

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

FEBRUARY 8, 1954

FIVE CENTS

Convention to Launch New United Young Socialist League

... Back Page and page 7

Djilas and the Crisis of Titoism—II

THE MOVEMENT BEHIND DJILAS

... page 5

The GOP's Attack on Reuther

... page 2

A Step Toward Labor Unity: Oil Unions to Meet on Fusion

By BEN HALL

Oil workers delegates meet in convention in Philadelphia on February 15 to discuss the founding of a new, united union to merge the score of small independent, AFL, and CIO unions which now share organization in this industry.

"We believe that the high degree of coordination between the various companies in the industry and other present-day circumstances make it futile for us to continue operating as widely scattered, separated unions. We believe that fully effective collective bargaining can be carried on in our industry only through an international union representing the majority of workers in the industry and operating under a democratic constitution and through democratic procedures."

So reads the convention call.

The trend toward unity of oil unions is the same trend that pushes the CIO and AFL together in all fields and leads to the signing of a no-raiding pact by both federations. In a threatening political and economic climate, unions seek strength through unity in the struggles to come.

UNITED FRONT

The AFL is virtually non-existent among production workers but has strength through fuel-distributors' locals of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters. The Teamster official attitude toward the approaching convention is not yet known but the determination of its president, Dave Beck, to expand his jurisdiction by gobbling up everything in sight leaves little prospect that the IBT would encourage a strong united oil union.

The call was issued by nine independent local unions from California to New Jersey, which have been cooperating for many months with the CIO and AFL in the National Coalition of Oil Unions, a joint national representative body formed to present a united front of oil labor to the employers.

FIRST STEP

Decisive in the industry is the CIO Oil Workers International Union, by far the largest union. Nevertheless, it has not yet been able to organize the majority of production workers who are still split up among a multitude of tiny local independents. The OWIU hails the convention call and announces that it will be represented in Philadelphia by a large delegation including three international officers and delegates from each of its re-

By attending the convention, the participants do not actually end their separate existence and effect the merger; they simply declare their agreement with the principle of unity and begin to work out tentative plans.

"I believe we can and should participate in this effort with an open mind in an honest and sincere effort to build a bigger and better international," said O. A. Knight, president of the CIO union.

Any new organization, he emphasized, would have to continue the principles of "a fully democratic constitution framework

(Continued on page 2)

Norwalk Vigilantes Arouse National Outcry Against Organized Stoolpigeonry

By GORDON HASKELL

When Post 603 of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of Norwalk, Conn. assembled for its monthly meeting last week, the outer hallway was jammed with newspaper writers and photographers, television cameramen, and radio newscasters. The Norwalk VFW had sprung into national prominence. Its activities became the subject of a presidential press conference and of editorial comment across the land.

What had vaulted the Norwalk VFW from its accustomed modest obscurity to the pinnacle of public attention? Had its members, perhaps, performed some great service to the nation; or had it been detected in a conspiracy to commit some spectacular crime?

The truth, of course, is known to all who read the papers, or who can converse with those who do. The Norwalk VFW had let it be known that as its

contribution to national security, it had set up a committee which was to gather information on any "communistic" activity in their town and turn it over to the authorities, particularly the FBI.

In a way, it is most heartening that the disclosure of this kind of program on the part of a private group of citizens can still arouse so much attention and discussion in the nation. The American people are still far from reconciling themselves to the idea that informing on the legal political ideas and activities of their neighbors is a normal function of citizenship, like turning in a fire alarm.

THEY HAD PRECEDENTS

Even years of the national glorification of professional informers has failed to break down the healthy feeling that something dark and sinister enters into political life if every man must feel obliged to consider whether or not he should report the private comings and goings of the fellow who lives across the street.

The instigators of the Norwalk VFW's program showed a good deal of surprise, and even shock, at the fact that they were subjected to so much comment and criticism. They pointed out that their action had been in conformity with a VFW convention resolution passed about twenty years ago, and further, that it had been approved by a series of public statements made by at least two presidents of the United States.

In this they were, of course, quite right. Both presidents Roosevelt and Truman had urged the people of the country to report any "suspicious" actions which might come to their attention to the FBI.

In the federal service itself, the failure to report any such activities is subject to penalty. Why should the patriotic VFW members of Norwalk take on themselves any less of an obligation than that imposed on federal employees?

When the newspapermen were finally admitted to the post meeting which had discussed the question, they were given

(Continued on page 3)

MOROCCO TODAY: Demagogy by Franco, Terror by France

By A. GIACOMETTI

PARIS, Jan. 25—Last week French colonialism in Morocco ran into trouble from an unexpected source: the Spanish government moved to proclaim a regent in the Spanish zone of Morocco to govern in the name of the exiled Sultan Mohammed V.

The action of the Spanish government can easily be explained in terms of the internal difficulties of the regime. By attempting to recapture some prestige on the level of external politics, the Spanish regime pursues a double purpose: restore the crumbling unity of reactionary forces inside the country and blackmail its way into international acceptance on the outside.

As LABOR ACTION has pointed out recently, tension between monarchists and Falangists has been increasing during the last months. This internal dissension within the regime was highlighted last November by the expulsion of Jean Creach, Madrid correspondent of *Le Monde*, the Paris neutralist daily. Even though *Le Monde* is a liberal newspaper, Jean Creach was by no means politically hostile to the Franco regime. On the contrary, he is rather inclined to support it.

What made him unacceptable in Madrid was the fact that, in his article series on Spain, he reported, in detail, precisely on the growing hostility between monarchist and Falangist circles, thereby touching on a sore spot of the regime. The Spanish-American treaty did not help matters much because, as it

left behind the kind of bitterness that comes from having been sold to a great power.

Therefore a prestige move on the outside became necessary, to unite monarchists and Falangists on an issue of external politics and to create an illusion of independent and forceful action. The agitation over the English queen's visit to Gibraltar must be understood in the same context.

FRANCO'S "TRIESTE"

Morocco lent itself very well to this maneuver, since it was in Morocco that Spain was humiliated recently by the unilateral action of the French, who did not bother to consult their Spanish parasite about deposing the sultan. In addition of becoming Franco's "Trieste" on the internal level, Spain's action in Morocco has the added advantage, from the point of view of the regime, of conciliating the Arab League nations, whose votes it will need when it seek admission to the UN.

The latter aspect is perhaps the most important one. Basically, the Spanish regime's maneuver amounts to blackmail, and tends to force France to revise its whole attitude to Spain as far as admission to EDC, NATO and UN is concerned. Thus the aspirations of the Moroccan people to national independence and to freedom from colonial exploitation are being cynically misused to achieve the international respectability of the Franco regime.

It Isn't Cricket

The N. Y. Times headline on Jan. 31 read as follows:

WEST DISPLAYING IMPRESSIVE UNITY

Allied Officials at Berlin Toss Ball from Hand to Hand Like Well-Drilled Soccer Team

That means the Allied officials are playing a rather foul game of soccer, but the Times needn't be so frank about it.

To balance the picture, we suggest the following headline to go with it:

Molotov Rabbit-Punching in the Clinches as He Bats Out to Right Field

GOP Attack on Reuther Gives It No Alibi for Unemployment

By JACK WILSON

DETROIT, January 31 — Among the many idiotic statements made recently about the growing unemployment in the country, first prize unquestionably goes to Leonard Hall, national chairman of the Republican Party, for his attack on Walter P. Reuther, CIO president.

Hall's blast at Reuther as causing unemployment, because he talks about it, so aroused people here that the usually mild-mannered "Commentator," widely read columnist of the Detroit News, devoted a full column to this subject. Its main points are worth repeating.

Commentator, who is W. K. Kelsey, lives in this world, specifically, in this automotive center, and he can see what is happening. It reminds him too much of 1929.

During the past week, for example, Great Lakes Steel, a major supplier of Ford, announced that 1800 men were laid off out of a work force of 12,000. The razzle-dazzle, super-salesmanship General Motors quietly admitted that its Chevrolet Division was going on a four-day week, perhaps for another month. Nash put in a four-day week schedule, following a vote of the United Auto Workers (CIO) for that policy as against a layoff. Hudson shut down for another week—schedule revisions. Dodge continued a four-day week.

These facts apparently mean nothing to Hall and the Republican Party. Hall was scheduled to speak in Detroit last Wednesday and copies of his speech were passed out in advance. Since poor weather kept him from arriving here (what a pity) he made the speech in Connecticut. Thus enabled the Detroit papers to play it down.

Hall says that Reuther is causing a depression because he talks about unemployment, and thus the country is losing confidence in itself. This is part of a dirty plot on the part of Reuther, who wants to establish a socialist state; this he can do only by having a depression and forcing government planning. . . .

IT'S AN OLD WHEEZE

For the benefit of the super-clever liberals whose faith in capitalism now rests on the hope that the "sophisticated" Republicans will defeat the "dinosaur" wing, this theory of depression via Reuther did not come from a crude Senator McCarthy but from the national chairman of the party, and it was billed as a major policy speech for the 1954 campaign!

The attack on Reuther came during the week when Secretary of Labor Mitchell explained that much of the auto unemployment was due to change-over of models, as if everyone in Detroit didn't know that

model change-overs took place in November and December, and full production was supposed to be resumed at the first of the year.

The attack also came at the time that Michigan Republicans announced at the state legislature that they were going to set up a study of unemployment compensation to be made in 1954 so that perhaps they might do something about it in 1955.

That is the background to Commentator's remarks. He wrote:

"A great deal of the talking about national economy is political and beside the point. It ignores the fact that there is an unusual amount of unemployment. It ignores the fact that the business index is about 8 per cent under what it was a year ago at this time. It emphasizes the theory that the country can talk itself into a depression, and it appears to indicate a belief in important circles that it can talk itself into prosperity.

"This belief was tested after the collapse of the stock market in October 1929, the beginning of the great depression that lasted for years and was chiefly responsible for the flight of the voters from the Hoover administration in 1932. From the October crash in Wall Street till the end of 1929, bankers, businessmen, and officials were saying that there was nothing wrong with business.

"John D. Rockefeller announced that he was buying stocks. So were many other people. Alfred P. Sloan Jr., head of General Motors, said business was sound. Even William Green, president of the AFL, thought that 'In a few months we will be back to a normal state in the industrial and economic life of the nation.' But all the optimistic talk did not check the slide into depression."

TALK WON'T DO

After outlining the brief but futile steps that President Hoover took to stop the depression, Commentator points out: "Talk couldn't stop the slump, and by degrees the people lost faith in the talkers. Nor did talk cause the slump except insofar as it had produced a booming stock market based on a wild-cat theory of perpetual and ever-growing prosperity on which speculation thrived. Once the bubble was pricked, the squeeze of \$30,000,000,000 out of stock values in a single month was bound to have disastrous effects on the economy.

"The country is in no such condition today as it was in October, 1929. Wall Street is well-guarded against wholesale gambling in stocks. But we are up against unusual unemployment, and a recession in industry is emphasized in a reduction in the demand for steel, a sensitive barometer.

"Walter Reuther is under attack, unjust-

ly. As head of one of the two great unions he has pointed to the increase in unemployment and asked that it be taken seriously, and something be done about it. Had he done otherwise, he would have been unfit for his job. Unemployment may be spotty, it may be temporary, but while it lasts it is real, and it can't be hot-aired away. It breeds further unemployment, and breeds it rapidly.

"Whether one calls it readjustment, temporary recession, or the beginning of a depression, the time to check it is before it becomes serious, and there are many ways of creating such a check. That is what Mr. Reuther has pointed out, and he wants them made operative. The idea that any labor leader wants bankruptcy for his followers in order to establish a socialist state is the production of a mind untrustworthy to the point of insanity in the average person, though perhaps normal in a politician."

WORKERS' PLIGHT

On a much higher level than the imbecility of Leonard Hall as a spokesman for the Republicans is the phrasemongering of Professor E. S. Woytinsky of John Hopkins in his reply to Colin Clark's view that America is headed for a "sharp, short depression and a recovery which, if wisely handled, may be as rapid as the depression which caused it." Professor Woytinsky speaks of a "recession de-luxe."

And for the middle-class, in any kind of liquid-savings position, the year 1954 may well be just a recession de-luxe.

What the current downward trend signifies to the working class, however, needs attention. For the auto workers now unemployed, this is what they have already lost: (1) insurance policies usually amounting to \$3,000 each, which automatically are canceled when a man is laid off; (2) Blue Cross coverage must be paid fully by the laid-off worker, whereas while working he pays only half, as a rule, and in some cases none of the amount.

Short work-weeks and layoffs reduce pension credits, and thus increase the number of years a man must work to draw his pension from the auto companies. If an auto worker takes another job—and these aren't easy to find—he loses the seniority rights he has built up over the years, as well as his accumulated vacation rights.

The union gains won through years of hard struggles and walkouts are wiped out for many auto workers in this recession de-luxe.

Is it a wonder that a kind of slow burn is building up in this industrial center? And that the fear of depression is a genuine reality?

ISL Launches Fund Drive Next Week

By ALBERT GATES
Fund Drive Director

On February 15, the annual fund drive of the Independent Socialist League will begin. The drive will seek to raise \$11,500 to equal the goal of a year ago. Initial plans have already been made and quotas assigned to the branches of the ISL. These will be announced in the next issue of LABOR ACTION.

The purpose of the drive should not be news to the readers of our paper. Funds collected in the campaign go to sustain the press, LABOR ACTION and The New International. Without the Fund Drive, it would be impossible to keep the press going. A contribution to the Fund Drive is a means of helping us to maintain our two periodicals, and to keep the activities of the ISL going.

The need for money will be greater than ever this year when the ISL has two important cases pending. It is pressing its case against the attorney general's "list of subversive organizations," and preparing the case of Shachtman against the State Department, which has refused to grant him a passport on the ground that he is an officer of an organization listed by the attorney general.

These are two extremely important, though related, cases. The ISL is attempting the first genuine challenge to Brownell's list under President Eisenhower's Executive Order 10450. Although under this order no organization was to be placed upon any attorney general's list without a hearing, this is exactly what the attorney general did. As a result of its protest, the ISL received a statement of grounds and interrogatories which it answered fully in September 1953. To date, the attorney general has failed to respond with a hearing on the case though obliged to do so according to the terms of the president's order.

MONEY TO FIGHT

The failure of the attorney general to grant the ISL a hearing and thereby to pursue its case has resulted in the State Department's refusal of a passport to Shachtman. This fact, among many others, makes it necessary to strengthen the fight against the attorney general's list, as well as against the State Department in the passport case.

Our readers and friends will understand how costly such matters are and we hope that they will respond to our 1954 fund drive so that we may proceed with our cases certain that we shall not be hampered by lack of funds.

The importance of our press increases, if that is possible, as a result of the above considerations. It is the most direct and consistent means we have of making our case known and carrying on the fight publicly.

When the quotas are announced in the next issue, we trust that all of you will respond to our call for help and respond quickly.

Oil Workers' Unions—

(Continued from page 1)

through which the membership completely controls the union. . . ."

For the first time, the prospect opens for the organization of the decisive majority of oil and allied workers into one solid union.

OPEN DISCUSSION

The oil workers' unity convention is a fitting and convenient occasion for calling the attention of the labor movement to a political discussion that has been raging in the pages of the International Oil Worker, official publication of the CIO Oil Workers Union. It has truly been "raging."

On December 7, on its first page, the paper printed gigantic pictures of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman, under the caption: "Their records will survive the yapping of the jackals." There is nothing unusual in this fact it-

self; the labor movement today, as in the past, has been a loud and loyal defender of the Democratic administrations of Roosevelt and Truman. (LABOR ACTION tries to convince organized labor that it should form a new, independent labor party and give up its self-defeating dependence upon the Democrats. But that is an old story, and it is not the point of this article.)

What is unusual is what followed. Two weeks later, on December 21, the paper published three separate letters of protest from active union members: Fred Hoffman, Ray L. Dickenson and A. N. Mangham, all denouncing official union political policy, decrying its support of the Democratic Party, and in general praising the Republican Party or insisting that the union "keep out of politics."

In virtually all international unions, the official paper becomes a periodical ledger for drily and mechanically reporting what is officially blessed by the leadership. Here in the Oil Workers' paper we find a refreshing example of how a real press discussion can stimulate democratic membership participation. We say this despite the fact that the views of LABOR ACTION do not correspond with the views expressed by either side in the oil workers' discussion.

HOW TO INTEREST MEMBERS

Since the members of the discussion by

ing with letters from the membership. As is to be expected, the majority support the official pro-Democratic policy; but a vociferous and articulate minority speaks out against it (unfortunately they are pro-Republicans). "Talk about the hand that feeds you," writes one anti-Republican worker, "they half-starved the workingman for the privileged few. But if you do anything for the workingman or farmer, its socialism."

One pro-Republican writes: "So far, I have seen nothing to cause me to be ashamed of the fact I voted for Eisenhower. In unity there is strength and since we are divided on politics, let's keep politics out of the OWIU-CIO and stand united in principle." And the discussion continues.

How can we interest the rank and file in union activity? This question is posed over and over again by officials, educators, editors, organizers in the labor movement. Every device to stimulate membership participation is weighed, from fines levied upon those who stay home to free beer issued to those who come to meetings. But one simple measure is always overlooked: give the membership a real voice in discussing and deciding all the main questions, from broad political issues facing the nation to key internal disputes in the union.

The discussion in the Oil Workers' press proper has hundreds of union

READ ABOUT SOCIALISM

- The Fight for Socialism cloth \$2 paper \$1
by Max Shachtman
- Socialism: the Hope of Humanity10
by Max Shachtman
- Marxism in the U. S.35
by Leon Trotsky
- Plenty for All: The Meaning of Socialism25
by Ernest Erber
- The Principles and Program of Independent Socialism10
(LA Special Issue)

Independent Socialist Press

114 West 14 Street, New York City

YOU'RE INVITED

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

LONDON LETTER

No Takers for Steel Plants!

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, Jan. 28—News from London today is of three important developments. The most significant did not reach the headlines of any national newspaper.

When the steel industry was denationalized the Labor Party pledged itself to return it to public ownership as soon as it got back to power. This pledge was confirmed both at Morecambe and Margate; furthermore, Labor leaders, including Richard Stokes, ex-minister of supply, stated categorically that they could not guarantee that any of the people who speculated in steel shares would be compensated for any losses accruing from denationalization.

Despite these threats, a bill denationalizing steel was passed last year in the face of fearsome Labor opposition. A Steel Realization Agency was set up to sell the shares to the public.

The report of this body was published last week. It shows that because of the uncertain prospects in steel speculation, only 6 per cent of the shares had so far been sold.

The biggest group of factories still remained without a buyer. This was despite the fact that steel production, at 16 million tons of steel, and 10.8 million tons of pig iron, was at a record rate.

The Tories will have to think again. If they try to make the shares cheaper, not only will the compensation for them be less when they are renationalized, but also they will be open to the political charge that they are letting private investors racketeer at the expense of the public.

The problem is no new one, because the bill denationalizing steel anticipated that the Realization Agency might not find buyers for the less productive steel plant; but they did not anticipate the extreme caution of the speculators, and the difficulty of assuring them that steel was a good risk.

Still, that is their headache—not ours.

NEW TURN IN STRIKE

The battle between the Electrical Trades Unions and the National Federated Employers Association in the electrical industry has taken a new turn.

Electricians have now been called out on strike by the town, instead of the location. There are now 7,000 out permanently as well. A meeting of 3,000 last week-end unanimously endorsed the Executive's action.

Meanwhile, both sides have been doing a little bit of mathematics. The employers know that the funds of the Electrical Trades Union stand at about £400,000 (\$1.12 million), and that strike pay for the present time is running at £40,000 per week. Thus the union can stand the strike without outside help, for ten weeks. Unfortunately for them, the National Federated Electrical Association cannot. They would rather have a fortnight's complete lock-out or strike which would have less effect on production.

The time has now come for the employers to seek a face-saving formula, so that they can give the workers a rise, without it appearing to be the result of the strike. They are believed to have unofficially offered a rise of 2½ cents an hour (a dollar a week). This would be in line with the similar rise given to the miners and the railwaymen.

But the electricians are beginning to feel more confident. Nevertheless, a settlement with wage increase will occur. The questions are, "How much?" and "What formula will they use for saving face?"

MORE ON KENYA SCANDAL

The report of the minister of war into alleged brutalities in Kenya was presented to Parliament yesterday. Anthony Head said that, except in the cases of the King's African Rifles (previously discussed in LA) there was no evidence of indiscriminate shooting, irresponsible conduct or inhumane practices.

About the reward of £5, this was said to have been offered to the unit which killed or captured a famous Mau Mau leader. It was not for the benefit of a particular individual. "The court considered that this offer, though mistaken, was explicable in the circumstances obtaining at the time." It cannot recur, because General Erskine has forbidden monetary rewards of any kind.

The court found no evidence of "scoreboards" kept to record number of Mau

Mau killed. "Due to a very wide dispersion the rivalry between battalions appears to be negligible. There was somewhat more rivalry between companies within a battalion, and still more between platoons in a company. The court satisfied themselves that the competitive spirit did not go beyond the natural rivalry to be found between sub-units in all good regiments in the British Army."

Usually when an African was killed his body was brought to a unit substation, but when this was difficult his hand was cut off for identification. This was done in 6 instances since August 1, 1953. This practice has been stopped since the widespread introduction of finger-printing.

Certain specific allegations made at, and connected with, the court-martial of Captain Griffiths, of the Kings African Rifles, are still under investigation.

What transpires from the report? Firstly, let us think about its terms of reference. One hundred and forty-seven witnesses, including six army chaplains, four regimental medical officers, the director of a native civil hospital and a

Roman Catholic bishop were interviewed. There is, however, no record of any so-called Mau Mau suspects or African prisoners. Secondly, this was an army investigation carried out by General McLean of the Regular Army in Kenya.

What Brockway wanted to know in Parliament yesterday was when, or if, an investigation was going to be made into the practices of the temporary regiments, the police and the Home Guard. They were not covered by the report. Mr. Head said that Colonial Secretary Lyttleton would give the matter his attention when he returned from Kenya.

Few people believe that the Regular Army itself would be heavily involved in brutality, because the majority are from England. It is, however, the local European population that is believed to be responsible for excesses, which have occurred because they are more mindful of their commercial interests.

Nevertheless, these excesses are inherent in the suppression of the aspirations of colonial peoples. Labor Party, please note!

Vigilantes — —

(Continued from page 1)

a prepared statement. The past commander was asked to give the definition of "subversive" by which the organization's committee was guided in deciding whose names they should turn in to the FBI. The VFW officials simply pointed to the statement (which did not bother to make such a definition) and refused further comment.

We cannot blame these officials of the VFW for declining to give their definition of "subversive." Should they be expected to accomplish that which has baffled the most cunning brains of the Department of Justice for years now?

Ever since 1948 the various attorneys-general have maintained a "list of subversive organizations" without ever bothering to define the term, or at least to make their definition public. It would be too much to expect the VFW vigilantes of Norwalk to be more precise in their witch-fingering than the Department of Justice is.

EYES OF NATO

When the private sleuths were pushed into the spotlight at Norwalk, they found that the eyes of the world, and not just of Connecticut, were upon them. As chance would have it, a visiting delegation of Western European newspapermen were spending a few days in this "typical American town." Here they were to see "the American Way of Life" as it is lived to the fullest.

They saw it. But the American Council on NATO (under whose auspices they are touring) decided that if left to draw their own conclusions, without an appropriate official interpretation, the American Way might look a little too raw to them. So former Assistant Secretary of State Edward J. Barrett was thrown into the breach with a brief address.

Barrett said that the people of the NATO countries "see us as a nation that has gone off on an emotional binge of witchhunting, book-burning and the like." This impression, as the newsmen could clearly see for themselves, is vastly exaggerated, he explained. "Even though we tolerate some strange doings, we haven't gone completely overboard," he continued. The public, he said, "is deploring any use of totalitarian methods to fight totalitarian subversion."

INTUITIVE POLITICIANS

"You will recognize, I believe," Barrett said, "that we are a young, spirited, energetic people who have blown off steam in a curious way, but that the very act of blowing off steam periodically, of giving vent to pent-up emotions, strengthens us for the long pull, improves our balance and fortifies the cause of true democracy."

What started the VFW in Norwalk on its particular campaign to fortify the cause of true democracy? Of course, the idea of seeking "subversives" under every bush and tree is abroad in the land, and no special factor need be present to induce groups of reactionaries to put their detection on an organized basis. But Norwalk is an old stronghold of American municipal socialism. The present mayor,

Irving C. Freese, was first elected to that office on a right-wing socialist ticket. In 1951 (now running as an "independent") he defeated one Stanley Stroffolino, a former state senator, who had received both Republican and Democratic support.

Stroffolino is not a member of VFW Post 603. But Albert Beres, post commander, is a close friend and political supporter of his. On the very day that Beres unveiled the organized informing of his post to public acclaim, Stroffolino took a full-page ad in a local paper to attack Mayor Freese on an apparently unrelated issue.

Stroffolino informed the press that he has been working on his own private list of subversives ever since he was defeated in the election of 1951. When asked how HE can tell a "subversive" he replied: "I guess it is just intuition."

That is as good and honest an answer as we are likely to get to the question for some time to come. And if it should just happen to turn out that a man's intuition has a marked tendency to pick out for attention people who are politically inconvenient to him, why he can rejoice in the thought that his personal interests, like those of General Motors, are also the interests of the country.

FOOTNOTE ON A STRIKE

A footnote can be added to the affair: It just happens that the town of Norwalk has been the scene, for some months, of a bitterly fought strike which is still going on. The Hatters' union (AFL) is striking the Hat Corporation of America (makers of Knox, Dunlap, Dobbs and Cavanaugh men's hats). The corporation has been planning to move many of its operations out of the town to take advantage of cheaper labor in the South and in Missouri, and the 1500 members of the union in the plant have been demanding a contract which will assure a measure of job security for the workers whose livelihood is threatened. Recently, AFL President George Meany was in Norwalk to hand out the one million dollar paid out in strike benefits so far. The hat company is one of the biggest enterprises in the town.

There has been no evidence that the strike was any factor in moving the VFW to go on its hunt for subversives. That does not appear to be the connection. But—

In view of the fact that there is no active Stalinist movement in the town of Norwalk, nor any obvious Stalinist activity of any sort, to be the immediate butt of the VFW's patrioteering efforts, the question arises of just what kind of "subversives" the VFW has been and is reporting. Given the mentality of the initiators of the project, this sort of witchhunting represents an ever-present danger for the labor movement, especially when it is engaged in a struggle which cannot fail to annoy the town's most substantial citizens.

Don't miss a single week of
LABOR ACTION
A sub is only \$2.00 a year!

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

The Handy Way to Subscribe!

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

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

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

Indian Student on Gandhi and Pacifism

The following letter is contributed apropos of the recent discussion in LABOR ACTION on Pacifism vs. Marxism. Its writer, an Indian student now in this country, is a graduate student at Yale, at the Department of International Relations. He informs us that he has been active in the Indian trade-union movement and Socialist Party and has held journalistic assignments in Asia and Europe.—Ed.

To the Editor:

I have painfully discovered in this country the tendency of the American pacifists to consider Gandhi as a pacifist and his technique of *Satyagraha* (non-violent non-cooperation) as an absolute image of pacifism. I think this view deserves to be corrected.

Gandhi was not a pacifist in the popular and absolute sense of the term. His insistence is primarily on non-cooperation rather than on non-violence. To be exact, while he considers violence as an evil, he does not consider it to be the absolute evil. His emphasis is rather on fearlessness and non-tolerance of tyranny than on pacifism and non-resistance to tyranny. For he considers fear to be negative, and violence to be positive: fearfulness being a human deficiency, and being at many times the agent for violent provocation. On the other hand violence is merely vitality misdirected: if it is rightly used it can be put to creative purposes and development.

Gandhi's conception of non-violence or pacifism is graded. A person who did not resist what he recognized to be tyranny or injustice, was for Gandhi even beyond contempt. He was not a non-violent soldier but a non-resisting coward, for he allowed a free hand to tyranny. This is why it becomes necessary to distinguish the Gandhian creed of *Satyagraha* from the rather vague Christian pacifism, which believes in "Resist not evil," or "Whoever shall smite thee on right cheek, turn to him the other also . . . whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain." Gandhi would have always refused to turn the other cheek or go another mile. He does not refrain from judging while the Christian pacifists throw the burden of judgment on God and the evil-doer. He has emphatically declared that tyranny and injustice must be resisted at all costs, the best being *Satyagraha*, for if they are not resisted with "means consistent with morality," they will be resisted through hate, war and corruption creating another atmosphere of evil.

I think it is this emphasis on resistance with which he becomes very much akin to the Marxian technique. Let us not also forget that he considered soldiers who took arms against aggression and injustice, who were prepared to lay down their lives for the sake of moral values, as quite near to non-violent resisters. He considered the Chinese armed resistance against Japan and of Poland against Hitler, as "the nearest approach to non-violence." In his last days, did he not bless Mr. Nehru's use of armed forces to counter the tyranny of insurrectionists in Kashmir? It cannot, however, be denied that Gandhi considered the non-violent resister, who did not take recourse to arms, as the highest man, but in accepting this, we should not forget

the steps he prescribed for the evolution of such an extraordinary man.

As I have stressed earlier Gandhi's main insistence seems to be on non-cooperation rather than on non-violence. This idea is as much Thoreau-ian as it is Marxian. It has been in the industrial field that the concepts of civil-resistance and non-cooperation have borne fruition. It has been the success of civil-resistance that has made non-violence possible. Non-violence does not lead to non-cooperation; as is seen by the attitude of those anti-war pacifist groups in this country who hate war but continue to pay taxes to the government, which are directed toward preparations for war. But there are reasonable chances of a civil-resistance movement becoming non-violent, despite provocations, if the persons involved in it are highly trained.

It is also necessary that the interdependence of ends with means be recognized. When we say that means have to be consistent with ends, we do not mean that means-ends is a one-way street. Means have not only to be consistent with morality but with the prevailing times. Non-violence is possible when military-technological totalitarianism is either in the process of development or such totalitarianism does not exist: to defeat Hitler by non-violent non-cooperation would have been possible in the early thirties but not in 1939. This is why, I

think, as one of your contributors has already pointed out, let us not be fanatical or predisposed toward a particular brand of means, let us pluralistically take stock of the situation in the context of the times we are moving in.

One need not be reminded that whatever means are employed "coercion" is necessary to achieve ideals. Whether it is ultra-Christian fanatical pacifism or Gandhian non-resistance or Marxian-Thoreau-ian non-cooperation, it always results in coercing certain people to give up their prerogatives. The Gandhian, as also the true Marxian, approach is to minimize "coercion": to make it rational. Persuasion may be defined as a rational coercion: but reason and logic can be applied between men and women, not between men and brutes. In the absence of reason, men may wisely refuse to cooperate with the brutes; but should they also refuse to resist the brutes? Brutes when given a free hand mean the death of men—and in that eventuality reason would continue to exist, but not those persons who may be able to apply it. At times when "force" has primacy over "ideas," a perfect copy-book pacifism is impossible. We cannot afford to lose our "core-values," whatever cost may we have to pay for their defense.

I have not essayed to "coerce" (!) pacifists to give up their pacifism: my humble attempt has been to clear up in their minds certain misunderstandings (or posed understandings) about Gandhi and his pacifist creed.

Brijen K. GUPTA

Win Stay and Hearing in Skoglund Deportation Case

(CRDC Release)

NEW YORK, Jan. 27—Deportation of Carl Skoglund, a victim of the unconstitutional McCarran Law, was halted only a few days before January 26, the date set by the Immigration authorities ordering the Minnesota labor leader to report to Ellis Island. Skoglund had been informed by the Swedish consulate that the American officials had notified them he was to be placed aboard a Norwegian ship for deportation to Sweden on January 28, two days after he had entered Ellis Island.

The speed with which the Immigration officials moved against him removed any possible illusions about the grim threat facing this working-class fighter, who has been in this country for 43 years and who, this month, reached his 70th birthday. But the blitz deportation was blocked through the strenuous efforts of Skoglund's counsel, Stanley Lowell, of the Alien Civil Liberties Committee of the American Civil Liberties Union.

He was scheduled for deportation on the grounds of his former membership in the Communist Party during the twenties, despite the fact that he was expelled from that party in 1928, and has long been known as an uncompromising opponent of Stalinism. The real reason for the long persecution of Skoglund is his adherence to the principles of union solidarity and socialism.

He was imprisoned for his socialist ideas in 1944 under the thought-control Smith-Act, after he had indignantly spurned an FBI proposal that he turn informer against his colleagues in the

labor movement. [Skoglund was convicted as one of the 18 defendants in the Minneapolis case involving Teamster local labor leaders and leaders of the Socialist Workers Party.—Ed.]

The McCarran Law, under which Skoglund is now being persecuted through deportation proceedings has been condemned as unconstitutional and undemocratic by almost all liberal and labor opinion.

Skoglund has been suffering from a severe cardiac condition, and a hearing had been requested to present evidence that he was eligible for discretionary relief, which the authorities have the legal power to grant him and thus end the threat of deportation. On February 3, 1953, the Board of Immigration Appeals had ignored the appeal for relief, and upheld the deportation order.

After vigorous intervention by Skoglund's attorney, the Board of Immigration Appeals on January 15 issued a new order that the deportation warrant be withdrawn and a hearing be held to permit presentation of evidence on the question of Skoglund's eligibility for discretionary relief that would suspend the deportation proceedings.

The Civil Rights Defense Committee, which has been carrying on the prolonged fight to save Skoglund from deportation, needs financial aid to carry the fight forward into this new stage. If unsuccessful in the new hearing that has been ordered, the Committee will help Skoglund make a further challenge in the courts of the unconstitutional McCarran Act.

Morocco Today — —

(Continued from page 1)

For, needless to say, Franco's improvised defense of the rights of the Moroccan people is an imposture. The Spanish zone of Morocco is under military government, and its tribes are under military control. Unions are prohibited, the living standard of the Moroccan population is miserable and economic stagnation is complete. The nationalist parties are allowed to function only to the extent that they conform to the interests of Spanish foreign policy.

IN FRENCH MOROCCO

In the meantime, police terror is being intensified in the French zone of Morocco. After having driven the nationalist opposition to resort to terrorism, the French authorities are aggravating the situation with every step they take.

On December 22 the Casablanca city authorities moved to create a new police system, in which every inhabitant of the Moroccan districts is supposed to take turns in the surveillance of his district. A special Moroccan police corps has also been formed to reinforce the new system. Since no volunteers could be found, this corps is composed of people drafted for the purpose.

But since people who have been drafted into the police whether they like it or not are often unreliable, this new police corps is in turn supervised by three more police corps, each in turn considered to be more loyal to the French authorities.

On December 23 the city was combed through by the police and numerous arrests were made. That evening, the new police system started functioning and guard posts were established at every intersection. Churches, movie theaters and post offices were guarded. On December 24 the bomb exploded in the central market that killed 20 people and wounded 34.

POLICE FRENZY

Since then, the French authorities are in a state of hysteria. Political prisoners are no longer allowed to receive visitors and parcels. One hundred and fifty people were arrested in Casablanca within 48 hours. On December 26 riding bicycles was prohibited in the Moroccan districts of Rabat. Police dogs were imported from Tunisia to patrol the streets. Road blocks have been established on all important highways. In Marrakesh, police operations "have just started," according to the French daily *La Vie Marocaine*. On December 30 a new law against terrorism was passed, extending the applicability of the death sentence.

The result of such "safety measures" has been so far mainly the extension of nationalist agitation to the mountain tribes, so far considered relatively "loyal" to the French administration.

In the cities, police reserves have been increased and a new corps, disposing of armored cars, has been created (not to be confused with the new Moroccan police corps of Casablanca). On January 6 the police, having been unable to find the authors of the bombing in the central market, offered a million francs for any indication leading to their arrest. At the time of the writing, they are still waiting.

In their panic, the French colonialists in Morocco develop increasingly totalitarian attitudes, which is well illustrated by their behavior toward what few Moroccan friends they have left.

After the bombing in the central market of Casablanca, a group of Moroccans, once guilty of "sympathy with nationalist ideas," attempted to whitewash themselves by publishing a manifesto in which they expressed their horror and indignation at terrorist methods. On the French side, the answer was sarcasm, and the daily *Maroc-Presse* let them know that their friendship for France would be judged by their "concrete contributions to the fight against terrorism."

This means that "concrete evidence" of your friendship for France is to inform on Moroccan patriots, and as a "friend of France" nothing less than a stoolpigeon will do.

WEEK by WEEK . . .

LABOR ACTION screens and analyzes the week's news, discusses the current problems of labor and socialism, gives you information you can't find anywhere else.

A sub is only \$2 a year!



LABOR ACTION

February 8, 1954 Vol. 18, No. 6

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
Asst. Editors: GORDON HASKELL,
BEN HALL, MARY BELL
Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

READ ABOUT INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM!

In four special pamphlet-issues of LABOR ACTION, the basic ideas of Independent Socialism are vividly and simply explained.

No. 1—The Principles and Program of Independent Socialism

No. 2—Independent Socialism and the Third World War

No. 3—The Fair Deal: A Socialist Analysis

No. 4—Socialism and Democracy

THE DJILAS CASE AND THE CRISIS OF TITOISM—II

THE MOVEMENT BEHIND DJILAS

By HAL DRAPER

"When democratic socialism comes to power . . . it will be engaged in a constant struggle not only against the class enemy, but against the bureaucracy as well. . . . As the class struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat levels off and gradually ebbs, the latter must be prepared for an existence which is even more dominated by struggle, for an existence which will undergo the most difficult Hamlet-like soul-struggle known to history. For this period will evoke contradictions not only inside every single political and social movement, but in the breast of every single active participant in this gigantic drama."

The above words written by Milovan Djilas may now be taken, in hindsight, as autobiographical. But the "Hamlet-like soul-struggle . . . [and] contradictions . . . in the breast" of Djilas and his co-thinkers in Yugoslavia reflect not merely a personal evolution but the political impact of the development of Titoism on a layer of the regime's supporters and sympathizers in the population.

As we pointed out last week, the emergence of a genuinely democratic tendency in Yugoslavia, which would be directed against the ruling bureaucracy and which would seek to make real the demagogic talk of democratization from above—this was no unexpected element in the Titoist crisis. It was expected and foreseen. What could not have been as easily predicted is the quantitative element: it is obvious that this democratic-oppositionist tendency is extremely powerful and self-conscious. Nor need it have been foreseen that this movement would find as its spokesman so highly placed a figure as Milovan Djilas was.

But the main interest still centers not on Djilas's personal fate, but on the movement behind him.

For there WAS AND IS a movement behind him. Of this there can be no doubt.

Why the Revelations?

The evidence for this statement comes not from any "inside information" (in general, there has been no reliable "inside dope" about the Titoist regime that has been worth a moment's attention, at any time since 1948). It emerges from an analysis of the material now available in the Yugoslav press about the Titoist Central Committee plenum.

The word "movement" is carefully chosen. To avoid misunderstanding we immediately add:

There is no evidence of a formally organized movement or faction behind Djilas. We do not believe there was any. It is a question, first of all, of a clear and conscious current of opinion and pressure inside and outside the Titoist party, of which Djilas was conscious and which was in turn conscious of him as its top spokesman; and in the second place, it is not unlikely that this current even took locally semi-organized *ad hoc* forms.

When opponents of Djilas referred to such phenomena at the CC plenum, they did not do so in such a fashion as to give the impression (to us at least) that they were conjuring up a "plot" as justification for the CC crackdown. They rather give the impression of going easy about such revelations; they do not want to exaggerate the strength of the democratic opposition forces, for that is dynamite. They would rather have dealt with Djilas as an individual deviator, a maverick, a personal tragedy, representing no one and nothing.

"Objective Consequences"

But this line would have been very difficult for them for the following reason among others:

In cracking down on Djilas, the bureaucracy did not want to seem to be cracking down on him in his capacity as an advocate of real democratization. The obvious reason for this is that the official line of the bureaucracy itself is that it is in favor of sweeping democratizations, especially some time in the future. The bluff of its demagogic democracy-talk has been called, but it does not want to admit this. It protests that much of what Djilas says is "breaking in an open door"—"we too are for it, but. . . ." But what? But not now—only eventually, come the higher stages of socialism in some indeterminate future, etc. Above all, they emphasize, the way in which Djilas has gone about it has had unfortunate consequences. . . .

It was the "objective consequences" of Djilas's literary campaign that they therefore emphasized at the CC plenum, while they posed as advocates of democracy themselves; and to do this, they had to indicate what "consequences" they were talking about, however gingerly. We will be able to interpret what they say in this regard.

Djilas's Rationalization

First of all, with regard to Djilas's own "Hamlet-like soul-struggle," it appears (if we take his writings on that point at face value) that he developed a rationale for himself about why it was not necessary for him

to organize a faction. It amounts pretty crudely to the idea that democratization is inevitable, that nobody can stop it, and therefore (it is possible to presume) that he need not organize to bring this inevitability about. In his *Borba* article of Dec. 24, entitled "Answer," he writes:

"But whether the reproaches made against my concepts are justified or unjustified, they cannot silence the democratic struggle against bureaucratism, since today it [this struggle] does not depend on this or that theory but on the reality of existing conditions. This struggle springs from all the pores of our society, and not only of ours. We are in an epoch of the struggle for democracy, and we cannot get away from it, and we do not want to. This struggle can be hampered or delayed, but never stopped. I am not writing this to secure a good position for myself, or from a boyish or childish intractability, and least of all for democratic glorification, but because I have to do it, because like many others I am the 'victim' of an objective social process which forces me to do so. There lies the source of my passion and belief." [Italics in all quotations in this article added by me—H. D.]

The primitiveness of this "theory of inevitability" does not deserve much discussion in itself, but that is not the point. With this theory Djilas was able to view himself not as a self-conscious inner-party factional oppositionist but as simply one "possessed" by the voices of democracy. We do not find it hard to assume that he really believed this, as a solution for his "soul-struggle."

It's His Contradiction

In another article he even mentioned a reason for being positively opposed to the formation of a factional group: ". . . no programmatic groups or currents, etc. are in question, because that would only be another step back to political monopolism of this or that kind, but rather [what we need is] a freer hand in moving from situation to situation, from question to question. . . ."

If I form a faction or counter-party—he is saying—and if we win, then my faction or party will become the monopolist, and we will be right back where we started from; we want no leading party or group, we want a free-for-all. . . . He falls into a semi-anarchist attitude, quite unawares and quite accidentally, but it is simply a rationale.

Yet in another place he is forced to recognize that "ideas" become a force only insofar as support is rallied behind them. This is in a passage which we quoted last week in another connection: Only experience can prove whether a new idea is progressive, he argues, and he adds: "The experience can be gained only if the idea gets around, if people gather around it, if they fight in its name."

Truly there is a "contradiction in his breast": he needn't form an opposition group, but nevertheless part of the objective process of "inevitability" is the organization of support around the given idea by "people." . . .

Hints on Djilas's View

In one of his *Borba* articles he had even written, "the aim of these articles is to arouse the socialist consciousness and conscience of ordinary people and of the most progressive capacities. . . . This new arousal of consciousness on the basis of an already new practice is in reality an emergence from the chrysalis form, from a closed circle (party circle, if you wish) into the 'ordinary world' and 'ordinary people.' . . ."

And indeed it appears from testimony given that, at least privately, Djilas was coming to the view that oppositional political organization should be PERMITTED.

When Djilas's articles stressed that new ideas had to be encouraged and that new ideas were always the ideas of a minority, the bureaucrats quite correctly concluded that this was laying the basis for permitting minority groups. So went the argument at the CC plenum by the old Titoist hack, Vukmanovic-Tempo, who later stepped into Djilas's shoes as a vice-president of the state:

"[Djilas wrote] that new ideas demand a struggle for them, and that ideas are on the side of the minority. What does this mean? Is this not a preparation for a minority in the party, new ideas, a faction within the party? I think it's just that."

To Tempo's mind, it was sufficient just to point this out for the heinousness of the crime to be apparent.

The "Communist-Democrats"

Djilas even gave his tendency a name: the COMMUNIST-DEMOCRATS. To be sure, he uses this term only in passing in the course of his *Borba* article of Dec. 27. The term, however, is specifically used to distinguish the "Communist-Democrats" from the party men who hang on to the old (Stalinist) forms and concepts.

So Djilas insists that he is speaking only for himself, not for any group (see beginning of his article in *LA* of Jan. 25). His supporter V. Dedijer went out of his way to deny that a Djilas faction existed. Tito himself assented, at the CC plenum, that "The articles by Comrade Milovan Djilas were his own products, his

own thoughts" (though we shall see that he also hedged). But though it was agreed that no "Djilas faction" existed, it was still the question of factionalism, actual and potential, that was raised as a major "consequence" of the Djilas articles, in order to condemn them.

Count No. 1 in the bureaucracy's indictment on this point is the charge that while Djilas may not have formed a faction he was contemplating the idea with favor or at least playing with the idea of permitting a factional or dual-party organization.

Thus Vukmanovic-Tempo, in his aforementioned speech at the CC plenum:

"I even want to remind Comrade Djilas of a conversation we had with Mostar at his house. At that time he said: 'Listen, Tempo, we are not going on with the development.'—'That is right,' I said.—'But he said, 'When there is freedom of struggle of opinion, then there is also the freedom of faction.'—Here I said, 'But a faction on counter-revolutionary positions within the party cannot exist!'"

That's how Tempo told it in all his bureaucratic naiveté.

Kardelj Tells a Tale

The bureaucrats do not bother to distinguish much between the idea of a faction inside the party and of an opposition party. In the main report at the CC plenum, Kardelj revealed the following, without denial by Djilas or Dedijer:

"I shall proceed to reproduce the contents of a long conversation I had with Comrade Djilas on December 22. . . . On December 22 we met to explain to him the essence of my disagreements [with the articles by Djilas that had so far appeared]. In a friendly and comradely manner I put forward my critical remarks. To my remarks Comrade Djilas reacted very nervously and as if he felt offended, and in the course of conversation put forward the following theses:

"First, that Comrade Tito was defending bureaucracy, and that he, Djilas, will sooner or later have to fight it out with him; second, that Comrade Rankovic and I were in fact in agreement with him, but that we were opportunists, and therefore did not want to argue with Tito; third, that whether we wanted it or not, a socialist left wing was emerging in our country; and fourth, that the possibility of two socialist parties emerging in our country cannot be discounted.

". . . I was dumbfounded. . . . I rejected all his allegations. In the later course of our conversation, Comrade Djilas agreed with me, withdraw his postulations. . . ."

". . . Djilas's conception of democracy is not ours, is not the socialist one, but a mixture of anarchism and bourgeois liberal forms. . . ."

". . . to place before the fighters for socialism the multi-party system of Western democracy as an ideal, that is, for me, moving backwards and in the end a rejection of socialism."

The "Nova Misao" Group

The speech by Stambolic (who hurled into the top Executive Committee over Djilas's body) at the CC plenum pointed to another facet. We should explain at this point that the notorious article by Djilas in which he wrote about the snubbing of a comrade's wife (the "young and beautiful actress") by the wives of the "inner circle" appeared in the magazine *Nova Misao*. His supporter Dedijer was also an editor of this magazine. And Stambolic is indicating that Djilas's intention was to build an ideological grouping, however loose, around this magazine:

"I told Djilas [related Stambolic] that it was a good thing that *Nova Misao* is gathering a wide circle of people and that this was significant for our ideological struggle. He then told me that he visualized the political party and its leadership as a circle around a magazine which is spreading its ideas. On another occasion he said 'they' wanted to make him into a civil servant [that is, holder of a government post—H. D.] which he did not want because he wanted to write. Comrade Tito once said that as soon as anybody started to say in the party 'I' and 'they,' then all was finished. I was a little shocked by his 'they,' particularly by the accent he put on it.

". . . I cannot assume that Djilas's ideas are the result of abstract thinking, and that they do not depend on the support of some quarters of our society. Djilas thinks he is some progressive force. People like Djilas, Dedijer and other petty-bourgeois intellectuals all think that they are following the right way of progress. We have already experienced how factions and groups are being set up. . . ."

"Objective Factionalism"

So while there was no Djilas faction, and while he may not even have intended to form one, he is charged with considering factions and even dual parties as per-

(Continued on page 6)

The Movement Behind Djilas —

(Continued from page 5)

missible. To this charge was added also a charge embodying the typically bureaucratic-totalitarian concept of "objective factionalism."

That is, it was necessary neither to prove that Djilas had a faction nor that he planned to form one: his activities and articles, taken with the reaction to them, "amounted" to factionalism regardless of the intent.

A minor CC hack, Cvijetin Mijatovic, put it most crudely:

"All he has been doing in the past few months amounts to factional activities, irrespective of whether the factions existed or not. I do not think it is important whether this faction had assumed some definite organizational forms."

Blazo Jovanovic (who also moved into the top Executive Committee as a result of Djilas's downfall) struck the same note, incidentally adding another bit of "evidence" about the scheme to make *Nova Misao* an "objectively" factional organ:

"I know that Milovan Djilas sent letters to all secretaries of district committees in Montenegro in order that they should make efforts to increase the circulation of *Nova Misao*. These comrades were very glad that Djido [nickname for Djilas] was writing in this paper, and they subscribed to it. . . .

"I do not know whether he is the organizer but I know that he is the spiritual father of that around which the petty bourgeoisie will gather. . . . It is my deep conviction that regardless of whether Djilas wishes it or not, he has become the standard-bearer of the petty-bourgeois elements, of everything which is negative in the country and the whole reaction against which we must fight."

"This Is Nonsense"

Kardelj, the main reporter, had said:

"I do not assert that all Communists must hold the same opinion on all questions, but it is obvious that the Communist League could not work as a united organization if in it the Communists were allowed to hold opinions similar to those put forward by Comrade Djilas. This would entail the formation of factions and the disruption of the Communist League. . . .

"This is not the only idea of this kind in our country; there are other people who try to undermine our struggle for socialist democracy from the standpoint of anarchism and bourgeois-liberalism. . . . Djilas's articles express this atmosphere. . . .

"Were we to accept this theory, then we would return to the position of bourgeois democracy. In that case we would require parties, for instance, one Conservative-Socialist and the other Progressive-Socialist. However, this is nonsense. . . .

"There existed such tendencies in our country, and no doubt they will exist again. I must say that in the past we underestimated them; this is why this case occurred. We have to fight against them. . . ."

It is plain, then, that the "objective factionalist" danger of Djilasism resided in the fact that there was plenty of tinder around to be ignited.

The Country "Seethed"

For an allusive moment—read his words carefully—Tito permitted himself a damning admission. He is speaking of Djilas's articles:

"... Where does that lead? That leads to anarchy, into terrible uncertainty. Because if we permit it, in one year from now there would be no more of our socialist reality, which would mean bloody struggles. This would be the result of such conceptions and the spreading of them in our country, in which there are still some incredible backwardness and ideas.

"This can be seen just at present, when in this short time, in the course of some days, it began to seethe, when reaction and all the wavering and immature elements in the country began to rear their heads, not to speak of the reaction in the West, which considers that he is the standard-bearer of democracy in our country. . . .

"... there are thousands and thousands of those who would swell the ranks of the waverers and a variety of adventurers. . . . Our country would not only lose in prestige, but would also have to reconquer what has already been conquered. These results Comrade Djilas did not realize. . . ."

Tito added: "the only positive thing" which has come out of Djilas's articles is "that they opened our eyes considerably and brought a rude awakening to us. . . ."

So in a matter of a few days the country began to "seethe"!

Letters to "Borba"

Here is some more evidence as cited, with overtones of unhappiness, at the CC plenum. Take Stambolic, who reveals that when Djilas's articles started appearing, letters of support started coming in, and that Djilas agreed with the *Borba* editors that it would be bad tactics to print them; this might make it seem as if there were a concerted movement:

"Djilas's supporters are petty-bourgeois intellectuals. Irrespective of the fact that he asked *Borba* not to publish letters which approved of his ideas,

people around him were exerting pressure, and his views were being brought into our lives. An example of this is an article in *Borba* which appeared together with one of Djilas's. It spoke of an ex-Mikhailovic man [Chetnik] who fought against bad practices in his enterprise much better than any Communist in the same enterprise. Journalist Pesic understood Djilas's articles in this way: the Communists are bureaucrats, while the Chetniks are progressives. [Note the typically bureaucratic interpretation!—H. D.] Nobody would have dared write this before his articles appeared. . . .

"Comrades, certain things will have to be cleaned up after this session. The group which has formed itself around *Nova Misao* is a small one—it is like a McCarthy committee which is trying to become the center of cultural life in Belgrade." [As they say: sic!]

(Incidentally, a note of comic relief, apropos of those letters of support which were not printed: Speaking at the CC plenum, one of the *Borba* editors, Veljko Vlahovic, remarked, "Only yesterday I received two letters in which the comrades thank us for not having published their letters. . . .")

The Diminic Tendency

Brkic, a minor CC member, embroidered the whole subject as follows, with "corroborative detail intended to give artistic verisimilitude to an otherwise bald and unconvincing narrative" (as Pooch-Bah put it). The reader can weigh it accordingly:

"He [Djilas] says we did not understand him, but I think we did, as did those forces on which he decided to rely and for whom he writes. Not only various 'sick' men inside the [Communist] League but all petty bourgeois 'understood' him correctly. In Zagreb, for instance, all merchants thought that their shops would be returned to them and said, 'Read Djilas, then you will understand our future.' In Zagreb a group calling itself 'The Underground Movement of Geniuses' appeared and started to elaborate Djilas's articles. They were angry that the League did not adopt Djilas's views.

"An article by one of these in *Naprijed* clearly spoke about this. Another, writing in *Najodni List*, said that nobody would be able to prevent Djilas's ideas from penetrating the League, because the climate was favorable and was getting more favorable every day. Thus a group was soon formed which began to collaborate. This group is organized ideologically and even otherwise. In this group, mainly composed of journalists around Diminic, Dedijer is also active. He went there to say that there was no struggle for thought in Croatia and that the struggle for thought in Zagreb was three years behind Belgrade.

"Now they are accusing Djilas of having been a bad tactician, saying that he began too soon and that he told them to be patient in the struggle for freedom of thought. This 'struggle for free thought' was nothing but factionalism and an attempt to liquidate the Communist League. Diminic organized this group, and I do not know if there are any contacts between Djilas and Diminic. I think perhaps not, but the ideas were here.

"Somebody wrote in *Vjesnik* that the League should be exhibited in a museum, because it was outdated. A third one suggested the division of membership fees, saying: 'Since we do not agree and have different views, let us divide the membership fees and all other material means so that we can fight and have the same facilities.'"

In this tirade, whatever one may think about the touch concerning the "Underground Movement of Geniuses" (come to think of it, could that be a mistranslation?) there obviously was a hard kernel of fact; for an AP dispatch dated January 24 reported that one of the first victims of the purge was none other than Dusan Diminic, editor of a weekly paper and a member of the Croatian Party Central Committee, who was on the carpet for writing articles on Djilasite lines "based on anti-socialist foundations."

In the Cultural Field

At the CC Plenum, a member from Macedonia, Krste Crvenkovski, naively beat his breast:

"I can say that we in Macedonia had been on the whole accepting Comrade Djilas's articles until the announcement of the Central Committee. We accepted them also because we had not examined them too closely and because we had faith in the Central Committee. However, after the communiqué of the CC, we realized that certain things do not coincide with reality. . . . The articles of Comrade Djilas caused terrific confusion, disorientation and even disillusion among good Communists. . . ."

Moma Markovic testified that "Djilas's articles . . . caused considerable confusion and disorientation among the rank and file of the Communist League. . . . Simultaneously, his articles, especially the last ones, have been approved by various petty bourgeois and 'intellectual' circles."

Before we leave this subject, special attention should be paid to indications that Djilas's campaign in *Borba* both reflected and stimulated oppositional tendencies particularly in the field of culture, art and literature, for freedom from party censorship and control.

It may well be true that Djilas's support is especially

strong among the "intellectuals" (as the bureaucracy repeatedly charged). That does not mean that support to him is limited to intellectual circles, as the bureaucracy also charged; we happen to have proof (it was broadcast over the Macedonia radio) that as late as January 9 one of the leaders of the Macedonian trade-union organization, a party man at that, was one of those who stuck his neck out with a strong statement of support to Djilas.

"Writers Are Tearing Their Hair"

But be that as it may, since it is one of those things which can not be ascertained from official data, at least the reaction in the cultural field was indubitably explosive. This was testified to, at the CC plenum, from both sides—by Dedijer speaking in support of Djilas and by Zihlerl speaking as a bitter enemy.

Dedijer charged in his speech that pressure had been exerted on certain Communist writers to come out against Djilas and that the writers concerned had refused to do so. Continuing he said:

"In the whole of our cultural world, and because of these methods adopted in respect to our Communist writers, a great amount of indignation and silent dissatisfaction has appeared. This is because of the fear of the writers that we shall return to administrative [bureaucratic] methods in this sphere of human life.

"A contributing reason for this development were also some articles by Comrade Zihlerl . . . on our cultural life. I know that Zihlerl had long ago announced his articles in reply to Djilas, but I think a mistake was made when his first article appeared in *Borba* on the same day as the statement by the Executive Committee [the one which censured Djilas], so that the impression has been created among the public that Zihlerl's views on the necessity to defend culture from transitory and fashionable trends were the official line.

"I have met many cultural workers and writers who are now simply tearing their hair and asking: 'What does all this mean? Cannot every writer have his own line and present something new? Why should we adhere to regulations drawn up 100 years ago, as though in literature nothing new has occurred since the days of Balzac? Why should ten commandments be issued for writers to which they should adhere?'

"People are asking what all this is for, what are we to do with such recipes when even in the Soviet Union itself Ehrenburg openly criticizes such methods. . . . I want to declare here before this forum [the CC plenum] that my pen could not write a single letter with Zihlerl's ink, however hard I tried. If I do not write from the heart, but if I am constantly persecuted by fear whether what I write will be to the liking of this or that authority or critic, there would be no writing."

Alas, as we all know now, the giant Vlado who wrote the gushing biography of Tito will not be writing his accustomed stint either with or without Zihlerl's ink. . . .

Djilas's "Adorers"

Zihlerl took the floor at the plenum to blame Djilas for the dismaying situation that obtained among the "cultural workers":

"If one turns the pages of our literary magazines, one often comes across novels and stories of whose literary value one simply could not argue because it does not exist and which were written with only one object: that of propagating, in the guise of art, some very reactionary views.

"I could quote you examples from Slovenia, where in this way everything—our struggle for Trieste, our efforts for the building of socialism—is belittled. And when I wrote a criticism about it, a group of supporters of this literature went after me: 'You are Zhdanov, you are prescribing what we have to write and what we cannot write.' . . . To give you an example, Comrade Vidmar, whom one could not consider a Zhdanov by any stretch of the imagination, or a critic for the regime, recently attacked a play by a French playwright and also published a criticism of the abstract arts. He was at once called a 'cultural policeman.'

"In a circle of adorers of Comrade Djilas, Vidmar was told that he was interfering in artistic creation, and that he wanted to lay down rules as to what was to be written. . . ."

Indeed, if one has read Zhdanov, it takes no stretch of the imagination to hear the cultural policeman's accents in Zihlerl's speech at the plenum, in his very accents of denial.

Out of the mouths of the Titoists themselves, then, we can get a very good idea of the tensions within the Titoist world, into which fell the articles of Djilas, and which thereupon began to "seethe." At the same time we get a good idea of the pressures and tendencies which were reflected by and gave the impulsion to Djilas's democratic "deviations."

This is what has so far been revealed of the movement behind Djilas.

(Concluded next week)

How the crisis at the CC plenum developed.)

SYL and YPSL Greet Unity

We Unite for Our Common Aims

Dear Comrades:

The Young Socialist Unity Convention in New York City during the weekend of February 12-14 and the emergence of a unified socialist youth organization from its deliberations and actions—a result which the SYL confidently expects—signify an important development for the socialist movement.

The separate existence of two rival organizations which are in substantial political agreement with each other, and the consequent duplication and waste of effort, will be eliminated. The unification of the SYL and YPSL, the pooling of their forces and resources is an advance for the socialist movement as a whole because it will provide greater and more effective activity and education among students and young workers.

Our unity will also result in drawing into the organization many independent and unorganized socialists who are to be found on campus as well as others who are today in liberal organizations or not active at all.

The SYL is well aware that there are differences between itself and the YPSL. But these differences—of tradition, over historical questions, and in regard to some current political questions—are insignificant in the face of two obviously over-riding considerations.

The first of these is the political nature of our times, a period in which reaction is constantly growing, democratic rights and liberties diminishing, and the socialist movement is tiny, weak and isolated.

The second consideration is that the SYL and YPSL are in agreement on the major questions of the day; they are united in their opposition to the imperialism and war drives of both Stalinism and capitalism; they work for the establish-

ment of the Third Camp of the international working class and the colonial peoples. Both organizations struggle for the preservation and extension of civil liberties and academic freedom.

In preparing to enter a unified organization, the SYL does not, of course, surrender its tradition, its high regard for the Independent Socialist League, or its viewpoints on those questions on which we differ with the YPSL; nor does the SYL expect or wish the YPSL to give up its tradition and viewpoint. The SYL does not approach unity with a factional attitude; the differing opinions can and will exist side by side, contending with each other in a loyal, comradely and democratic manner, while we work together for our common aims.

We know that the comrades of the YPSL approach the unity convention with the same spirit. Our negotiations for unity and the close and active collaboration between us which has preceded this convention give us the utmost confidence in the intentions of our YPSL comrades. Given such attitudes on the part of both organizations and their members, we shall assuredly have a successful convention and a successful unity.

We invite all young socialists who are today outside of the ranks of both the SYL and YPSL to join with us. Ancient quarrels and old wounds must be forgotten in view of the tasks facing those who have not surrendered to the pressures, the fears and the apathy of our time.

The formation of the Young Socialist League can become a turning point toward the rejuvenation of socialist struggle. It is to this end that we must address ourselves.

MAX MARTIN
Acting Natl. Sec'y, SYL

There Are No Barriers to Unity

Comrades:

We hope that through the work of the Young Socialist Unity Convention we will go out of existence as a separate organization. If this is so, the convention will have done its work well. We feel that there is no barrier to the immediate unity of all young socialists, who adhere in general to an internationalist Third Camp program now. Our negotiations with the resident committee of the SYL have obviously been mutually satisfactory or this convention would not be taking place.

However, on the eve of this socialist youth unity, we wish to make certain things crystal-clear and placed on the record. This is to prevent any future misunderstandings—and to prevent as much as possible the attempts which will be made by pro-war socialists to slander the new youth organization.

First: We come to the socialist youth unity, not because we have been convinced that the program of the ISL-SYL is "better than ours" but because we feel that it is now possible for both the SYL and the YPSL to exist in the same organization, without either capitulating to the views of the other. That is, we come to the unity convention with our program and traditions intact.

Secondly: We feel that it is important to note that there are concrete programmatic differences between the YPSL and SYL, distinct from and separate from any traditional differences.

To name a few, and only a few: the YPSL still approaches the problems of the "breathing spell" and coexistence between imperialist powers differently; its position on conscientious objection is favorable to refusal on the part of its members to serve in the armed forces; and the YPSL tends to place much less em-

phasis on the role of the organization as the carrier of socialist ideas than do our comrades of the SYL.

Thirdly: In our view the new socialist youth organization is not in any way a "back door" to our joining the ISL-SYL. If we were not convinced that there is an independent role for the new youth organization we would not have gone through the motions of a unity convention but would have simply joined the SYL as a separate tendency. The new organization is a cooperative project, where neither the SYL nor the YPSL even attempted to force its views on the other. The mutual respect and the close political alliance of the two revolutionary youth organizations precluded such an approach.

Therefore it is important to state now that although there are differences between us and our comrades of the SYL on a number of questions, in no sense do we expect factional divisions to form in the new organization over these questions. As a matter of fact we believe that whatever political tendencies develop in the new youth organization will cross the present organizational lines and have no relationship to them. Not the least reason for this is our firm conviction that the new organization will be a model of internal democracy and our consequent willingness to subject our views to the test of the democratic discussion and decision in the new organization.

Fourthly: All tendencies now present in the YPSL will be represented on the executive committees of the new organization. This specifically includes the revolutionary pacifists and the non-Marxists.

Having made these things clear, we now want to add the following. All evidence before us indicates that the unity between the SYL and the YPSL will be successfully accomplished. The result—a broader and more effective movement—deserves the full support of all independent young socialists.

We are confident that the delegates to the unity convention will do their work well, and will lay sound and democratic foundations for a growing and powerful socialist youth movement.

FRATERNAL AND SOCIALIST GREETINGS TO THE YOUTH UNITY CONVENTION — AGAINST BOTH WAR CAMPS!

National Organization Committee YPSL

An Appeal to Militant Pacifists — —

(Continued from back page)

fulfill the terrible obligation to face the present.

The Young Socialist League will not be a pacifist organization. It will give unquestioned support to the struggle for the civil liberties of conscientious objectors, but it will leave the decision of participation in military service up to the conscience of its individual members. From its formation, the YSL will have a strong pacifist minority and C. O. representation among the leadership. It does not look to supplant the functions of the traditional C. O. organizations. It does propose to give a political, economic and social emphasis to the problem of war.

The YSL believes that the ultimate answer is found in democratic socialism. But much more pertinently, it believes that the present answer is in the day-to-day socialist struggle for a new society.

NO ISOLATION

Two organizations have joined in initiating the Young Socialist League: the Young Peoples' Socialist League and the Socialist Youth League. One of these groups, the SYL, has been the affiliate of the Independent Socialist League, a group formed out of a split in the Trotskyist movement. The pacifist may well wonder what kind of "Bolshevik" cast these comrades have, for pacifism is certainly alien to both Bolshevism and Trotskyism.

Several points should be made. First, we conscientious objectors have long prided ourselves on our insistence on the creative potential of reconciliation, of a personal approach based not on violence, but on love. Yet, with some honorable exceptions, the pacifists in the United States have reacted toward these "Bolsheviks" as toward pariahs. The proper attitude for them is not reconciliation and the free exchange of ideas, but isolation, refusal even to fraternize.

We have prided ourselves that we

would confront a Nazi or a Stalinist as a human being. Yet in dealing with the ISL-SYL we have too often treated with a bogey-man.

This is not to say that I—or for that matter any pacifist—agrees with the ISL-SYL. I do not identify with Trotskyism in any way. It is to say that pacifists could well consider taking a pacifist approach in this case.

Secondly, there is the actual content of the image of the Bolshevik. We are told that the SYLers are undemocratic, conniving, untrustworthy, etc.

Now although I do disagree with the Trotskyist tradition, my personal contact with these comrades who have come from that tradition is another thing. Through personal contact, I have found that the SYLers are democratic, almost utopianly so. When I find a press that gives as free a range to criticism as LABOR ACTION, it will be a totally democratic press. Kronstadt, the nature of a socialist movement, parliamentarianism, violence—here I disagree. But in the actual contact and day-to-day work with the comrades of the SYL I can only honestly say that I have found more democracy than in almost any organization I know.

VITAL ARENA

We have conceived of our immediate mission as that of a witness. We have not deluded ourselves with the idea that we were leading a mass movement. Yet a witness in a complex, industrial world is a complex thing. It does not mean quietism. It does not mean that we shun all but those who agree with us to the last dotted "i." It means a commitment to struggle within the limits of our convictions on the relation between end and means.

These limits are not abridged in the Young Socialist League. They are part of the organization. Here we have an opportunity for a broader participation, in a democratic organization, in the struggle against war. Here, in a small war, we have an immediate opportunity for reconciliation. Here we have a chance to learn.

The Young Socialist League is not a great mass movement. Yet it does mark an expression of profound feeling for unity, for the principle of agreeing to disagree in order that we may implement our aims of agreement.

In a small—a pathetically small—way,

against war, the experience of a democratic organization, of that give-and-take we prize so highly. In actual workings, it will be non-violent.

In estimating this new organization, and in relating to it, I recommend to pacifists their own method. I believe if we approach it in the spirit of reconciliation and friendship that we will find, as we have so long proclaimed, that it will react in the spirit of reconciliation, friendship—and cooperation.

We Remember!

February 12, the date of the Young Socialist Unity Convention, marks the twentieth anniversary of the fascist attack on the workers of Austria. On that day, as the young socialists of America meet to found their new united organization, they will remember this great episode in the heroic tradition of socialism.

Twenty years ago, to the sound of the fascist artillery in Vienna, the Austrian socialist movement stood and fought back against the tide of fascism that was engulfing Europe. Thus, the workers of the Austrian socialist movement, reformist though it was, saved the honor of the working-class movement—since but a few months before, German Stalinism and Social-Democracy, representing the largest organized working-class on the continent, had permitted the Nazis to take power without a fight.

The fascists took over the federal government of Austria through a coalition between the Christian Social (Catholic) Party led by Engelbert Dollfuss and the Heimwehr, a private military organization representing the organized reaction. Through an unstable parliamentary majority of two, Dollfuss became chancellor. The new regime, known as the "Patriotic Front," was supported by the wealthy landowners, former officers of the Hapsburg armies, the middle classes and the Catholic Church. By 1933 Dollfuss had dismissed the parliament and supreme court, ruling by personal decree. He refused to hold elections.

The Austrian Social-Democratic leadership, representing the vast majority of the working class, refused to take any

vention by European reaction. While the Heimwehr, composed of the most criminal elements of the population, grew in power, becoming officially designated as an auxiliary police force, harassing the workers, the Republican Schutzbund—a workers militia—was outlawed.

The Civil War broke out on February 12, 1934 when the federal police and the Heimwehr attacked the socialist headquarters in Linz. The workers of Vienna came out in a general strike to which the government responded with martial law. Leaders of the socialist movement, including the mayor of Vienna and members of parliament, were arrested. The Heimwehr and the fascist gangs set out to seize all the members of the Schutzbund. With outdated weapons, outnumbered and almost leaderless, the men of the Schutzbund resisted.

For days the struggle raged in the working-class districts all over Austria. Particularly bloody were the struggles in Vienna, where the fascist regime used artillery to raze the Karl Marx Hof, a model housing project erected by the socialist municipality.

"Red" Vienna was destroyed, but its labor movement went down fighting—and it left a tradition that all militant socialists have in common.

Sentenced to death by the fascist courts, Kolomon Wallisch, a member of the people's militia, declared: "I have devoted my life to the working class. I know that I am being condemned for it. I do not ask for mercy; I need no mercy. Whoever fights for the rights of the working class

THE YOUNG SOCIALIST UNITY CONVENTION IS OPEN

to all friends of the young socialist movement and interested youth. See the back page

STUDENT SOCIALIST

FEBRUARY 8, 1954

STUDENT-YOUTH SECTION of LABOR ACTION

FIVE CENTS

Convention to Launch New United Young Socialist League

By **BOGDAN DENITCH**

On Friday, the 12th of February, the Young Socialist Unity Convention will begin its first session at Labor Action Hall, 114 West 14 Street in New York.

At the three-day convention that follows, delegates from the Socialist Youth League and the Young People's Socialist League, together with any independent delegates that join in, will take up the launching of a unified Third Camp socialist organization, the Young Socialist League.

Delegates from the West Coast, the Midwest, New England and New York will work out the program and the constitution of the new youth organization—the organization which will be, without a doubt, the largest single socialist youth organization in the U. S. Composed primarily of students and young industrial workers, it brings together in one movement trained and experienced young socialists from the two socialist Third Camp youth organizations.

Such is the proposal which the leading committees of the SYL and YPSL will first present to their own delegates for approval, prior to the scheduled convening of the united groups, before they're out of existence as independent organizations.

TWO CURRENTS

Both the SYL and the YPSL have their own history and traditions. The YPSL, dating back to the pre-World War I days of the socialist movement, has a tradition of having produced left wing after left wing which were forced out of the Socialist Party. Its tradition is for the most part internationalist and anti-war. The SYL, the youth section of the Independent Socialist League, although very much younger—having been formed in 1946—had come to be identified as the Third Camp socialist youth organization on the campuses for years, until the left wing in the YPSL won the League also to a revolutionary Third Camp program.

The YPSL and the SYL have, to be sure, differences in tradition and to a smaller extent in program. The SYL is at present the youth section of the Independent Socialist League and by and large defends the revolutionary traditions of Bolshevism and revolutionary Marxism. The YPSL was, up to last September, the youth section of the Socialist Party and has always been hostile in its attitude toward the historical past of both Trotskyism and Bolshevism and their traditions. In addition the YPSL has a large proportion of pacifists in its makeup.

The united youth organization therefore will be a union of diverse tendencies and currents and will conscientiously endeavor to be as wide as possible in its appeal to independent anti-war young socialists of all kinds.

REGROUPING

In spite of such differences, in view of the overwhelming agreement between the two youth organizations on most of the serious political issues of the day—attitude toward the two imperialist blocs, the war, defense of democracy, working-class orientation, and the goals of socialism—the historical differences between the two youth organizations have receded into the background.

The convention will represent a regrouping of the radical socialist youth on the basis of political program rather than traditions. Thus the new organization will represent a synthesis of the ideas and principles held in common by most socialist Third Camp youth.

The new youth organization will be independent and unaffiliated to any adult socialist organization. It will permit its members to work with any adult socialist group of their choice. But the new organization will, of course, be most closely oriented to the other Third Camp socialists as well as to the revolutionary pacifists.

In view of the fraternal feeling be-

ACTION, the organ of the ISL, LABOR ACTION will be supported by the Young Socialist League. This is not only because LABOR ACTION today reflects most closely the Third Camp program common to both youth organizations but also because LABOR ACTION has willingly offered its pages to the new youth organization as a forum for its own views. Thus, in effect, LABOR ACTION is making room within its pages for what will be a sister publication—to be called the *Young Socialist Challenge*—which will be under the exclusive editorship of the new youth organization.

FOCUS ON CAMPUS

The new socialist youth organization should become the focus on the campus and among youth for independent socialists of all kinds. It will be broad and democratic. It will avoid sterile and useless controversies in its work of education and agitation for the socialist alternative to the war drive of the two armed camps.

The political climate in the United States today precludes any real mass political work among the youth, but the Young Socialist League faces political tasks which, while modest, are at least realistic and achievable. The first and most important is to keep the ideas of anti-war socialism alive and present

among the young students and workers. This the YSL can do through the work of its members on the campuses, through its press, through forums and summer schools.

While only the most politically advanced of youth may join a socialist organization today, the effect of our ideas on the others can be considerable. YSL members will strive to bring its message to the larger looser organizations for immediate issues: civil-liberty groups, anti-war groups, anti-racist groups, and so on. There they will attempt to relate the isolated work of democratic groups to the basic socialist critique of the capitalist system and act as a radicalizing element.

CLIMATE THAWING

By uniting and forming a stable national organization the YSL will be able to reach many campuses which neither the SYL nor the YPSL have been able to reach alone. By pooling our joint experiences—and it is important to remember the paucity of trained political leaders in the youth field—we will form an organization that will in its understanding and effectiveness stand head and shoulders above the other political youth organizations.

Active student leaders on campuses throughout the U. S. report a general rise in political interest on the part of students. It is as if some thawing out of the frozen campus situation is slowly taking place, but this increased interest is chaotic, undirected and unaffected by any of the existing political organizations.

Today there are no "mass" or even large student movements on the campus—the field is wide open, and the weakness of the formal liberal organizations makes it unlikely that they will be able to capitalize on the increasing feeling by the students that "something" is very, very wrong in the world.

CLEAN HANDS

One of the reasons for the "thaw" is perhaps the collapse of the Stalinists on the campuses and the consequent reaction against the witchhunt. It is difficult for the witchhunters to talk to the students of the Stalinist danger on campuses as a justification for the atmosphere of fear, when students know, from their

Convention Schedule

All sessions are open to friends and visitors up to and including Sunday morning. They will take place at Labor Action Hall, 114 West 14 Street, New York City.

FRIDAY, FEB. 12

12-2 p.m. . . . Registration.
Session (1) 2-6 p.m. . . . Reports. Election of convention committees. Discussion of press (*Young Socialist Challenge*).

(2) 8-11 p.m. . . . Greetings from fraternal organizations. Discussion on Perspective of YSL.

SATURDAY, FEB. 13

(3) 10-1 p.m. . . . Constitution.
(4) 2-6 p.m. . . . Draft program.
Evening . . . Buffet-dinner and social (see below).

SUNDAY, FEB. 14

(5) 10-1 p.m. . . . Discussion on Anvil.
(6) 2-6 p.m. . . . Resolutions. Election of NEC.

A Sunday evening session will be held if necessary to take care of an overflow of business.

BUFFET-DINNER AND SOCIAL

Saturday evening of the convention weekend will see the young socialist delegates and friends gathered at a buffet dinner which will be followed by a social. It's at Labor Action Hall, the price will be \$1.50 a plate (refreshments included) and everybody is urged to come.

own experience just how negligible the Stalinist influence actually is today.

A socialist youth organization can "talk sense" to the students; it has clean hands when it defends democracy. Because of the failure of the liberals to do so, the socialists must become the focus for the democratic struggle against the witchhunters.

But to reach the students, organization is necessary. And organizations do not spring out of the blue but are the result of painstaking work, study and sacrifice. This the young militants who will form the Young Socialist League are well aware of. They are girding themselves for a new effort to push to a new high the building of such a movement.

Challenge

According to present plans—as projected by the SYL and YPSL committees for the new united Young Socialist League and to be taken up by the unity convention at its first session—the press organ of the League will be a regular section in LABOR ACTION, to be called THE YOUNG SOCIALIST CHALLENGE.

The aim will be to have THE YOUNG SOCIALIST CHALLENGE constitute a regular page of LABOR ACTION every week, and to constitute a special 4-page section at periodical intervals.

By a Pacifist-Socialist: For Unity— An Appeal to Militant Pacifists

By **MICHAEL HARRINGTON**

Since its decimation at the beginning of World War II, the pacifist movement has placed its major emphasis on the bitter struggle for survival. The negative aspect of the C. O. position has been at the forefront: that of draft refusal. The positive part of pacifism, the campaign against war through removing the political, economic and social causes of war, has suffered.

Yet if pacifism is to be a real force in the world today, it must think out its answers to the agonizingly complex problems which confront us here and now. It is not enough to talk about a messianic vision of the future in which the rule of non-violence and of charity will prevail. For charity is confronted, right now, with the ex-

are held in subjugation by the two great imperialist camps. If it does not heed their call, it is simply quietism, a "matter of taste," the politics of the self-satisfied.

For charity has its politics—or, if the word is distasteful, charity has the problem of actual implementing itself in complex undertakings.

When millions of Indians are starving, it is not enough to say that we love them

agencies of distribution. More than that, we must work toward the abolition of the causes which produced the famine. Many of us believe that the politics of charity is socialism. We feel that the only movement for the abolition of exploitation, and the extension of economic, political and social decision to all peoples, is the socialist movement. In this movement, we can attempt to begin to work out the positive, creative aspect of our opposition to war.

On this February 12, a new youth organization, the Young Socialist League, will come into existence. In principled opposition to the war, it represents an effort to discover the causes of war and to actively engage in the campaign to destroy them. For a pacifist, it provides the opportunity to broaden perspective—to