development of the situation.

The totalitarian atmosphere of hysteria and blood-demands cannot save "Justicialism" and its Leader from defeat. After this period of terror, or in its course, I rather expect that the forces of rebellion will penetrate to the high government and army offices, and, backed by the opposition in the streets, will be capable of destroying the tyranny. Peron's dictatorship is today weaker than it was before the last rebellion, in spite of all the shouting. It looks as if the time for totalitarian dictatorship is over, not only in Argentina.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, New York City

specializes in books and pamphlets on the Labor and Socialist movement, Marxism, etc., and can supply books of all publishers.

Send for our free book list.

LONDON LETTER

Left Wing Puts Up Stiff Fight at TUC Congress

By OWEN ROBERTS

SOUTHPORT, Sept. 7—The traditional British holiday month of August has ended and, as if to definitely mark its passing, this Lancashire seaside resort has said farewell to most of its holiday makers and welcomed in their place nearly one thousand trade unionists who have gathered here for the eighty-seventh Trades Union Congress. The trade unionists, delegates representing some eight million workers of the 183 trade unions affiliated to the TUC, have reached the half-way stage in their week of deliberations and so far the Congress has lived up to expectations by providing hot debates on issues of top importance to British workers.

On Sunday, the day before Congress proper began, a galaxy of Labor Party stars arrived in Southport to address a special meeting of trade union leaders. The main speaker was Hugh Gaitskell—the Party treasurer—and his objective was to encourage the trade unions to part up with more money for the Party coffers. Gaitskell did not find this job difficult and the leaders of many big unions responded in terms which leave no doubt that the extra money will be forthcoming after the necessary alterations have been made to the rules of individual unions.

The price which the Labor Party is to pay for this boost to its finance is not yet known but it is fairly certain that many of the trade union leaders—particularly those of the right wing—see the situation as one from which they can ultimately benefit by gaining an increase say on matters of party policy. Many of the trade union leaders would like to see more of their nominees adopted as Parliamentary candidates in place of the less orthodox candidates for whom the constituency Labor parties seem to show a preference. The extra money which the unions will now provide might well be used as a lever to secure this objective. Should this be the case, many of the constituency parties who are badly in need of funds might find themselves in a position where they adopt a Parliamentary candidate with whom they have little sympathy merely because they need the money in order to have a candidate at all.

The Stalinists also recognize that in the Labor Party today he who pays the piper

calls the tune. At the meeting on Sunday the Stalinist general secretary of the Electrical Trades Union attempted to turn this to the advantage of the CP. He indicated that while the ETU, which is firmly in the hands of the CP, is prepared to part with more cash for the Labor Party funds, it also wants to see an end to the bans which exclude the CP from participation in Labor Party affairs. This is very much wishful thinking for there is not the slightest possible chance that the Labor Party would relax its attitude toward the CP to encourage the Stalinist dominated unions to come across with more money. This is particularly true because the leaders of many unions, and those which really count, are only prepared to grant the cash required so long as the Stalinists are kept out of the Labor Party. Indeed, many of the unions likely to provide the extra cash would like to see a similar ban applied to the Bevanites and any other left wing tendency within the Labor Party.

ON THE BALL

The Congress itself opened on Monday with a fairly quiet session which is becoming almost a regular feature of the TUC gatherings. The first resolution to be debated received considerable publicity because it dealt with a subject very close to the heart of many British workers—football. Jimmy Guthrie, the delegate from the Association of Football Players' and Trainers' Union which has but recently affiliated to the TUC, made a slashing attack on the bosses of the sport and upon the transfer system under which players are bought and sold among the various football clubs. Him-

self a one-time football star and hero of a million homes, Guthrie received a great ovation from the delegates who agreed, with no hesitation, to his resolution which demanded that professional footballers be granted the same rights as all other workers in matters concerning contracts of employment and collective bargaining.

After this pleasant beginning the Congress got down to business proper and began debating the big issues—the first of which concerned the powers of the General Council, the top body of the TUC. Previously the rules of the TUC have specified that the General Council can only intervene in industrial disputes after negotiations between the particular unions and employers concerned. With the experience of the railway, dock and newspaper strikes of the past year behind them, the General Council proposed an amendment to this rule so that the General Council has the right to intervene if "there is a likelihood of negotiations breaking down and creating a situation in which other bodies of workpeople might be involved in a stoppage of work or have their wages, hours, and conditions of employment imperilled."

VOTE NEW POWERS

This proposal did not find favor with many of the unions who saw it as a weakening of their own powers and too great a strengthening of those of the General Council. Various trade union leaders expressed the fear that employers would exploit the rule by playing off the individual unions and the TUC against one another.

One of the hardest hitting contributions in this debate came from Bryn Roberts, general secretary of the National Union of Public Employees and for many years a fierce and vocal left wing critic of the General Council.

On this occasion Roberts supported the General Council in their plea for wider powers—but he did it in a fashion which gave them little comfort. Roberts said that the General Council needed the extra powers because it should be the spearhead of the trade union movement—but at the present it was as blunt as a bus. He also had a crack at what he called the "childish practice" of the General Council of electing as chairman the member with

the greatest number of years' service. "It should be the best man for the job," he said. This prompted one of the delegates to shout "Bryn Roberts"—a statement which was met with laughter from the hall and a bland "I agree" from Roberts himself. It must be mentioned that Roberts is not even a member of the General Council—but not for want of trying. Each year he stands for election and each year he is defeated by the massive card votes of the two big general unions which are led by men with whom Roberts is usually in violent disagreement.

When the vote was taken at the end of the debate the General Council, with the aid of Bryn Roberts, emerged as victors with a majority of 1,403,000 votes in a total tally of just under eight millions.

ANSWERS TO AUTOMATION

When the Congress later debated technological advancements in industry Bryn Roberts was once again on the rostrum—but this time in opposition to the General Council. The right wing National Union of General and Municipal Workers moved a resolution which recognized that the new developments "will be attended by new and complex human, social and economic problems." Part of the solution, as seen by the NUGMW, was "a greater measure of workers' participation in industry through the medium of joint consultation."

This did not go far enough for many trade unionists and NUPE, lead by Roberts, moved an amendment which called for plans for the extension of social ownership and, although opting for a greater measure of workers' participation, did not share the faith of the NUGMW in joint consultation as the medium. As was expected this amendment of the NUPE met with opposition from the General Council and the right wing of the Congress. The speaker for the General Council did not appreciate in the least the desire to nationalize industries which had been subjected to "technological advance" (for some reason unknown the word automation was discarded for this more highfaluting description). He wanted to know if the only industries to be nationalized were to be those which had developed technically, and if this was to be the yardstick for future nationalization. He also thought that industrialists would be frightened off capitalizing their plants if the Labor Movement talked too much about nationalization.

Supporters of the amendment expressed the contrary view and Roberts said that without including the demand for an extension of social ownership the resolution was pious and would give the workers a false sense of security. The problems of automation could not be solved by discussion and joint consultation between workers and employers but only by bringing industry under public control and so ensuring that the workers get their share of the benefits. When the vote was called the big battalions raised their cards against the amendment which was lost by 4,465,000 votes to 3,359,000—a majority of just over a million.

CLASH ON WORK-WEEK

Although those who wanted to press ahead with plans for Socialism did not win the day on this occasion their support was wider than many believed would be forthcoming and will doubtless be strengthened as the impact of automation grows in Britain.

Another big debate took place on hours of work. J. Jarvie, of the Associated Blacksmiths' Forge and Smithy Workers' Society, moved a resolution which called for an end to systematic and excessive overtime and demanded that the General Council launch an all out campaign for the 40 hour week.

The platform could not openly oppose such a resolution, for the 40 hour week has for long been part of TUC policy. Instead it said that the time was not opportune for such a campaign and, in any case, if the TUC conducted such a campaign it would be interfering with the autonomy of individual unions. This latter statement brought ironical cheers from the delegates who had previously granted the TUC extra powers. The General Council spokesman asked the Blacksmiths' union to remit the motion to the Council.

Jarvie mounted the rostrum and absolutely refused to remit the resolution. He said he was tired of hearing of issues which were acceptable in principle but the present time was inappropriate for

(Turn to last page)

POLAND Limits of the Literary Thaw Culture-Cops Push Writers Back into Line

By A. RUDZIENSKI

Ever since the occupation of Poland by Russia, writers, artists and painters have had to accept the new political reality if they wanted to continue as "cultural workers," and to live. They had to collaborate ideologically with the new "popular regime," and work for its glory. Only writers and artists in exile could continue their independent work, but they were faced with isolation from the Polish cultural environment. They were without readers and without means. Moreover, the best writers remained in the country, not having the same possibility of escaping as politicians or men with political connections. Two of the best Polish poets, Julian Tuwim and Wladyslaw Broninski returned to Poland, preferring political slavery to literary death.

The government created a special "Ministry of Culture and Arts" to "protect" the writers, painters and artists for the luster of "popular democracy." In the first period, the government could not control "intellectual production" because it did not control the political life of the country with the support of the majority of the people, or more accurately, against the opposition of that majority.

During this period, the writers, deprived for six years of the possibility of writing and publishing by the German occupation, began to write about their experiences under Nazi slavery. Some interesting books appeared. But the "comrade minister of Culture," Wladyslaw Sokorski, very quickly demanded literary production for the support of the "popular re-

gime." That is, he imposed the doctrine of "socialist realism."

The pressure of the cultural police against the poor cultural workers began to grow. During this period some of the leftist critics and litterateurs were silenced, despite their loyalty to the regime. Others, such as the poet Czeslaw Milosz, the well-known and excellent composer Andrzej Panufnik, Cracow University professor Korowicz, were forced to escape to the West. Both Milosz and Panufnik are intellectuals of the younger generation, sympathizers of the left who certainly accepted the imagination of the "popular democracy" with hope and illusions. The greatest Polish poet, Julian Tuwim, who preferred to return, wrote no important works in spite of all the favors the government conferred on him, and died during the past year.

It is interesting that the growing pressure of the party was directed primarily against the leftist writers, and not against the bourgeois collaborators. This corresponds to the political evolution of the regime from the "left" of the first period to the totalitarian right. Thus the bourgeois writers and artists, like the loyal, pro-regime Catholics, receive more tolerance and favors from the party cultural police than do the leftists.

NEW 'DEVIATORS'

This policy of cultural pressure, and the obligatory doctrine of "socialist realism" completely exhausted Polish creation in literature, the theater and painting. The flood of "literary productions" produced on order, which had to "sing" the greatness of "socialist construction" were without artistic value and interest for the readers, who preferred to find refuge in the past, in the classics of Polish literature. Thus the cultural totalitarianism of the regime ended in bankruptcy, in cultural sterility and tediousness.

Faced by its failure on the cultural front, the party has proclaimed a cultural "thaw," on the Russian model. It claims that it now wants the cultural collaboration of talented writers, and not only the execution of its orders by cultural bureaucrats.

But this new turn immediately resulted in a recurrence of a new kind of "Gomulko-usczyzna" (Gomulka-deviation), this time not on the political, but rather on the literary front. A representative of the so-called "Cracow sect," professor Chalasinski, who is a member of the Academy of Sciences and the editor of the *Philosophic Review*, proclaimed that the "Polish revolution" is different from the Russian, and hence cultural creation is condemned to death without metaphysical and spiritual values. Even after he had been officially condemned by the "Nowe Drogi" (New Ways), he repeated his heresy, this time to affirm that "Marxism must be supplied with a metaphysic, if it is to speak to the heart and imagination."

Chalasinski is a fellow-traveller. But the leftist critics, Kott, Mach and others have been silenced by the bureaucratic pressure, as were the writer Jastrun and the poet Przybos, the last named fighting audaciously in the defense of his right to write in his own way, and hence in defense of the formal values of poetry.

Thus the thaw in culture is very relative and limited, and the life of the cultural workers, and real, independent artists is not easy in Poland, any more than it is in Russia.

Even if one cannot deny the merits of the regime in the popularization of culture among the masses, the cultural police has led to exhaustion and sterility in the realm of artistic and cultural creation. It is high time indeed for a cultural thaw, but this is impossible without the abolition of the police government.

BEHIND THE IRA'S COMMANDO RAIDS

FESTERING SORE: THE PARTITION OF IRELAND

By M. M.

Dublin, Aug. 24

The Irish and English papers in the last few weeks have featured the Irish Republican Army's raids on British military installations as precursors of an all-out campaign to focus world attention on the continued partition of Ireland by Britain.

The raid on Arborfield Barracks in Berkshire, England, by IRA commandos, and the removal of thousands of rounds of ammunition and a quantity of machine guns threw the British security forces into a state of nerves. Military and police activity recalled the 1939-41 bomb campaign by the IRA in English cities which culminated in hangings and prison sentences for IRA activists.

Petty bourgeois and fringed with fascists, the leadership of the IRA and Sinn Fein (its political mouthpiece) is a conspiratorial cloak and dagger sect. Its basic approach to national unity is emotional and hysterical. It proclaims that its mission is "preordained" and "holy" by virtue of its opposition to British imperialism. But it lacks an elementary understanding of the international role of imperialism in general, and is wholly out of touch with the social and national struggles of other colonial peoples.

The commando-like raids in Britain, were preceded by two attacks across the border into Northern Ireland. But the problem of being confronted by armed fellow-Irishmen of the British army garrison in Northern Ireland was a propaganda difficulty unlikely to be encountered by attacks in Britain proper. Also in Britain, the Irish, northern and southern, enjoy the same rights as British subjects and among the millions of emigrant Irish in Britain the IRA finds a fruitful field for sympathizers and recruits in the very heart of "enemy" territory. Repressive police measures against even moderate nationalists domiciled in Northern Ireland makes the extra-legal activity of the IRA doubly difficult in what is termed the "occupied" sectors of the country. Hence the actions in Britain.

Socialist influence in the ranks of the IRA and Sinn Fein is non-existent. Connolly's association

with the independence movement 40 years ago is hailed by them today as a vindication of their "progressiveness." Connolly's Marxist approach to the national question is misrepresented as having been super-patriotic and chauvinist.

LABORITE LINE

The political labor movement as represented by the Labor Party in Ireland has no principled position on the anti-partition struggle. Therefore its attitude toward the IRA and its physical force policy is utterly opportunist. It seeks for purely parliamentary reasons to identify itself (but not too closely) with the anti-British chauvinism that the IRA evokes. But one waits vainly for a statement on the matter from the government of the Republic in which the Labor Party holds four ministries, including Justice, which would be charged with combatting the "illegal" IRA in the Republic. It is reported that a "pact" between the government and the IRA has been concluded in which the "blind eye" is turned to the IRA's extra-territorial activities in return for "hands off" the authority and institutions of the Republic (which the IRA characterizes as a creature of British imperialism) in whose parliament they refuse to sit. (One should bear in mind, of course, the fact that they have not won even one seat in the House of Representatives [*An Dail*].)

The Trade Union Congress—as distinct from the nominal claim of the Labor Party—is a genuine all-Ireland body, being the trade union center for both States. It is not recognized by the Northern Ireland authorities by virtue of this supra-border complexion. It nevertheless retains its homogeneity in an industrial sense by avoiding the national question or the constitutional position of the two States. To retain this unity means being completely pragmatic; and in deference to the unions with members in Northern Ireland, the Congress affords a measure of autonomy via a Northern Ireland Committee of the T. U. C. which concerns itself with problems peculiar to its State.

Labor unity is sorely hampered by the national question. A small center for purely "Irish" unions exists in the Republic alongside the TUC. It represents a breakaway from the TUC some ten years ago over a change of the domination of the Irish TUC by "English" unions (unions which were English by origin and extended their activities to Ireland) which were claimed to have a quasi-imperialist orientation. There is a germ of substance in this claim, for without a doubt these amalgamated unions recruited Irish labor for the war effort, and were assisted by the Stalinists to this end! However the basic lead-

ership of this nationalist center is incorrigibly sectarian nationalist, and basically petty bourgeois in politics, though a few of its leaders still sentimentally, and for mostly corrupt reasons continue their membership in the Labor Party.

Northern Ireland capitalists, represented by shipbuilding and linens, believe that union with Britain serves their interests better than membership in an Irish Republic. Perhaps when Britain led the world's manufacturing race and the Empire basked in economic sunshine while the colonial peoples perished in the shade there was some substance to this attitude. But today with Britain losing her edge in textiles and shipbuilding the economic backwater of Northern Ireland is fast becoming a stagnant pool. Yet the Tory Unionist Party is as intransigent on the question of union as it was 30 years ago when it came to power!

ORANGE COUNTERWEIGHT

Nevertheless, it still can, by manipulating anti-Catholic and anti-Republican prejudices, command a mass following even in periods of mass unemployment. The militant politico-religious Protestant Orange Order provides a fanatical loyalist counterweight to the threats of Republican fanaticism. Added to this a very efficient gerrymandering of electoral areas which precludes the emergence of either a Nationalist or Labor opposition in the Northern Ireland parliament.

The Machiavellian role of the Catholic Church in the politics of the Republic and the threats of violence by the IRA extremists lends substance to the claims of the Tory Unionists that Northern Ireland citizens in an all-Ireland Republic would be second-class, and thereby consolidate the Unionists at every turn. The threats of the IRA "justify" the Northern regime in ruling by emergency powers and retaining an armed semi-military police force, which intimidates even the most moderate political crisis of the regime.

Westminster exercises absolute control over fiscal, defense and social policies in Northern Ireland with the exception of the policing of the area which is the prerogative of the Northern Ireland Minister for Home Affairs, who in his own immediate political interests can be relied upon to do a good job!

ECONOMIC BACKGROUND

The Republic, which extends over four-fifths of the island is ruled at the moment by a coalition composed of extreme right, center and the left-center Labor Party, with de Valera's populist party in opposition. The Republic has its own institutions, and accredited representatives abroad.

The economy of the Republic is basically agricultural, with a light manufacturing industry dependent on the importation of raw materials from abroad, and a processing industry ancillary to some agricultural products like sugar beet growing and the manufacture of sugar, barley for brewing and distilling, etc. A miserable under-capitalization, primarily in agriculture, with the volume of production remaining fairly stagnant, begets an impoverished and under-employed rural proletariat who leave the country at the rate of 15,000 to 20,000 per year for Britain (where jobs are chasing men) and for other countries, mostly Canada and the United States.

Some secondary causes drive young people for the most part into emigration:

(1) The restrictive and coercive role of parents toward youthful exuberance, and the desire to wed without necessarily having the accommodations or the means to live on the basis of the peasant proprietorship of the parents.

(2) The all-prevailing clerical influence that isolates and exercises social and domestic pressures on young people who betray any sign of non-conformism in politics, philosophy or literary tastes. It is against this background, then, that the nationalist demagogues of the IRA and Sinn Fein seek to win the allegiance of the revolutionary youth

(with a measure of success) for a chauvinist and petty bourgeois concept of national unity. To this extent this demagoguery has found a response in quasi-socialist circles and among Labor elements, and for want of a faith in the efficacy of socialist action, they have drifted toward if not an open justification of physical force and direct action, then an acquiescence in the use of these methods by the anti-socialist, anti-democratic IRA and Sinn Fein.

With the emergence of an influential and anti-imperialist current in the British Labor Party the Irish working class movement could take the initiative on the unity question. Without the Imperial Preference that Northern Ireland enjoys, and the tremendous financial assistance from the British exchequer, the artificially inflated economy and the social services (which paradoxically are a monument to the BLP administration; implemented by the Tory Unionist government in Northern Ireland to justify their integral position in the United Kingdom, though politically galling to them) would collapse like a pricked bubble if British patronage ceased in Northern Ireland.

However, considerations like Northern Ireland's strategic position as part of NATO's military network are not absent from Britain's (and quite possibly America's) attitude, because of the possibility of a united Ireland staying outside current military alignments.

A SUGGESTION

If one can offer an opinion on this vexing question it is this: In any solution that can be found, cognizance must be taken of the intangible elements like loyalty to forms of religious beliefs and cultural and traditional ties of the dissident local majority and national minority in what is now Northern Ireland. The broadest democratic and political rights must be afforded what would be a minority in the national context. Sinn Fein and the IRA would coerce the will and force the consent of the citizens of the area, and would undoubtedly police it for a whole period in an attempt to exorcise what they would consider treasonable and heretical loyalties, as does the regime in Northern Ireland today vis-a-vis the Nationalists.

Only a socialist-led working class party could give these democratic guarantees to the workers of Northern Ireland on the basis of an economic communion; a basic identity of social and economic interests, in collaboration with a real socialist Labor Government at Westminster. Any interim settlement must be a federal one where each state would be locally autonomous and yet subscribe to a national objective.

SPOTLIGHT

(Continued from page 1)

support of the idea that there really is no witchhunt at all; that Stalinist teachers should be barred from the schools because they "indoctrinate" their pupils, etc., etc. The headline raised the question: has Sidney Hook had a change of heart?

The story below the headline dealt with a speech made by Hook at the Fifth International Conference of the Congress for Cultural Freedom, held in Milan, Italy. Although the story did not report Hook's remarks in full, it gave enough of them to disabuse us of any hope the headline may have aroused.

Hook was not talking about the "sacrifice of freedoms" to the demands of "security" in the United States. He was talking about Stalinism and other totalitarian societies.

"In an unfree world, only those who have resigned themselves to being slaves can feel secure," Professor Hook told his audience. "And even for them, since there is no institutional restraint on their masters' will, security may prove to be an illusion."

Well said, Mr. Hook! And how are your feelings of security these days?

Doing Him Good

Stephen Ramasodi, the African school boy awarded a scholarship to study in this country, has been definitely refused a passport to leave South Africa. A lot of hypocritical nonsense has been given as a reason, to the effect that the benevolent Nationalists are protecting the boy from upsetting experiences by not letting him go. We wonder that none of America's law makers or officials protest this insult to a fine American institution like Kent School. Unhappily, we do not wonder why they do not protest the insult to the boy.



LABOR ACTION

September 19, 1955 Vol. 19, No. 38

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

Editor: HAL DRAPER

Associate Editors:

GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL

Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

YSL Convention Marks Political Progress

By MAX MARTIN

The Young Socialist League, the major socialist youth organization in the United States and chief advocate among students and young workers of the Third Camp point of view, held its second national convention in Chicago over the Labor Day weekend. More than fifty delegates, alternates and visitors from many parts of the country gathered to participate in or listen to the three full days of reports, debate and discussion of the outstanding political questions of the day and the organizational affairs of the YSL.

Marked by lively discussion and efficient organization, the convention accomplished all of its tasks in the allotted time. It adopted resolutions embodying the basic programmatic views of the movement on international and domestic politics, outlined the tasks and orientation of the organization in the coming period, thrashed out many questions relating to the building of the YSL, and elected the leading committees of the organization. In the opinion of those present the convention was a notable success.

BASIC DECISIONS

In brief, the following were accomplished:

By an overwhelming majority, the convention adopted a Resolution on the International Question setting forth the YSL's analyses of and attitudes toward capitalism, Stalinism and the cold war. Defining Stalinism as a new, exploitive social system, bureaucratic collectivism, it urged the international working class and the colonial peoples to reject the leadership of both Stalinism and the camp of capitalist imperialism led by Washington. For the cold war period, and its present détente stage, as well as for the threatened holocaust should it break out, the YSL pointed to the organization of a Third Camp of world labor as the force which alone can ultimately assure peace and the progressive solution of the social problems facing mankind.

In a resolution on Tasks and Orientation, the convention projected the YSL orientation toward the campus as its major arena for socialist youth activity in this period and clarified its views on many problems of campus functioning. Looking forward to the building of a working-class socialist youth movement, the resolution dealt with the necessity of encouraging a shop orientation for YSLers as well as problems of work in the labor movement. The tasks of older YSL members who are no longer in school and are not in the union movement were also discussed.

The convention elected a new National Executive Committee composed of most of the experienced members of the outgoing NEC and several newer capable comrades who have shown organizational and political leadership abilities in the past period.

At a post-convention plenum of the

new NEC, a resident committee was elected and the national officers of the YSL were chosen. Michael Harrington was elected national chairman, and Max Martin national secretary. Harrington, well-known in pacifist circles, was a leading member of the Young People's Socialist League, one of the two organizations which united to form the YSL. Comrade Harrington has played a leading role in the YSL since its inception and has been editor of *Challenge*. Martin, who came from the Socialist Youth League, the other of the two organizations which united a year and a half ago, previously was YSL national chairman.

The YSL reaffirmed its character as an independent youth organization, unaffiliated with any adult socialist party or group, and at the same time emphasized the importance of its close fraternal relations with the Independent Socialist League, explaining that the basis of these relations lay in the common basic political views of the two organizations. The convention announced the YSL endorsement and support of LABOR ACTION and the New International, hailed the victory for the ISL and for civil liberties in general in the Shachtman passport case, and declared its firmest support to the ISL in its efforts to be removed from the attorney general's "Subversive List."

FOCUS ON WORLD POLITICS

The convention approved the National Action Committee's Draft Resolution on the American Question which analyzed the basic social and political developments in the United States since World War II as flowing from the cold war between capitalism and Stalinism. Pointing out that current American prosperity rests upon the Permanent War Economy, the resolution went on to discuss the forces at work which will ultimately lead to the breakup of the stagnation in American political life.

The resolution emphasized the necessity for the struggle for democracy in this witchhunting period and of the organization of a labor party by the workers as the next step in the development of the working class. In this connection it discussed the progressive significance of the forthcoming AFL-CIO merger.

In addition, the convention approved a motion declaring YSL support to the student magazine *Anvil*, adopted certain changes in the YSL Constitution, and heard and discussed a report on the YSL press, a national organizational report,

and reports from the various units of the YSL.

The major focus of interest at the convention, as had been the case in the pre-convention discussion period, resided in the documents and discussions dealing with world politics. The resolution presented to the convention by the NAC, and which was overwhelmingly approved by the delegates in an amended form, contained as the point of departure for its analysis of the international situation the view that the struggle in the world today was a contest for world domination by two reactionary and antagonistic social forces, capitalism and bureaucratic collectivism. To capitalist imperialism and totalitarian Stalinism it counterposed the Third Camp struggle for socialism and democracy. The resolution outlined a series of democratic and progressive demands, including the demand here in the United States that the labor movement develop a democratic foreign policy, as a key to the struggle for socialism.

NO SUPPORT TO STALINISM

It described the conquest of power by Stalinism in China and in North Vietnam as victories of this reactionary social force and in no way a progressive development or one serving the interests of the Asian masses. It called for the Third Camp fight of the peoples in opposition to Stalinism and capitalist imperialism in Asia as in other parts of the world.

A minority resolution, decisively rejected by the convention, presented a different picture of the world conflict. In the view of its sponsors, Stalinist society is state-capitalist and the cold war conflict between the American and Russian camps does not represent a social struggle. Moreover, this resolution presented the view that the cold war is one for world domination only on the part of the American camp. According to this document, the victory of Stalinism in China and North Vietnam is actually the bourgeois national revolution, occurring under Stalinist leadership, and therefore represents a progressive development, in one aspect. The minority holding these views felt that insofar as this aspect is concerned socialists should work in Stalinist movements in Asia; hence they favored the victory of the Vietminh in Indochina.

AMENDMENTS

Two major sets of amendments were added to the NAC draft resolution before its adoption by the convention. One of these dealt with the current détente period. These amendments explained that while no final solution to the problem of war and peace could be expected from the relaxation of tension which has characterized the past period, limited agreements between the imperialist powers negotiated in their imperialist interests and resulting from pressures faced by them, were distinctly possible.

The amendments stated that insofar as some agreements, such as the Austrian treaty, might result in gains for the peoples of the world, they were to be welcomed, pointing up the advantages accruing to Third Camp forces as a result of the breathing-spell created.

The Berkeley delegates proposed a separate war resolution. After discussion, this was withdrawn, and instead amendments to the NAC's International Resolution were adopted which spelled out additional aspects of the opposition of the YSL to all imperialist war. The amendments declared the refusal of the YSL to support in the context of World War III any war waged by any government, "Laborite" or social-democratic in composition as well as bourgeois, which had not broken with imperialism and capitalism.

During the discussion on Tasks and Orientation a dispute centered around the question of how to fight Stalinist and Stalinist-front student groups. The document proposed by the NAC called for an attitude of opposition to inviting Stalinist student organizations into cam-

pus united-front actions, and where Stalinist groups were invited in by other student clubs, or were present to start with, expressed the YSL position as being one of working for the political and organizational isolation and exclusion of the CP youth groups from such united-front actions.

While retaining this general attitude, the delegates adopted amendments making possible, for tactical reasons in specific circumstances, such invitations to Stalinist student groups. Under certain conditions, it was felt by a majority of the delegates, such actions serve to embarrass and defeat the Stalinists politically.

The convention held a lengthy discussion of various organizational successes and shortcomings recorded in the past period. During this convention session the idea of encouraging tours from the units to campuses and localities in their areas was projected as a means of bringing socialist ideas and laying the basis for expanding the YSL into new areas. As a result of this session and of the convention as a whole, the delegates returned to their localities convinced that the next period would continue to witness the growth of the YSL and the furtherance of its aim in bringing the ideas of socialism to wider circles of young people.

New-Type 'Clearance'

The kinship cops are still in business. N. Pierre Gaston, a Coast Guard officer candidate, will be commissioned as ordered by a Review Board. Before total jubilation sets in, one thing should be noted: the Coast Guard reversal was on the grounds that Gaston had "not been close" to his mother, not because there were objections to the whole idea of finding a man subversive on account of his parents or relatives. The Gaston case, it has now been determined, was a mistake. But what if he had been "close" to an allegedly subversive mother . . . ?

THE AIM OF THE YSL

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

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

—From the Constitution of the YSL

Los Angeles Young Socialists Make a Stir With Picket Line Against French Consulate

A picket line organized by the Young Socialist League unit in Los Angeles recently picketed the French consulate in that city. The demonstrators were proclaiming their opposition to the French terror in North Africa. Their action received wide coverage from press, radio and television in Los Angeles.

According to one newspaper report, the officials at the consulate took the attitude that some Americans might protest over the North African situation because of the "human element" involved. But, the Consulate went on to claim, such demonstrations are mistaken because the demonstrators had no real knowledge of the actual state of affairs in North Africa. This was evidently the extent to which the French officials could defend the conduct of their government

in the repression that has already taken place.

A spokesman for the YSL, according to the press, said that the demonstration was intended to show that "Americans are not totally indifferent or hostile to the struggles of the North African peoples for independence."

A full report of the picket line from the YSLers in Los Angeles is not available as we go to press. We hope to present a complete account in one of the next issues of *Challenge*.

Judging only by the reception which the action received from the newspapers, radio and television, it seems that the YSL made an important point which found something of a receptive public. A similar kind of demonstration is being considered by the New York unit of the Young Socialist League.

Young Socialist CHALLENGE

organ of the Young Socialist League, is published as a weekly section of *Labor Action* but is under the sole editorship of the YSL. Opinions expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of the *Challenge* or the YSL.

Strike Wave Rocks France — —

(Continued from page 1)

their leadership politically, they would go home and wait for the strike to be settled.

In short, the working-class could only assert its independence on a narrow, economic level, while limited and partial victories became less and less possible. In the long run, this situation contributed much to the clarification of political thinking in the labor movement. In the short run, however, it made every perspective seem to lead to a dead end.

In 1953 decisive changes occurred in this pattern, as a consequence of the decrease in international tension and the slow-down in the armaments race. For the first time it became possible for the French workers to engage in large-scale struggles without necessarily integrating them into the framework of international Stalinist politics. For the reformist organizations like FO and CFTC, the reasons that had impelled them; to those the "Western" bloc lost some of their urgency. The opposite political commitments which had paralyzed the French labor movement in the preceding period were no longer decisive factors. Such were the general circumstances in which the August strikes of 1953 broke out.

The new and remarkable thing about the August strikes was the fact that they were the first authentic manifestation of the French labor movement since the end of the war. The workers who had previously withdrawn from the political and trade-union organizations, in protest against their misuse by class interests other than their own, in no way returned to them; they went into action on their own, with a spontaneous militancy and discipline that frightened the trade-union leaders as much as it frightened the bourgeoisie. The August strikes were general, i.e., they were fought on the only really effective basis in the present state of the economy, and with a sharp point against the government; they were carried on by the rank and file, more or less independently from the official organizations.

At the same time, they had a number of weaknesses, both as to aims and as to methods. Their aims were very modest. The civil servants, postal workers, etc. who started the strike and set its pace only demanded a return to the retirement plan existing before Lanier's decrees. As to the organization of the strikes, it reflected the recent past of passivity and withdrawal. In general, there were no elected strike committees but joint committees appointed by the official organizations; there were very few contacts on the rank and file level between industries or between factories; there were no street demonstrations, no sit-down strikes. In this first manifestation of independence, the working-class had not yet developed its own forms of struggle (as in 1936, for instance), nor did it develop its own alternative leadership against the officialdom of its traditional organizations. This explains the nature of the August strikes which were, after all, disappointing. Here was a spontaneous movement involving several hundreds of thousands of workers, lasting three weeks, practically general in the main nationalized industries, and raising fundamental political issues—yet very "tame" in its forms, very limited in its stated objectives, and also limited in its immediate results.

THE ST. NAZAIRE PICTURE

An examination of the recent strikes in St. Nazaire, Nantes, Albert, Homecourt, Commeny, Saut du Tern, La Courneuve, etc., reveals at the same time certain similarities and a few important differences. We shall briefly recall what occurred in St. Nazaire and in Nantes. The strikes in the other places all showed the same basic characteristics.

In St. Nazaire the immediate cause of the strike was the adjustment of wages to those paid in the Paris region for similar work (equivalent of a 30 per cent raise). Negotiations had already dragged along for months. In June, the management of the great Penhoet shipyards indirectly cut the welders' wages by reducing the wage rates on piece work. On the initiative of the welders a general strike was called on June 21 at Penhoet, then, on June 22, in the whole metal industry of St. Nazaire (other ship yards, steel mills, aircraft, etc.) involving 12,000 workers. When the management of Penhoet refused to negotiate, the strikers invaded the offices, threw the furniture, blueprints, documents, champagne bottles prepared for the launching of a tanker, etc., out the windows and burned them in the yard. The trade-unions "deplored" the incidents, but said that they were due to the lack of understanding on the part of management. Negotiations continued and, on July 5, management proposed a raise of 9 to 11 per cent, which was rejected by referendum on July 8. The vacations interrupted any further developments, as they tend to interrupt the class-struggle in France generally.

On their return to the job, the workers found a haughty letter from the management pointing to the raise they could have had, had they accepted the proposals of July 5. So the workers neatly assembled the letters in a large pile in the yard and burned them. Then they demonstrated before the office building. This happened on the morning of August 1. By noon, the police had arrived in trucks and occupied the office building, while the workers occupied the plant. The plant whistles were blowing continuously, calling the workers of other plants to join those of Penhoet.

By one o'clock an enormous crowd of metal workers had gathered before Penhoet. The police standing in front of the gate was caught between the workers inside the plant and those outside. Fighting broke out, in which the police used first tear gas, then hand grenades. The workers fought back with bricks, bolts, nuts, beams, etc. At this point the "Compagnies républicaines de sûreté" (CRS) were brought in, a special police corps which specializes in breaking strikes and burning Algerian villages. A battle broke out around the Penhoet shipyards which lasted until evening. About 60 workers were wounded; the police suffered an equal number of casual-

ties. The correspondent of *Le Monde* commented: "It would seem that at St. Nazaire, showing a unanimity which far exceeds the traditional trade-union unity, the 'troops' compelled the 'leaders' to advance much farther than was originally intended."

Within the next few days the trade unions, under pressure from the ranks, got the authorities to withdraw the CRS and to stop the attempted lock-out at Penhoet. By August 15 an agreement was reached between the trade-unions and management on the basis of a general 22 per cent raise for all shipyard workers.

During the strikes, the press became aware of a surprising fact: 70 per cent of the metal workers in St. Nazaire were unorganized; yet, these unorganized workers had been fully as militant, as firm, as united and as disciplined as those belonging to trade unions. They had formed strike committees along with the unionized workers and had, in fact, determined the form and the content of the struggle at every stage.

One week after the end of the strike in St. Nazaire, a similar movement broke out in Nantes. The workers in the metal industry (also shipyards for the most part) demanded a 25 per cent raise, that is, an increase of 40 francs (10¢) an hour. On August 18, 5 to 6,000 workers left the factories and shipyards on the demand of the trade unions and demonstrated before the building where the negotiations were taking place. As the management representatives refused to go beyond a 10-15 francs increase, they entered the building and occupied the first floor. Within two hours, management raised its proposal to 20 francs. At this point the strikers started to break things. After a while, management was offering 33 francs. The workers yelled from below: "No! Forty francs!" So the trade-union spokesman told management: "As you can hear, the workers want forty francs. If you don't agree, we'll have to withdraw and you can discuss directly with them." Without further discussion, the management representatives signed for the 40 francs raise.

However, late in the evening, management withdrew its signature under the pretext that it had been obtained under duress. During the night, truckloads of CRS were brought in from Bordeaux, Rennes, Metz, etc. They occupied the factories and placed machine-guns at the gates. The next morning, 10,000 metal workers met in a public square and demanded the application of the signed agreement, the end of the lock-out, the withdrawal of police forces. In the meantime, the building-trade workers had gone on strike also demanding a wage raise. In the afternoon, eight trade union delegates went to the city hall to present the workers' demands. About 12,000 workers followed them, and were met in front of the city hall by fully armed CRS.

For a while, the two masses of men stood facing each other. Suddenly there was an explosion in the midst of the CRS. Eighteen were wounded. It was established later that the explosion had been due to the manipulation of a hand-grenade by a CRS. At the time, however, it was assumed that one of the workers had thrown a home-made grenade. The trade-union delegates were immediately expelled from the city hall and the CRS started attacking. Street fighting, at various points in the city, followed for 5 hours, until late in the evening. Three hundred CRS were put out of combat; 42 of them were seriously wounded. Twenty-nine workers were wounded, about 100 of them were arrested.

The following morning (August 19) the city workers went out on a solidarity strike, while the firemen made it known that they would not allow themselves to be used against the strikers. A mass-meeting took place (attendance estimates ranged between 15,000 and 30,000). Hébert of FO stated: "We are sure to win, because we are sure of the support of all workers in France." The workers wanted to march on city hall but the trade-union leaders, wanting to avoid a clash with the CRS, proposed a demonstration before the prison instead.

Soon 6-7,000 strikers arrived in front of the prison, and started to break down the gates to liberate the arrested strikers. Tear gas was thrown by the wardens. The CRS arrived on the scene and started to push the

Strike Wave Continues

AS LABOR ACTION goes to press, it appears that the strike wave in France continues to grow.

On September 12, a 24-hour general strike tied up Nantes. Twenty thousand striking workers paraded to the prefecture to present their demands. The locked-out shipyard workers were joined by workers in the metal and building industry, chemical and clothing factories, one oil refinery, the docks, streetcars and busses.

At Belfort, in the east of France, the Alsthom Electrical Company locked out its workers on a charge of slowdown strikes.

At Lorient, in Brittany, the unions called a general strike for September 13.

Negotiations between the unions and the metal industry continued at St. Etienne; and in the north, the nationalized coal industry granted a bonus to the miners.

As could have been expected, the French bourgeois press is attacking the strikers on the ground that their wage demands, if granted, would start another inflationary spiral in France. Writing in *Le Figaro*, Raymond Aron said the workers are not, this time, simply trying to catch up with the cost of living, but seek to get a greater share in the existing prosperity at a time when relative full employment gives them greater bargaining power.

As far as the danger of inflation is concerned, it is certainly being increased by the massive addition to the already large deficit in the government's budget which is incurred by the campaign of military repression in North Africa.

demonstrators into a main thoroughfare. There they started shooting into the unarmed crowd without warning. One construction worker was killed. The strikers started building barricades out of cobble stones and trees; several groups broke into two shops selling guns. Thirty CRS and 22 strikers were wounded that day. The CP Federation of Loire-Inférieure thought it wise to state that the attack on the prisons and the armories had been started by "Trotskyite provocateurs." The CGT and CFTC merely mentioned "provocateurs," while FO stated that the police alone were responsible for the violence. The cells of the PCI⁵ rejected the Stalinist slanders. *Le Monde*, however, picked them up with relish.

On August 22, the strikers voted to resume work. Negotiations were continued in another town under the supervision of government mediators. During the night, the CRS and other police forces were withdrawn from the plants and shipyards, and all arrested strikers except 18 were liberated. (Of the 18, only 4 got sentences a few days later.) The prefect of Loire-Inférieure resigned. Several thousand workers took part in the funeral of the striker who had been shot by the CRS. At the date of this writing, negotiations are still under way. In Nantes, there are continuous meetings, slow-down strikes, limited strikes, while the workers are waiting for the result of the talks. On September 1, a mass-meeting of 12,000 was held in the middle of the town; there was no police force present at all.

SPONTANEITY AND ORGANIZATION

From this account of the bare facts, several obvious characteristics are reminiscent of the August strikes. First, the spontaneity of the outbreaks and the secondary role of the trade union leadership. As in St. Nazaire a majority of the workers in Nantes are unorganized (60 per cent). They were the ones who played the decisive role, deciding, for instance, to generalize the strikes, while the official leadership, especially of the CGT, had only planned on a series of limited one-hour strikes, hitting one section of a factory after another ("grèves tournantes"). Needless to say, in a situation where a major showdown is in perspective, there is no better way to squander the energies and the morale of the workers than to isolate and limit their struggle by the "grève tournante" tactic.

On the other hand, the development of the strike was undoubtedly favored by the fact that FO in Loire-Inférieure is led by the minority (anarcho-sindicalist and revolutionary socialist) while the local CFTC is led by the "Reconstruction" tendency. Moreover, the forces of the CGT, FO and CFTC are more or less evenly balanced. Consequently, the local leaders of FO and CFTC had no political objections to a militant general strike, nor did they have to fear that the CGT would take over the strike. Unity of action was therefore easy to establish among the trade unions. However, in the other industrial centers of France, where the CGT is strong, very similar strikes are occurring. It would seem, therefore, that regardless of the trade union situation, the rank and file determined the course of the strike from beginning to end.

Here the first difference from the August strikes appears. Then, the rank and file also struck spontaneously, but they did not, in any real sense, conduct the strikes. Except in a few isolated instances, they walked out and went fishing, leaving the organization of the strikes and the subsequent negotiations to their official leadership. This summer, on the contrary, strike committees were formed, meetings were held continuously, the strikers demonstrated in the streets, occupied their plants, went to get management in its own offices, fought with the CRS. Along with this activity, they put forward specific policies, that is, they developed an alternative leadership.

THE DYNAMIC IS POLITICAL

This is precisely one of the main factors that was lacking in the August strikes. It is clear that if the August strikes had been conducted in the same manner, they would have been revolutionary not only by distant implication but in their method and in their objectives as well. It was stated in some quarters that the metal strikes were an expression of "primitive economism." This is the view of people who believe that in order to have political significance, a strike has to remain under bureaucratic control. The very contrary is true. Like the August strikes, the metal strikes are thoroughly political, both as a declaration of independence from the official trade union leadership and in their aggressive edge against the government. With these strikes, the workers have begun to free themselves from the handicap of Stalinist and reformist control. They have begun to catch up, in terms of consciousness, with the long-standing needs of the economy and of French society in general.

The great danger in the situation comes from the fact that this growth in political consciousness is still lagging behind the growth of the movement, which is unfolding at an ever-increasing speed. Already the conflicts are spreading from the metal industry to the building trades, mining, rubber, transport, etc. At the present time, strikes have again flared up in Commeny, and broken out in St. Etienne, Montluçon, Belfort, Besançon, in central and eastern France. A general raise in wages is a pressing demand not only in the metal industry. On the other hand, as the strikes become more general, they are necessarily directed more and more against the government rather than against individual employers, since they aim at raising wages by legislative means, and are faced with government repression. This anti-government character will become even stronger if the strikes should spread to the civil service and to the nationalized industries, as they almost did in June.

If the coming strike movement is not to fall short of its objectives, as it did in August 1953, it is essential that the workers' demands be formulated with sufficient

(Continued bottom of next page)

Another Victim of Imperialist Partition

By PRISCILLA CADY

One of the many crimes that colonialism has perpetrated on the people of Africa has been the dislocation of old nations and the setting up in one new geographical area of various national groups or, worse, splitting up a homogeneous group and dividing its people among various governing powers. Such is the case of the Somalis, who live in North-East Africa in a semi-arid land, lying to the south of Ethiopia on the Indian Ocean. They are a Moslem people and for the most part nomadic shepherds; they number, according to various estimates, between five and twelve million, the larger figure being the more probable.

The Somali people are split up five ways. The largest division is Italian Somaliland, a United Nations Trust Territory administered by Italy (!). This is the only even partially industrialized area (sugar and textiles) and as a result is the center of the nationalist movement. Self-government has been promised by 1960. In addition there are French Somaliland, the British Protectorate of Somaliland, and a corner of Kenya which was carved out of the original Somali territory.

The fifth division is the most outrageous, and is the subject of current interest. Three parts of formerly British-held territory were handed over to Ethiopia (the Ogaden in 1948, and the Haud and the Domo in February of this year) as the result of an agreement made, we are told, with the Ethiopians fifty years ago in payment for help in putting down some "disturbances." When violent objections were made by the Somalis to this cynical and brutal bartering of people and their land, the British took an aloof and principled attitude as if to say, "Sorry, old chaps, but we gave our word, you know."

In reply to those who make the claim that this is a progressive step, Ethiopia being, after all, a self-determining African nation, let us say a few words about the nature of this country and the role it is playing today. Haile Selassie's rule is one of the most vicious and absolute tyrannies in the, shall we say, "free world," and it has kept its people in a state of backwardness and subjugation that is appalling. The only even somewhat modern roads and buildings in the country occur in the areas formerly occupied by Italy. This does not, of course, justify in any sense, Italy's conquest, but does point up the undeveloped character of the country. Selassie, living in a state of glory and splendor, has done nothing for the people he rules except tighten the screws ever tighter.

As a brutal example of what the transfer of power has meant to the Somalis we would cite the question of taxes. In addition to approximately a forty per cent sales tax, they are forced to pay an assessment tax on their livestock—from this they receive absolutely no benefits. (If anyone doubts the feasibility of establishing such benefits, he need only heed the proposals that nomadic people have made: since they return periodically to certain fixed centers, schools, hospitals, etc., could be established there.) Seven Somalis recently refused to pay these taxes to the Ethiopian government. They were executed.

As is well known, America has signed pacts with Ethiopia establishing air bases there, and like England, has a principled code of ethics, namely, if you're getting something out of him, don't knock him. The United States, therefore, has blocked all efforts in the Trusteeship Council on the part of the Somalis for a redress of their grievances.

Since Italian Somaliland is the most advanced area, and the springboard to independence, the aim of the Somali leaders is not to have the Ogaden, Haud and Domo restored to British rule but incorporated into the mother area. Negotiations have been going on in Addis Ababa between the Italians and Ethiopians on the question and the UN has large-mindedly encouraged them to arrive at a settlement. If they fail the question will be raised in the UN, and on and on. . . .

An important development in Italian Somaliland has been the formation of a united front among all political parties and tribes to work

Algerian Nationalists Issue Appeal to French Workers

The Algerian National Movement is the revolutionary majority of the now illegal MTLD (*Mouvement pour le Triomphe de Libertés Démocratiques*), led by Messali Hadj. In mid-July, it issued a leaflet to the French workers calling for a general strike. Contrary to the assertions of the Stalinists and of the French bourgeoisie, which unanimously represent the Algerian revolutionary-nationalist movement as a sect of backward fanatics, this document shows an uncommon degree of political maturity and intelligence. It is certainly more relevant to the present social situation in France than the empty proclamations of FO, CFTC and CGT.

A. G.

FORWARD TO GENERAL STRIKE: AN APPEAL OF THE MNA TO THE FRENCH WORKERS

You have countless demands that must be met. Your wages and your living conditions are far below a normal level. Each day you have to face ever-increasing difficulties.

Your government, instead of considering your welfare, deprives you daily of nearly 400 million francs which it sinks into the Algerian war. The sole purpose of this war is to defend the extraordinary privileges of great industrialists, the very same that exploit you in various ways.

GENERALIZE THE STRUGGLE

For the past several days, numerous strike movements have broken out throughout France, and tend to spread. In St. Nazaire, Homécourt, Nantes, La Courneuve and many other towns the workers have fought and are still fighting with magnificent solidarity against the employers, the government and its CRS. At the same time, imperialism is trying to crush the national aspirations of the Algerian people and the legitimate demands of the French workers.

A UNIQUE OCCASION

Now or never is the time to impose the satisfaction of all your demands. The bulk of police forces, of army troops and of CRS are kept in Algeria by the courageous action of the Algerian patriots. It is impossible for the government to use them to break your movement. The united action of the Algerian and French peoples can be decisive at this time,

French Strike Wave — —

(Continued from page 61)

clarity to unify and harden the largest possible mass of workers against the government. This means not only demands that are equally valid in all industries, but also demands that can tie the strikes to the revolt in North Africa. This would put the government before a genuine "popular front" encompassing the entire industrial working class from France to Morocco, a force which the government cannot possibly resist.

Such demands could include a general wage raise of 20 to 30 per cent in all industries without a price increase, to be taken out of the budget for the military and police forces; a return to the 40 hour week; withdrawal of all troops from North Africa. At the same time, the strikes will have to be organized from below in such a way as to escape the control of the traditional organizations, and to enable the ranks to conduct them independently, in their own manner and in their own interests.

But this assumes a new leadership. What was lacking in the August strikes, and what is only beginning to take shape today, is a leadership capable of solidly unifying

for independence and unification of Somalia. The two principal parties are the Hisbia, Dighil and Mirifle Party, a right-wing group, and the more powerful Somali Youth League (SYL), which is reportedly democratic-socialist in character. In 1953 it had a membership of 134,000. An interesting point about the Somali Youth League is the fact that in 1948 it opened its ranks to women, who now make up about a third of its membership and occupy many leading positions.

The Somali people, like all colonial people, can put no trust in the paper policies of the United Nations or the fly-blown expostulations of America about being for the independence and self-determination of colonial peoples.

and can strike a mortal blow against the imperialism which exploits all of us. All workers (metal, mines, transport, post-office, white collar, civil service, building trades, longshoremen, etc.) should seize upon this occasion to call a GENERAL STRIKE.

THE ALGERIAN WORKERS ARE WITH YOU

The Algerian emigration in France, which has always been at your side, will not fail in its duty. Not a single Algerian worker will stand aside from the strike. The Algerians have their own demands, and their own word to say in this struggle. They will fight with you for:

- equal wages with French workers;
- a yearly vacation of one month with paid round-trip to North Africa*;
- payment of family allowances according to French rates;
- unemployment compensation;
- professional training in skilled jobs for North African labor;
- decent housing and medical check-ups;
- withdrawal of all occupation troops from Algeria;
- an end to all military and repressive operations in Algeria;
- liberation of Messali Hadj and of all other Algerians imprisoned because of their anti-colonialist struggle;
- opening of Franco-Algerian talks on the basis of a sovereign Algerian Constituent Assembly.

THE ALGERIAN PEOPLE WILL NOT FORGET

A general strike in France will be interpreted by the Algerians as an active manifestation of solidarity of the French workers with the Algerian people and with its fight for freedom and independence. Such gestures leave their mark in history more solidly than all governmental talk.

French workers! Our struggle is the same.

We have everything to win and nothing to lose in a general strike.

The Algerian National Movement.

*Many Algerian workers in France are supporting families in Algeria which they have not seen for months or years.

the strikes, of stating their political and economic objectives, and of organizing their progress. Such leadership will be urgently needed, as the strike movement will not only face the hostility of the government and of its CRS, but also the opposition of the traditional trade-union organizations. Already Bothereau, president of FO, has made contact with the employers' federation to forestall the strike wave with an elaborate system of collective agreements. On the national level, the leadership of the CFTC can be expected to take the same attitude.

The attitude of the CGT, which has so far confined itself to the "grève tournante" tactic, is more difficult to determine. Internationally, it is hampered by the "soft" line from Russia, and cannot throw its whole weight into a general showdown with the government. On the other hand, precisely the decrease in international tension has tended to isolate the French government from its NATO allies, both in its colonial and social wars. In any case, the CGT will not oppose a movement outright that is too strong to be opposed anyway; it could not afford to do so from the point of view of its French base and also from the point of view of the North African peoples, who are waiting for the French strike wave to take some pressure off them. Experience shows, however, that the CGT will attempt to kill a strike that it cannot control. Also there are more ways to kill a strike than to oppose it outright, and the CGT has had sufficient practice in 1953.

At this point, the crucial question is: will the strikes produce an independent leadership in time? Will they contribute to unify an independent left that could translate their aims into political terms?

1. Force Ouvriere (FO)—The reformist trade union center.
2. RDR (*Rassemblement Democratique Revolutionnaire*)—An attempt to form a grouping of anti-capitalist, anti-Stalinist left wingers in France. Formed in 1948, it lasted for about a year.
3. CGT (*Confederation General du Travail*)—The Stalinist-controlled trade union center, and still the largest one in France.
4. CFTC (*Confederation Francaise Travailleurs Chretiens*)—The Catholic trade union center.
5. PCI (*Parti Communiste Internationaliste*)—A Trotskyist organization.

HOW BROWNELL JUSTIFIES HIS RULING

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

During the course of this proceeding, relating to the designation of organizations in connection with the Federal Employee Security Program (8 CFR, Part 41), counsel for the organizations transmitted to me a lengthy telegram requesting the removal of the hearing examiner "on ground of bias and prejudice." (Tr. 308-313) In a letter dated July 30, 1955, I replied that I would determine the matter if they filed, in a timely manner and in good faith, an affidavit of personal bias or disqualification of the hearing examiner. The letter stated that counsel for the organizations might, if they wished, file a memorandum in support of the affidavit and that an opportunity would be afforded to the attorneys conducting the proceeding for the Department of Justice to file a memorandum in opposition if they cared to do so. The letter also stated that if the affidavit was filed I would determine whether it would be appropriate to hold a hearing on the claim of bias and prejudice, as requested by counsel for the organizations in their telegram. (Tr. 317-319) A timely affidavit "as to prejudice and bias" was thereafter filed by counsel for the organizations together with a memorandum in support thereof. The attorneys for the Government filed a memorandum in opposition and the attorneys for the organizations filed a supplemental memorandum in support of the affidavit.

Preliminarily, it may be appropriate to clarify one matter which has apparently been the subject of misinterpretation. In the memorandum in support of their affidavit counsel for the organizations state:

"1. The Attorney General apparently shares the view of counsel for the organizations that the facts set forth in our telegram of July 26, 1955, state a prima facie case for the disqualification of the examiner. Otherwise, there would have been no point in the Attorney General suggesting that counsel file this affidavit. We

cannot believe the Attorney General would put counsel to the effort and expense of preparing this affidavit if a prima facie case had not been made out in the telegram."

The inference made by counsel for the organizations is incorrect. The suggestion contained in my letter, that I would determine the matter if counsel filed an affidavit, was made solely in order to maintain procedural regularity. The examiner has ruled that the proceeding is to "be governed in accordance with the rules of the Administrative Procedure Act, and also, in accordance with the rules as set up by the Attorney General for a proceeding of this nature." (Tr. 122) The "Attorney General's Rules" are silent as to the procedures to be followed with respect to the disposition of a claim to bias and prejudice on the part of the hearing officer. However, section 7(a) of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 1006(a)) provides:

"Any such officer may at any time withdraw if he deems himself disqualified; and, upon the filing in good faith of a timely and sufficient affidavit of personal bias or disqualification of any such officer, the agency shall determine the matter as a part of the record and decision in the case."

It appeared to me to be patently irregular to decide a matter of this gravity relating to the conduct of a hearing upon the basis of a telegram. Since the Administrative Procedure Act establishes a procedure for the handling of claims of bias and prejudice which is not inconsistent with the Attorney General's Rules, I believed that if the claim was to be seriously asserted that procedure should be followed. The opportunity afforded counsel to the organizations to follow it represented an effectuation of the foregoing views. It did not represent a judgment, *prima facie*, tentative or otherwise, that the facts set forth in the

1. The examiner refused to rule in advance of such a conflict actually arising whether the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 1101, et seq.) or the Attorney General's Rules for proceedings of this type (28 CFR, Part 41) would govern if a situation arose during the course of the hearing which presented a conflict between the two. This is alleged to be one of the rulings which constitute evidence of bias and prejudice.

telegram established a case for disqualification of the examiner. Consideration of that question was reserved until such time as the point might be made in an appropriate and orderly manner.

Turning now to the merits of the claim made in the affidavit and supporting memoranda, the great bulk of the evidence which counsel for the organizations marshal in order to establish bias and prejudice is made up of rulings on the part of the examiner which were adverse to them. These relate to a clarification of the standards by which the organizations would be judged, the meaning of the word "communist," the legal effect, if any, of the failure to capitalize that word in Executive Order 9835, as amended, and of the use of an initial capital in Executive Order 10450, as amended, which would govern the Administrative Procedure Act or the Attorney General's Rules, in the event that a situation which presented a conflict between them should arise in the course of the proceeding, the propriety of certain of the grounds of designation, the applicability of the clear and present danger test to hearings of this type, and the requirement that the Government make an opening statement.

It is well established, both with respect to judicial and administrative proceedings, that the bias and prejudice which establish ground for the disqualification of a presiding officer must be based on something more than rulings in the proceeding. *Ex Parte Am. Steel Barrel Co.*, 230 U.S. 39, 43-44; *Berger v. United States*, 255 U.S. 22, 31. The "total rejection of an opposed view cannot of itself impugn the integrity or competence of a trier of fact." *Labor Board v. Pittsburgh SS. Co.*, 337 U.S. 656, 659. It is true that the conduct of a hearing, including the rulings, may be such as to evidence partiality or bias. See Davis, *Administrative Law* (1951), pp. 374-375. However, whatever the evidence to support the conclusion, the basis for disqualification must be personal bias against the affiant or in favor of the opposite party. *Ex Parte Am. Steel Barrel Co.*, *supra*; *Berger v. United States*, *supra*. Facts must be alleged which support the existence "of a bent of mind which may prevent or impede impartiality of judgment." *Hurd v. Letts*, 152 F (2d) 121, 122 (C.A.D.C. 1945); *Eisler v. United States*, 170 F (2d) 273, 278 (C.A.D.C. 1948), removed from docket 330 U.S. 189. Such facts are not shown in the affidavit. They cannot be conjured into existence in this proceeding, as counsel for the organizations try to do, by reference to the unsuccessful attempt by the Government in an entirely unrelated matter to establish the requisite inference from the language used by a judge in a memorandum opinion. *United States v. Lattimore*, 125 F. Supp. 295 (D.C.D.C., 1954).

Counsel for the organizations state "there is no doubt in our minds that Mr. Morrissey has a fixed determination to justify the Attorney General's listing—a clear equivalent of a fixed opinion on guilt or innocence." If the affidavit established facts which would justify this belief, grounds for disqualification would exist. However, such grounds are not even remotely supported by the facts alleged in the affidavit. In reaching this conclusion I am aware that the claim to bias and prejudice is not solely based upon rulings on motions. However, insofar as they have any bearing on the existence of bias and prejudice the additional matters are magnified out of proportion to their importance. Much is made of the refusal of the examiner to read into the record the letter designating him to sit in the case and to submit to questions on the part of counsel as to discussions or consultations with representatives of the

Department of Justice with respect to the proceeding. It is contended that this is evidence of hostility to the organizations. Actually it is evidence of no more than a judgment on the part of the examiner that there was no necessity for introducing his designation in the record, and that it was improper for him to submit to examination by counsel on his conversations with the representatives of the Department of Justice. The incident appears to me to provide not the remotest support for the conclusion that the examiner "has a fixed determination to justify the Attorney General's listing."

Stress is also placed upon a request by the hearing examiner, addressed to counsel for the organizations, to explain, with respect to the word "communist" the difference between use of a small "c" and a large "C." Since counsel for the organizations had been emphasizing the distinction in meaning and usage between the small "c" and the large "C" and rulings had already been made in connection with this matter, they argue that the examiner "ruled against the organizations several times on the crucial issue in the proceeding without understanding or trying to understand the basic issue being raised by the organization." The inference they draw is that he was, therefore, predisposed to rule against the organizations. Even if their interpretation of the significance of the question is correct—that the examiner did not understand the issue when he made his earlier rulings—it would not establish a fixed intention to justify listing by the Attorney General. However, the question was asked in the course of a prolonged argument, which thereafter continued, relating to the meanings of the word "communist," the standards to be applied for listing, and similar matters. The request for elucidation on this point does not evidence anything more than an attempt to clarify further an issue which had been discussed in a lengthy and complicated manner and which thereafter continued to be discussed.

Counsel for the organizations claim that the examiner made hostile remarks to them. The record indicates that at times the hearing was not conducted in a wholly calm atmosphere. Interruptions and heated exchanges between counsel were frequent, and the participants from time to time indicated annoyance with each other. The attitude of counsel for the organizations to the examiner was not itself always remarkable for its punctilio (e.g., Tr. 128-130, 138), and none of the remarks of the examiner made in this atmosphere indicate any personal bias.

The memorandum filed by counsel for the organizations shows that basically they are of the view that the organizations cannot be afforded what they consider a fair hearing unless the rulings they requested are granted, and that dissatisfaction with the effect of the rulings of the examiner rather than his bias or hostility is the real basis for their complaint. No position is taken here on the correctness or incorrectness of the rulings. They will ultimately be reviewed at the proper time in an orderly manner. However, it is elementary that allegedly incorrect rulings should be attacked on review and that an affidavit of personal bias and prejudice is not an appropriate vehicle for such attack.

For the foregoing reasons the request to disqualify the hearing examiner is denied. A hearing on the issues raised by the affidavit does not appear necessary and is not granted.

/s/ Herbert Brownell, Jr.
Attorney General
September 2, 1955

TUC Congress — —

(Continued from page 3)

their implementation. "As long as we are under capitalism we will have problems which timid trade union leaders will not find it an appropriate time to solve," he said, and pressed the resolution to a vote.

When the vote was taken the Miners' Union card was raised against the resolution and an uproar immediately arose among the members of the miners' delegation. Voices were heard shouting: "The miners' vote is a fiddle." It was subsequently explained that the miners' delegation had agreed to support the resolution of the resolution to the General Council and "in keeping with past practice," as this was refused by the movers of the resolution the miners' vote was cast against the resolution. This explanation did not satisfy many of the miners—particularly when the vote was announced. This showed that the resolution was lost by 4,303,000 votes to 3,644,000—a majority of 639,000. Had the miners' vote been cast any other way the resolution would have been carried and the General Council would have suffered a major defeat. As it is, the echoes

of the row among the miners at Southport will probably vibrate around the local miners' lodges for a long time in the future.

With half the agenda now behind it the Congress has dealt with many other matters in addition to the bigger debates outlined above. It has demanded that the school leaving age be raised to 16 (it is now 15), and made known that it will resist any attempt to raise the age at which state retirement pensions are paid. The latter point arises out of the report of a government committee which previously urged that the age be raised to 68 for men and 63 for women—an increase of three years on existing levels. It has also urged the extension of the Industrial Injuries Act to cover certain diseases brought about during the course of employment, and has come down in favor of the development of Health Centers under the National Health Scheme.

Before the week is out many such minor issues—but of importance to the general well-being of the British workers—will be dealt with as well as other topics of wider importance. One of these is the question of compulsory service in the armed forces. The United Patternmakers' Association has placed a resolution on the order paper calling upon the government to take immediate steps to reduce the period of service in the armed forces; the Association of Engineering and Shipbuilding Draughtsmen have placed an amendment down which calls upon the government to immediately abolish compulsory military service.

By the end of the week it is fairly certain that the right wing will have carried their point of view on all the issues at controversy—but it is also certain that the narrowness of their victories, as indicated by the voting so far, leaves them no grounds for rejoicing. This Southport Congress is proving that the left wing in the trade union movement is still full of fight and, perhaps more important, is able to present the issues with a fair degree of clarity. It now remains to be seen what happens at the Labor Party annual conference due to be held in six weeks.

Labor Action FORUM New York

Thursday at 8:45 p.m.

Sept. 22—All Findley
WORKERS' CONTROL
IN ISRAEL

Sept. 29—Michael Harrington
THE EDUCATION OF
HENRY ADAMS

Labor Action Hall
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

ISL "Subversive List" Case — —

(Continued from page 1)

ing the Attorney General is offering the organizations, the courts will again reverse the Department of Justice as they have in virtually all cases to date involving the Attorney General's list. If, however, a really fair hearing is to be offered, the time has come to start over—to designate a new examiner, to direct the Department of Justice representatives to set forth standards of judgment and clear charges, and generally to create an atmosphere for this hearing that will meet the expectations of fair-minded Americans."

Brownell has refused to disqualify the

hearing examiner or to issue instructions for a fair hearing. The ISL's attorneys are now considering the next steps to be taken with respect to the hearing and the fight against the subversive list. Readers of LABOR ACTION will be informed of further developments in the proceeding as soon as they arise.

In the meantime, the Workers Defense League's special committee in the ISL's fight against the "subversive list" is proceeding with its work of publicizing the case and gathering moral and financial support for it. Every assistance given them by readers of LABOR ACTION and their friends is a blow for democratic liberties in America.