

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JULY 2, 1956

FIVE CENTS

Kutcher Case Ends in Victory As Gov't Yields

James Kutcher, the "legless veteran," has at long last won his basic case for reinstatement in his Veterans Administration job. On June 20 VA head Higley ordered his return with full seniority, to the position in the Newark office from which he was discharged 8 years ago for membership in the Socialist Workers Party.

The VA's abandonment of its shameful persecution of Kutcher came as a result of the Court of Appeals decision of last April 20 which ruled that the government had presented no adequate basis for depriving Kutcher of his job.

To keep Kutcher out, the government would have had to bring another case. Apparently it decided that its war against the legless vet had already gone as far as possible.

The Kutcher victory is a notable gain in the battle against the witchhunt in general and against the subversive-list system in particular. The government's case was essentially based on the fact that the SWP was "listed" by the attorney general.

The Kutcher decision of April 20 was also an important precedent for the Supreme Court ruling in the recent Cole case.

As the CP Leaders Issue Their "Critical" Statements—

CP Crisis Opens Way to Rebirth Of Militant Socialism in Europe

By HAL DRAPER

The impact on the Communist Parties of the 20th Congress revelations has now been redoubled by a second shock: the publication of Khrushchev's secret speech on Stalin's crimes. Clearly a new high is being reached in confusion, self-doubt and suspicion of the leadership among the ranks of the Communist Parties, especially in the West.

For the first time since the end of the war, a potentiality arises which can possibly change the political map of Europe, and therefore the world.

For us, this potentiality is not that of the self-reform of the CPs and their transformation into genuinely socialist and revolutionary workers' parties that really fight for the interests of the working class, rather than for the interests of the Russian state.

For some others—we are concerned here about non-Stalinists, not about those with plenty of practise in fostering Stalinoid illusions—there may be some tendency to go into a tailspin over the show of "independence" and "criticism" which is being put up by the CP leaderships of Italy, France, Britain, the U. S., et al. *Who knows? ... maybe they'll break ... strange things are happening ... why be doctrinaire ... anything is possible.*

It is an indisputable fact that unprecedented things are happening in the Stalinist parties. The above-mentioned CP leaderships are openly dissenting with some of Khrushchev's statements; they demand a deeper, "Marxist" explanation for the "cult of personality";

they imply that the present leadership's responsibility for the Stalin cult and Stalin's crimes cannot be excused by Stalin's terror; they ask for further "explanations" on these and other matters. . . .

If these unprecedented things are happening IN the CPs, it is because unprecedented things have happened TO the CPs.

Any wishful thinker can persuade himself that these unaccustomed things are being said aloud by these veteran line-tooters (Togliatti, Thorez, Eugene Dennis, etc.) as an affront to the Kremlin and in the teeth of Khrushchev's fury at being so bearded by his ex-puppets.

It would take a strong wish, however. There is not the slightest evidence that this show of independence is not taking place with at least the toleration of the Kremlin leaders themselves, in view of the crisis of Stalinism which all sections are going through. No doubt, in good time Khrushchev will "yield" to the demand of his independent satraps and deign to explain what they want to know. (We leave aside discussion of any closer connection between the Kremlin and the suspiciously uniform formulations of "legal" criticism which have been coming from these "independent" CPs; and we leave aside also speculation on links between dissenters in the CPs and factional line-ups inside the Kremlin.)

[As we go to press, *Pravda* has given a long spread to Eugene Dennis' criticisms of the Khrushchev speech. It would not seem that the Kremlin rulers are mortally offended.—H. D.]

HEAD THE PARADE

What has been happening to the CPs has been clear enough. Their ranks have been shaken as never before in the last quarter of a century. This is where we would like to put the spotlight on the potentialities of the Stalinist crisis.

Whatever other factors are involved, (Continued on page 4)

ISL Hearing Is First Step To Court Test of 'Subversive List'

Now that the attorney general's "subversive list" hearing on the Independent Socialist League appears to be coming to a close this week as we go to press, the question arises how soon the government department will render a decision so that the indicated steps can be taken to put the whole "list" system to court test.

On pages 6-7 inside, we report, fully as usual, on the proceedings for the first part of last week, devoted to the government's cross-examination of Max Shachtman, national chairman of the ISL.

By the end of last week, Friday the 22nd, this had been finished, but the government attorneys then indicated they might still want to present a rebuttal case, i.e., make another attempt to present evidence. The following week they did so decide, and on Wednesday, June 27, the hearing reconvened for this purpose.

Following this there will still be left the possibility of motions by the attorneys, final arguments, and the presentation to the hearing examiner of "proposed findings" by each side.

After that, the hearing examiner, Edward Morrissey, is supposed to present his findings to Attorney General Brownell,

who can in turn accept, reverse or re-write the examiner's decision.

This departmental hearing, of course, is a "trial" of the attorney general's listing by an examiner appointed by the attorney general himself, under rules laid down by him, and with the final decision reserved for him. If therefore the decision is a re-endorsement of the attorney general's list by the attorney general, no one will be amazed.

The importance of this hearing is the fact that only after it is over will it become possible to do what has been impossible so far for anyone: a direct test in the courts of the subversive list.

The federal courts have made clear that they will not consider the matter till the "administrative remedies" have been exhausted. The form of the departmental hearing was the "administrative remedy" provided by the government. The ISL, however, is the first organization that has ever managed to get such a hearing.

Moreover, the record made in the hearing becomes the basis for the court case which is the next step.

The issue which the courts will have to decide is not only the arbitrary listing of the ISL but also the constitutionality of the list system

NEXT WEEK IN L. A.

A FIRSTHAND REPORT FROM THE ALGERIAN RESISTANCE

by Claude Gérard

WHAT HAPPENED IN THE DUTCH ELECTION?

by Daniel Faber

THE LAST TESTIMONY IN THE ISL'S WASHINGTON HEARING

A Detailed Report

AS WE GO TO PRESS

When the hearing reconvened on Wednesday, the government finally proved that it could manage to convince at least one person to testify against the ISL. They trotted out James Burnham.

This person told the hearing that he had declined the government's plea to testify several times, even as late as a week or ten days ago (namely, even after Shachtman's testimony) but that he had finally accepted only the preceding Friday, out of "duty."

It was clear from his testimony that the government had pleaded with him to do a Giffow because it was obvious to them that they had not even the semblance of a case against the ISL.

The notorious McCarthyite testified for 15-20 minutes and then was turned over for cross-examination, which will be continued when the hearing is reconvened after a recess.

Report on all this will be in next week's issue.

AFRICAN VIEW

"The first impression I have of the UN is that it is a place where powerful governments meet together, and they have laid down regulations to prevent any help being given to weaker people; and those who would be likely to help are prevented from it because of their friendly relationships with each other, or because they fear they may be said to be out of order. The members of the United Nations are all friends. Each one has interests with another party and is careful not to hurt the other country's feelings. I do not think it is a place which is intended for the benefit of the poor and weak people."

—Interview with Sultan Behi Momeen, delegate from Somaliland, *Africa Digest*, Jan. 1956

Socialists Gain in Italian Vote, Appeal to CP's Rank and File

By LUCIO LIBERTINI

Rome, June 8

Local elections are usually an excellent gauge of the political temper of a country. The day after May 27, however, after the election in this country, to the city and provincial councils, it seemed that the gauge was out of order. All parties announced a victory and claimed significant advances.

The Ministry of the Interior, of which the election services with their excellent technical equipment are a part, could have brought some light into this confusion; instead, it added to the confusion, then fell silent for seven long days.

At first, it only published the figures for the provincial elections. However, these figures did not convey the real picture.

Unlike the city councils of the large centers, which are elected by proportional representation, the provincial administrations are elected by the uninominal system, where all seats go to the majority. This compels the various parties to enter all kinds of alliances.

Thus, the figures for the Christian-Democrats include many votes for the monarchist and neo-fascist parties, which were often allied to the Christian-Democratic party. Elsewhere, the figures for the monarchists and fascists have not been separated; neither has the socialist vote been separated from the CP vote; finally, the table does not show that in many places the social-democrat tick-

et also included Republicans, Liberals and other lay independents.

From all this, a single fact of political importance emerges, if one compares it with the results of the elections to the city councils: about 400,000 voters who voted for Nenni in the city elections, voted for Saragat in the provincial elections, because in the latter Nenni and Togliatti presented a common ticket.

After seven years of silence, the pressure of the opposition papers forced the Ministry of the Interior to publish also the results of the city elections, which many pro-government papers then refused to print because they were no longer news. In the accompanying table are the results of the city elections in the centers of over 10,000 inhabitants (in Sicily, of over 50,000), where the vote was counted according to proportional representation.

If these data are extrapolated to include the smaller communities where the present electoral system has reduced all tickets to two blocs (Left vs. Right), and if one compares them with the figures of 1953, the following picture appears:

The PSI (Nenni) has advanced from 3.4 million votes to over 4 million (from 12.3 per cent to 15.7 per cent of the total).

The CP has lost some of its strength, dropping from 6 million votes to 5.9 million.

The PSDI (Saragat) has increased

its vote by 150,000 (to a total of 1.35 million, advancing from 4.5 per cent to 5.5 per cent).

Christian-Democracy has suffered a distinct loss, dropping from 40.1 per cent to 34.7 per cent.

The neo-fascists also suffered a definite loss.

PUSH TO LEFT

As a whole, the electorate moved to the Left, stopping however at the PSI—the move to the Left did not benefit the CP.

If one considers the general trend, leaving aside local variants, one observes:

(1) the reappearance of a large socialist party, the PSI, with 4.2 million votes (a potential of 90 deputies in Parliament out of 590, as opposed to its present 75). This advance of the socialists, however, is closely tied to their new policy tending toward independence, and to their alliance with the Independent Socialists who contributed about 300,000 votes to the joint tickets. This has been recognized by everyone, including Togliatti, who admitted these facts in an interview to the foreign press.

(2) The CP remains a massive fact in Italy, even though it has lost its capacity to expand: its strength has definitely been reduced in the industrial regions, but is has recovered these losses to some extent in the rural provinces.

(3) Social-democracy has recovered a small part of the votes lost in 1953 (1948: 1.8 million; 1953: 1.2 million; 1956: 1.35 million). These votes were recovered from the Right, not from the Left.

(4) Christian-Democracy continues to have the largest electoral following, but has lost many marginal votes. The aim of obtaining an absolute majority (as in 1948) which Fanfani assigned to the Catholic party now seems completely out of reach.

(5) The monarchist and fascist Right loses ground, and the Liberal Party, in spite of its efforts, is unable to take its succession: the votes of the Right either go to Christian Democracy or change sides and go directly to the socialists.

CITY-COUNCIL ISSUE

Naturally these results had immediate and profound repercussions on the Italian situation, which show up especially as the new city councils are being formed.

Up to now, the majority in the great urban centers (except in those of the South, where Christian-Democracy has allied itself with the monarchists and the fascists) was composed of the four center parties: Christian-Democrats, Social-Democrats, Liberals and Republicans. Now the situation is different, partly because of the adoption of proportional representation, partly because of the socialist advance. The "Center" no longer has a majority in many cities.

In the North and Center the alliance with the monarchists and fascists is out of question (all parties in these regions are strongly anti-fascists and republican) and only an orientation towards the socialists makes the formation of city councils possible.

Nenni has immediately seized the opportunity: in agreement with its allies of the USI (Independent Socialists) the PSI has made a proposal to the social-democrats for common action to exclude the Liberals from the city councils and to enable the two socialist parties to form a coalition with the Catholics on the basis of a progressive social program. The PSI has made clear that it agrees to entering the new city councils without the Communists.

So far, social-democracy has broken the discipline of the "democratic center" and has agreed to discuss Nenni's proposal. This has focused the attention of the whole country on the socialists and has provoked furious reactions in reactionary and conservative circles. The Christian-Democratic Party has assumed an attitude of rigid refusal.

This is the situation at the time of this writing. American readers should keep in mind that the problem of the

city councils also raises the problem of government. If the door is opened to the socialists in the city councils, the "Centrist" formula on which the present government is based becomes obsolete, and a question is raised that the socialists may have to be admitted to government.

Personally, I don't believe that this development will occur in the immediate future. From contacts with the social-democratic leaders in the course of the present negotiations, I gathered that the PSDI will subject itself again to the government's discipline and will seek another compromise.

But there is no doubt that the ice is broken. The socialist pressure on the conservative front will sooner or later produce its effects, most likely in the form of a crisis of social-democracy.

NENNI AND THE CP

A few more general remarks are called for now. In these administrative elections, the Italian Independent Socialists have entered an alliance with the PSI (Nenni), with the purpose of contributing to the shaping of the new phase which is opening in the history of the Italian labor movement.

The PSI, after years of servile subordination to the Stalinists, is gradually recovering its independence. Its alliance with the Independent Socialists has favored this trend, and has enabled the Independent Socialists to reach the masses with their message. The possibility is not to be excluded that at some future time the PSI will become the common ground for a reunification of the Italian socialists, although today the political conditions for such an event do not exist as yet.

Another fact of the present situation is that it will not be possible to lead the Italian Communist Party much longer by the old methods.

Until today, we rightly condemned the CP as the immovable expression of Stalinism, and this was sufficient to separate socialists from Communists. Today, however, a process has begun in the Communist Party leading to a profound transformation, which will certainly require a few years but which undoubtedly exists.

It is necessary to keep in mind here that a substantial difference distinguishes the Italian CP from its counterpart in England, Germany or in other countries. In most other countries, the CP could simply be defined as a group of Russian agents. Here in Italy, the apparatus that dominates the CP has been, and continues to be, an instrument of Russian policy, but there are other factors present that lead six million workers to support the CP.

EXPLOITING THE CRISIS

The crisis of Italian socialism, its splits, the errors of reformism and of maximalism, its chronic lack of an organization, of ideological preparation and of method—these are the reasons why, under fascism, the main body of the resistance was organized by the Communists, the Communists led the partisan war and the Communists provided the cadres for the struggle of the Italian working class.

There are two souls in the Italian CP (and this is certainly not true in England, for example): on the one hand the Russian, Stalinist soul, on the other hand the working-class movement, with its structure, its spontaneous inner connections, its view of the world. In this world, there is now a deep crisis, as the idols of Stalinism are crashing to the ground.

The Italian socialists cannot afford to either ignore this crisis, or to exploit it for polemical purposes alone. While safeguarding their independence with the utmost inflexibility, the Italian socialists should not cut all bridges to the Communist world: without that part of the working class which now supports the CP one cannot fight the bourgeoisie in Italy. This is an undeniable fact of the present society.

Yesterday as today, this fact existed, but Stalinism made all contacts impossible. Today, the situation is beginning to change, even though very slowly.

These are some of the reasons why the Italian socialists consider their electoral alliance with the PSI as a highly positive experience and, while welcoming the trend in social-democracy toward socialist positions as an important fact, do not lose sight of the working-class movement as a whole.

Parties	Vote	% 1956	% 1953
Communist Party (PCI)	3,238,872	24.3	22.7
SP (Nenni) & USI (Ind. Soc.)	2,057,295	15.5	12.7
CP and SP (Nenni)	10,202	0.1	...
Soc. Dem. (Saragat PSDI)	738,767	5.5	4.5
Republican Party (PRI)	236,605	1.8	1.6
Christian-Dem. Party (DC)	4,611,879	34.7	40.1
Liberal Party (PLI)	388,770	2.9	3.0
Joint center tickets	33,270	.3	...
Monarchist (PMP)	417,076	3.1	...
Monarchist (PNM)	343,438	2.6	6.9
Neo-Fascists (MSI)	663,155	5.0	5.9
Joint right tickets	176,153	1.3	...
Others	385,519	2.9	...

Norman Thomas vs. Wm. Buckley

By RUTH KAREL

New York, June 8

The suave, sophisticated and superior young Yale-grad-made-good faced the vigorous civil-libertarian to debate the question, "Do We Need the Smith Act?" before an audience of about 700 at Community Church in New York on June 7. The debate was sponsored by the New York Civil Liberties Union.

William Buckley, the youth, and Norman Thomas, the septuagenarian, represent a switch in the usual radical-conservative dichotomy of the "wait till you're my age" variety. Where, we wonder will Bill Buckley be in his seventies?

Thomas, taking the negative side of the question, made clear that the Smith Act was not in any way concerned with espionage or sabotage, which were adequately covered by other laws. The Smith Act concerns itself with "conspiracy to advocate" and does not demand proof of an act; moreover, it allows the government to dictate what people shall and shall not believe; hence he attacked it as a severe abridgment of civil liberties.

Attacking the conception that the CP is primarily a conspiracy while at the same time recognizing the existence of a Russian spy apparatus, Thomas called for an end to the Smith Act as a measure which essentially harms the national security by diverting attention from the political appeal of the Stalinists. We must fight them, said Thomas, by persuasion and truth and meet them in the political field as another political party. Not by police acts but by free discussion can we hope to defeat them.

Judging by the enthusiastic response to Thomas' talk there must have been very few Hook-toppers "liberals" or Democratic Party supporters present to hear this in-

dictment of them as well as of Buckley.

Buckley's defense of the Smith Act was indeed curious. He began by saying that the act was clearly unconstitutional under the First Amendment (one of Thomas' minor points) but grouped it with libel and slander laws as being equally unconstitutional, in his opinion. The solution? Amend the amendment.

It is obvious, however, that he has no objection whatsoever to seeing the unconstitutional Smith Act continue in operation until such a legalization of it can be effected, despite his strict-constructionism. Why? For political reasons; of course: this is a fine way to outlaw the Communist Party.

And why is this necessary? Because, as "the liberals themselves" have pointed out time and again, said Buckley, the CP is a conspiracy against which we must defend our free society. After all, he demagogically asked, how can we wait until they have a majority and stage a coup? (He seemed to think this is the same thing—strange notion of democracy.) Why not arrest them just as we arrested the Puerto Ricans who shot up Congress? This attempt at a parallel was quite outrageous—as Thomas effectively pointed out.

In discussing the Smith Act itself, Buckley saw it as a symbol—a consensus of the feeling of the people—a plea to the government to do something they can't do themselves as individuals. Quite an absurd rationalization for Buckley of all people. He who is so afraid of "disorder," popular movements, and actions which may in some way upset the balanced, ordered structure of society attempts to justify the Smith Act on the basis of popular will—shades of McCarthy!

LONDON LETTER **Portent of Middle-Class Frustration: Tories Shaken by Defeat in By-Election**

By OWEN ROBERTS

London, June 15

Britain's Tory Government suffered a moral defeat last week at the hands of its own supporters. The occasion was a by-election to fill a vacant parliamentary seat at Tonbridge, a traditional Tory constituency in the Southeast of England. Twelve months and twelve days earlier, at the General Election, the Tory majority had been a comfortable 10,196 in a total poll of around 48,000 votes. When the ballot papers were counted last week the majority had slumped to a mere 1,602.

This spectacular result caused a near panic in government circles, bewildered many rank-and-file Tory party members, and sent a wave of elation sweeping through the Labor Party. Comments of the Tory press headlines speak volumes. "Jolt for the Government," was the description of the *Times*. "A smashing blow to the Government," roared the *Daily Express* of Lord Beaverbrook, and "Tonbridge is a Warning," said Lord Kemsley's *Sunday Times*.

To understand the full implications of the Tonbridge defeat (for it was a defeat in spite of the fact that the Tories held the seat), it is necessary to know something of the area involved. Tucked away in Kent, an agricultural county, it contains a number of rural communities coupled with local light industries. But it is primarily a residential area populated largely by middle-class elements, many of whom are retired professional types, of the kind that provides the backbone of local Tory organizations. It was this middle-class element that revolted against the government and stayed away from the polling booth.

That it was a "stay-away strike" by Tory supporters is borne out by the figures. Both the Tory and the Labor vote fell when compared to the General Election. But the Tory vote dropped by 9,000 whereas the Labor vote showed only a 400 decrease. Thus many Tonbridge voters registered their lack of support for the present Tory policies but at the same time showed no desire to support the Labor Party. A study of a Tory press comment shows why this was so.

Most outspoken was the *Sunday Times*. Describing the middle-class voters of Tonbridge as "patriotic, realistic and unselfish," the Kemsley organ voiced the complaint that the Tory government was holding back from the fight against inflation in that it was not pressing the squeeze on industry so that it could not pay the "inflated wages" demanded by the trade unions.

In other words, the middle-class voters of Tonbridge withheld their votes as a protest against the government's lack of attack upon the workers.

"The trade-union vote is important to the Conservative Party," said the *Sunday Times*, "but if it loses the middle-class vote it can have no hope of renewed office."

"POUJADISM" APPEARS

This comment aptly exposes the dilemma which now faces the Tory government. Since the General Election the economic situation in Britain has grown steadily worse; the value of the pound has slumped, prices have climbed upward, and the possibility of devaluation is apparent. The middle-class Tory blames this situation on higher wages, and demands that the government get tough with the trade unions, put a peg on wages, cut social-welfare benefits to ease taxation, and generally apply good old-fashioned ruling-class remedies.

The government would doubtless like to put such measures into operation—but fear acts as a brake.

At no time since the end of the war has the trade-union movement been so antagonistic toward any British government, Labor or Tory, and it only needs the government to start putting the pressure on the working class to provoke an outbreak of strikes in many industrial centers. Hence the government is holding back from a direct attack on the worker's living standards and is incurring the wrath of its middle-class supporters as a consequence.

The frustration of the middle-class Tories is apparent in the Poujadist-type or-

ganizations that are mushrooming up to provide a platform for dissatisfied middle-class elements and to create an organized form of protest which can put pressure on the Tory party and the government.

One such organization has been formed by the Tory Member of Parliament for the south London constituency of Lewisham and is known as the Middle Class Alliance. Its leader, Henry Price, claims that he is receiving wide support, and also opposition from the Tory party Central Office.

Another Poujadist movement, which shows signs of becoming the organization for discontented Tories, is the People's League for the Defense of Freedom. This movement has the advantage of having as one of its leading lights W. J. Brown, an ex-Member of Parliament and ex-general secretary of one of the Civil Service trade unions, who in recent years has earned himself a reputation as one of the extreme right-wing elements in British politics.

The People's League produces large quantities of propaganda material, has its own journal and holds public meet-

ings. Its appeal is distinctly to the middle class and it concentrates on what it describes as "the tyranny of the trade unions" as the main evil of modern times.

Its leading members have produced a policy which advocates legal restraint on trade unions, their severance from the Labor Party, and dissolution of those unions in which less than half of the members vote in elections for officers. It has also prepared elaborate plans for producing a newspaper in the event of a strike in the printing trade and it requires its members to cooperate in keeping the life of the community going in a "national emergency."

CROSS-FIRE

The Tory government is thus caught between cross-fire from its own supporters and that of the trade-unionists who have made it quite clear that any attempt by the government to freeze wages will be met with swift retaliation by the workers.

At the moment a number of trade unions are holding their annual conferences, and as a consequence the government is in a position to judge with fair accuracy the mood of the rank and file—and it obviously doesn't like what it sees. At conference after conference, even of the traditional right-wing unions, fierce attacks are made upon the government coupled with the indication that the workers have no intention of being used as a sacrifice on the altar of Tory economics.

But if the Tory government is on the spot, the Labor Party has no cause for

celebration. The discontent with the government is not of the making of the Labor Party and, as indicated above, springs principally from the right. The big worry for the Labor Party at this moment is to be able to hold out a program attractive enough to counter the growing militancy of its opponents—even if this militancy is not expressing itself through the Tory party proper.

The Laborite right wing has, of course, its own solution to the problem. This consists of diluting the program of the Labor Party even further until it means all things to all men and so that even the dissatisfied middle-class voter, antagonistic to the trade unions, can feel sure enough to put a cross against a Labor candidate at election times.

This line of thought manifests itself in the claims by certain Labor leaders that the Labor Party is not a "sectional" party for the benefit of the working class alone, but is a "national" party capable of representing the interests of all sections of the community.

On the surface the Labor Party is fairly quiet at the moment. But underneath there is much movement as preparations are being made for the annual conference, due to take place in three months time, at which the first of a new series of policy statements will be presented by the leadership. When these statements are discussed the conflict between the left and the right will once more become clearly visible.

It can be seen that the current political situation in Britain is very much like a tug-of-war in which a large number of teams are pulling in different directions at the same time. Sooner or later the rope must snap, and when it does the team which can get to its feet quickest in the ensuing scramble will be the team which determines the future development of British politics for the next period.

BOLIVIA

MNR Regime Rigs a Plebiscite

The following article was received from our Latin American correspondent before the elections in Bolivia which has just been held. As Comrade Rey expected, the government candidate Siles was declared elected. A. N. Y. Times dispatch from La Paz in part confirmed the rigged character of the elections which is here described.—Ed.

By JUAN REY

The economic situation in Bolivia can be described as an agony. The nationalized tin mines are working at a deficit which the government covers by printing currency. Thus the dollar now stands at 8000 pesos. Of course, this financial magic has to be paid for by the mine workers, with their low wages. This, in turn, results in low production in the mines.

The government saves itself from a catastrophe by begging for financial assistance from the State Department, and by giving important concessions to United States capital in the exploitation of Bolivia's oil resources (McCarthy, Gulf Oil Co., etc.). It appears that without the financial help of the State Department the Nationalist regime could not survive. It is an irony of politics that the people who have fought under the banner of anti-imperialism for years and years are now begging for the financial help of the United States, and are willing to sell their country at any price in order to get it.

To the economic agony is added the political. The Nationalist regime can give nothing to the masses, and the old bourgeois opposition has been destroyed. Now opposition to the regime and to the leaders of the COB (trade-union federation) is surging among the workers, but it is being kept in check by the "left" parties who continue to support the Nationalists.

Despite the fact that Lechin himself is no longer a member of the government, the COB under his leadership continues to back it. Because Lechin has represented a majority of the workers, this has been the strongest government Bolivia has had in a long time.

But now Lechin and his friends are beginning to lose their popularity, both because of the catastrophic economic situation of the workers, and because the

country knows that he and all the Nationalist leaders have made big money and are now rich "new bourgeois."

BONAPARTIST ELECTION

To get out of this situation the government has decided to hold elections in order to substitute support by the Indian peasants for the declining prestige of Lechin and Pres. Paz Estenssoro among the workers.

But this will be a peculiar election, in the style of the bonapartist plebiscites.

The government expects to win the election through its control of the Indian peasants, since it has introduced the universal franchise in the country. But to assure its victory, the government has also decreed an electoral statute according to which only one electoral list will be permitted in any departamento (state), so that the opposition must appear on the same list as the government's candidates. This is the device by which the government hopes to eliminate the danger of both bourgeois and worker oppositions in the urban centers, and to be safe with its peasant majority.

The control over the peasants is very simple, because the MNR, the government party, has no competition in the countryside, while it has in every hamlet an MNR chief who rules all the peasants of the village. This official boss also distributes to the peasants all commodities which come from the city, and in this way he controls all the Indians absolutely.

His order to vote for the government amounts, in practice, to an automatic victory for the regime, because the Indians have two-thirds of the votes. Thus the regime is guaranteed a victory in the country in the plebiscitary manner.

This is the way in which the government thinks it can overcome the fact that the COB's prestige is declining, and thus it hopes to shift its base from the workers to the peasantry. The symbol of this new policy is the candidacy of Hernan Siles for the presidency.

Siles is considered to be the leader of the Nationalist Right. He will push forward a new Nationalist policy of capitalist restoration, if one can use this term for a country in which capitalism has

never ceased to reign. It will be his job to suppress the workers' movement, and to consolidate the new Nationalist "Rosca" (the great owners, the rich) in power.

The bourgeois opposition, with the exception of the pro-Franco "Falange," has decided to boycott the totalitarian plebiscite. But the left has decided to participate in the elections, and thus again supports the Nationalist regime.

CRISIS ON LEFT

The left is wracked by crisis. The most important force, the POR (Fourth Internationalists) is divided into four factions, and in part has deserted to the MNR (Moller, Ayala). The Stalinist camp is divided into three parties, the resuscitated PIR, the Communist Party, and the PPR (Partido de Revolucion Popular).

One group of ex-POR people, the VOR (Vanguardia Revolucionario Obrera), has proclaimed a boycott of the elections. It remains under the leadership of the workers' ex-deputy, Salamanca, and stands for the workers' upsurge against MNR Nationalism and for the conquest of workers' power.

Guillermo Lora of the POR has decided to participate in the elections and to use them to contest with the MNR for the masses. He has been in prison for nine months, either at the order of or with the toleration of his ex-friends, Lechin and Co. In spite of his political integrity he is making a mistake, because the left does not have any chance to win the elections. He can get only about 10 deputies from the government, and this will be used for the purpose of giving the masses the illusion that this is a democratic regime.

Thus the agony of Bolivia's "National Revolution" is moving toward a counter-revolutionary restoration and the suppression of the workers' movement. But the agony can endure for a long time yet, because Bolivian Nationalism is politically weak, the workers' movement is still strong, and the left, divided into its pro-Stalinist and anti-Stalinist wings, remains in a deep crisis, incapable of overcoming the present political situation and giving the masses a socialist program and a socialist solution.

Left-Winger Raises the Issue of Algeria and Guy Mollet

Politics at the SP Convention

By HAL DRAPER

Besides the unity question, which we fully reported on last week, there were some other aspects of the recent Socialist Party convention which have interest. One of these was the question of the French socialists and Algeria.

As our readers know [see LA for May 28] the ISL has tried forcibly to bring before the SP its socialist obligation in this matter. The bloody suppression of a national liberation movement in Algeria is being carried on by none other than the head of the French Socialist Party, Premier Guy Mollet, who is acting as executioner for the interests of an outlived imperialism. The American Socialist Party had not found its voice to say a peep against this truly shameful discredit of socialism.

But it came up at the Chicago convention, toward the very end, and quite against the intent of the convention's right-wing majority.

It was during the last session, when with time pressing, the Resolutions Committee was hastily reporting out some dozens of resolutions that had been placed before it by delegates. Some concerned questions like recognition of China, or the struggle against Franco, or the Powell amendment; and some concerned questions like pure-water supplies, better car design to reduce highway accidents, juvenile delinquency, educational TV, etc.

Impartially all were being disposed of at the rate of about two a minute, as committee reporter Sam Friedman gave the subject of the resolution, a few words about its content, and usually a recom-

mendation to either adopt "in principle" or refer to the NEC.

As an observer closely following the proceedings, I was not always sure which were being adopted "in principle" and which referred, not to speak of having little idea of what was in the resolutions so treated; though, of course it is possible that the delegates had greater powers of concentration.

In any case the gears stopped grinding suddenly when a left-wing delegate, Jack Cyphen (Suffolk County, L. I.), got up to say that he wanted to read his two resolutions to the body. One was on the Israel-Arab conflict and reflected a good version of the Bund position; but it was the other, on Algeria, which threw the convention into a discussion.

For Cyphen's brief resolution did not mince words. Its first sentence said we "condemn" Guy Mollet for the appropriate reason. Its second sentence came out foursquare in favor of self-determination for Algeria. (Lastly it came out for UN mediation in the conflict, or some such proposal which I do not have exactly.)

The right-wingers were evidently at some loss to know just what to do with this hot potato. Not one of them wanted to, or ever did, get up to defend Mollet or to oppose self-determination. They wanted to get it off the floor or smooth it over into something less "offensive" to their French colleagues.

FAST WORK

National Secretary Herman Singer got up to say that the criticism was "valid" but that Mollet's Algerian policy had begun with a "rather good social policy"; he proposed an amendment to

add this pat-on-the-back to the motion. It was carried without dispute but still left the bristling "condemn."

Then a right-winger made the indicated motion to dispose of it by referring to the NEC. When this was defeated in a hand vote, some of the more experienced right-wingers woke up to the fact that there was a "danger" that this inconveniently forthright resolution might actually be passed. Things started to happen quite fast.

Lena Tulchin (N. Y.) arose to say that the resolution would need "rephrasing and re-toning"; it should not, for example, begin with "condemn," she said.

No sooner had she sat down than the chairman (Bloom, N. Y.) announced that the motion before the house was to adopt the Cyphen resolution "in principle" and direct the NEC to issue a statement on the question. (No one had made this motion; the chairman had plucked it out of the atmosphere himself.)

Apparently understanding quite well what this reformulation meant, a left-winger (Anderson, Chi.) jumped up to say that this would be OK provided you "don't change the first two sentences" (i.e., the "condemn," and self-determination).

At this point Sam Friedman, the committee reporter, launched into a very passionate plea to the convention not to pass a resolution like this one without an "opportunity for full discussion" by the convention, but to refer it to the NEC. He did not pay any attention to the fact that such a motion had just been defeated.

Barely had his ringing echoes ceased when a right-winger (Parker, O.) threw in the motion to refer. Literally almost as fast as it takes to write this, the chairman mentioned that this motion had already been defeated, suggested that it be changed to "approve in principle" as well as refer, Parker agreed, the thing was put to a vote in a twinkling of an eye, and passed by voice vote against a few bewildered nays.

While some of the delegates (I thought) were still dazedly shaking their heads to figure out what had just hit them, and amid a general buzz of what may have been bewilderment or indignation or possibly only curiosity, Sam Friedman arose to tell the chairman: "I think the comrades have a right to know what we just passed," and suggested that the chairman read the motion. Since this particular right was indubitable, the chairman repeated the formulation about approve-in-principle-and-refer.

Not completely enlightened, a left-wing delegate asked: "Is it correct, Comrade Chairman, that the convention has just gone on record, in part, as condemning Guy Mollet?"

"Ye-es," said the chairman musingly, but then he hastily added more strongly, "provided you say something approving his social program. . ."

This is the best this reporter can do in trying to report what the SP convention decided on this very important point.

RIGHT-WING CORE

The Algerian question was one of the few which came before the convention as a touchstone of the party's politics, not so much because Algeria is so decisive in itself, but especially because the other issues were usually so amorphous and cloudy.

For example, on the question of electoral action (to run candidates or not), the underlying issue was never clearly posed, though it was implied in some of the right-wing speeches. This was: the viewpoint of the consistent right wing that the SP should refrain from running candidates in order to have "better relations" with the "labor movement."

The idea behind this, of course, is that SPers should be allowed to support Democrats just like anyone else among the labor politicians; that SP action should at least not get in the way of supporting Democrats.

This was more or less the basis of the right-wing motion against running any slate, even a write-in slate; and in the vote, one third of the convention recorded its support to this consistent right-

wing view. The other two-thirds, who voted for a write-in slate, included the left-wing group, but won because of the traditional SP phenomenon of right-wing "fundamentalists," who could not conceive of a socialist party which was not engaged in parliamentary action.

The foreign-policy point on agenda could have pointed a clear dividing-line but it fell short. Two resolutions, however, were presented to the convention.

The right-wing resolution, fairly long, discussed a great number of specific foreign-policy questions very concretely, in the spirit of critical support to basic American foreign policy. The left-wing resolution stated, rather abstractly, a position of opposition in principle to U. S. foreign policy and a view of socialism as an "independent third force" in world affairs.

Strangely enough, by agreement of both sides—and not because of press of time—it was decided to have no debate or discussion whatsoever on these resolutions, but only a vote.

In the vote, the convention divided down the middle. After three recounts, the vote on the left-wing resolution stood defeated at 22-24. In the next vote on the majority resolution, for some reason most of the left-wingers decided to abstain rather than vote against; and so it was carried 24-11.

However, later that day one delegate changed his vote, making the first vote 23-23. Hoopes thereupon moved the halved motion that both resolutions be referred to the NEC "to be used as a basis for a foreign-policy resolution."

As compared with the previous convention of '54, which hit a low point under the circumstances described last week, this convention represented something of a gain for the left wing; but that has to be taken very relatively.

Still, there is no doubt that the left-wingers, who are among the most active socialist elements in the party, will continue to press for their convictions, as well as develop them; and as always Independent Socialists have only the most cordial best wishes for the strengthening of militant socialist views in the Socialist Party.

John G. Wright

One of the veterans of the American Trotskyist movement, John G. Wright, died in New York on June 21 when he collapsed of heart failure after a six-month illness. Friends and comrades, in sorrow, attended a memorial meeting held on June 27 at the headquarters of the Socialist Workers Party, in which he had been an NC member since 1940.

Wright (pen name of Joseph Vanzler—"Usick" to his friends) entered the old Communist League of America in 1933. Born in Samarkand about 52 years ago, he came to the U. S. at 12. Though he graduated from Harvard as a specialist in colloidal chemistry, he was attracted by philosophy; from the study of Hegel he came to Marx, and then to the revolutionary movement under the influence of the late Dr. Antoinette Konikow, whose daughter he married.

John G. Wright will be remembered particularly as the translator of a number of Leon Trotsky's works, including *The Third International After Lenin*, *The Stalin School of Falsification*, *The First Five Years of the Comintern*.

CP Crisis Opens Way --

(Continued from page 1)

this much is certain: in making their show of public criticism, the CP leaders are trying to run up ahead of the parade lest they be left behind. What is truly unprecedented is the amount of discordance, disaffection, perplexity and ideological fragmentation that has been produced below in the CPs.

Take for example the CP leaderships of Italy (Togliatti) and France (Thorez), rather than the unimportant camp-followers in the U. S. and Britain: the record is quite clear that in the first weeks after the 20th Congress, these protégés of Stalin dragged their feet.

For weeks the French press, all sections of it, needled Thorez on his muteness about the 20th Congress upheaval. Claude Bourdet's weekly *France-Observateur*, which is indeed chock-full of Stalinoids, started wondering in point whether Thorez was determined to be the last "Stalinist" in Europe. It had similar thoughts about Togliatti at the time.

If Togliatti and Thorez are now finding their voices, it is not because they greeted the desanctification of Stalin with unbounded joy and unmeasured relief.

Far more relevant is the fact that, behind them and below them, are masses of Communist workers who follow this party only because they know of no other which can satisfy their anti-capitalist aspirations; who never have been hardened cadre-Stalinists imbued with the discipline of the totalitarian machine; who are not and cannot be intimidated by a state terror which fortunately these CP leaders do not yet possess; who are not *gleichschaltet* into a totalitarian straitjacket but have simply been deceived by Stalinist demagoguery; who, even in many layers of their secondary leadership, are still idealistic Communists who have unwisely closed their eyes to the facts of Stalinist life, but who cannot now keep them closed.

This is even more true in Italy than in France; and more true in these two countries, with their mass Communist Parties, than in any other; and so it is no accident that it is Togliatti who has taken the lead in following the "critical" line.

There are three ways in which Italy is unique in this connection:

(1) It has the largest Communist Party in the world whose members are

free and voluntary adherents—and who can therefore just as freely and voluntarily break.

(2) This mass following went over to the CP after a revolutionary break with fascism, i.e., vivid experience with dictatorship and with such phenomena as the "cult of the individual" as are simply words in other countries.

(3) Italy is the only country where there has been a mass socialist party (Nenni's) which, while toying a Stalinoid line as Nenni has done pretty consistently up to now, has yet been entirely independent while so doing.

Thus the very existence of the Nenni-SP offers the Italian revolutionary workers an immediate and (to them) acceptable alternative for breaking with the GP. This threat was borne out in part in the results of the recent Italian elections (see page 2). For the immediate future, if the CP did nothing, this threat loomed even greater. It is no accident that right after Nenni issued a highly critical statement on Khrushchev's secret speech, demanding democratic changes, Togliatti upped his own previous ante with another statement which was much more critical than before.

The possibility is real, for the first time since the war's end, of breaking the CP's monopoly on the best sections of the Italian working class.

REVOLUTIONARY POTENTIAL

The potentiality is real for the development of an adequately anti-Stalinist wing of Nenni's party, especially under the influence of or in cooperation with the Independent Socialists of Italy (USI—for whom, again, see page 2).

In France, while the possibilities for dynamic changes in this crisis cannot be gainsaid, it is more difficult to look for similar changes soon, in view of the relative weakness of independent socialist forces about which to crystallize.

It is the scope and sweep of the Stalinist crisis which makes this potentiality a real one, even though we cannot be so foolhardy as to prophesy that the potentiality will indeed be realized.

What it can mean is a great rebirth of revolutionary socialism on the Continent.

It is in pivotal crises like these that the existence or absence of independent socialist centers of crystallization can be decisive in making history.

**LABOR ACTION**

July 2, 1956 Vol. 20, No. 27

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

LYL: Back to the Popular-Front Fraud

By MICHAEL HARRINGTON

In last week's issue of *Challenge*, we reported on the SDA convention. One of the events which took place there deserves much more detailed comment: the operations of the observer from the Labor Youth League. The LYL representative presented himself as an advocate of "unity," a foe of YSL membership, and in general associated himself with the right-wing leadership (which disavowed any connection with him later on) as much as he could.

As we noted in our analysis of the convention, this probably followed from two general considerations: first, the LYLER was implementing the new Stalinist Popular Front line; and second, he was driving to exclude a knowledgeable anti-Stalinist tendency from the organization.

It is this first aspect, the Popular Front, which requires more analysis. It must be remembered that the American youth movement has not had the experience of Stalinist Popular-Fronting and must be brought up to date on the whole question.

The general conception underlying any analysis of the Popular Front concerns the relation of Stalinist parties throughout the world to the Russian CP: the Stalinist parties act as agents of Moscow.

The various changes in Stalinist line outside of Russia are phrased in terms of the indigenous politics of the particular nation; the American party will proclaim that it is altering its position because of the needs of the American working class. But this sudden recognition of the needs of the American (or French, or Italian) workers is always preceded by a shift in Russia. And there is a strange coincidence of the newly discovered political reality in the country outside of Russia and the needs of Stalinist foreign policy.

LINE-SWITCHERS

The point is easy enough to document. Until the fall of 1939, the American CP was for the Popular Front, pro-Roosevelt, etc. Then came the Hitler-Stalin pact. The Stalinists became "anti-war" and joined with all kinds of elements, including far-right isolationists, in opposing Roosevelt. But when Russia was invaded, the imperialist war became a "democratic war," and the American CP appeared as an active follower of the ex-warmonger Franklin Roosevelt.

During this, the World War II period, the Popular Front line took the CP into support of piecemeal, speed-up, the no-strike pledge, etc., and into opposition to the struggle of the Negroes for equality in the armed forces. In 1945, Jacques Duclos wrote his famous letter, Earl Browder was expelled, the party moved

YSL CLASS • NEW YORK

INTRODUCTION TO SOCIALISM A Class Based on Max Shachtman's "The Fight for Socialism"

Sunday evenings at 8 p.m.

- (2) July 1—*Cy Jackson*
IMPERIALISM AND WAR
- (3) July 8—*Tim Wohlforth*
GOVERNMENT AND THE STATE
- (4) July 22—*Ruth Karel*
THE LABOR MOVEMENT
- (5) July 29—*Ray Walsh*
WHAT KIND OF PARTY?
- (6) Aug. 5—*Joan Morris*
FASCISM, STALINISM
OR SOCIALISM

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

"left," the Progressive Party was formed, etc.

Now Eugene Dennis has discovered that this was all a mistake. Purporting to base himself on an analysis of American conditions (which occurred to him after the Russians changed their line—the day after, you might say), he has now discovered that this was all a mistake, that it was left-sectarianism, and that American Communists must find their way back into the liberal-labor movement.

In Claude Lightfoot's report to the National Committee of the party, kind words are found even for ADA, which is described as if it were moving in the direction of a labor party.

HAVE THEY CHANGED?

Now all of this, as we mentioned before, is easy to document. Indeed, one can prove it by citing as an authority... the Communist Party of the U. S. A.

In its statement of June 24, the National Committee of the party said: "we admit frankly that we uncritically justified many foreign and domestic policies of the Soviet Union which are now shown to be wrong. We have begun to re-examine our previously oversimplified and wrong concept of the relations which should exist between the Marxists of various countries..." Which is a euphemism for the admission that in the past the American CP was a simple tool of the Russians, and a statement that things will be different.

What about this point? Do the statements of Dennis, and those of the French, Italian, and English Communist Parties, really indicate that a basic change has taken place?

What is being asked is: has the nature of the various Communist Parties changed? Not whether sincere rank-and-filers want to change; not even whether a leader or two has been shaken up by the Twentieth Congress; but whether the parties themselves, as institutions, have been transformed. And here one must recognize a crucial notion: the relationship between the Communist Parties outside of Russia and the Russian ruling class.

CP'S BASE

In some countries, France and Italy for example, the Communist Parties have a mass base of their own. They have thousands of paid functionaries, hundreds of newspapers and magazines, unions, social clubs, and so on. In other countries, particularly in the United States, this is much less true. And this has made a difference. It has been clear that the American party has been treated as the poor relation of international Stalinism, that it has been handled more bureaucratically and arbitrarily than the French or Italian parties. But this difference does not define the institutional nature of the parties.

In the case of all Stalinist parties outside of Russia, one element is essential to the party's hold over its masses: that its leaders appear as the plenipotentiaries of Moscow, as the representatives of Russian "socialism" to this or that country. It is here that one encounters a fundamental element in the power of the various Communist Parties—their purported possession of the symbols of October, their claim to the tradition of revolutionary Marxism.

That this claim is a hoax and fraud is not the issue. The point is that millions accept the claim, and that every Communist Party in the world exploits it for all it's worth.

ROAD TO POWER

And more than this is involved. The present leaderships of the various Communist Parties all have this distinguishing feature: without exception, they all possess a history of uninterrupted subservience to the Russian CP.

They have all followed every twist and turn of Russian policy faithfully; they all outdid themselves and each other in condemning and expelling the Trotskyist and Lovestone-Brandler oppositions from the Communist International when that was decided upon by Stalin. Indeed, the present leaderships of the CP's are their present leaderships precisely because of this subservience; they run the Communist Parties because they proved to Moscow that their loyalty was undying.

But it is even deeper than that. For the question arises as to why none of these leaderships ever took the risk of breaking with Moscow, why they were so willing to be its tools.

The answer lies in the degeneration of the Russian Revolution and the ebbing of the revolutionary moods which had shaken Europe after the First World War. As a result of these phenomena in the mid-twenties, those who rule the CP's today decided that their road to power lay only through Moscow, via subservience to Stalin, and not along the road of international struggle for socialism. And with the further degeneration of the Russian Revolution and the emergence of a new ruling class, the leaderships of the various national CP's, cynical and hardened bureaucrats, began to dream of one day ruling in their own countries as the Russian bureaucrats ruled in Stalinland. They saw the road toward such a development as lying in the expansion of Russian power, to which, therefore they had to subordinate themselves totally.

Their road to power ran through Moscow, not through the class struggle.

NO BREAK

This relationship has not changed. Various Communist Parties may carp at Khrushchev, they may drag their feet on this or that point, but none of them can seriously break with Russian policy because they must be identified with that policy.

If any Stalinist party did reject some fundamental line—the popular front, say—its leadership would face the risk of being read out of the international Stalinist movement. In other words, the character of the Stalinist parties as agents of international Stalinism is embedded in their very nature; it is an aspect essential to those parties. It hasn't changed because it can't.

We gladly accept the American CP's admission of how it operated in the past; but we reject the notion that it will change in the future. That is not dependent on a sudden thought in the night occurring to Dennis about the American working class right after he has read the latest dictate of the Russian ruling class; that change is made impossible by the nature of the party itself.

But then how will this Popular Front line manifest itself?

There is no way to speak of the politics of Stalinist parties as "left" or "right" because that assumes that they are motivated by a response to the situation in their own country, and not, as is the case, by a response to the situation of the Russian Stalinist ruling class. But the politics of the Popular Front will have the quality of a "right-wing" turn, i.e., the American Stalinists will become

quite unradical, try to appear to be liberals just like everybody else; they will move toward the official centers of lib-lab power, and so on.

This, for example, explains why Walter Reuther, long an arch-enemy of the workingclass in the Stalinist press, was discussed at the National Committee meeting of the American CP in friendly terms. This is why Dennis now repudiates the Progressive Party policy, the split from the CIO; this is why he denounces "left sectarianism." All of these changes are phrased as if they develop out of the CP's re-evaluation of the American scene, but this rediscovery of America, as we pointed out before, is a function of a shift in Moscow, not in the United States.

RUSSIAN-ORIENTED

And this brings us back to the role of the LYL at the SDA convention.

Here we have the LYL representative calling for unity, moderation, expelling the radicals, chatting amiably with the right-wingers, standing on the fringe of their caucus at the parking-lot meeting, and so on. When the LYL representative spoke from the floor, it was as if he had no interest in his own organization; his ruling passion, it seemed, was the health and wellbeing of SDA—and an SDA under the control of the right wing.

So our basic point has to be repeated in the case of LYL and SDA: The LYL observer's "right" policy is not a consequence of a sudden decision on the part of the LYL that the politics of moderation are the best politics. It follows from the same general considerations which rule in the case of the American CP: the needs of international Stalinism, specifically the Russian ruling class, now demand a Popular Front turn, and all of the myriad agents of that ruling class throughout the world are turning.

This has important consequences for the American youth movement in the future.

For one thing, the politics of the Popular Front are not so identifiable as those of a "left," Progressive-Party-type, turn Stalinists will not rasp away about Russia; indeed they will hardly be contentious at all. They will endeavor to make themselves the organizational loyalists of the lib-lab movement; they will be for unity, unity, unity. And in doing so, it may well be that they will confuse many sincere young students.

EPITHETS

They will argue that articles such as this are "sectarian," red-baiting, etc. The point is an important one to clear up.

Discussion of Stalinist politics and Stalinist Parties, intransigent opposition to them, is not "red-baiting." Informing, calling on the cops, fingering Stalinists for the government—in general, joining in with that indiscriminate, anti-libertarian, buckshot approach of the right-wing—that is red-baiting. But fighting the Stalinist politically, defeating them because their ideas and purposes are alien to democracy, that is not red-baiting; it is rather the obligation of every democrat, liberal or socialist.

Similarly with the epithet "sectarian." This charge often has an appeal among liberals whose general ideology (reform, class-collaboration, an "unlightened capitalism," etc.) does not dispose them to notions of the necessity for sharp struggle, especially when the fight must be waged against those who present themselves as just another-kind-of-left-winger. And here is where the crucial point recurs.

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

AT THE ISL'S WASHINGTON HEARING—

SHACHTMAN LECTURES IN THE HEARING ROOM

By GORDON HASKELL

Washington, June 19

Throughout this whole day the Department of Justice attorneys continued with the cross-examination of Max Shachtman, International Socialist League national chairman. The questions dealt, in the main, with the relationship of the Workers Party and the Independent Socialist League to the Socialist Workers Party, the Fourth International, and Leon Trotsky.

Since these relationships were purely ideological, and involved some of the most difficult theoretical and political problems which the world socialist movement has faced in the past two decades, Shachtman's answers at times assumed the form of brief lectures on these problems.

Shachtman went into great detail, under questioning by government attorney Maddrix, to explain the ideological character of the struggle in the Socialist Workers Party in 1939 and 1940 which led to the split in that organization and the formation of the Workers Party, which later became the ISL.

He explained that the minority group in the SWP who later led the formation of the WP first banded together on the idea that Stalinist Russia's attack on Poland and Finland was imperialist in character, and that hence socialists could no longer stand on the traditional position of the Trotskyist movement for "unconditional defense of the Soviet Union." He explained that within the minority in the SWP there were, at that time, considerable differences over the social character of the Stalinist regime in Russia, and that it was only some time after the formation of the Workers Party that a broad consensus was reached on this question.

IEWS ON RUSSIA

During this part of the testimony, Maddrix appeared to be trying to bring out the point that the WP abandoned the idea of "unconditional defense" of Russia only when "you claimed Russia was no longer a workers state." Shachtman pointed out that it was Stalinist Russia's imperialist actions in the early stages of World War II which led the minority in the SWP to decide that "unconditional defense" was no longer applicable to Russia, but that this conviction was reinforced by the conclusion, eventually arrived at by a majority of the new organization, that in Russia a new form

of exploitive society had arisen, bureaucratic collectivism.

Maddrix: "Did you say that the bureaucratic dictatorship did not follow the ideas of Lenin and Trotsky?"

Shachtman: "It was a rupture not only with that, but with anything socialistic whatever."

Q—"What form of regime would be in conformity with the political philosophy of Lenin and Trotsky?"

Shachtman explained that the early revolutionary regime in Russia, under Lenin and Trotsky, "was moving toward, or sought to move toward" a socialist regime; that there was the broadest democracy, the most direct peoples' rule possible under the circumstances.

Maddrix: "What you would call the dictatorship of the proletariat?"

Shachtman: "Yes," and then he went on to point out that the meaning for socialists, and especially for the Workers Party, of this term had been explained previously in the hearing.

LABELS

Maddrix then launched into a whole series of questions which seemed to revolve around the point of whether the WP had considered itself a "Trotskyist organization" for some time after the split in 1940. Shachtman explained that they had, in the same sense in which they had considered themselves Marxists and Leninists.

The government attorney insisted that Shachtman list all the differences the WP had had with Trotsky down through the years. Shachtman referred to differences on Russia, on the nature of the Communist Parties all over the world and the attitude revolutionary socialists should have toward them; to the different estimate Trotsky had of the British Labor Party and any government it might form in 1926 and that of the Independent Socialist League of the Labor government of 1945.

Over and over again, throughout the day, Shachtman had to emphasize the difference between a label such as "Trotskyist" or "Leninist" and the reality of

the political and theoretical views of a living socialist organization. "We are Marxists . . ." he said at one point, "We have no rigid views, no dogmas. As our movement developed, its ideas developed and changed. . . . We have written much even in re-evaluation of the Russian Revolution. . . . Lenin and Trotsky tended to adopt as principles what they originally adopted from necessity . . . the idea of one-party rule. . . ."

Over and over again Shachtman drove home the point that what we have in common with Trotsky, as with the great socialist leaders who preceded him, was a common spirit, a common methodology, and not identity of views on all questions. Over and over, and without avail, he requested that Maddrix ask him specific questions about specific "principles" of Trotsky, Marx, Engels, or Lenin so that he could say whether or not the organizations in the hearing had taken favorable or unfavorable attitudes toward them.

"UNITY" QUESTION

At this point, Maddrix introduced as an exhibit a pamphlet *The Question of Unity Between the Workers Party and the Socialist Workers Party* by Albert Goldman, with an introduction by Max Shachtman, written in December 1946. From this introduction, and from the text of the pamphlet itself, he read references to "two Trotskyist organizations" and to "The Workers Party and the Socialist Workers Party, both of which claim firm adherence to the principles of Marxism and to the Fourth International."

It appears that in this hearing it is not possible for a witness to refer, in answer to a question, to a previous answer to an identical question. Thus Shachtman had to explain again what the Workers Party had meant, in this context, in calling itself one of "two Trotskyist parties," and what it had meant by its "firm adherence to the principles of Marxism and to the Fourth International."

In the course of the discussion, Maddrix asked Shachtman to state what was meant by a statement in this pamphlet that "Everything else that divided the two parties was unimportant in comparison with the difference on the kind of party that is needed." His selection of this quotation seemed to cast some light on previous questions he had asked about the importance of the organizational question in the split of 1940. On this particular tack, it seemed he was trying to introduce the idea that what had divided the WP from the SWP was not basic political issues, but only secondary organizational ones.

IDEOLOGICAL DIFFERENCES

A little later on, he sought to get Shachtman to "admit" that the division between the two organizations, and the disagreements the WP had with Trotsky, were "primarily ideological" in character. Shachtman emphasized that inherent in the organizational question was a primary dispute over the essential democratic character of the socialist movement, and that the "ideological" differences were not some doctrinaire or abstract hair-splitting, but were decisive for the attitude of the socialist movement toward the central political issue of the epoch, the nature, character and role of Stalinism.

From the Unity pamphlet, Maddrix quoted references to democratic centralism, and Shachtman explained what the Workers Party meant by that term, as contrasted with the practices of the SWP on the one hand, and the Stalinists on the other. He pointed out that the claim by Hitler's army that they stood for Christianity, and the similar claim by the American army in World War II, did not mean that their goals in the war were identical, and that when organizations with radically different internal regimes say they are all based on the same

organizational principle, it would make much more sense to look at what they practice than to try to make some kind of connection among them because of their similar verbal claims.

Maddrix asked Shachtman whether Goldman was correct in his pamphlet when he wrote that "both [WP and SWP] refused to support the war on the ground that they considered it, on the part of the United States, imperialist in character." Shachtman explained what is meant by political support or non-support of a war, and went on to point out that the internationalist socialist position is to support neither side in an imperialist war.

EXPROPRIATION

After the lunch recess, Maddrix introduced a pamphlet entitled *Declaration of Principles and Constitution of the Socialist Workers Party*, and read a paragraph to the effect that the fundamental instruments of the workers in their struggle for power cannot be the existing institutions of the governmental apparatus, since that belongs to the bourgeoisie. He then asked Shachtman whether he agreed with this statement.

Shachtman pointed out that the pamphlet in question was not a document published by any of the organizations involved in this hearing, and went on to point out that on some questions, at least, it differed from views expressed by leaders or official bodies of these organizations.

Specifically, he pointed out that the ISL has never taken the position that a socialist government has to expropriate the means of production from the capitalist class without compensation, but that its spokesmen had explained that the amount of compensation may be decided by a future socialist government according to circumstances and on the basis of fair proceedings.

In further discussion on this point, Shachtman had to once again outline the different attitude socialists have toward personal property and property in the means of production.

With regard to the ability of the workers to use "the existing institutions of the governmental apparatus" in their struggle for power, Shachtman explained that to socialists "government is a reflex of the social power of the capitalist class," and that even if the workers are able to achieve governmental power, to take over the government, they will not have real social power until they have socialized the means of production.

THE CONSTITUTION

Maddrix: "Aren't they saying that the present institutions . . . are not sufficient to attain a workers state?"

Shachtman: "What do you mean . . . to take power . . . or to exercise it?"

Q—"For instance, would there be any courts?"

A—"I should hope so, Mr. Maddrix."

Q—"Would there be three departments . . . separation of powers?"

A—"We are generally against separation of powers . . . we are for clear responsibility of sections of government to the people. . . ."

Q—"Under such a state there would be no need for our present Constitution?"

A—"Just to what extend a socialist society would revise the Constitution I don't know . . . I would expect it would be a very drastic revision."

Q—"Would there be any place for the rights of minorities?"

A—"Unless minorities have full rights, there would be no socialism. . . ."

Q—"What would happen to the bourgeoisie?"

A—"If they are law-abiding . . . I assume they would become members of the working class. . . ."

At this point, Maddrix once again returned to the question of what differences the organizations in this hearing had with Trotsky. Shachtman explained again that Marxism is a living ideology. He pointed out that Trotsky had expressed all kinds of opinions during a lifetime of political activity, depending on the concrete circumstances with which the working class was faced in each specific instance. At one time he was for soviets in China, and at another time he thought that to call for them was a mistake.

TROTSKY'S ROLE

Maddrix sought instances in which the WP had "disavowed any of the principles of Trotsky." Shachtman referred

YOUNG
Socialist CHALLENGE

(Continued from page 5)

The various Stalinist turns are rhetorically presented as arising out of American needs, but they are actually a response to Russian demands. And this means that Stalinist organizational participation is always subordinate to this foreign interest, that they can never become loyal members, not even members of a loyal minority.

For example: during the Hitler-Stalin pact, the Stalinists worked closely with the pacifist movements; the day after the pact they denounced those same movements as "fascist." That is only one case. There are quite literally hundreds. One final point. A distinction must be made between Stalinist organizations and their leadership on the one hand, and rank-and-file members of those organizations on the other.

It is often true that the rank and file are sincerely attracted to Stalinism on the basis of the "American" line, i.e., in terms of the manifest content of the new turn, in ignorance of the latent real causes. Obviously, one's personal attitude toward such people—who are often

sincere radicals—is different from one's intransigent hostility to the Stalinist organizations. But when they act politically under Stalinist discipline or influence, they are working for the latent aim, know it or not, and must be politically opposed.

These questions will become very important in the near future for the American youth movement. That movement must understand now that there are changes going on in Russia, in the various Communist Parties, and that they are very important; but that nothing has happened to change the fundamental, institutional nature of Stalinist organizations and politics; that American Stalinism, as always, still represents an attempt to subordinate the needs of the American workers, farmers and minorities, and the international working-class and colonial revolution, to the demands of the bureaucratic ruling class in Russia.

We don't call them cops—but we do want to fight these Stalinist politics wherever we find them.

ISL Chairman Answers Quiz on War, Revolution, Class Struggle, et al.

again to the differences on specific questions which had developed during Trotsky's lifetime, and pointed out the impossibility of successful conjecture on just what Trotsky would have thought about the many political problems with which the ISL had grappled in the past 15 years.

As to the "charge" that the WP's negotiations with the SWP in 1945 for reunification showed that there were no real differences between them, Shachtman pointed out that he is still for the unity of the socialist movement, and that if there were no good political reasons for the present divisions he would be for uniting all socialist organizations.

In his continued attempt to tie the WP and ISL to Trotsky or Trotskyism, Maddrix read from a speech delivered by Shachtman at a Trotsky memorial meeting in 1947, at which Shachtman had spoken of Trotsky as a great revolutionist, and had pointed to his life and ideas as models for today. Shachtman replied that he would say the same thing about Trotsky today. "He was a great socialist, a great revolutionist."

Maddrix: "Having been closely connected with the SWP, would it be your opinion that its leaders advocated overthrow of the government of the United States by force and violence?"

Shachtman: "Not to my knowledge."

Q—"Were they tried in a federal court on the charge that they advocated...?"

A—"They were tried under the Smith Act."

Q—"About what year?"

At this point Attorney John Silard,

who was representing the organizations at this session, rose to inquire why the government was trying to use Shachtman as its expert witness on this matter, and what relevance the matter might have to the listing of the organizations. After some exchange among Examiner Morrissey, Maddrix and Silard, Maddrix asked Shachtman whether the WP had taken any part in the defense of the SWP in their Smith Act trial during World War II. Shachtman replied that the WP had "supported their case, and asked people to give financial and other support to the case."

The session ended with a number of questions on the resignation of James Burnham from the Workers Party in 1940, and the reply to his letter of resignation by the Political Committee of the WP. Here again, the point appeared to be that Burnham had called the WP "a faction of the Trotskyist movement" in his letter of resignation, and that the WP had said that Burnham had fought for a revolutionary socialist party based on the principles of Lenin, Trotsky, Luxemburg and the Fourth International. Once again there had to be an explanation of what is meant by such a phrase when used in this kind of context.

The hearing then recessed for another day.

So much of the cross-examination is repetitious that one can only conclude the government hopes to cover up the essential emptiness of its case by piling up a record of identical quotations about the "principles of Marxism" or the "ideas of Trotsky."

appropriate union on his job, but that he was sure the disciplinary measure mentioned had never been invoked in the history of the organization.

Maddrix then asked whether the organizations were primarily interested in the working class, and whether they opposed class-collaboration.

Shachtman explained once again the role which socialists ascribe to the working class, even though "socialism... is for all humanity." He also stated that "we are against all class-collaboration... we say the workers are at a disadvantage in class-collaboration..."

Q—"Doesn't it [WP-ISL] try to foment class disagreement?"

A—"... We try to make the worker conscious of his class position in society... to make him conscious of the irreconcilable difference between his class and the capitalist class... of his historical mission to lift society above the class struggle... when a fight takes place, we seek to deepen the understanding of the workers of their role in society..."

Q—"Wasn't it the position of the organizations to 'constantly encourage strikes and class conflict?'"

A—"It is ridiculous... to 'constantly' encourage strikes... we encourage them to seek the most they can get, in a practical way, at any time..."

MADDRIX'S MOTIVES

Maddrix then launched on a line of questioning which seemed designed to show that the WP-ISL was not "really" interested in the welfare of the workers, but merely sought to "use" them for the purpose of achieving its goal of a workers' government. From there he went to the question of what is meant by the social-economic base of a society and its political structure; to whether the idea of the WP-ISL, as expounded by Shachtman, of the nature of a revolutionary party was the same as the ideas of Trotsky and Lenin on the same question; and once again, over the WP-ISL's conception of the use of the term "dictatorship of the proletariat."

Since all this territory had been covered repeatedly, either by the answer of the organizations to the attorney general's original interrogatories or by Shachtman's direct testimony, it appeared that Maddrix was just trying to "beef-up" the record, or possibly hoped, by asking the same questions over and over again during the five weeks of the hearing, either to find some real or apparent contradictions in Shachtman's answers, or to induce him to use some poorly formulated phrase which could later be picked up for inclusion in the Justice Department's recommendations on findings to their own hearing examiner. If such were indeed his aims, Shachtman's carefully measured, painstakingly accurate replies frustrated them.

The rest of the day was taken up with much the same kind of thing. Maddrix asked Shachtman whether the organizations were "opposed to forcible revolutions." Shachtman replied that in certain circumstances they were certainly for such revolutions: under Stalin... Hitler... in the circumstances of the 13 colonies, etc.

"FORMULA"?

From there a long time was spent on the Russian Revolution; the question of dual power; the dispersal of the Constituent Assembly; whether or not the Kerensky government was a real government in any sense; whether or not Vernadsky was just an authority or an unimpeachable source, in every line, on the Russian Revolution; and so forth.

Shachtman explained the views he and other ISL writers had expressed on the various subjects dealt with. In connection with the Vernadsky matter, he delivered a brief lecture on the nature of historical writing, since Maddrix could not understand how Shachtman could refer to Vernadsky on certain aspects of the Russian Revolution but dispute his writings on others.

The discussion became so detailed and technical that finally Shachtman pointed out that although this was one of his favorite subjects, he could not possibly understand why his opinion on this or that happening in Russia in 1917, whether he was right or wrong, had any bearing on the listing of the WP-ISL by the attorney general as subversive.

Q—"Am I correct in saying that you

accept what happened in Russia as a recommended formula...?"

Shachtman explained why the organizations could not possibly recommend the course of the Bolshevik party in 1917 in Russia as a formula for a party in the United States in 1956.

Maddrix then went right back to the Constituent Assembly, and the learned historical lecture by Shachtman continued. Finally Maddrix seemed either satisfied or exhausted by this particular phase of his examination.

He then read a quotation from a legal decision by Justice Learned Hand which started: "Revolutions are often right, but there is no right to revolution." He demanded to know whether Shachtman agreed or disagreed with this quotation.

Shachtman asked to see the context in which the statement was made. Maddrix refused, and insisted that Shachtman state yes-or-no whether he agreed with this quotation from Hand. Shachtman said that unless he could see the context, and could comment on it in his own way, he could not answer.

"FOR OR AGAINST"?

Almost immediately after this, Maddrix asked whether in Shachtman's opinion, "genuine democracy, as you understand it, would exist only under a socialist society." Shachtman explained that the democracy in the United States, and these organizations believe there is capitalist democracy in the United States, and there would be a much fuller democracy under socialism, and that socialists would much prefer the latter.

Q—"Are you against capitalist democracy?"

Shachtman explained that socialists prefer a socialist democracy.

Q—"Then you are against the democracy of this country?"

Shachtman explained that socialists support capitalist democracy as against fascism, and are for socialist democracy as against capitalist democracy.

Q—"Are you opposed to capitalist democracy... yes or no?"

At this point John Silard, who was appearing as attorney for the organizations at the hearing rose to point out to Hearing Examiner Morrissey that although he had permitted Maddrix every possible latitude in cross-examination, his demand at this point was going too far. "Mr. Shachtman says," Silard pointed out, "that he prefers hamburger to spinach, and steak to hamburger. You want him to say that he is 'against' hamburger."

In order to show the actual attitude of the organizations toward the "form of government" which now exists in the United States, Shachtman read the section from his book, *The Fight for Socialism* which deals with this question (beginning on page 143). This section deals with the criticisms socialists have made of the separation of powers between the legislative and executive branches of the government, the unrepresentative character of the Senate, and the like, and sketches roughly the kind of governmental set-up which socialists believe would be more democratic, representative, and suitable to a workers state or a socialist society.

Maddrix again appeared to be trying to get Shachtman to make some off-the-cuff statement about the organizations being opposed to "our form of democracy," and once again Shachtman explained that the organizations oppose and seek to replace not only the present government but also the social and economic system only in the interest of establishing a more democratic one.

ABOUT REFORMISM

Maddrix then switched to a series of questions on the British Labor Party, and the difference between a reformist and a revolutionary socialist party.

Q—"When you use the term reformist, you mean a socialist organization which intends to achieve its ends by reformist methods. Can you be more explicit?"

A—"Reformists seek to make capitalism work in a way in which we think only socialism can work... they want to reform it here and there... we are for a more radical change of the basis of society."

Q—"Is it your position that the Brit-

(Turn to last page)

Cross-Exam Ranges Over Many Problems

Washington, June 20

Justice Department attorney Maddrix continued today with the cross-examination of Max Shachtman, chairman of the Independent Socialist League. The first subject which he took up at this session was the formation of the Socialist Youth League, the youth organization of the Workers Party up to 1953, its functions and relations to the Workers Party and the Independent Socialist League.

Maddrix asked Shachtman whether part of the purpose of the Socialist Youth League was to train the youth for eventual membership in the Workers Party, and "for various ramifications of the class struggle." He wanted to know whether the youth were "to be used to benefit the WP" and in what way.

Shachtman explained that, as would be the case with any socialist youth organization affiliated with an adult organization, its purpose was to cooperate with the WP in all kinds of enterprises such as classes and schools, distribution of the press, and so forth.

MADDRIX: "Were they used in the colleges in any way to advance the theory of socialism held by the Workers Party?"

SHACHTMAN: "Indeed."

Q—"In what way?"

Shachtman answered that they talked to other students, organized lectures, debates, forums, and the like. They sought to sell their own publications and those of the WP to students and others.

Q—"Were members of the SYL used to establish contact with industrial workers...?"

Shachtman explained that the SYL had sought to recruit young workers as well as students, and that they tried to influence fellow workers in much the same ways as they tried to influence students.

Maddrix asked whether the members of the SYL were "educated, so to speak" in the theories of Marxism, and Shachtman said that, properly understood, the organization had done its best to so educate them.

Q—"That would include the writings of Marx, Lenin and Trotsky, would it not?"

A—"Yes... in the writings of all socialist writers, and many others besides."

Q—"Did they attempt to combine theory and practice?"

Shachtman explained that the youth and the adults as well always attempt to combine theory and practice, that aside from its relationship to practice, theory is of very little interest to socialists.

The point of the above exchange, however remote it may seem to be from the question of whether the SYL should be on the attorney general's list of subversive

organizations, should be clear. It was similar to many of the "points" Maddrix appeared to be trying to make throughout his cross-examination. Just what might be thought to be "subversive" about people trying to combine theory with practice it is difficult even to imagine. But, since that is a well-known Marxist platitude, and has been repeated by the Stalinists and others, it is assumed to have some sinister, if not occult, or possibly "Aesopian" connotation.

Shachtman went on to list the kind of topics which were taught in various classes and schools of the SYL.

Maddrix then asked, in an offhand sort of way, "What is the name of this new youth organization?" Shachtman explained that the Young Socialist League of today is different from the old Socialist Youth League in that it is an independent organization which "owes no political fealty to the ISL" and was constituted by a merger of the Socialist Youth League and the Young Peoples Socialist League, youth group of the Socialist Party.

Q—"I suppose it holds the same views as the SYL?"

A—"I haven't seen any of the documents of the new organization... they have very friendly relations with us."

Q—"Did the SYL have delegates to your national conventions?"

Shachtman explained that there were such delegates, elected by the youth themselves, and in some detail explained the degree of organizational autonomy the SYL had enjoyed with regard to the WP-ISL.

JOINING UNIONS

Maddrix then jumped to the question of whether or not the WP had made it mandatory for all its members to join some union. Shachtman explained that the organizations were for every worker belonging to a union, for every housewife belonging to some housewives' organization, and in general, for their members getting into the organized political and social arenas, rather than cultivating their socialist ideas in solitude.

Maddrix read from some WP bulletin to the effect that "every eligible member, if not directed otherwise, must join a trade union..." and asked whether it was not true that if members failed to join such organizations within three months of going to work they were put on probation in the WP.

Shachtman said that although there may very well have been some such rule at one time or another, it was simply to give the heaviest emphasis possible to the idea that no socialist worth his salt who was a worker would stay out of the

ISL's Washington Hearing — —

(Continued from page 7)

ish Labor Party wants to educate . . . to a socialist society?"

Shachtman explained that there are different tendencies within the BLP, some more conservative and others more radical, with different ideas of how the party should proceed and just what its objectives should be.

Q—"Even so . . . do you consider it a Marxian organization . . .?"

Shachtman explained that neither the organizations, nor the BLP itself, in the main, consider the BLP a Marxist organization, although many of their attitudes and ideas about capitalism, the role of the working class, and other matters are far closer to the ideas of Marx than they themselves know.

WAR POLICY

Maddrix then asked whether there is any difference between the BLP's manner of conducting itself in the last war, and the way in which a real Marxist organization would have conducted itself. Shachtman replied that the difference was that "we would not, for example . . . participate in a government headed by the Tory party . . . we would not follow the policy of such a party in the war . . ."

Q—"The position of your organization was that the class struggle should not cease during wartime . . .?"

A—"The class struggle never ceases . . . it takes many forms, often a concealed form . . . the capitalist class never gives up its interests . . . in wartime or peacetime . . ."

Maddrix then asked whether it wasn't true that the Bolsheviks criticized reformist socialists for supporting their various governments during the war, and whether the policy of the organizations was not the same as that of the Bolsheviks in this respect. Shachtman explained that to the extent to which there were differences between the character of the two wars, a correspondingly different attitude was adopted by the organizations in their political opposition to World War II. Under questioning he explained that the primary new elements which entered into the evaluation of policy in World War II were the nature of fascism and the importance of the national question in it. He stated that the organizations had "come out in complete support and sympathy for all national-resistance movements which came out against the Hitler regime . . ."

Maddrix asked whether it was not true that the organizations had stated that World War II was not a war against fascism. Shachtman said that the governments involved were not fighting fascism, but rather for the preservation of their imperialist and especially colonial interests. He emphasized that where there is a direct struggle between fascism and democracy, even capitalist democracy, "we will always support democracy . . ."

FASCISM AND WAR

Here followed a lengthy discussion on the wartime policy of the organizations, involving the questions of what "support" for the government in its war means. Maddrix kept demanding that Shachtman answer why, if the organizations admit that Nazi Germany was fascist, and that the United States government was fighting Germany, they had not supported the war. Shachtman explained over and over again that, while the members of the organizations had fought in the war like other citizens, the organizations had exercised their right to criticize and to refuse to accept or support the policies of the government in the war.

He stated that the organizations had considered that a victory of the fascist powers would be a disaster for the working class and for democracy in general, and that their opposition to the government's war policies in no way implied any kind of support to the fascist powers, but on the contrary was designed to make possible a truly democratic victory over fascism rather than the imperialist victory from which the whole world suffers to this day. He pointed out that the organizations' "opposition to the war" consisted of specific opposition to the American government's policy in North Africa, British policy in India, the deals at Yalta, Teheran and elsewhere in which the imperialist nature of the American camp's war aims and purposes had been concretized.

From here, Maddrix turned the cross-examination to the transitional program which had been adopted by the Workers Party in the first years of its existence, and asked what the purpose of such a program was.

Shachtman explained that in the '30s Trotsky and others had thought that the United States was in a pre-revolutionary situation, and that a program was necessary which would raise the consciousness of the workers to the level necessary to achieve socialism. He stated that, in general, a transitional program was designed to bring the workers step-by-step closer to the idea of a socialist government.

TYPES OF PROGRAM

Maddrix asked whether there was a difference between a transitional program and a program of minimum demands. Shachtman said that any particular demand might be either "minimum" or "transitional," depending on circumstances, with the essential characteristic of a transitional demand being that its purpose is to set the workers in motion toward a broader socialist program. He explained, further, that when the organizations realized that the analysis that the United States was in a pre-revolutionary situation was faulty, they had ceased talking about their program as a "transitional program" and had adopted such terms as the "reconversion program"—"program of the Workers Party," etc.

Maddrix demanded to know whether it was not the view of the organizations that the transitional program was designed to exploit a crisis for the purpose of overthrowing the government, and referred to passages in the pamphlet *Plenty for All* in this connection. Shachtman explained that these passages were the author's historical prognostication of what was likely to happen if a crisis did occur, not any kind of a blueprint or program for the organizations.

In this connection, Maddrix again brought up the question of workers defense guards and factory committees, which had been gone into earlier in the cross-examination, and Shachtman again explained the ideas the organizations had had in mind when they advocated these forms of workers' organizations.

TRADE UNIONS

Maddrix asked whether the organizations believed the leaders of the American trade unions were fundamentally interested in the welfare of the workers of the country. Shachtman said that they were, from their own standpoint.

Q—"Is it the position of your organizations that the leaders of the major unions are more interested in perpetuating themselves in office than in the welfare of the workers whom they lead?"

Shachtman replied that this is indeed

the attitude of many of them, and that we have been very critical of that type of labor leader. He pointed out that although many of the labor leaders take aggressive stands on economic questions, they tend to be conservative in politics, to the extent that they support one of the capitalist parties instead of trying to form a party which would represent the interest of labor.

He said that in addition to seeking to convince trade-unionists of the economic and political views of the organizations, ISL members generally fight for a maximum of democracy inside the labor movement as they do in the rest of society. "We have a passion for democracy," Shachtman said.

Maddrix then went to the question of workers' control of industry, as it has been advocated in the organizations' literature, and asked exactly what was meant by this and how it was to be brought about. Shachtman said that the workers already try to control such matters as hiring and firing under capitalism, as well as many working conditions. Socialists are for a vast extension of that even under capitalism. But once they have established a socialist or workers' state, they would plan production from top to bottom in the socialized industries. Socialists believe that the people should plan their own production, and that the workers should have complete control over working conditions and the like in the factories.

Q—"Is it the position of the organizations that the main purpose of a labor party is to achieve a socialist society?"

A—"Yes."

Q—"Your primary object in using a labor party is to achieve a socialist society?"

A—"Certainly . . . I want to see the American working class organized politically . . . so that they can achieve socialism."

Maddrix had found some reference, in Erber's study outline *The Role of the Party in the Fight for Socialism*, to a distinction between what Erber had called a "trade-union party" and a "labor party." He questioned Shachtman about this, and Shachtman pointed out that although the organizations are for a labor party based on the trade unions, what Erber had been writing about was the difference between a party based on the present views of the trade union leadership, which he had called a "trade-union party," and a labor party which seeks to give leadership to the nation.

CLASS STRUGGLE

Maddrix then asked a hypothetical question along the lines: "if there was a trade-union party . . . and if it could do more good for the people right now than a labor party which sought to establish socialism, would you support such a trade-union party or the labor party?"

Shachtman appeared to have a bit of difficulty in following the weird hypothesis Maddrix was trying to draw for him, but pointed out that revolutionary socialists, far from demanding that a labor party adopt their program before they are willing to support it, are even willing to support independent candidates on the line of the Liberal Party in New York with the idea that this encourages working-class independence in politics.

Maddrix then turned briefly, again, to the war question. Once more he attempted to work out one of the assertion-series with which the government is seeking to prove its case: *You say the capitalist class controls the government; you oppose the capitalist class; hence you oppose the government. You are for class struggle against the capitalist class; therefore you are for class struggle against the government.*

Shachtman explained patiently that, properly understood, all this was correct and incontestable. But despite the clarity of his explanation, Maddrix ended up with what he seemed to regard as a crushing challenge:

"Why would we want class struggle instead of class collaboration during a war, Mr. Shachtman?"

We continue next week with a full report of the following two sessions, June 21 and 22, which concluded the cross-examination of Max Shachtman, plus a report on what may be the final proceedings during the current week.—ED.

The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Get Acquainted!

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

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

NAME (please print) _____
ADDRESS _____
CITY _____
ZONE STATE _____

HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE

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

- Please enter my subscription:
- 1 year at \$2. 6 months at \$1.
 - Payment enclosed. Bill me.
 - New sub. Renewal.

NAME (please print) _____
ADDRESS _____
CITY _____
ZONE STATE _____

A NEW PAMPHLET, JUST PUBLISHED IN ENGLAND

Russia from Stalin to Khrushchev

by **TONY CLIFF**

22 pages 15 cents

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

Labor Action FORUM
New York

THURSDAYS at 9 p.m.

July 5—Sam Taylor
IS THE ECONOMIC RECESSION HERE?

July 12—Michael Harrington
REINHOLD NIEBUHR'S POLITICS

114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.