

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JULY 9, 1956

FIVE CENTS

At the ISL Hearing:
JAMES BURNHAM AS POLICE AGENT

... page 7

Cassocks and Overalls in Dutch Politics

... page 4

A Firsthand Report on Algeria's Army

... page 3

Hungary: Youth Focuses the Opposition

... page 5

Polish Workers' Rising in Poznan Rips Pretenses of Stalinist 'Democratization'

Three Things That Poznan Tells Us About the Revolution in Stalinland

By HAL DRAPER

In a demonstration strike and uprising of epic heroism, the revolutionary workers of Poland have torn through the showpiece of the regime's "democratization" and "de-Stalinization."

On the pattern of the 1953 workers' revolt in East Germany, "June Days" flared again in the industrial center of Poznan, to show that the much-publicized "liberalization" of the regimes run by Stalin's disciples has not lessened the hatred of the people for their totalitarian masters.

As has happened so many times before in history, the easing-up of a tyranny has only encouraged its victims to strike out against it more boldly, since they instinctively understand that brutal despots do not ease up—or talk sugarily of liberalization and democratization and reforms—*except when they feel shaky*. In East Germany, the uprising occurred in the wake of Stalin's death and new concessions by the regime, followed, however, by an attempt to squeeze the workers for higher work-quotas.

No one has a right to believe for one moment, now, that the line inaugurated by the 20th Congress in Moscow has brought any basic social change to the post-Stalin Stalinist regimes.

Here is the big fact: This unexampled revolutionary outbreak took place precisely in that country, among all the

"STALIN WAS TOO POPULAR

for us to depose him"—this is the fantastic reply of the Russian Kremlin leaders to the criticism that has been rolling up from the Stalinist ranks. Next week we will have room to discuss the latest pronouncements of the Moscow men.

ALSO NEXT WEEK—

Full coverage on the steel strike that broke out this week.

satellite regimes of the Russian empire, which had gone farthest in the much-vaunted "de-Stalinization"; whose government had gone ahead most rapidly in sloughing off the stupid and maniacal excesses of the personal regime of Stalin; which had let down the bars most for a certain range of criticism; which was putting up the best show of reform-from-above.

Certainly this Polish regime, above all the others, should have won popularity. (Continued on page 2)

THE GROUND IS BURNING

Reports of anti-Stalinist demonstrations in Poland outside of Poznan have so far remained entirely unconfirmed. West German journalists and travelers have been talking about "disorders" in Szczecin (Stettin), Gdansk (Danzig), Gdynia, Lodz, Gnessen, Alfenstein, to a lesser degree also Cracow and Warsaw.

One West Berlin paper, *Telegraf*, printed a dispatch from Helsinki claiming that "resistance action" had taken place in the three Baltic states now incorporated into Russia.

Apparently more substantial, however, were reports of an uprising in Tibet directed against the imperialist domination of the country by Mao's regime in China. Tibetan rebels inflicted heavy casualties on Chinese troops, the *New Delhi Statesman* said, reporting a "wave of rebellion" in Eastern Tibet.

All eyes, of course, have turned to East Germany, whose "June Days" occurred three years ago in a workers' uprising which no doubt set an example for the Polish revolutionists. The Stalinist regime in East Berlin screamed raucous threats and exhortations in fear of a repetition now, abusing the Polish fighters as "imperialist provocateurs," etc., in the usual Stalinist style.

One news commentator hopefully asked, "Is Czechoslovakia next?" remembering that it was Czechoslovakia which preceded East Germany in June 1953 as the scene of revolutionary demonstrations and strikes. Student demonstrations against the regime in Prague have recently raised the temperature there.

Meanwhile the discontent is visibly rising in Hungary—for which see page 5.

The ground is burning under Stalin's disciples.

On June 28 the second workers' uprising behind the Iron Curtain broke out in Poznan, an industrial center of Poland.

It began with a strike and shutdown in heavy industry at 8 a.m., followed by mass demonstrations and parades into the center of town, in well-organized ranks, under banners and slogans calling for bread and freedom, particularly freedom from Russian control.

This was met by the Stalinist regime with tanks and machineguns; heavy fighting raged in some places. The workers stormed and took over government buildings, the CP headquarters, the city hall, radio stations, jails, and wrecked the Security Police headquarters. Even homes of secret-police officers were sacked. Hundreds of prisoners were released from jail.

Many soldiers and militiamen went over to the side of the revolt. According to reports, the people were put down only by troops under Russian officers.

There was widespread belief that the uprising was the work of an organized underground—perhaps built around the cadres of pre-Stalinist trade-unionists in the steel and tractor plants.

Such were the reports brought back by eyewitnesses—Western businessmen attending the annual Poznan trade fair. Without doubt the holding of the fair and the presence of large numbers of foreigners, who could tell the world about what happened, was at least one of the reasons for the outburst at this place and time.

THE SIGNAL IS STRIKE

Not even in the East German revolt of June 1953, it seems, was such courage and heroism displayed by the revolutionary workers battling against the totalitarian power.

The slogans and demands reported leave no doubt of the political nature of the movement and of the revolutionary drive behind it, though, as always, it was very likely touched off or stimulated by more immediate grievances. According to one report by a newspaperman-eyewitness (F. G. Hickman, a Memphis editor), "Workers had demanded a 15 per cent wage increase and gave management until 8 last night to meet their demands."

From other sources: "One report said a Communist crackdown on Poznan's worker-leaders might have touched off the rebellion. A worker delegation went to the Polish capital Monday to ask for better living conditions and was jailed immediately upon its return to Poznan Wednesday, it was reported."

Neither report is necessarily in contradiction with the belief that the action was also deliberately planned in advance. This side of the event however, is almost totally speculative.

It is a certainty that the action began with a strike in the industrial plants.

TITO'S SIDE

It is fitting that one of the first voices raised to spew venomous slanders against the Polish working-class fighters was that of the Yugoslav Titoists—who have had their own share of inducing sweet dreams of "democratization" and "de-Stalinization" in the minds of dupes.

Within 24 hours after they heard of the uprising, the editors of the *Belgrade Borba*, official organ of the Tito-Stalinists, had already deduced that the action was "reactionary and destructive." They insinuated that the outbreak was instigated by pro-Stalin elements:

"Poland is among the countries that have been farthest ahead in democratization. It is not accidental that disturbances have broken out there, because there are circles and elements inside and outside Poland which are directly affected by this new situation."

The technique of smearing an opponent with his political opposite is one of the talents which the Titoists have retained in their Stalinist heritage.

The outbreak of revolt in Stalinland finds the Titoists standing shoulder to shoulder with the men of Moscow.

First reports assigned the central role to the workers of the Stalin Locomotive Works; the government later named the Zispo tractor works as the initiating point. Whoever moved first, the general strike was solid and complete. All transportation stopped running; shops closed.

A dispatch out of Poznan itself, to the *London Times*, said: "The disturbances (Continued on page 2)

She Was There

In the Sunday N. Y. Times magazine just before the Poznan uprising, there appeared an article entitled "The Second Revolution in Poland," by Flora Lewis (wife of Times foreign correspondent Sydney Gruson).

By the "second revolution" Miss Lewis meant the reform-from-above being touted by the CP leadership of the regime. She did NOT mean any action by the people. On the contrary she wrote:

"At the outset it is important to make it clear that this is a Communist revolution [i.e., a "revolution" within the regime], not the surging reaction of oppressed populations against a whole system of government and way of life on which some Western statesmen seem to have pinned their hopes."

Of the upsurge "against a whole system of government," she saw nothing.

On Wednesday the *Daily Worker* proudly exhibited her remarks. Columnist Joe Clark quoted the above and saluted.

The same day, Poznan exploded.

Polish Workers' Rising Rips — —

(Continued from page 1)

began with a strike for higher wages at the Stalin engineering works in the city early yesterday morning. Strikers marched out of the gates and entered offices and buildings on their way to bring out others to join them." (N. Y. Times, June 30.)

The slogans raised began with "We Want Bread" (chanted by a mass parade moving into the town) but immediately ramified out into all the basic political demands: for democratic rights, and against Moscow. Russian flags were torn down.

Businessmen-witnesses "reported that the workers increased their demands from 'bread' to 'Russians go home'... They quoted one Pole as saying: 'We have lived in a jail since 1939—we have nothing to lose.' Demonstrators shouted: 'down with the Russians!' and 'we want bread and freedom' as they surged through the streets." (N. Y. World-Telegram, June 29.)

The London Times dispatch, referred to above, quoted Robert Davies, a Labor city councillor of Cambridge who was in Poznan as part of a British economists' delegation, plus other members of his delegation. Davies reported the following slogans:

"We want freedom!" "Down with this phony Communism!" "Down with the Russkis!" "Down with the Soviet occupation!" "We demand lower prices and higher wages!" "Down with dictatorship!"

"The words 'We want bread!' were scrawled on scraps of paper and handed around among the crowds as home-made leaflets."

It is not certain from reports which slogans were being shouted and which were on posters and placards.

WORKERS MARCH

Accounts of the fighting are vivid. Following are some of them, all stemming from foreign visitors to Poznan, in an approximation of chronological order.

"We saw crowds of workmen, apparently steelworkers, in overalls marching in an orderly manner through the streets. They carried in front of them a large Polish flag. They had placards too. They were chanting something. I was told it was 'We want bread.' The demonstration appeared to be organized..."

A Times dispatch: "Disturbances began with some workers going on strike and demonstrating in front of their places of employment, the travelers said. The strike spread to operators on the street car lines. Crowds were reported gathering in the streets. Automobiles were turned across roads as barricades. Red banners bearing Communist slogans were ripped down. The police appeared with machinegun pistols."

Other travelers also said the workers "had set up roadblocks at strategic intersections in their first move."

A United Press summary: "Columns of demonstrators, with muscular steelworkers in overalls and carrying placards in the front ranks, marched through the streets. Their ranks were swelled steadily. Streetcars stopped and taxi drivers deserted their cabs. Telephone and telegraph workers quit work. 'Bread!' the workers shouted. 'This is our revolution!' They began ripping down Communist flags. They overturned automobiles and barricaded the streets. Only cars carrying foreigners were permitted to pass. All shops closed except for a few state-run food stores. The demonstrators massed before the city center, the rail station and the fair hall. 'This is our revolution,' they chanted. They shouted it in English, French and German to the hundreds of foreign visitors in Poznan for the fair."

SOLDIERS FRATERNIZE

Editor Hickman wrote:

"Thousands converged on the center of Poznan. They were intent on first capturing the secret police headquarters which they set afire. After two hours the building was pretty well destroyed. Next they attacked the prison, burned a file on political prisoners and freed the prisoners. They then destroyed the radio jamming station. The strikers also took over the city hall and hoisted a white flag on top of the building."

"It is estimated 30,000 were in the mob. The police looked on disinterestedly as did many of the ordinary soldiers,

some of whom turned their weapons over to the uprisers. Two tanks seized by the strikers guarded the bank opposite the Poznanski Hotel. Five army tanks moved up about 3 p.m. . . ."

The London Times dispatch from Poznan:

"According to eyewitness reports, the first troop of tanks and truckload of infantry to arrive before the security police headquarters yesterday while it was under attack fraternized with the demonstrators and joined in attacking the unpopular security police. . . ."

"About 10:30 a.m. yesterday, the demonstrators arrived before the castle at Poznan where a Communist Party member attempted to address them. He was seized and beaten. The demonstrators continued past the police headquarters while a voice from a loudspeaker van accompanying them shouted that they would not go back to work until their demands had been met. Later the demonstrators were joined by groups of workers armed with rifles, presumed to have been taken from the Stalin engineering works. They attacked the jail, set it on fire, and released the prisoners. . . . Mr. Davies saw young workers firing rifles at the security-police building from close quarters. . . ."

WITH LOCKED ARMS

At this point the best eyewitness account is that of a correspondent of the leading German daily *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, Dr. Heinz Brestel:

"At noon, military help was requested. Suddenly T-34 tanks and armored cars rolled through the streets toward the market square and closed all main traffic arteries. Anti-aircraft guns took up positions on the main city squares. Machineguns were brought up against the demonstrators. The first shots were fired shortly after. Women and children fled to their homes and to sidestreets."

"The workers, however, tightened their ranks. They hooked their arms and began to march against the soldiers. Then the officers gave orders to shoot. The first victim lay dead on the cobblestones. The angry mob tore branches from the trees and rushed again against the military, shouting their demand for freedom. A flag was put over the dead man. Others lifted

him and carried the body before them as they surged forward."

"The second victim was a Polish soldier. He refused to fire his gun. An officer pointed his pistol at the soldier and killed him."

According to Dr. Brestel "Communist functionaries in Poznan apparently even supported the strike. They said: 'Warsaw should know that we do not stand for this any longer.'"

When the workers took the jail, overwhelmed the guards, freed the prisoners and fired the building, "the militia did nothing. The crowd shouted at them, 'You yourselves have nothing to eat.'"

"WE ARE WITH YOU"

From other sources:

"Other witnesses said they saw workers in dungarees and overalls seize six tanks from Communist cadet crews and turn the guns on Red troops. Many soldiers who were trucked into Poznan to quell the uprising turned over their weapons to the rioters, the witnesses said. . . ."

"Armed rebels, they said, swarmed over six tanks and forced the crews to flee. The partisans then used the tanks to fight the troops, they added."

The above-mentioned Robert Davies testified to the fraternization by the troops: "The commander of one of the leading tanks was said to have answered with strong affirmative gestures questions hurled at him by demonstrators whether he was a true Pole, and then to have turned his guns against the security-police building. A wounded soldier with a bandage round his head was quoted as having shouted to the crowds as he was being taken away in an ambulance: 'You have nothing to fear from us Polish soldiers. We are with you.'"

Another businessman-eyewitness "said that the army remained loyal to the Communist regime but that the militia and workers-factory guards proved untrustworthy. They said many of the machineguns and rifles with which the rebels fought were given them by militiamen and factory guards. (A dispatch from Warsaw said the rioters seized the main arsenal at militia headquarters and disarmed militiamen.) Demonstrators also were armed with weapons recovered from caches of the underground resist-

ance fighters, the businessman said. United Press writer Konrad Osterloff cabled from Warsaw that the rioters had used Molotov cocktails to combat the tanks."

On Monday, foaming threats from the Warsaw government revealed that Communist Party functionaries went into hiding in Poznan when the people rose, and did not crawl out of the woodwork again until the tanks and troops had gotten things under control.

STALINIST TERROR

For two days after June 28, sporadic fighting and firing was reported from Poznan, though not from the center of the town which seemed to be quiet.

As soon as action had ceased, the Warsaw regime unleashed its terror. As we go to press, it has been reported that mass arrests are under way and, according to some, that summary executions of "ring-leaders" by Stalinist death squads are letting the blood of the Poznan heroes, under the direct supervision of the leaders of the government.

At the same time, these butchers are talking of making concessions to the workers' demands, and are beating their breast, with now well-practised fists, for having previously ignored the little matter that people who were already in need of food had had their wages slashed and their work-quotas raised.

In the Western capitals, the reaction has had more than a suggestion of the same response as met the East German rising. "Capital Minimizes Effects of Revolt" (N. Y. World-Telegram). "Poznan's Echoes Are Discouraged" (N. Y. Times).

"There were misgivings among some of the State Department diplomats about the wisdom of saying anything at all that might encourage other Poles to rise against the Communist regime and be shot down. If there was to be a public statement, these officials said, it should not be provocative." (Times.)

The "president" of the "Polish Republic in Exile," August Zaleski—a Pilsudskyite who detests people's uprisings as heartily as do the Stalinists—groaned about "calamity" if there were to be "premature uprisings."

"British diplomatic circles" opined, according to the Times, "that the Poznan riots stemmed from local industrial discontent rather than from general widespread political unrest inside Poland."

This spirit of coolness was evident in

(Turn to last page)

Three Things That Poznan Tells — —

(Continued from page 1)

loyalty and support—if we have been wrong in our dim view of the 20th Congress turn.

Instead it faced what may well be the world's most courageous example of a virtually united population showing the world its unslaked detestation of and will to fight against this regime!

That is the first thing that the Poznan workers did.

CARRIER OF FREEDOM

The second thing is that they showed again who will overthrow Stalinism, where to look for the gravediggers of this totalitarianism.

In the Polish "June Days" as in the East German, the undisputed leader and organizer of the people was the working class, no one else. Far from having been "finished" as the carrier of the socialist revolution just because of the Stalinist victory, it is the working class and even the working class alone which has taken the forefront in every movement against Stalinism. Thus another old debate is being settled.

The Poznan revolt was a proletarian action from beginning to end. Every single report confirmed it; even the government abuse admitted it. "Relying on the responsible part of the working class" we have "restored order," said the government communiqué revealingly. The government has also admitted it, of course, in its subsequent promises to "satisfy the justified demands of the working class" which led to the discontent.

The action started as a strike movement in the factories of this industrial town of 365,000—in the unnamed Stalin Locomotive Works, or, according to the Warsaw radio, in the Zispo tractor factory. Steelworkers marched at the head of the demonstrations, said the

business men returning to the West from the Poznan trade fair, who are the sources for our knowledge of the movement. Every description reported in the papers stresses its class character.

On the one side, there are the capitulators to Stalinism who pretend that these totalitarianisms are "socialist" or "workers states." The Poznan workers have told us whether the state is "theirs."

On the other side, there are the renegades of various types who have consoled themselves for their abandonment of the socialist struggle with the thought that, after all, Stalinism means that the working class becomes a mass of enslaved "proles," its mission is "through," the working-class revolution is done for, and the best thing anyone can do is engage himself in lucrative employment.

The Poznan workers have showed that their revolution will yet bring down the edifice of Stalinism.

NO HOPE IN WEST

Their revolution: they do not look to Western capitalism to save them. This is the third great thing proved by the Poznan uprising.

Just as in the East German uprising, just as in the Czech demonstrations of June 1953, there was not a single indication that the Polish workers in revolt conceived of themselves as allies of the "West" or its capitalism.

This is truly remarkable. Surely it could be expected that somewhere in this elemental mass struggle, observers should have been able to spot some explicit sympathy for the "West," which after all is the enemy of their enemy. And the observers—the businessmen who brought back the reports in a steady stream for three days, scores and scores of them—were themselves Westerners,

men who spoke with some of the demonstrators, saw their banners and placards.

There was not a single sign—not a banner, not a slogan, not even a remark—reported by anyone, as far as we have seen in the press.

Only this reference: "The people do not expect any help. They place no great hopes on the Western powers," said a Western businessman returning from the Poznan trade fair. (N. Y. Post, July 2.)

It is not necessary, naturally, to insist that there was really not a single sign of pro-West sentiment among the Polish fighters. There may have been a smidgin, a speck, or a scintilla. What is beyond doubt is the general character of the people's movement of which this great fight was the outcome.

It was as its sole propaganda means of trying to discredit and smear this fight and this movement that the regime slanderously accused it of having some connection with the Western powers. It was as the most effective smear that it knew that the regime issued the absurd charge that Radio Free Europe was behind it. This is a dirty word in Poland.

The Radio Free Europe people may take it as an advertisement. To anyone who thinks, it is the clearest proof of the political character of anti-Stalinism on that side of the Iron Curtain: the people do not want to go back to the old regimes, nor do they want America's brand of liberation.

They want a democratic workers' government—that is, a socialist revolution. They are the Third Camp in Stalinland, though they may never have heard of it.

"This is our revolution," the Poznan workers told observers, according to the reports brought back.

"This is our revolution," they mean.

It is also ours.

LONDON LETTER

Labor Threatens as Auto Unemployment Rises

By OWEN ROBERTS

London, June 28

Is it the beginning of the end of full employment?

That was the question being asked in hundreds of workshops up and down Britain today as workers read in their morning newspapers of the decision of one of Britain's largest automobile companies to discharge 12 per cent of its labor force and put the remainder on a reduced work-week of either three or four days.

The firm, the British Motor Corporation, had given no indication of its intentions until yesterday. It then announced that 6000 workers would be sacked on Friday, tomorrow, and that most of the remaining 50,000 would be switched to the shortened work-week with a consequent reduction in wages.

Hard on the heels of this statement by the BMC came another statement, this time from the Rover Car Company. This said that between 800 and 900 of its 4000 workers were to be switched to a four-day week.

As if this was not enough to settle an atmosphere of deep depression over the men who work in the automobile industry, the Standard Motor Company, which as reported in a previous London Letter marked down 2500 workers for discharge some weeks ago, announced that negotiations with the unions over the retention of half these men had broken down.

In a lengthy statement explaining the reasons for its actions the BMC laid the blame on a variety of factors. Three years ago, it said, the company had made plans for a great expansion of its products to meet the demand of "a world hungry for transport." As a consequence of these plans production rose from 364,097 units in 1954 to 462,719 units in 1955, and, added the company, every one of these was sold.

In recent months, however, the demand has slackened off. The credit squeeze applied by the Tory government at home, in the shape of higher purchase tax and stiffer installment-buying terms, and restrictions on imports by various countries abroad, produced a situation where cars were being made but not sold. Therefore, said the BMC, it had decided that production must be cut in the "future interests of the majority of its employees."

NO HAPPY FUTURE

Most of the men discharged are from BMC plants in the Midlands area where the British automobile industry is concentrated. Already there are more than 7000 unemployed in the area and as of tomorrow a further 5000 will be signing on the dole queues.

Economists and others of a like mind point to the fact that there are at the moment vacancies for some 19,000 men waiting to be filled in the area and so the unemployed auto workers should have little difficulty in finding other work. Mathematically this is true, but, as is often the case, mathematics don't always make two and two equal four when applied to problems affecting workers as human beings rather than statistical units.

Firstly, many of the vacant jobs in the Midlands—as elsewhere in the country—are the jobs carrying the lowest pay. It is for this reason that they are vacant.

The workers in the auto industry are used to having a takehome pay of around \$35 a week, which marks them out as members of the labor aristocracy in Britain. The jobs now vacant in the Midlands carry a wage packet of anything between \$5 to \$10 a week less than that to which the average auto worker is accustomed.

The second factor, seemingly overlooked by those who can solve all of the workers' problems with the aid of a slide rule and a book of logarithm tables is the fact that the Midlands area covers a fairly wide field. Even if workers were prepared to take on a job at a lower wage it would mean moving house to be within daily traveling distance of the new job. And to expect to find vacant houses just for the looking in Britain at this moment is like expecting to be able to find a ready sale for volumes of Stalin's *Collected Works* in the Kremlin.

It can be seen, therefore, that the sacked auto workers are not in for a particularly happy time in the future. And there appears little hope that they will be able to jog along for a few months on a much reduced standard of living, through state unemployment pay and the like, in the expectation that the employment situation in the automobile industry will pick up. This is normally a good season for car sales and the prophets are therefore saying that by the autumn the situation will be much worse and that further sackings can be expected.

It is too soon after the event to be able to quote the reaction of the various interests in Britain, as indicated by the press, to this situation. But taking a lead from past utterances it is reasonably certain to forecast that organs such as the *Financial Times*, *The Banker* and *The Economist* will see in the automobile layoffs the possibilities of a situation developing which they have long advocated.

It will be recalled that many months ago it was reported in these London Letters that sections of the Tory party, dutifully prodded by business interests, were saying that the only way in which Britain could escape from the current "inflationary spiral" was for a pool of unemployment to be created which would enable employers to resist wage demands.

It was not, of course, put quite so openly. Instead they spoke of the need for a pool around 750,000 workers to create the desired degree of mobility of labor required to end the current stagnation in the economy.

But whatever way the package was wrapped up, the goods inside remained the same. And it looks very much as though the automobile industry is to be the place which starts the package off.

WAGE TACTICS

This feeling is further strengthened by the fact that the workers in the auto industry are faced with the position where a strike against the sackings would not produce any great impact. In fact, one or two firms where production is barely ticking over on a much reduced work-week might not look unfavorably on the idea of its workers going on strike for a period. The plant could then be shut down completely, overhead costs greatly reduced and the labor force whittled down by the wastage that normally occurs during a strike as odd workers are driven by personal financial difficulties to seek other employment.

Alongside this development in the automobile industry there is a movement taking place in the nationalized industries which could have serious repercussions at a later date.

Following conversations with the prime minister this week the chairman of the nationalized electricity-supply industry, gas, coal mining and railroads have announced that for a period of twelve months they will not raise prices to consumers. This movement is being widely hailed as a serious endeavor to peg the price of basic services and raw materials which will in turn lead to price stability in most other goods.

This may or may not be true—but there also remains the fact that unions have tended to use the nationalized industries as spearheads in the general struggle for increased wages. Having now made public pledges to hold prices steady the bosses of the nationalized boards will be in a position to resist wage by reminding union leaders of these pledges and pointing out that higher wages are thus out of the question "in the national interest."

If this proves to be the case it will mean that the Tories have realized that nationalized industries can be so manipulated that they set the pace for industry as a whole.

Two things emerge from the general situation as it stands at the moment.

The first is that the peak period of union bargaining power—due to full employment—now seems to have been passed and the initiative is with the employers. The weak policies of the right-wing union leaders, who failed to exploit their strong position during the past few years, is thus rebounding on the workers. If the union leaders had gone all out for higher wages,

A Firsthand Report: Inside the Algerian Camp

By ANDRE GIACOMETTI

Paris, June 10

The following article by Mlle. Claude Gérard was first published in the French weekly *Demain*, which represents European-federalist circles of French socialism. It was written after her return from Algeria, where she had spent 10 days with groups of the National-Liberation Army (NLA). In this, and in another article which *LA* will publish shortly, Mlle. Gérard gives a vivid firsthand picture of certain important aspects of the Algerian movement, particularly the difference in approach between its left wing and right wing. In this way it supplements the more general account which we have just given in the last three issues of *LA*.

The right wing is presently organized in the Front de Libération Nationale (FLN), hence it is referred to here as the "Front" or "Frontists." The left wing is organized in the MNA, led by Messali Hadj, hence called also "Messalists." Both are wings of the military fighting force which is opposing the French, the NLA.

The information given here by Claude Gérard has been confirmed and complemented by recent press reports.

It appears that in the cities (Algiers and Oran in particular) the MNA predominates. This is shown by episodes such as this: On April 10, a merchant in Algiers, member of the MNA, was assassinated by the FLN. The news spread through the press. Less than half an hour before the burial, the MNA ordered a closure of all shops. This order was followed unanimously, and 7,000 persons were present at the burial.

Fighting between FLN and MNA continues to be reported in Algiers, when the two groups interfere with each other, for instance when leaflet distributors of the two rival groups meet, etc. However, this does not seem to exclude certain forms of cooperation.

According to newspaper reports, the police found documents in a raid in Algiers showing that the FLN, which is better armed because of the supplies it gets from Egypt, is selling weapons to the MNA. Letters have been found in which MNA leaders complain of the exorbitant prices charged by the FLN (\$200 for a machine-pistol). Other letters have been found in which FLN leaders complain that the MNA is stealing arms from them.

A significant aspect of the chauvinistic and reactionary trends in the politics of the FLN has been revealed in documents, discovered in the same raid, describing plans of the FLN to launch a large-scale anti-Semitic campaign, probably with the aim of sharpening the struggle by stressing its "racial" religious aspects.

On the trade-union level, the action of both FLN and MNA has been brutally stopped by the mass arrests of leading members of both, and by the action of the government barring ICFTU representatives from Algeria. By this action, the government of Mollet and Lacoste is paralyzing precisely those activities which, by their very nature,

unemployment compensation, guaranteed wages and a shorter working week without reduction in pay when their position was strong, the current situation might never have arisen.

As it is they are now being pushed by their members to take a tough line at a moment when the advantage seems to be passing to the employers.

The second thing which now seems apparent is that Tory government and the employers are rapidly developing the pace of their attacks upon the workers' living standards in an effort to solve their current economic problems. And the pattern of these attacks is one of classical capitalism: a pool of unemployed workers to put a downward pressure on wages, coupled with an "economy ax" swung by the government at state spending on social and welfare measures in order to relieve what is described as "the crushing burden of taxation."

tend to give a conscious class-character to the nationalist struggle and to counteract the chauvinistic themes.

INSIDE ALGERIA

By CLAUDE GERARD

Some people ask: if the population supports the partisans, how does it happen that in Kabylia it rallies to the French authorities?

There was the spectacular gathering near Palestro: "5,000 Kabylis affirm their faithfulness to France." It may be remembered that this affair occurred on March 22. A few days earlier the partisans had executed a number of Europeans, and the army organized "cleaning-up" operations throughout the region. The frightened population came down from the mountains to seek refuge in Palestro, an urban center which is less exposed. It was met by official speeches and photographers.

There exists another type of "rallying," also in Kabylia. Let us stress from the beginning that it is limited to a few villages only.

Certain partisan groups in Greater Kabylia (led by Krim Bel-Kacem, Ouamrane, and Amirouche) which are controlled by the "Liberation Front" (FLN) have adopted methods that differ considerably from those of other armed groups operating on Algerian territory. They move in on the population by force: peasants who did not pay the imposed tax had their throats cut and their houses burned down.

In the same region the assassinations of European civilians occurred. What was the result? Considering that these were not methods of "real" soldiers, the population called upon neighboring partisan groups for protection. These groups, which are Messalist, had already been attacked by the partisans of the FLN for this reason.

The label of "Frontist" has been given by the Kabylis to the groups of Krim and Amirouche to differentiate them from the others, who are designated as "National Liberation Army". Sometimes the NLA groups were not able to respond to the population's appeal against the "Frontists" because they were engaged in battles with the French army. The population then appealed to the authorities for arms. It goes without saying that these people did not think of such demands as "rallying" to the French authorities.

These "Frontist" groups live on the land, requisition groups of villagers to cut telegraph poles, force the villagers to walk in front of them when they fight Messalist partisans of the NLA and, when the inhabitants of a village offer resistance, they organize punitive expeditions, burning down the houses and manhandling the women.

"As for us," said the soldiers of the NLA whom I met, "we even avoid making an ambush too close to a village. If necessary, we go 50 km. further before attempting an operation, since our primary concern is to spare the population."

During a night of anxiety, the village where I was staying was threatened from two sides: from the "Frontists" and from the "French." If the "French" had arrived, I would have been disguised as an Arab woman and would have passed unnoticed among the others. If it had been the "Frontists," I would have shown my correspondent card of *Al Alam* [the newspaper of the Istiqlal Party in Morocco—A. G.] which was printed in Arab and might have prevented violence. The next day we learned that several houses had been burned down by the "Frontists" within a few kilometers. . . .

When the small section of the NLA arrived, everyone was reassured. "Our soldiers," "our army" is here, these poor people would say. And the commander of the small group, after telling me "you are safe now, we are here," explained to me that throughout the region the Kabylis peasants were calling on the NLA for help. Also that relatives of soldiers had been enrolled Rfim

(Turn to last page)

The Elections in the Netherlands:

CASSOCKS AND OVERALLS IN DUTCH POLITICS

By DANIEL FABER

On June 13, general elections for a new lower house took place in the Netherlands. Unexpectedly, the main feature of the election has been a significant advance of the Dutch Labor Party, which emerges as the strongest party not only in terms of votes but also in Parliament.

This victory is not likely to lead to any major change in the policies of the government, which will remain a coalition of the two major parties (Catholic and Labor). However, certain features of the elections, showing a weakening of the clerical hold, deserve closer attention.

	1952	1956
Labor Party	30	34
Catholic Peoples Party	30	33
Anti-Revolutionary Party	12	10
Historical Christian Party	9	8
Liberal Party	9	9
Calvinist Party	2	2
Communist Party	6	4
Catholic National Party	2	...

Few countries are ridden with confessional parties to the same extent as the Netherlands. Aside from a large Catholic Party, which is based on the rural and mining areas of Brabant and Limburg in the South, there are no less than three Protestant confessional parties: the conservative Anti-Revolutionary Party, the liberal Christian Historical Party, and the arch-conservative Calvinist Party.

These confessional divisions affect the entire political, economic, social and cultural life of the country. The main body of the trade-union movement is also split three ways; next to the social-democratic Netherlands Federation of Trade-Unions (NVV) with its 460,000 members, there is a Catholic federation (KAB) with 350,000 members and a Protestant federation (CNV) with 190,000 members.

Besides these three major federations, there is also a small Stalinist trade-union federation (EVC) and an independent leftist federation (OVB); together they number about 50,000. The independent federation broke away from the EVG in 1948; it can be considered as the heir of the pre-war revolutionary unions organized by the Revolutionary Socialist Party of Sneevliet. Its membership is mostly in Rotterdam.

The unusual influence wielded by the various confessional parties is mostly the result of a mistake of the socialists and liberals on the question of the relationship between church and state. As a consequence of a badly understood policy of neutrality, the lay parties never made a fight against the granting of subsidies to the religious schools. Since the beginning of the century, the influence of the churches dominated the educational system, and produced a generation of clerical voters.

In 1946 social-democracy tried to break this clerical stranglehold by merging the old Social-Democratic Party with its Marxist tradition with several leftist Protestant and Catholic groups which had emerged from the Resistance movement. This policy was called significantly "doobrak" (breakthrough) and led to the formation of the present Labor Party.

Although the merger was fought by the left wing of the Social-Democratic Party, which feared a further dilution of the Marxist tradition, the realignment in the new Labor Party took place along entirely new lines. Party members with a religious background often took the lead in defending a militant socialist position against the right-wing leadership, which is mostly composed of old social-democrats.

Since 1948 the Netherlands have been ruled by a coalition government based on the Catholic People's Party and the Labor Party, with minority representatives from the larger Protestant parties. This partnership has become increasingly strained in recent years, partly as a result of differences over economic policies,

partly as a result of the efforts of the Labor Party to attract left-wing Catholics into its ranks.

The Catholic hierarchy began to be genuinely alarmed in 1952, when the general elections resulted in serious losses for the Catholic People's Party in its Southern strongholds, especially among the coal miners of Limburg, many of whom voted Labor. The elections to the city councils in 1953 showed another aspect of the differentiation that was taking place in the CPPP: dissident tickets of Catholic trade-unionists appeared, which drew a few votes here and there from the Labor Party, but cut into the CPPP's vote to the extent of reducing it to 40 per cent even in the Southern provinces.

CATHOLICS ATTACK

If the hierarchy had permitted the creation of a Catholic workers' party, these votes would probably have remained within the confessional orbit. However, the hierarchy chose to take a rigid line, opposing the formation of a party based on the Catholic trade-unions and opening an all-out attack on the Labor Party.

On May 30, 1954, the seven Catholic bishops of the country issued a mandate calling for the "strict public unity of Catholics." Announcing their alarm over co-religionists who deserted Catholic organizations and activities in favor of socialist causes, the bishops declared: "Whoever follows the development without prejudice must fear that our political power and influence will crumble."

They went on to state that "it is not permissible for a Catholic to be a member of socialist associations, such as the Netherlands Federation of Trade-Unions, or to visit socialist gatherings regularly, or to listen to the V.A.R.A. (Labor Party radio network) regularly."

Grave sanctions were to punish those disregarding the bishops' directives: the holy sacraments would be refused and, if the offending Catholic died without repenting, he was to be denied church burial. Concerning the Labor Party itself, these sanctions were not supposed to apply; the bishops declared, however, that no good Catholic should support it.

The hierarchy had already issued two statements to the same effect in 1918 and in 1946; none, however, had been worded as aggressively as the mandate of 1954.

LAY PARTIES GAIN

The Labor Party reacted immediately, and sharply. In a public meeting at Utrecht, with over 7,000 people present, leaders of the LP, including the head of the government Willem Drees, strongly attacked the bishops' statement.

The leader of the Catholic group in the Labor Party declared that the desertion of the LP by its Catholic followers was out of the question. In protest against the support given to the bishops by both Catholic and Protestant trade-union leaders, the NVV withdrew from the Council of Trade-Unions, a joint coordinating body set up after the war by the three major trade-union federations.

In the general elections of June 13, the statement of the bishops was expected to reverse the trend in favor of the Labor Party in the Southern provinces; the Catholic People's Party was also expected to advance through its absorption of the small Catholic National Party, which had gained two seats in 1952, and through the proportionally more rapid increase in the Catholic population.

However, the very contrary happened. Although the CPP advanced in comparison with 1952, it advanced far less than the Labor Party.

The latter picked up, first of all, the votes of numerous Protestants who felt that their rights, as Protestants, were better defended by a large lay party than by a scattering of confessional groups.

Secondly, the Labor Party advanced once again in the mining areas of the South, confirming the disaffection of large sections of the Catholic working class from the CPP.

The Dutch are a stubborn and contrary people and it now appears that the threat of the bishops only confirmed the Catholic dissidents in their resolve to support the DLP.

Finally, the DLP also picked up 50,000 votes in the great cities that had gone to the CP in 1952.

On the other side of the fence, the Liberal Party slightly increased its vote at the expense of the conservative Protestant parties, and is now bidding for the position of the representative party of the conservative bourgeoisie.

Its gains can be interpreted as another sign of the "de-confessionalization" of Dutch political life, leading to its polarization between the Catholic and Liberal parties on the Right and the Labor Party on the Left.

WELFARISM STRAINED

From an immediate point of view, the result of the elections cannot be expected to change the political and social situation. As far as foreign policy is concerned, the right-wing leadership of the Labor Party and the Catholic People's Party have found a common ground in the energetic support of U. S. policy on the economic and military level (OEEC, NATO, etc.). This will undoubtedly continue to be the basis of foreign policy in the near future.

On the domestic level, the Labor Party has confined itself, as in other countries, to the efficient administration of the capitalist economy. In partnership with the CPP, it has built a "welfare state," based on rigid government control of wages, prices and investments.

From the point of view of capitalist economics, this policy has been a success: the low cost of Dutch consumers' goods, based on low wages, has enabled Dutch industry to conquer a privileged place on foreign markets, thus maintaining a positive balance of payments and full employment. On the other hand, in the years following the war, living standards remained higher than in the neighboring countries as prices were also kept low.

In recent years, however, this situation has changed as wages have failed to keep up with the cost of living, and the government's policy has been subjected to conflicting strains. The bourgeois parties of all shades press for a reduction in profit taxes and a relaxation of government controls in general. From the other side, the rank-and-file of the trade unions are pressing the Labor Party leadership for wage raises.

STRIKES SPREAD

One of the issues in this conflict is the housing question. Following the destruction of the war, there has been a tragic housing shortage in the Netherlands, which the government has failed to meet to a sufficient extent.

The bourgeois parties contend that the low level of rents fixed by the government provides no incentive for construction and advocate massive increases in the rent prices; the Labor Party contends that such an increase would have to be met by an increase in wages, which it opposes on the grounds that it would raise the price of manufactured products, endanger the balance of payment and threaten full employment. The opposition of the Labor Party to rent increases led to the only major crisis of the coalition government in June 1954.

More important, however, is the fact that the unwillingness of the Labor Party leadership to seek a socialist solution to this problem, its opposition to wage increases, its failure to press points in its program such as extension of nationalization (to the coal mines and life insurance, for instance) has caused

growing dissatisfaction in the working class.

In the course of the last year, this dissatisfaction made itself felt by a series of wildcat strikes: by the diamond workers (March 1955), by the public-service workers in Amsterdam (April 1955) and by the longshoremen in Rotterdam and Amsterdam (August 1955). Although involving relatively few workers, these strikes were significant for their militancy, revealing deep grievances which had remained hidden behind the facade of government-sponsored "social peace."

In the case of the Amsterdam city workers, 4000 out of 24,000 workers followed the strike call; the strike ended in defeat after the government called in the army to operate the city services and after the city administration, the Labor Party and the three large trade-unions had taken a brutally hostile attitude toward the strikers.

Only the Stalinist EVC supported the strike, but by no means controlled it. The strike committee was composed of two Christian workers, two socialists, and one Stalinist; and this fact probably accounts more than any other for the violent hostility of the reformist leaders: it showed that "their own" workers were no longer following them.

SYMPTOMS

The strikes of the longshoremen had a different outcome.

The first was called for 24 hours in Rotterdam by the independent leftist OVB, in protest against a contract which the three major federations had signed with the employers. Ten thousand out of a total of 13,000 longshoremen followed the strike call.

A week later, the Stalinist EVC followed suit by calling on the dockworkers in Amsterdam to strike for 24 hours against the contract. This time 3000 out of 4500 workers struck. When they attempted to march on the headquarters of the NVV, they were met by the police and, during the fight, a few were badly hurt.

Upon hearing the news, the OVB called a 48-hour solidarity strike in Rotterdam. This time only 3500 workers struck, and the employers felt sufficiently strong to retaliate by firing all strikers. However, in response to these reprisals, all other longshoremen, who had not at first followed the strike call, walked out too, and compelled the employers to reinstate all.

Strikes such as these, in a country like the Netherlands, have great symptomatic importance. As in the Scandinavian countries, the employers, the trade-unions, the LP and the government are jointly operating a system of class-collaboration which perpetuates at the same time the essential privileges of the bourgeoisie and the leaden dictatorship of the reformist bureaucracy over the workers. The system works as long as the reformist leadership delivers the goods, that is, defends the living standards of the working class.

At the present time, it does not seem that these living standards can be effectively defended any longer unless the trade-unions and the Labor Party intervene in the economy by new and unprecedented measures. Last year's strikes in the Netherlands, in Sweden and in Denmark, then again the strike wave in Denmark and in Finland last March, are a warning to the official trade-union leaders and clearly show the limits of the bourgeois-reformist "welfare state."



LABOR ACTION

July 9, 1956 Vol. 20, No. 28

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

Editor: HAL DRAPER

Associate Editors:
GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL
Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

In Hungary a Youth Club Becomes Focus of Opposition

By MAX MARTIN

Students and young people in general have been playing an active and important role in the disaffection and revolt which have swept Eastern Europe in the wake of the Twentieth Congress of the Russian Communist Party. Czechoslovakia was shaken by student demonstrations in May. And now press reports during the last few days indicate that widespread discontent with the Hungarian Stalinist regime is rife among Hungary's youth.

These anti-Stalinist moods culminated in a stormy mass meeting of the Petofi Youth Club in Budapest last week, during the course of which strong indictments of Matyas Rakosi and other Hungarian Stalinist leaders were made.

News of the Budapest meeting reached the outside world through an article published in *Politika*, Belgrade organ of the Tito government of Yugoslavia. The author of the *Politika* article had attended the Petofi Youth Club meeting on his way back from accompanying Tito on the latter's recent trip to Moscow. His reports have received confirmation from a Budapest radio broadcast which announced that the Central Committee of the Hungarian CP had condemned the youth club as being a gathering place for

"reactionary elements."

None of the dispatches have made clear the exact nature of the club, but it seems to be either a direct CP youth group, or one connected with the Hungarian Stalinist movement in an indirect fashion. In this light, the meeting held takes on particular significance.

More than 1000 persons jammed the Belvarosi Cafe, where the meeting was held, and an additional 5000 listened to the discussions over loudspeakers in other rooms of the building. The meeting lasted until 3 a.m., by which time over eighty speakers had been heard, and broke up at that hour even though there were others who, still wanted the floor. Leading Hungarian scientists and writers were among those who participated in the meeting.

Professor Lajos Janossy, a leading cosmic-ray expert and a member of the Hungarian Atomic Commission, condemned the government's attitude toward scientists. He told the club that he had not yet been officially informed of the discovery of uranium in Hungary, despite his position and despite the fact that this "secret" was openly known. Scientific workers, it was stated, are hampered in the performance of their research and work by the regime's attitudes.

PLAIN TALK

More important, however, were the criticisms of Tibor Deri, a well-known Hungarian writer who is a member of the Communist Party. It is not enough to criticize personalities, he said; a deep analysis of Hungary's troubles is required. Deri called for the removal of leaders who had been making "one mistake after another" but who had not yet been called to account for their actions.

Other speakers raised the same demand, specifically listing Rakosi as one of those who should be removed from his post.

Deri summed up the views of these speakers by stating: "It is high time that an end be made to this present regime of gendarmes and bureaucrats."

Martin Hovrath, a member of the Central Committee of the Hungarian CP and editor of its organ, *Szabad Nep*, tried to reply to the criticisms by offering excuses for his "mistakes." According to the report, his reply was met with derision and he was not allowed to finish his speech.

Another member of the CP Central Committee, Zoltan Vas, took a different and more conciliatory tack. He admitted that in the past, "the situation was such that if someone knocked at your door at 6 you prayed it would be the milkman and not the representative of some other institution."

But he claimed that the policy adopted

by the Russian CP's Twentieth Congress "had made it possible for Communists to breathe more easily," and that Hungary was beginning to adopt itself to the decisions of the congress. These statements were greeted by cries of "Too slow!"

Just before the meeting ended a former CP member who had just been released from jail after a long imprisonment, one Geza Lovoney, took the floor to demand that Imre Nagy, who had been deposed as premier in Hungary for urging a "new course" of increased emphasis on consumer's goods, be permitted to speak publicly. He declared that Nagy had been expelled from the CP despite the fact that he had support from many members. The audience echoed Lovoney with shouts of "Put him back in the party!"

SPECIAL FACTORS

Two special factors appear to be at work among the youth of Hungary, including those young people who joined and have supported the Hungarian CP out of mistaken-idealistic conviction, out of the belief that it would lead them and the country to a better life.

For one thing, the student and youth groups appear to be under the influence of Hungarian Stalinists who at one time or another have been purged by the regime and imprisoned, and some of whom are now being released from jail.

Thus the *Politika* correspondent reported that meetings between the youth club and various supporters of Nagy had taken place several days before its mass meeting, and that at these, discussion on the purges in the Hungarian CP during the years 1949-1953 had taken place. The broadcast of the Budapest Radio which announced the Central Committee condemnation of the Petofi Youth Club linked it to Nagy.

Thus there may have been some connection between this meeting and another which had taken place a few days earlier, and at which 2000 "old-time Communists, and former partisan and underground workers" had criticized the regime.

At this meeting, the widow of Lazlo Rajk stated that the entire leadership of the CP should be held responsible for her late husband's death. She accused the regime of having "utterly destroyed our country's political, economic and moral life," and of having driven all true socialists out of the party.

Another speaker, Dr. Gyula Hajdu, called for the ousting of the CP's leadership and charged that every "Communist old-timer" who had ideals or wanted a moral life had been exterminated or ejected from the party.

Secondly, the students and youth of Hungary appear to have been influenced considerably by the current revulsion against Stalinist rule among writers and intellectuals. During the past two years there has been a widespread revolt against Stalinism in cultural circles throughout Eastern Europe.

Stormy sessions of the various writers' congresses have been held in which leading novelists and poets have demanded that the regime stop interfering in the creative work of artists and put an end to intellectual dictation in general. At some of these gatherings the attacks on the government were broadened to include condemnations of the lack of freedom generally.

Several such protests took place this past spring in both Hungary and Poland. As was also the case in the student protests in Czechoslovakia, these have played an important role in influencing the students and youth in the same direction.

Nor have these developments been confined to Hungary. While none of the dispatches from Poznan makes any reference to the participation of student groups as such in the uprising there, all

indications are that young workers played a key role in the events.

All photos which have appeared in the press of the marching workers show young workers as being perhaps most prominent among those leading the demonstrations and military defense which the workers of that Polish city conducted.

CZECH ECHOES

Meanwhile, repercussions of the Czech student demonstrations held in May in Prague and other cities continue. On the one hand, the students appear to have won several concessions from the government. The Russian flag, which had occupied a special place alongside the Czech banner over all public buildings, was demoted from this place. Also, the student demand that French and English non-Stalinist newspapers be made available to them was granted in part.

At the same time, Vice-Premier Vacek Kopecky declared that the students had surpassed permissible bounds in May. He denounced their call for academic freedom as "tendentious demands" and provocative. "They misuse the word freedom," he declared. "When we hear this word we grow suspicious."

Subsequently the Stalinist government announced that the disorders of last May had resulted from the presence at the universities of the sons and daughters of former members of the pre-1948 Czech bourgeoisie, and from the "liberal" policies of the regime in permitting them to attend. The government declared that henceforth it would see to it that the colleges and universities would have a higher "proletarian" composition of its student body. This is the demagogic way in which the Stalinist government reveals that it intends to screen the political reliability of students applying for admission to the universities more carefully in the future.

These developments testify to the results of the Twentieth Party Congress. The masses everywhere interpret the "relaxation" as a signal for struggle in favor of greater freedom.

They bear witness to the irrepressibility of democratic moods, even after so many years of Stalinist repression and dictatorship. And they offer a promise of continued struggle by the students and young people of Stalinland for democracy.

COMING: YSL's West Coast Weekend Camp. Tentative date: July 28-29. Watch *Challenge* for announcement, or write for details to Berkeley or Los Angeles YSL.

YSL FUND DRIVE

Over the Top!

By MAX MARTIN

The Young Socialist League oversubscribed its 1956 Fund Drive quota by 18 per cent and thereby achieved its most successful fund-raising campaign to date. As this final report is being written we have received a total of \$1736, or 118 per cent of our \$1475 goal. The excellent cooperation of all members and friends of the YSL made this outstanding result possible.

Actually, the final figures in the YSL's books will show an even better record. Several friends of the YSL whose contributions would be listed under "At Large & National Office" have not yet sent in their donations but have pledged to do so in the near future. These will bring that category up to 100 per cent. In addition, the Fund Drive director of the Chicago Unit, who has been doing an excellent job considering the financial difficulties in that locality, promises that Chicago will come close to achieving its goal also. Several of the other units which have not reached 100 per cent may also yet be heard from again.

Top honors in the drive have been earned by the comrades and friends of New York. This unit remitted \$1064.50, which represents 177.4 per cent of its original \$600 quota. The New York comrades deserve the commendation of the YSL for this magnificent achievement, made at great sacrifice, as does also the New York Fund Drive director for an excellent job performed.

The Albany, Pittsburgh, Dayton Area and Cleveland Area units are also to be commended. Each of these reached 100 per cent or over, and thereby contributed significantly to the success of the drive as a whole.

We wish to thank all of the comrades and friends of the YSL and the readers of the *Young Socialist Challenge* for their generosity, both with money and time. As everybody knows, these are not particularly good days for the socialist movement. Our success in this drive, however, proves that there are still many young people in this country for whom the struggle for socialism has meaning and who are prepared and willing to make financial and other sacrifices for it. This spirit augurs well for the future of socialism.

WHAT'S THE SCORE?

City	Quota	Paid	%
Total	\$1475	\$1736	118.0
New York	600	1064.50	177.4
Albany	75	85	113.3
Pittsburgh	50	52	104
Dayton Area	25	25.50	102
Cleveland Area	25	25	100
At Lge. & N.O.	100	88	88
Chicago	350	270	77.1
Los Angeles	150	101	67.3
Berkeley	75	20	26.7
San Francisco	25	5	20

YSL CLASS • NEW YORK

WORLD POLITICS SINCE 1925

Wednesday evenings at 8

- (1) July 11—Hal Draper
The Post-War Background, 1917-23.
- (2) July 18—Cy Jackson
China, 1925-28.
- (3) July 25—George Rawlings
Germany: the Rise of Nazism.
- (4) Aug. 1—Max Martin
France: the Popular Front.
- (5) Aug. 8—Anne Russell
Spain: the Civil War.
- (6) Aug. 15—Sam Taylor
The Second World War.

114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

Socialism, Capitalism, Stalinism At the ISL's Washington Hearing

SOCIALIST POLICY UNDER THE SPOTLIGHT

By GORDON HASKELL

Washington, June 21

At the beginning of this session of the ISL's Washington hearing, the Department of Justice presented in evidence a photostatic copy of the front page of the March 11, 1946 issue of LABOR ACTION. A banner headline at the top of the page reads "No. 1 Lesson of the GM Strike: POLITICAL ACTION IS LABOR'S NEED!"

The government attorneys, however, wished to draw special attention to an editorial which appeared on the same page with a headline: "For Workers Defense Guards—If We Do Not Defend Ourselves Against Violence, We Are Slaves!"

The editorial deals with the attack of 1500 Philadelphia police on the picket line of the United Electrical Workers (CIO) against General Electric on February 27 and 28, 1946. The sections picked out by government attorney Maddrix for quotation were:

"Something, however, was missing. And we think the Philadelphia workers will understand this. Against organized violence there must be organized defense. By organized defense we mean WORKERS DEFENSE GUARDS organized by the UNIONS to protect labor from fascist attack. . . . It becomes the responsibility of every worker and every worker-veteran in Philadelphia to raise this question in his union and in every assemblage of workers. It becomes his responsibility to insist on Workers Defense Guards."

Maddrix then asked Max Shachtman, ISL chairman under cross-examination, whether he had not said, earlier in the hearing, that the only purpose for which the Independent Socialist League and its precedent organizations had advocated Workers Defense Guards was to protect their own meetings from Stalinist and fascist attack. Shachtman pointed out that he had said that the purpose of the guards would have been to protect ALL workers' meetings, all legitimate workers' assemblages, including picket lines, from such violence.

There followed some discussion on the pictures, which had originated with the Philadelphia Daily News, of police attacks on the picket lines, carried on the same page with the editorial.

OLD GAMBIT

Maddrix turned once again to the series of articles by Shachtman which had appeared in the *New Internationalist* during 1951, entitled "Socialist Policy and the War." He quoted from the July-August 1951 issue (page 202) as follows:

"The war with Russia is regarded and spoken of by the American ruling class as a war against communism. From our standpoint, that is arch-stupidity, for there is nothing in common between communism and Stalinism."

MADDRIX: "In other words, your organizations represented true communism, while the Stalinists did not. Is that so?"

SHACHTMAN: "If by 'true communism' you mean an organization devoted to the proposition that they are for a society in which the principle 'from each according to his ability, to each according to his need' prevails, that is so. . . ."

This was a restatement of the position of the organizations from the beginning of the hearing. A year ago the ISL's attorney, Joseph L. Rauh Jr., had told the hearing examiner that if the government's interpretation of the word "communist" was the one given by Shachtman above, the organizations would proudly plead guilty, and no further hearing would be necessary. The government denied that this was its interpretation, but refused to give any of its own.

Maddrix appeared in the above ex-

change to be trying to get Shachtman to make an "admission" which would have been at variance with all the rest of his testimony as well as the wealth of the material presented by the organizations in their own behalf during the hearing.

He then went through the gambit of seeking the same kind of assertions with regard to Leninism, i.e., that Stalinism does not represent, in the opinion of the organizations, "true Leninism," while they do. Shachtman again explained exactly what the organizations have meant by their use of the term "Leninism," and that in this sense, Stalinism has, indeed, nothing in common with it.

"MAJORITY'S WILL"

From there he veered to the resignation of Ernest Erber from the Workers Party, and the reply to Erber's resignation written by Shachtman with the title "Under the Banner of Marxism." Since Erber was not a witness who could be cross-examined, his resignation statement was accepted not as an exhibit whose content could be used to prove anything for or against the organization, but merely for identification purposes.

Then Maddrix read a passage from Shachtman's reply to Erber (p. 59), as follows:

"Nothing can be lost by instilling the revolutionary concept into the minds of the working class! A lot can be lost, including seas of proletarian blood, by instilling the rosy reformist concept into the minds of the working class! . . ."

Maddrix demanded to know what Shachtman had meant by that. Shachtman read the passages which preceded and followed this one which explained that if the capitalists are willing to abide by the will of the majority, once the working class has embraced socialism, "it will be an enormous relief to all of us and a happy augur for a fairly painless transition to socialist brotherhood and peace."

A series of questions followed devoted to the question of the "political strike" as a tactic in the class struggle. Shachtman explained that such strikes, rather than seeking immediate contractual gains from an employer, are directed at influencing public policy. He mentioned specifically the railroad strike which had influenced Congress to pass the Adamson 8-hour-day law.

POLITICAL STRIKES

Maddrix then referred to some writing by Trotsky in which the latter had described the effects of a political strike on the railroads, telegraph and other means of transportation and communication, and had written that such a strike could paralyze the economy, and "isolate the government and render it impotent."

Shachtman explained that the organizations had never taken a position on this question. Maddrix demanded to know whether the organizations would be for a political strike if it would paralyze the governmental apparatus, or if they would do anything to hamper the effective operation of their government. Shachtman said that he could not answer such a general question, but would have to know the circumstances. He pointed out that none of the organizations, and none of its members, has ever been indicted, tried or convicted for seeking to hamper the effective operation of the government.

Attorney Silard, in objecting to this vague and hypothetical line of questioning, pointed out that most citizens, wittingly or otherwise, probably hamper the effective operation of the government every day of their lives.

Maddrix asked whether it is the position of the organizations that Stalinism must be defeated "in order to preserve Marxism." Shachtman explained that they are against Stalinism in the interest of the

working class, of democracy and of socialism.

The government attorney asked whether the organizations would be satisfied with a defeat of Stalinism by the United States government, or whether they would only be in favor of a defeat of Stalinism by a working-class government.

Shachtman stated that although we hope the working class itself will defeat Stalinism we would be for a defeat of Stalinism by any government which follows a genuinely democratic policy.

AIMS OF U.S.

At this point, Maddrix read a quotation from the May 1, 1950 issue of LABOR ACTION by James M. Fenwick, as follows:

"To profess support of democratic United States imperialism against Russian imperialism, as do most liberal-labor leaders and the Socialist Party, is also to aid the reactionary aims of the United States government, and to provide the Stalinists the opportunity of offering their demagogic alternative program, especially among the European and Asiatic workers, who see not at all unclearly the intentions of the United States."

Maddrix asked if this is the position of the organizations. Shachtman said that although written in Fenwick's own words, the position is substantially that of the organizations, and amplified on its meaning briefly.

Q—"What are the aims of the United States government as understood by your organizations . . .?"

A—"To maintain capitalism all over the world."

He went on to explain that the U.S. does this by its own direct territorial imperialism, by supporting the empires of its allies, and by propping up capitalism generally.

Maddrix then read statements in which the Workers Party had formally proclaimed that it had no connection with the Fourth International in view of the passage of the Voorhis Act, and another statement in which, upon its formation, the ISL had proclaimed that "in relinquishing an old name, was abandoned none of our great liberating principles. . . ." Shachtman explained that although the organizations had actually never had any formal or other ties with the Fourth International, they had thought it desirable to make a formal announcement of "severance" so that no one could honestly or maliciously try to make it appear that they were a section of the Fourth in violation of the Voorhis Act.

He also affirmed that in changing its name from Workers Party to Independent Socialist League, the organization had neither abandoned nor changed any of its fundamental principles.

NO BLUEPRINTS

Maddrix then went back to Ernest Erber's pamphlet *Plenty for All*, and referred to testimony in which Shachtman had described sections of the pamphlet which discussed the socialist revolution as "historical prognostication." Maddrix then read from a review of the pamphlet which appeared in LABOR ACTION on August 16, 1943, in which the reviewer had written:

"The job of building a workers' world is a job for agitators—agitators who work with FACTS, not wild creations of the imagination—and this is a handbook for agitators."

Maddrix then questioned Shachtman about the form of government advocated by the organizations, and the steps necessary to achieve it. Shachtman described the general ideas the organizations have put forward with regard to centralization of responsibility rather than separation of powers and the like,

while making it clear that the organizations have never espoused a governmental blueprint for the future.

Shachtman explained, once again, that it would not be the policy of a workers government to withhold the franchise and other political rights from anyone who was willing to conduct his struggle against it by political means rather than by force.

There then followed a long series of questions relating to Shachtman's use of pen names, and the like; to his visits to Trotsky when the latter was in exile in Turkey, Norway and Mexico; to his relations with Natalia Sedova, Trotsky's widow, and the fact that he is presently executor of Trotsky's literary estate in America, on appointment by Natalia Sedova.

FORCE AND VIOLENCE

Maddrix referred to some passage in the work *In Defense of Marxism*, in which he claimed Trotsky had said for 10 years Shachtman had sent him "information." Shachtman said that he had corresponded with Trotsky over a period of many years, and that he regretted that he had not written more frequently.

He was then questioned about his various trips to Moscow in the past as representative of the Young Communist League and the International Labor Defense. The purpose of this questioning became evident on the following day when the government produced Shachtman's passport application forms for the trips he had mentioned, and showed that he had not listed Russia as among the countries he intended to visit. Shachtman pointed out that he had already gone over that in the informal hearing given him by the passport division of the State Department in connection with his passport case several years ago. What bearing these matters had on the issues before the hearing it was impossible to tell.

After the lunch recess, Maddrix again launched on one of his chains of questions which appeared to be designed to lead the witness to a damaging conclusion. This series went something like this:

Q—"Would you say that any government which exploits and oppresses the majority of its workers is a bad government?"

A—"Yes. . . ."

Q—"Do you consider that the United States . . . so-called capitalist government . . . oppresses a majority of the workers?"

A—"In the sense that it maintains capitalism . . . yes."

Q—"Do you . . . think that any government which oppresses a majority of its citizens should be overthrown by force and violence if necessary?"

A—"Not as long as there is a democracy . . . not as long as the United States is a government which permits the workers to change it."

Q—"Suppose every other means fails to secure a workers' state except the employment of force . . .?"

A—"No matter how often the means fail . . . we are not for employment of force and violence against any government which permits democracy."

Q—"Was it Lenin's position that force and violence should be used against any government . . .?"

A—"Not against democratic governments."

Q—"Do you draw, for this purpose, any distinction between the types of government you have described as bourgeois and socialist democracies . . .?"

A—"No."

Q—"Suppose that in the United States every other means had failed to secure a workers state, but there is an opportunity to secure it by employment of force and violence. Would your organizations reject the use of force and violence in such a situation?"

A—"Yes."

Q—"It is your opinion that Lenin did not teach the employment of force and violence against democratic regimes?"

A—"He did not."

Q—"How about Trotsky?"

A—"Same answer."

THEORY OF CASE

Maddrix then read a passage from a pamphlet by Trotsky entitled *In Defense of Terrorism* which, he appeared to think, contradicted the assertions made by Shachtman. Attorney Silard protested on the ground that such a passage, unless the book had been published by the WP-ISL, or incorporated into one of

(Turn to last page)

The Gov't Trots Out J. Burnham

A McCarthyite Police Agent Speaks His Lines

The attorney general's office, whose attorneys began the present hearing with a show of confidence that they had a "case" for their listing, is bringing the hearing to an end with an all but open acknowledgment that their "case" against the organizations, after some five weeks of hearing sessions, has collapsed.

That is the only sense that can be made of the fact that, after having devoted the first two weeks of the hearing to a presentation of its arguments and "evidence" and "testimony" against the organizations, presumably calculated to show that they were properly listed as "communist" and as organizations "advocating the overthrow of the government of the United States by unconstitutional means," i.e., by force and violence, and then having to listen to three weeks of their "case" being shot to smithereens by witnesses and evidence presented for the organizations—the government finally found it necessary to present its case all over again under the guise of a "rebuttal."

And today the totality of its "rebuttal" was something like twenty minutes of testimonials in favor of the government by its last-minute "surprise" witness and expert on the organizations, James Burnham.

The appearance of this characterless turncoat in the first public performance of his new role as a police agent is an index to the degree of desperation reached by the government, in the brief course of the hearing which it was finally driven to grant the organizations after eight years of stalling.

BIT OF BACKGROUND

Readers will recall that the entire presentation of the government in the case against the WP-ISL-SYL was marked, among other farcical aspects of this farcical procedure, by two things.

First is the fact that the only witness brought into the hearing by the government, Professor G. T. Robinson of Columbia, hurriedly assured Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., counsel for the organizations who put him through a cross-examination, that he, Robinson, knew nothing whatsoever about the organizations in questions, their activities or their theoretical and political positions. This assurance may still have left open the possibility that the professor, who is firmly established in American academic circles as nobody in particular, might be an expert on the subject of archaeology or science fiction; but it wiped out all possibility that he could be considered an authority of the least kind on the question before the hearing.

The second fact is that not a single document introduced by the government as exhibit, or any other references emanating from the government, could be shown to sustain the claim that the organizations advocated the overthrow of the government by force and violence or that they were "communist" in any sense other than their support of a classless socialist society.

In contrast to the government's presentation, that of the organizations, as contained in the testimony of political opponents like Norman Thomas, Harry Fleischman, Daniel Bell and Dwight Macdonald, on the one hand, and ISL National Chairman Max Shachtman, on the other, was not only overwhelming against the government's case but stood up firmly under every attempt by the government attorney, in cross-examination, to break it down by so much as a hair's breadth.

So the government found it necessary to present the so-called "rebuttal," which was no rebuttal at all. It found it necessary to bring into the hearing, one way or another, a live witness who could at least claim familiarity with the organizations. That was the first big sign of the desperation of the government.

The other big sign was the witness whom it finally managed to bring in.

From completely reliable sources,

some at least of the government attorneys' efforts in the past few months to solicit witnesses for its case have come to be known to the organizations and their counsel. All sorts of experts, real and alleged, were visited and pleaded with to testify against the ISL. But of all those who were sought, not one could be found to help the attorney general in this dirty job, even though many of those who were asked for this help are and have long been strong political opponents of the organizations.

Yet, opponents or not, there was not one of them that could be induced to forget his self-respect. So the government representatives sought a witness who would have none to forget.

OUT OF THE GUTTER

That is how they found Burnham, ex-Marxist, ex-Trotskyist, ex-leader-of-the-Workers-Party-for-three-weeks, ex-admirer of Stalin, ex-democrat, now a frenzied champion of "preventive" war against Russia and Ivy League literary lawyer for the McCarthyite sewer. The attorney general appointed by the president who has said that he "would not get into the gutter" with McCarthy, has thus put forth a fitting witness to serve as the symbol of its case against the organizations.

The testimony of the witness? Nothing but the spiteful offal of a well-coached turncoat.

"Was the Workers Party a Communist organization when it was formed in 1940?" The expert replies: "Yes, it was."

"Have you seen any evidence since that time that it no longer is a Communist organization?" The expert replies emphatically, "None."

"What form of Communism did you refer to in calling the organizations communists?" asks the examiner, Mr. Morrissey. The expert replies with well-rehearsed promptness, "One that accepts the basic doctrines of Lenin."

And what would those be? They are four in number: the ultimate objective of a collectivized economy in a classless socialist society; the teaching that this objective cannot be achieved by reforms of the existing government; the teaching that a new form and structure of government must replace the existing government, that is, a proletarian dictatorship, or what Shachtman's *Fight for Socialism* calls a workers' government; and the formation of counter-organs of power, a new army and political institutions like soviets, workers' councils and the like, which are to carry through the transition to socialism.

CUNNING TESTIMONY

Do these organizations then advocate force and violence to achieve their ends? asked Maddrix, the government attorney.

To this question—asked more than once by Maddrix, and several times in the first part of the cross-examination by the organizations' counsel, John Silard—Burnham could not be induced to give a direct and honest answer. But then again, such an answer was not the purpose of his testimony.

Do they advocate force and violence? Burnham replied, "It inevitably follows from the analysis of society made by the Workers Party."

Does he know from any of the organizations' pronouncements that they advocate force and violence? asked Silard. No, he does not; he cannot point to a single specific document in which force and violence are advocated as the only means of establishing a workers' govern-

ment; in fact, he added, explicit advocacy is "seldom" found.

Does he know of such advocacy from any of the literature of the organizations? It is brought out in the hearing that his direct knowledge of the three organizations is limited to the three or at most four weeks during which he was a member of the Workers Party, that is, from the day he helped found it in April 1940 to the day he sent in his resignation from the party in May 1940.

It is further brought out in cross-examination that his knowledge of the organization since then has been confined to a recent reading—just before he decided to testify—of Shachtman's booklet *The Fight for Socialism* and his reading of *LABOR ACTION*. How often does he read it, to make it possible for him to testify about its position for the past sixteen years? *Two or three times a year!* he replies.

From what, then, are derived his conclusions about force and violence? Answer of the expert: "The doctrines which they teach logically entail the use of force and violence."

Only that? Oh no, there is more. It can also be "inferred from negation," that is, explained Burnham, they do not repudiate force and violence as their means of achieving the workers' government.

Then what about this statement in Shachtman's booklet which places the entire responsibility for violence upon capitalist counter-revolution? That is no problem for the expert: "The language is Aesopian"—it says one thing only because it means another.

CAUGHT IN LIE

When the stenographic transcript of the examination and cross-examination of Burnham is available, *LABOR ACTION* will publish more extensive excerpts from the undocumented and undocumentable assertions characteristic of the type of renegade who finds it necessary to take revenge upon his own past by perfidious attacks upon those who honor and respect their past.

But the flavor of the testimony and the low-grade dishonesty of the witness can be judged by one sample from the exchange that occurred during a brief part of the cross-examination that attorney Rauh was able to conduct in person during the short while he was able to absent himself from testimony he was giving on other matters before a Senate sub committee.

Burnham testified that when he joined the Trotskyist movement he took the name of "John West." During the earlier cross-examination of Shachtman, Maddrix had tried to show that the organizations "ordered" members to take and use "false names," as part of the government's effort to create around the organizations the atmosphere of a secretive, conspiratorial, sinister movement. Burnham, in his new capacity as fiction writer for the government, tried to thicken this atmosphere for Maddrix, even though he knows more than enough about the organizations to know—not just assume, but know—that the charge is fraudulent and preposterous.

Were you ordered to take a false name, the name of West? asked Rauh.

With eager promptness Burnham replied that he was!

But when Rauh began to pursue this deliberate lie with questions like, "Who ordered you?" and "When were you ordered to?" Burnham, who likes nothing better than to appear politely but superiorly contemptuous, aloofly urbane, unshakably suave, began to stammer and stutter and squirm and flush like a man caught with his hand in another's pocket.

And inside of three minutes of Rauh's swift hammering, Burnham asked to correct the record—first, he could not remember who "ordered" him, and then, well, he had not been ordered to change his name at all! Not ordered—it was "suggested" to him.

But Rauh would not let the honorable

witness off so lightly. He chased the McCarthyite, who testified that he is an "anti-anti-McCarthyite," away from this McCarthyism too. Who "suggested" the use of a name other than Burnham? and when was it "suggested?" and why was it "suggested?" Three more minutes of Rauh's tearing away like a terrier at Burnham—and "terrier" could not be more appropriate in this case—and the witness ingloriously and lamely acknowledged that his memory on this point was "vague" and that the change of name had not even been "suggested" to him!

In fact, it turns out that in those days he suffered from the "illusion" that he could not teach at New York University and be a member of the Trotskyist organization under one and the same name, and that was his final testimony on this score.

THE SLAVE OF DUTY

The fact that he leaped so readily to a lie which he knew was a lie, and did it only because it seemed that this lie would help incriminate the organizations in some way as meriting the conduct of the government toward them, gives an exact measurement of the value of his testimony and of the character of the only live witness about the organizations that the government bent down to fish up out of the gutter that its president would not get into.

Under Rauh's relentless prodding, Burnham admitted that Waterman, the attorney general's man in charge of the case against the organizations, had visited him last September to ask him to testify for the government, but that he had declined the invitation on the ground that he "preferred not to." Then Waterman asked him again about two months afterward, and again he said he "preferred not to." Then Waterman asked Burnham a third time, three months ago, and received the same answer.

Finally, Waterman visited him a fourth time, a week or ten days before the session, according to Burnham. Waterman then "outlined the progress of the case," and told Burnham that Norman Thomas, Harry Fleischman, Daniel Bell and Dwight Macdonald had testified that the organizations did not advocate force and violence as the government charged.

Waterman said to Burnham, "Well, that's the trouble. Their side always gets its people to come down. Our side doesn't." Thereupon, testified Burnham, "I decided to come. It was my duty."

Due to divers circumstances, the resumption of Burnham's cross-examination by attorney Rauh was postponed until July 11. If Burnham can tear himself away from his arduous duties as one of the editors of Buckley's McCarthyite *National Review*, it will be seen how he stands up under cross-examination in the performance of the "duty" he recognized so belatedly.

It is not possible to predict that Burnham will have a happy time.

There's No Angel Around to finance *LABOR ACTION*. It has appeared every week since 1940 because it's been backed by the dime and dollars of independent socialists — AND YOUR SUBSCRIPTIONS.

A sub is only \$2 a year—
Subscribe now!

Labor Action FORUM
New York

THURSDAYS at 9 p.m.

July 12—Michael Harrington
REINHOLD NIEBUHR'S POLITICS

July 19—L. C. Brown

THE NEGRO STRUGGLE IN THE SOUTH

114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

Socialist Policy — —

(Continued from page 6)

its resolutions, could not possibly be held against the organizations in these proceedings.

At this point Maddrix delivered a short speech which, perhaps for the first time in the hearing, explicitly stated the government's theory of their "case." (The government had refused to state this theory on the request of the organizations' attorney at the beginning of the hearing.)

Maddrix explained the purpose of this type of cross-examination. The organizations, he said, are based on the fundamental principles of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky. They can't say, on the one hand that this is their position, and on the other, deny their teachings when they appear to be damaging.

This came after days and days of testimony in which Shachtman had made it fully clear that it was not a question of "admitting" or "denying" this or that quotation of the great socialist leaders of the past, but rather that the only valid way in which to judge what an organization means when it refers to its tradition, its great forbears, is to study what the organization itself has taught, advocated, and done.

Here Maddrix again returned to the war question, particularly as discussed by Shachtman in his articles in the *New Internationalist* during 1951. In a lengthy discussion, Maddrix kept demanding whether it was not the citizen's duty to come to the support of his government during wartime, regardless of all other considerations.

Shachtman pointed out that every citizen of this country has the right, indeed the duty, to retain and express his opinion of the government's actions and policies in wartime as in peacetime. He read a passage from the same article as follows:

"What is the meaning of this demand made upon us that we support the United States in the coming war? Does it mean that we agree to serve in the armed forces when called by the state, to obey its commands while in the armed forces? . . . So long as we remain in the minority among the population, and even in the working class, we are obliged to abide by the decision, in wartime or in peacetime, of the majority. . . . We fight alongside the fighters and work alongside the work-

ers, under the social conditions imposed upon or accepted by both. But precisely as a minority, we socialists insist upon the right to our own opinions, our own program, and to the democratic expression of our views.

"Actually, the demand is not for our 'physical' military support, which we have no alternative but to give. Actually, it is our political support that is demanded. It is our opinions we are asked to abandon, our program of working-class independence. . . ."

WHO'S FOOLED?

Maddrix then moved to a discussion of the policy of the Workers Party toward the draft and the war in general, in 1940. He read from a series entitled "Conscript the War Industries! But Under Control of the Workers!" which appear in *LABOR ACTION* during the fall of 1940.

Maddrix read the beginning of the second article as follows:

"Workers going into the army should have no illusions about the task they are being forced to perform. They should not be fooled by any propaganda calling for defense of the United States against attack, or for the protection of the Western Hemisphere."

Maddrix stopped reading at this point, and demanded to know if that was the position of the organizations, that soldiers "should not be fooled by any propaganda calling for defense of the United States against attack." Shachtman pointed out that the quotation was incomplete, "and it is quite clear to me why you stopped reading just where you did, Mr. Maddrix."

He then continued to read from the editorial in question: "Nor should they be fooled by Roosevelt's promises that they will not be sent to fight on European soil. We must always keep in mind the kind of war this is, and how we got into the army."

The rest of the day was taken up with these articles. They called for a people's army in which the workers and the people could have complete confidence. They pointed out the French capitalism had permitted Hitler to overrun France with only a token struggle, and that if the workers place their confidence in capitalist governments they could well suffer the same fate.

that there was a certain difference between a revolution and a movement, Maddrix demanded to know what the difference is!

The whole point of this seemed to be that Maddrix considered the organizations "guilty" of hoping that the war would somehow lead to the establishment of workers governments here or abroad. Shachtman readily admitted that the organizations always hoped that such government would be established, in wartime or peacetime, but that they tempered their hopes with concrete analyses of the possibilities in different places at different times.

Later on Maddrix went into the position shared by Marxists and others that the aggressor in a war is not necessarily determined by the question of who fired the first shot. He asked whether the organizations had favored strikes during the war, and Shachtman replied that they always support the workers in their struggle against the employers, but that they were not for indiscriminate strikes.

Maddrix asked whether the organizations favor strikes by federal employees, and Shachtman replied that the organizations favored them in the same circumstances as for other workers, "where the method is available to them . . . or is permissible to them." He pointed out that the organizations were and are for the repeal of laws restricting the rights of federal workers to strike.

Maddrix then went into a discussion of the revisions made in the *ABC of Marxism* many years ago. After asking Shachtman whether he could tell whether the same typewriter and the same kind of paper had been used on all pages of the revised edition, he asked whether the witness would have any objection if the government would subject these matters to expert analysis. Shachtman said that he was not himself an expert on these matters, and that he had absolutely no objection to an expert being brought into the matter, since, for one thing, he didn't have the slightest idea of what the government was driving at.

Maddrix read a long list of names which, he said, were the authors of articles which the organizations had introduced during the presentation of their case. He asked Shachtman in each case to state whether he knew the author to be a member of the party, whether the names used was their real name or a pseudonym. In each case, Shachtman refused to reply in line with the position taken by the organizations when they answered the attorney general's interrogatories on these matters a long time ago.

WINDING UP

In concluding the cross-examination, Maddrix said that he had forgotten to introduce one piece of evidence earlier. He was permitted to introduce it. He then read into the record the concluding paragraph of the *Communist Manifesto*: "Workers of the world unite! You have nothing to lose but your chains, you have a world to win!"

Attorney John Silard conducted a brief re-direct examination. He had Shachtman once again go over the facts tradition. When Shachtman pointed out

Polish Workers — —

(Continued from page 2)

spite of the fact that Dulles bethought himself to make such a gesture as offering Red Cross food to the Polish people. This is perhaps just as well, since any connection with the capitalist West is the best aid to Warsaw for discrediting the anti-Stalinist fighters.

From other quarters there will undoubtedly be cries that the Poznan rebels will only "scare" the Stalinist regimes away from the "democratization" which they are pretending—in the Stalinoid tradition of Isaac Deutscher, who attacked the East German rising on this basis.

In this and other ways, the Poznan battle separates out the enemies of democracy and socialism, regardless of their other pretenses.

about the relations of the organizations with the Fourth International.

Silard then took the government's "Statement of Grounds" for placing the organizations on the attorney general's "subversive list," and went down the list, re-phrasing the grounds in such a way that they could form relevant criteria for legal or administrative action. For instance, where a ground as written by the attorney general reads: "The WP, ISL and SYL would destroy the existing machinery of the government in the United States." Silard would re-state it: "The WP, ISL and SYL would destroy the existing machinery of the government in the United States by force and violence, or by unconstitutional means."

This way of putting the questions made it possible for Shachtman to give brief and concise answers, and made a striking contrast to the vagueness and catch-all quality of the government's charges. Maddrix protested vigorously at this line of questioning, but Hearing Examiner Morrissey permitted Silard to go on to the end.

Silard also asked Shachtman a few questions on matters which he felt had been left dangling up till then, or which he wanted clarified for the record.

Shachtman's testimony was concluded by a brief re-cross-examination by Maddrix. The latter asked such questions as where Lenin and Trotsky had said they were against force and violence in democratic countries. Shachtman mentioned some instances, and went on to explain that in any event that is the view of the organizations, and if there is anything in the writings of Lenin and Trotsky which contradicts it, or if anything different is attributed to them, the organizations do not agree with it.

Maddrix also asked whether it is the policy of the organizations to have their members use pseudonyms in connections other than writing for its press. Shachtman said that the organizations have no policy on this question, and that some members undoubtedly use such names as a protection against job-discrimination or for other reasons.

The re-cross-examination concluded with such questions as whether there are any principles of the United States Constitution to which the organizations are opposed, and the like.

Algeria — —

(Continued from page 3)

soldiers fighting with the "Frontists" came to him to explain that these soldiers had been enrolled by force.

In these few days, 74 "Frontists" rallied to the Messalist groups of the NLA. Furthermore, I saw two former prisoners whom the Messalists had captured from the "Front" and who had become soldiers of the NLA quite freely and "happily." They had been recruited by the "Front" in the name of Messali.

There is a system of partisan groups in Greater Kabylia that owes allegiance to the "Front" alone. Only in this sector has "rallying" to the French authorities taken place and, only in the East and Southeast of this sector, "settling of accounts" have been reported between "Frontists" and Messalist partisans.

It follows that in all other regions of the country there is cooperation between partisan groups. This means that even if one local leader has ties with the FLN and another with the MNA, the influence of the "Front" is not sufficiently strong to have its groups "exterminate" the Messalists.

From reliable sources of information we know that ties exist precisely between the Messalist partisan groups of the NLA established in those sectors of Greater Kabylia where "settling of accounts" have been reported most frequently, and other groups operating in Northern Constantine (Zirout Youcef), in Western Constantine, in the Aurès and in the Oran region. There may be other contacts, but these exist at the very least.

We also know that the leaders of some partisan groups, operating in the Oran region, near the Moroccan border, which are better armed because of their contacts with the Rif [region in the former Spanish zone of Morocco—A. G.] are supporting the FLN and that other groups in the same region, possibly more numerous but less well armed, are connected with the MNA. There is no trouble between the two tendencies.

Gov't Ends Cross-Examination

Washington, June 22

The final day of the cross-examination of Max Shachtman opened on the question of the organizations' attitudes toward World War III. Once again the examination went over Shachtman's articles in the *New Internationalist* of 1951 on the war question.

Maddrix attempted to show that Shachtman was advocating the adoption of Lenin's views on war policy as propounded in World War I. Shachtman pointed out that the whole purpose of the articles had been, rightly or wrongly, to urge the idea that Lenin's policies of 1914-1917 would not be applicable to World War III because of the different character of that war from the earlier one. Shachtman read into the record the whole section of the article in which he had discussed the differences, and had urged that socialist policy in World War III "must be based upon the idea of transforming the imperialist war into a democratic war."

A long discussion followed in which Maddrix kept hammering away at the idea that the organizations "reserve to

themselves" the right to decide whether or not the aims of a particular war are progressive before they decide whether or not to support the war. Maddrix seemed to feel that such an attitude is somehow subversive.

Shachtman pointed out repeatedly that not only socialists but every thoughtful and conscientious citizen "reserves to himself" the right to decide whether or not to accept, support or oppose any particular policy or goal of the government, in wartime as well as in peacetime, and that in this respect it makes no sense to demand of socialist organizations what is demanded of no one else.

In this whole exchange, when Maddrix kept trying to identify the position of the ISL toward World War III with a vulgar idea of what Lenin had been for in 1914-17, and Shachtman kept pointing to the difference in the view expressed in his article, Maddrix finally said at one point: "They [the organizations] are just going along with Lenin in changing their idea of changing an imperialist war into a civil war to his idea of 1917 of changing an imperialist war into a democratic war."

At another point, Maddrix read from Ernest Erber's resignation a passage in which Erber said that the Workers Party had counted on a victorious socialist revolution to end World War II, and when this failed to happen the party had been left without hope. Shachtman said he did not agree with that statement.

Maddrix then read from an article in the May 1, 1950 issue of *LABOR ACTION* by Albert Gates in which Gates had written that the "party counted on a revival of the world socialist movement at the end of World War II." He read this with the triumphal air of a man who had just caught his witness in a flagrant contradiction. When Shachtman pointed out

A NEW PAMPHLET, JUST PUBLISHED IN ENGLAND

Russia from Stalin to Khrushchev by TONY CLIFF

22 pages 15 cents
LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.