

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JUNE 11, 1956

FIVE CENTS

THE IMPACT OF UNITY ON THE AFL-CIO

... page 2

The Fight Inside The Algerian Liberation Movement

... page 7

A FABLE FROM THE CZECH JUNGLE

... page 4

CZECH STUDENTS DEFY THE REGIME

... page 5

Gov't Fails to Call Single Witness in ISL Hearing

At the end of its second week, the Department of Justice attorneys, representing the government in the Washington hearing of the Independent Socialist League, rested the presentation of its own case without having presented a single witness to bolster its "listing" of the ISL as "subversive."

The one professor who had been put on the stand had turned out to be an "expert" consultant who admitted that he had never even heard of the organization before being persuaded to testify—on Lenin.

The remainder of the government case, it develops, consists solely of selected quotations from the Independent Socialist press, mostly referring to the abolition of capitalism. (See, for example, the "subversive" cartoon on page 6.)

This is the sum and substance of the first effort which the attorney general's office has had to make in any case to substantiate a "listing" on its notorious subversive list, which is used for national witchhunting purposes.

The ISL is the first organization on the list which has managed to get a hearing before a Department of Justice examiner. The next step, if and when the government-appointed examiner upholds his appointer, will be to take the question to court, for the first effective judicial test of the list system.

The extreme degree to which the government failed even to make a show of presenting a reasonable case has been something of a surprise. The full story of the third week of hearings begins on page 3 inside.

Negro Bus Boycott Spreads to Florida, Wins in Court

BY MAX MARTIN

A number of important developments during the past week signalize the intensification of the conflict between the militant Southern Negroes who fight for democracy and the reactionary racist Southern Bourbons who resist its spread.

On the one hand, the boycott weapon, whose effective utilization by the Negroes of Montgomery has heartened Negroes throughout the country, spread to a new locality, Tallahassee, Florida. And on the other, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People was outlawed in Alabama.

The bus boycott in Tallahassee was initiated by students on May 26. Two girl students at the Florida A. & M. University for Negroes, Wilhelmina Jakes and Carrie F. Patterson, boarded one of the buses which go by the school and seated themselves in the only two empty seats, which were in the "reserved for Whites" section. For this "offense" Miss Jakes and Mrs. Patterson were arrested and later released on bail. The following day a flaming cross was thrown onto the lawn of the boarding house where they roomed.

The reaction of the students at the university was immediate. On the following day they met in the university auditorium to protest, petitions calling for a bus boycott were circulated. The student body began the boycott that day and during the next it spread among the Negro population of Tallahassee. With the cooperation of the NAACP, an Inter-Civic Council was organized to conduct the boycott under the leadership of the Rev. C. K. Steele, who is president of the Tallahassee branch of the NAACP.

GOING AHEAD

The council organized a car pool and within a few days approximately 80 per cent of Tallahassee's 14,000 Negroes (out of an over-all population of 40,000) were refusing to ride the buses. The Negroes of Tallahassee formulated a series of demands similar to those in Montgomery.

Within several days the bus line and city officials were ready to compromise.

(Continued on page 4)

Partners in Crime: THE BASIC POLITICS OF KHRUSHCHEV'S SECRET SPEECH ON STALIN'S RULE

By GORDON HASKELL

Nikita S. Khrushchev's famous secret speech to the closed session of the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has finally been made available to the public in what purports to be a fairly complete version (*New York Times*, June 5). Although this speech reveals nothing about Stalinist society and the particular role of Stalin in it which was not known before, it is nevertheless sensational.

Here, from the mouth of the present top bureaucrat of all the Russias, is a concentrated, detailed and murderous indictment of the rule of the class which he represents from the time it seized power to the present day.

The publication of the text of the speech is bound to heighten the demoralization in the ranks of the Stalinist movement throughout the world which had already begun when excerpts and summaries of it became widely known right after the 20th Congress.

For it should be clear that although almost all of the story told by Khrushchev had been told during the past thirty years by opponents of Stalinism, it had been denied hotly by the whole world Stalinist movement, and those who told it had been denounced as slanderers, liars, and enemies of socialism.

Although many things are still unclear about the precise motivation for Khrushchev's speech at the time he made it, on one thing, at least, there can be absolutely no doubt: despite all that this speech cleverly conceals in the typical Stalinist mode of the half-truth, distortion and outright lie, the picture it paints of the Stalinist regime in Russia during the past twenty years is a complete and triumph-

ant vindication of one political and historical school of analysis, that which stems from Leon Trotsky.

Let us make this clear. The errors in analysis and prognostication which flowed inevitably from Trotsky's fundamental theoretical mistake in believing that Russia was, even under Stalin, a "degenerated workers' state" remain, and they continue to be grossly exaggerated by his epigones who have compounded them into a form of capitulation to Stalinism since his death.

CONFIRMATION

But what Khrushchev reveals in his speech, and much that he merely hints at, proves beyond further dispute that despite the persecution and isolation to which Leon Trotsky, his colleagues, and their movement were subjected by the Stalinists and by the broad stratum of scholarly and popular bourgeois writers who were influenced by them and by the "successes" of Stalinism, Trotsky was and remained till his death a political analyst and historian without peer in our epoch.

Winston Churchill, no mean historian himself, referred to the Stalinist regime as a mystery wrapped in an enigma. To Trotsky, it was an open book. From his

(Turn to last page)

FROM ANOTHER SECRET SPEECH BY KHRUSHCHEV:

U.S. Kept Mao from Split with Moscow!

Another speech by Nikita Khrushchev has made the headlines, this one delivered in March in Warsaw to a gathering of East European CP leaders. *Times* correspondent Gruson reports from Prague (June 4) on its contents "according to Communist sources."

It contains a sensational statement of the greatest importance for evaluating U. S. foreign policy.

According to this account, Khrushchev accused Stalin of alienating Mao Tse-tung and his Chinese regime by "a series of economic demands smacking of colonialism" and by demanding the final say on all things. The dispatch then "Mr. Mao was extremely embittered by Stalin's insistence on jointly controlled companies and mining and in-

dustrial concessions, and he refused to submit to Stalin's authority over Chinese affairs.

"Had it not been for the hardness of United States policy toward Red China, the Peiping government might well have decided to break openly with Moscow as Marshal Tito did in 1948."

This statement of Khrushchev's, intended to be a denunciation of Stalin, is also and equally a crushing indictment of U. S. policy.

By the "hardness" of U. S. policy is obviously meant the Korean war policy, the danger of war on China, based on the fact that Washington backed the Chiang Kai-shek regime on Formosa. If Mao decided not to break with Moscow, it was because the U. S. was brandishing

Chiang and the atom bomb.

Here we have documented the incalculable might that could have been displayed by a progressive political offensive against Stalinism, instead of reliance on military power. If the defection of Tito shook the Russian empire, the defection of Mao would have delivered staggering blows against it.

Instead, U. S. policy forced Mao and Stalin together, in mutual protection.

The choice was not between a "hard" policy against Chinese Stalinism, or a "soft" accommodation to it, but the choice of political versus military weapons in the fight against Stalinism.

Once again, the capitalist "realists" could not grasp a chance to change the history of the world.

RIGHT WING ON THE DEFENSIVE

The Impact of Unity On the AFL-CIO

By BEN HALL

Open resistance to unity from the right wing in the union movement arises belatedly and futilely. The ultra-conservatives in the old AFL seem to have reconciled themselves to the CIO without understanding what was happening.

It is clear now that unity was not a victory for conservatism over the relative "radicalism" of the CIO. The right wing wants to take a second look. It is too late! But they try.

In February, the founding conference of the Committee on Political Education (COPE), successor to PAC and LLPE, was boycotted by the Teamsters and Carpenters. Dave Beck proclaimed later that labor should stay out of politics.

Simultaneously, the Teamsters and 18 other unions in the Building Trades Department agreed to undertake an organizing drive in common. This coalition was aimed not only at organizing the unorganized, if at all, but at defending the alliance against the industrial unions.

Finally, on April 27 the Building Trades Department announced that it would oppose the merger of all state and local federations where it was in conflict with industrial unions. Eighteen Department affiliates, including the Teamsters and excluding only the Bricklayers, signed a joint manifesto urging resistance to further unity steps.

When the Montana State Federation of Labor met to consider unity, Teamsters and Hod Carriers delegates led the opposition. They lost when a roll call approved merger 148-81. But unity was defeated in the Detroit and Wayne County Federation early in May when the Teamsters, led by James Hoffa, put over an endorsement of the Building Trades policy, "discouraging the merger of central bodies until true unity can be effected."

In Oklahoma, all discussion of CIO-AFL unity on a state-wide scale was terminated on May 4. Unity has been effectuated in six states: Arkansas, Tennessee, Louisiana, Arizona, Montana, and Missouri. In Missouri too, the Team-

sters led an ineffective opposition inside the AFL council.

The AFL-CIO Executive Council made no compromise with the opponents of unity. On May 1 it found the Building Trades Department to be "in direct violation of the letter and spirit of the merger agreement."

The vote was unanimous; but three council members had absented themselves: Beck; Charles MacGowan of the Boilermakers; and Maurice Hutcheson of the Carpenters. All three are from the Building Trades Department. The Council instructed all city and state bodies to go ahead with merger plans.

THE PICTURE BEFORE

In the quest for "true unity," the right wing seeks a formula to preserve its power and influence unimpaired. That is now impossible. When the AFL and CIO united, they were pushed into the shadows, without hope of emerging. Consider how the whole internal state of the labor movement was transformed by unity:

Before unity, the CIO had reached its peak with prospects only of slow growth; in fact, it had declined when Stalinist-dominated unions were expelled.

Dave MacDonald, Steel Union president, was eager to undermine Reuther and blocked up with John L. Lewis and Dave Beck.

The CIO remained a minority of the organized labor movement with no perspective capable of moving the rest of the labor movement.

The AFL, which had slowly been forced in the direction blazed by the CIO, was nevertheless still dominated by the conservative crafts. The Building Trades exercised decisive influence.

Racketeering persisted. Discrimination continued against Negroes in several affiliates.

Political action had been raised to a position of official importance with the AFL's formation of Labor's League for Political Education. But in the localities, the AFL, under the influence of the Building Trades, was intertwined with old-fashioned wardheeling political machines.

The CIO stood as a progressive minority for clean, politically-conscious unionism, and for Negro equality. But it was utterly incapable of winning these principles in the rest of the labor movement.

In the AFL, those who wanted to act against racism, raiding, and racketeering were an impotent minority.

In sum, the labor movement was at a stalemate; its internal life was stagnant. Yet big reforms were needed.

NEW SPIRIT

With unity, the whole balance of power changed.

The right wing which had dominated the AFL automatically became a minority. A decisive majority passed into the hands of a coalition of unions indisputably progressive compared to the old AFL right wing. The new line-up was instantly revealed when the Teamsters officials were cut down to size.

The Teamsters Union had been emerging as the spearhead and rallying center of everything conservative, unhealthy and outlived within the labor movement. Its president, Dave Beck, was touted in the bourgeois press as the big "man of tomorrow." He was claiming jurisdiction over everything moved on wheels.

The Teamsters had just carved away a section of the CIO Brewery Union while the CIO replied with impotent rage; it had sabotaged the AFL drive on the New York waterfronts; its officials did nothing about racketeering; they were feared by other unions who saw no protection against raidings; their power seemed intact, united and uncurbed.

The day after unity, all this changed. Over-representation in the new Industrial Union Department; if not, he threatened, the Teamsters might pull out of the new federation. His demand was rejected; he entered the Department docilely, his ultimatum filed and forgotten. Soon the Teamsters officials, who had been threatening to quit the federation, were defending their right to remain within it.

TEAMSTERS RETREAT

On February 28, the Eastern-Southern-Central conference of Teamsters, controlled by Hoffa, voted to make a \$400,000 loan to the International Longshoremen's Association. The ILA had been expelled from the AFL for racketeering and was fighting to keep its hold on the New York waterfront and smash the new AFL-CIO union, the International Brotherhood of Longshoremen. The proposed loan not only defied the federation majority; it gave material aid to racketeering inside the labor movement.

In announcing the loan, Hoffa declared that the Teamsters were signing a mutual-aid pact with the ILA and that he opposed any new elections among New York longshoremen that would give the AFL-CIO a chance to replace the ILA. Dave Beck, Teamster president, made clear that he would do nothing to block the loan. "Our regional conferences," he said, "have the autonomous right to loan or invest their money any way they see fit. . . ." But he soon changed his mind.

George Meany called a special meeting of the AFL-CIO Executive Council, threatening to suspend the Teamsters from the federation if the loan went through. Beck capitulated. On March 7, a meeting of the Teamsters International Executive Board summoned by him voted to cancel the loan.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

But the crisis is not over. In April Beck called for the admission of the ILA to the AFL-CIO. On May 1 he got his reply: the AFL-CIO Council endorsed Meany's stand on the loan.

However, one matter remained to be settled. Beck had given up the loan but he refused to cancel the mutual-aid pact with the ILA. On April 28 the ILA itself voted to cancel the pact. According to the New York Times, "The ILA action appeared to have extricated Mr. Beck from a precarious position."

But Beck still refused to denounce the pact for the Teamsters. When the AFL-CIO Council met on May 1, it was not satisfied; it decided to place on the agenda of its regular meeting on June 4 the question of the "principle" of the pact. And it will also hear protests from other unions against Teamsters' raiding.

While these events were unfolding, 8000 workers at Macy's in New York went on strike only to see members of Teamster Local 804 crash through their picketlines. The New York State CIO Council dispatched a letter to Meany and Beck complaining that "the effect of the strikebreaking activity by Local 804 has been disastrous to the spirit of unity brought about by the merger of the AFL and CIO."

And the International Brotherhood of Longshoremen wrote to Meany. "... we feel the time has come when the AFL-CIO should give an ultimatum to the International Brotherhood of Teamsters to clean up their organization of the

At the unity convention, Teamster Vice-President James Hoffa demanded racketeering element and to stop doing business through 'mutual aid pacts' with the ILA or else expel them from membership."

UNDER FIRE

Thus the Teamsters officials, yesterday on the offensive, come under constant fire inside the labor movement. No more threats to leave the federation. When asked if he thought that the Teamsters would still be in the AFL-CIO after the May 1 council meeting, Beck replied that it would "positively be affiliated" for a long time to come.

In a letter to the membership of his union, Beck prepared them for what is coming. "I am convinced," he wrote, "that regardless of differences which may arise from time to time among the individuals of the International Union, that every officer and those representing the International will stand in any attack made on the International Union from within or without the labor movement."

But he is wrong. If the fight comes to the point of a split between him and the AFL-CIO, the Teamsters will not remain united around a leadership which tolerates racketeering. In fact, the leader of Western Conference of Teamsters, once headed by Beck himself, announced that his section of the union would stay in the federation under all circumstances.

For the first time the threat of split arises inside the Beck-Hoffa machine.

RACKETEER PROBLEM

Machinery for acting against racketeering was carefully built into the AFL-CIO constitution. Meany announced that it would not be allowed to rust.

So far, no concrete steps have been taken. And not because the problem has disappeared:

In March, Attorney Louis Saperstein was shot and critically wounded. He had been involved in a welfare-fund racket linking known racketeers and local unions. He was shot after agreeing to give evidence to the New York district attorney.

Three days before in Newark, a local teamster official was shot; he had served ten years for stabbing a man to death in an argument over a minor traffic accident. Previously, he had shot and killed a union rival but was acquitted on the grounds of self-defense.

In April, columnist Victor Riesel was blinded by an acid-throwing thug.

On April 13 the U. S. district attorney for Northern Illinois opened a grand-jury investigation into the local affairs of the International Union of Operating Engineers.

In New York the State Insurance Department uncovered shady deals involving millions of dollars in Teamster welfare funds.

So far, no action from the AFL-CIO. But such passivity cannot last.

COMING TO A BOIL

At its convention in May, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers called for the opening of a campaign against racketeering in labor; it proposed that the Committee on Ethical Practices be authorized to initiate investigations on its own authority instead of awaiting the command of the federation council. At the same time the International Ladies Garment Workers union denounced labor leaders who set up businesses in industries organized by their unions. Dubinsky called such men "immoral, unethical, and unfit to serve the labor movement." Such double-dealing is common practice in the Teamsters Union.

George Meany quickly and publicly endorsed the position of the ILGWU. It is only a question of time before the fight on racketeering comes to a boil.

Unity is only six months old. Yet, in that short time, more has been done and said to curb the power of narrow conservatism and open racketeering in the labor movement than in the whole decade before. It is only the beginning and much remains to be done.

So far, the ranks have been left in the background; there has been no call to the membership of unions infested by rackets to throw out corrupt leaders and put in new ones. But the merger has its own logic. Even without official stimulus from above, courageous men in the ranks have begun.

What's On in N.Y.

Sat., June 9

YSL Social cancelled.

Mon., June 11

Demonstration & picketline to protest Galindez murder, 42 St. & Fifth Ave., 12-2 p.m.

Tues., June 12

Rally on Galindez case—Norman Thomas main speaker. Community Church, 40 E. 35 St., at 8:30.

Thurs., June 14

ISL New York Forum—Hal Draper reports on Socialist Party Convention held in Chicago June 8-10. Labor Action Hall at 9.

Fri., June 15

YSL's long-awaited Book Bazaar—Labor Action Hall at 8:30. Spectacular bargains in books, pamphlets, prints, records of all kinds and subjects. Followed by informal social and folk dancing.

Sun., June 17

Joint ISL-YSL Picnic & Outing to Clove Lake Park, Staten Is. . . . Boating, Baseball, sun and fresh air.

Fri., June 22

Joint ISL-YSL Forum: ISL Versus the Subversive List—Max Shachtman and Albert Gates report on the Washington hearing. Adelphi Hall, 74 Fifth Ave. (near 14 St.) at 8:15.

Fri., June 29

ISL New York Forum: Abe Stein on the Crisis of Russian Stalinism. Labor Action Hal at 9.

ISL HEARING IN WASHINGTON—THIRD WEEK:

Gov't Rests Case Solely on Its 'Exhibits'

By ALBERT GATES

Washington, May 31

On this seventh day of the hearing in the case of the ISL's listing by the attorney general, following the introduction of several more exhibits, the government suddenly rested its case with the statement, "That is the end of our evidence."

The hearing session had opened with a discussion once more of the matter of the "Chinese leaflet." Government attorney Maddrix reported back that the Department of Justice would adhere to its position that it would not further pursue the matter through other government departments and that the task of obtaining information from the De-

partment of State or Department of Defense (Air Force) belonged to the organizations and their counsel.

The government contended that it did not know where to look for the information and that the organizations did not suggest where it might seek it. Rauh replied once more that such information was not available to the organizations; that the State Department and /or the Defense Department has the information; that upon request from the Department of Justice the information could be made available, and that the government was obligated to seek that information for the organizations.

Thereafter, Rauh read into the record a telegram that was subsequently sent to John Foster Dulles and Charles E.

Wilson, Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense respectively. The telegram called on them to open their files on the matter of the leaflet or else send a statement summarizing the essential facts.

As already indicated, the government continued to introduce additional exhibits. Toward the close of the morning session, Maddrix read off a listing of Selected Works by Lenin, indicating citations which he recommended to the hearing examiner and then rested the case of the government against the Workers Party, Socialist Youth League and the Independent Socialist League.

The action was as sudden as it was anti-climactic. The hearing had gone on for seven days. In those seven days the

government had presented one witness, if the term may be used, a professorial "expert" on Leninism and "Soviet Communism," Dr. Geroid T. Robinson, who acknowledged complete ignorance of the organizations involved, of their programs, policies, activities and writings.

Aside from two and a half days of miscellaneous readings from Lenin's writings over a number of years, his most important contribution, from the government's point of view, was the assertion that all "scholars" and "experts" were agreed on interpretation and that he knew of no important differences between them on the meaning of Lenin's main theories and policies—an assertion which was easily punctured without any extended effort.

With the groundwork laid by the professor's readings, the government proceeded to introduce exhibits as referred to earlier in these reports. The exhibits, it will undoubtedly be contended by the government, were supposed to connect up the organizations with the professor's testimony and establish the case for it.

It is the only way in which it can keep Dr. Robinson's testimony from being stricken, since the witness, knowing nothing about the organizations, could not himself connect up his testimony to the WP, SYL and ISL. On the contrary, when asked if he knew any organization in the United States which resembled Lenin's party either in doctrine, policy, tactics or activities, he could only answer that he did not.

As the government's "expert," he stated that the post-Lenin state in Russia, under Stalin and under Khrushchev were Leninist states and that if an organization opposed or disagreed with the fundamental nature of those states, they were not Leninist "in that respect."

What then did the exhibits establish? Remembrance of the great leaders of world socialism Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky; acknowledgment and acceptance of the great traditions which they left; defense of the Russian Revolution and the ideas of revolutionary socialism, by which is meant the program for the abolition of capitalism and its replacement by the socialist society.

What else? That the organizations were against World War II; that they issued the slogan "Neither Washington Nor Moscow," that the Socialist Youth League was the youth organization of the Workers Party and the Independent Socialist League.

What the exhibits did not, and could not, establish was that the organizations were "Communist" in the everyday meaning of the term or that they advocated, either directly or indirectly, the overthrow of the government by force and violence.

Rauh Asks Verdict

Washington, June 4

Today, the first day after the government had rested its case, Joseph Rauh, attorney for the ISL, presented a series of motions calling on the hearing examiner, Edward Morrissey, to find in favor of the "listed" organizations on the basis solely of the inadequacy of the government case.

Examiner Morrissey said he would study the motions overnight in order to make his ruling tomorrow.

Of course, if the motions are denied, the ISL and Rauh will then proceed to present their own testimony and evidence to the hearing, as scheduled.

The Rauh motions precipitated in effect a review of the material which the government attorneys had presented during their seven days of hearing time. One of the points brought out is the fact that the government has not even tried to make out a case for its original "Statement of Grounds."

(Continued on page 6)

LABOR SCOPE

Packinghouse Unity Off . . . A Hint to the UAW

Unity between the Packinghouse Workers Union (CIO) and the Amalgamated Meat Cutters is indefinitely postponed.

The merger was all but complete; an agreement had been signed; a date was set, June 11. But on the eve of merger, the Amalgamated unexpectedly reopened negotiations and put new demands to the Packinghouse Workers.

The former AFL union had been guaranteed a majority on the new ruling board but it suddenly insisted upon an even larger majority and in addition proposed that all employees of the new union be required to sign Taft-Hartley affidavits annually. When these demands were rejected by the former CIO union, the merger fell through.

Taking the Rap

"The Montgomery bus protest has shown that the Negro workers of the South . . . are 'taking the rap' for the union movement in the fight against the anti-labor boycott law."

So writes Sam Pollock, president of Cleveland Local 427 of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters Union. In a full-page article in the union's magazine he urges full labor support to the boycott movement.

Further South, the Kentucky Labor News called the arrest of the Montgomery boycott leaders "a sad day for organized labor in Alabama." Its editorial concluded, "If the Reverend King loses his appeal in the higher courts of our nation, both 'white supremacy' and 'boss supremacy' will have won another battle in the cradle of the Confederacy."

Hint to the UAW

Layoffs have hit the UAW. In the auto industry 125,000 are idle; and in the agricultural implement industry 35,900.

The union is asking for a labor-management conference not for "collective bargaining" but merely to discuss the critical employment situation. It is doubtful that the companies will countenance such a meeting. For the union is asking to discuss such matters as: production schedules, inventories, timing of the introduction of new models, future production plans, automation, decentralization.

Since such things have always been jealously guarded as sacred management "prerogatives," the UAW will have to do more than dispatch a letter to get its foot in the door.

Still, it undoubtedly makes for good "public relations;" the union shows that it wants action on unemployment. But meanwhile something must be done for the unemployed.

A hint on methods comes from coal miners. Eight pensioned miners came in working clothes from West Virginia to Wall Street ready to picket. They had come to demand that the West Penn

Electric Company, whose stockholders were meeting in New York, stop all purchases of coal from scab companies. The company had refused to discuss with the union. But when these mine veterans got ready to throw a two-day picket line in front of the company's offices, the union committee was admitted and its petitions received.

The UAW, for the moment, restricts its request for a labor-management conference to the U. S. mails. Perhaps it would have more success if the missive was delivered by a few thousand pickets. The whole country would quickly find out that the request was made.

NMU Crows Too Soon

John Hunt was found innocent by a Special Sessions Court in New York. For those who have forgotten, he is a member of the National Maritime Union; was New York Port Agent; was indicted for a racket in selling NMU books; and was a loyal supporter of Joe Curran.

Now that the case is dismissed, the NMU, which was silent for a long time, speaks up jubilantly in the May 10 issue of the Pilot. The union had refused to take any action; it had refused to investigate. Now it feels justified: see, he was not found guilty.

And the Pilot even warns that it will take action against those who demanded action in the union against racketeering:

"The union must now examine the case carefully with a view to guarding against this type of conspiracy which can be aimed at any official who is doing a job for the union by groups with a special axe to grind. Fortunately, the conscience of the membership can be clear on this matter because of the union's policy of letting the law take its course."

Hunt was cleared. But the shadow over the union does not automatically lift. There was a book-selling racket. The union was passive. There was no vigorous internal investigation. Who was responsible?

Above all, does Curran like Dave Beck, feel that corruption in the union is a matter exclusively for the police or has the union responsibility for exercising initiative?

This is the basic question in the Hunt case and it remains unanswered.

Peace Note

George Howell, president of the UAW Local 81, reminds us of a strike that is in danger of being forgotten by the labor movement. Four UAW locals, 79, 81, 450 and 865, have been on strike against the John Deere Company, manufacturer of agricultural implements.

The stoppage is purely defensive; the workers, who are entering their sixth month of strike, are not asking for im-

provements. They are resisting company demands for wage cuts.

Not much labor peace at John Deere. The UAW has already paid out over \$1 million in strike relief.

Labor and the Negro

1,500 UAW members heard E. Daniel Nixon, Montgomery boycott leader, speak on the East Side of Detroit at a rally sponsored by the UAW Regional Office. He went back to Alabama with several thousand dollars contributed by UAW locals and members.

Dublin, Georgia passed a city ordinance requiring that all union organizers pay a fee of \$2,500 and pledge support to segregation laws. The law was passed immediately after the formation of a local Citizens Council.

J. O. Moore, president of the Atlanta Federation of Trades, said, "It would be difficult to learn who composes the Laurens County Citizens Council or . . . the mayor and City Council in Dublin. But I have a pretty good idea that not many of them are of the working class."

He calls for a boycott of Dublin merchants by unionists.

In a Nutshell

Another voice is raised in the labor movement for a stronger political stand. Rodney C. Jacobson, Minnesota State CIO secretary-treasurer, has a lot to say about labor's role in the Democratic Party.

He points out that the Southern conservatives dominate the party and that the liberals are, in his words, "cowardly." To the Democratic leaders who say that labor has nowhere else to go he says:

"Instead of trying to show Democrats how nice and cooperative we are in their fund-raising activities, why aren't we screaming our heads off? Why are we beguiled by the advocates of 'unity' for the 1956 Democratic convention? Haven't we learned that 'unity' is bought on Southern terms? . . . To put it in a nutshell, we must abandon our defensive attitude and start fighting for our principles, even though it may seem at times to conflict with a political or legislative goal."

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.

A Fable from The Czech Jungle

The following fable "How Criticism Progressed in Lion's Kingdom" is by Jiri Marek, a Czech author and the director of the Czechoslovak Film Organization. It was published recently in the Prague Literarni Noviny, a weekly devoted to art and politics. The Manchester Guardian translated it on May 22.

It is an outspoken satire on the nature of "criticism from below" under the Stalinist system. The author shows that he is fully aware of the risk he is taking, for he says plainly that the leaders who talk about opening the door to criticism will want to "have the strength to slam it when the time comes." The reader should remember also that in May a student procession in Prague openly used poster slogans and other means to satirize and attack the stifling of free expression.

There is no doubt about the intellectual ferment stirred up in East Europe (even more than in Russia), in Czechoslovakia as well as Poland, by the anti-Stalin turn. The bureaucracy will only exacerbate it when they "slam it when the time comes."—ED.

A Fable by Jiri Marek

In the kingdom ruled by King Lion much has recently been said about opening the door for criticism. This is always disconcerting—not for those who criticize (they for the most part are irresponsible creatures) but for the responsible officials to whom such matters cause anxiety. Open the door—why not? But who will have the strength to slam it when the time comes?

For this reason King Lion thought deeply and, being the enlightened ruler that he was (with due regard to what is possible), gave an order that attention should be paid to criticism.

The monkeys, pointing to their ability to climb, offered to help. King Lion refused. Even the sparrow offered his services, but who would entrust the department of criticism to a sparrow? He blabs out everything, and in this matter discretion is needed. Nor could the praying mantis, for example, be appointed for the task on account of his physical weakness.

"No, no," said King Lion. "As far as we are concerned, the investigation of criticism and grievances shall be entrusted to select creatures, such as are respected and know how to deal with problems."

THE GRADUALIST

So he appointed the tiger, the wolf, and the fox to examine carefully all critical manifestations of discontent and draw conclusions accordingly. After this decision, which was wise and proceeded from his concern about the welfare of subjects, the lion lay down. After all it was after lunch.

The tiger settled down in a carefully chosen place frequented by animals on their way to drink, and waited for whoever might come first. Naturally, the animals hesitated. But then, after repeated appeals that nobody should hesitate to make bold criticism, the gazelle came forward.

"Excellent," said the tiger. "Do not be shy my dear friend, and tell me, without fear and with regard to principles: What is the matter?"

"The matter is," said the gazelle, "that

our pastures are far too far from here. We spend half the day on our journey to them. What sort of a productivity is this, I ask myself? We have complained everywhere, but in vain. What sort of a concern for the voice of the working people is this?"

"You are quite right. The pastures are too far. Your suggestion is, I take it, to move them to a nearby spot. Near by, however, are the zebras' pastures. In that case, the zebras would have to be transferred farther off and you nearer. But you will appreciate that the zebras... Dear me! What a difficult problem it is! Still I shall solve it somehow, depend upon it."

The gazelle thanked him, and the tiger looked at her with evident delight. As she was leaving the office he jumped at her and devoured her.

"One must proceed with due regard to what is possible," he said to himself, licking his chops.

THE SELF-CRITICS

"Just tell me, and as far as possible in detail," said the wolf, receiving in his office the complaints of the lamb. "You have no idea how important it is to explain exactly what is the matter. If you don't, justice cannot be done. Have no fears, it is only between you and me."

The lamb was very pleased and explained at great length all the wrongs done to him. He listed all his enemies—the fox, the leopard, the lynx, the tiger. The wolf alone he omitted, for obvious reasons. One must not go too far, the lamb wisely said to himself.

The wolf listened and was sincerely moved. "Such a fine lamb and so many enemies; he is all white, fluffy, and no doubt tender—and living in fear. Where are we heading for?" the wolf asked himself.

"This is no life, my friend," he said at last, genuinely grieved. "I shall seek remedy."

He found it. In order to put an end to the lamb's anxieties about his many enemies, he ate him himself.

The fox received, on the one hand, a delegation of rabbits who came to complain against the hare, and on the other a delegation of frightened hens. He had a friendly chat with them all and in no way did he take advantage of his slyness to deceive the petitioners and the critics.

On the contrary, he admitted self-critically that his knowledge of the life in a hen-house was far from profound and asked for permission to study the welter of problems on the spot. Within a short space of time the fox put on three kilos [over 6 pounds].

THE JUST RULER

One day the lion remembered his decision and summoned the appointed investigators. "How is the work?"

"Collective," they replied.

"I am glad to hear that," replied the lion. "And what about grievances?"

"They are under consideration," whispered the tiger respectfully.

"There are many," sighed the fox.

"One does not know sometimes where to turn first."

"Quite so," said the wolf. "We are doing our best."

"That is what I had in mind." The lion was satisfied. "Does anyone come to complain twice. I wonder?"

"Never." The three told the truth in one voice.

"That is how things should be," said the lion. "Enter the decision," he called to the scribe, the most learned marabout.

"Put down that it was found, after a discussion and thorough screening, that the special branch for the handling of complaints has proved uncommonly successful. Do your ranks need reinforcement?"

"No, sir," said the tiger. "My family is helping me a little."

King Lion lay down again, because it was after lunch.

"I am a just ruler and am doing my best," he said to himself before falling asleep.

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

Ask Release of Albizu Campos

The following communication is from the Committee for Justice to Puerto Ricans, a group concerned with the civil liberties side of the Puerto Rican question.

To the Editor:

Hovering between life and death in the Presbyterian Hospital in San Juan, Puerto Rico, Don Pedro Albizu Campos, president of the Nationalist Party, remains a prisoner without indictment, separated from his friends by an array of armed detectives who inhabit his room and the corridors outside it, and stand guard at the entrances to the hospital itself.

Transferred from the Insular Penitentiary on March 30th, four days after he suffered an attack of cerebral thrombosis that has paralyzed his right side and his vocal organs, physicians state that even if he lives he may be unable to speak or to write, and thus almost as incapable of expressing himself as if locked in the solitary confinement cell where he has spent the past two years.

If he is returned to prison, there is little doubt that death will soon follow.

Don Pedro's present condition is the culmination that he predicted of the illness that began during his 1950-53 confinement in La Princesa, San Juan, on charges of sedition. Incidentally, these charges are now apparently nullified by the Supreme Court decision pre-empting for the federal government all prosecution for advocacy of its overthrow. There were mysterious aspects in this illness, and Don Pedro charged the United States government with applying invisible radiation-bearing rays to his body, thus producing burns, and demanded an investigation by competent and impartial non-governmental scientists—an investigation which, his friends maintain, has not yet been made.

When he was freed on unconditional pardon in September 1953, there was some hope that such an investigation might be effected. However, the bed-ridden patient was rushed back to prison, without a hearing and without new charges, a few days after the Congressional shooting of March 1954. He has since been held in solitary confinement.

Petitions previously directed to Presi-

dent Eisenhower, requesting the release of Albizu Campos so that he might receive appropriate medical care, have either been ignored or shunted off to minor officials in the Department of Justice or Interior, who have replied correctly that the political prisoner was not under their jurisdiction, implying incorrectly that neither was he under the jurisdiction of President Eisenhower. In communications now our president needs to be reminded that American citizens may appropriately petition him on any subject in the world, and that he is president wherever the United States flag flies.

Will you wire or write to the president today, urging that he exert his utmost influence to secure the release of Don Pedro Albizu Campos, or the implementation of the 1953 pardon, if that is the correct procedure.

We believe that, on the face of it, there are adequate humanitarian grounds for this action.

It should, however, be borne in mind that, whatever their views may be on the program and activities of the Nationalist Party of Puerto Rico, Don Pedro Albizu Campos has a powerful emotional hold on a multitude of his fellow countrymen (the daily papers of San Juan report on his illness and transfer to the Presbyterian Hospital with huge headlines) and also on large numbers of people throughout Latin America—and even in Asian and African countries. These people are extremely sensitive to the issue of national independence, and we are convinced that if, under the president's urging, the action we propose were taken, it would result in an increase of good will towards the United States among them. That the United States needs this good will at this juncture of world affairs need not be argued.

We urge you to wire or write to the president today, asking him to do his utmost to insure that Don Pedro Albizu Campos spends the rest of his days in freedom, so that he may be reasonably accessible to friends and in a position that will guarantee him the maximum opportunity for such recovery of his health as may now be possible.

A. J. MUSTE
JULIUS EICHEL

P. S.—If you have access to members of the United States House or Senate or to other influential citizens who might be interested, will you not write or telegraph them immediately.

Negro Bus Boycott — —

(Continued from page 11)

They dropped the charges against the two Negro students and appeared to be ready to grant the demands of the council. But by this time the Negroes gratified by the success of the campaign, were demanding the complete abolition of segregation. This also followed the pattern in Montgomery.

ALABAMA OUTLAWS

In addition to boycotting the buses, the Montgomery Improvement Association had brought suit in the federal courts for a judicial order banning segregation. Now a federal court has ruled 2-1 that segregation on the Montgomery bus line is unconstitutional. This court victory will undoubtedly help give further heart to the embattled Negroes.

In Alabama, meanwhile, a circuit judge has granted the application of the attorney general of that state to outlaw the NAACP. This action adds additional proof that the "white supremacy" believers will stop at no violation of democracy in their effort to keep the

Negro repressed. The NAACP has announced that it will fight the decision in the courts.

The spreading of the boycott makes it evident that the Montgomery boycott was not an isolated phenomena which was possible only there as a result of special circumstances. It is a method of struggle which has wide applicability in the South—one which may be repeated in many cities.



LABOR ACTION

June 11, 1956

Vol. 20, No. 24

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

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, New York City

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

Send for our free book list.

YOU'RE INVITED

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

YOUNG Socialist CHALLENGE

June 11, 1956

Edited and Published by the YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE

FIVE CENTS

U. OF CALIF. • BERKELEY

'Rule 17' Paradox at Berkeley

By CHARLES WALKER

Berkeley, May 30

The administration at the University of California has once more shown its hypocritical attitude in arbitrarily excluding political speakers from campus facilities, by scheduling the Tito-Stalinist Yugoslav ambassador Leo Mates on Yugoslavia's foreign policy and rejecting Stevenson and Kefauver the preceding week.

In the editorial "Speaking of Speaking on Campus" (*Daily Cal*, May 17), this anomaly was noted.

"It would appear that the comparatively young experiment known as democracy is having a rather hard time of it at the university. While UCLA's political theory marches to the tune of 'yes, we have no elections,' on the Berkeley campus we are told that we mustn't get our hands dirtied by nasty old politics.

"The university's hospitality has been denied to the former presidential candidate of one of the country's two political parties. . . . And yet, a man, not an American citizen, and the representative of a communist regime, has been invited to speak on campus as a guest of the university.

"His non-American citizenship is and should be no bar to his right to speak. Neither should his political views be.

"But it is even more paradoxical that Rule 17 was used to bar Adlai Stevenson from this campus while it has apparently been ignored in order to allow the ambassador of a nation ideologically opposed to that of the United States to speak on campus.

"The administration fears that the university may be associated with politics if the likes of Stevenson, Kefauver or Nixon speak on campus should be interesting.

"The wrong isn't that a Communist

is speaking on campus; he should be allowed to talk, for we fight best what we understand best. . . .

"Leo Mates' talk is not part of a series representing several viewpoints [one Rule 17 bugaboo]; it is a single speech. Perhaps it is being presented as part of an effort to retain a strategic nation as our ally [natch]. The motive, in terms of international politics, is honorable [but political!].

"The motive behind the 'free political action' of political speeches, rallies and campaigns [in the U. S.] is even more honorable. . . .

"When one looks at Leo Mates speaking in Dwinelle Hall today, and at leaders of democracy speaking from the gutter of Oxford Avenue [e.g., West Gate], one can only feel that whereas the university's motto is 'Let there be light,' the fire is slowly dying out."

Two other letters appeared on this subject; one entitled "Comrade Leo" criticized "despotic Tito's communist regime"—but the name of the writer "has been withheld at his request, and for reasons satisfactory to the editor." The reasons are probably fear of offending "officials." The other letter was by the new president of SCLU, the student government, also noting the hypocrisy of barring Stevenson and Kefauver in favor of Mates.

In conclusion, the administration got forced into an embarrassing position, in order to carry out its State Department responsibilities of providing a forum at the "world's largest university" for a "friendly" country's ambassador. Unfortunately this exposed its hypocritical attitude on "free speech," and it got called down on it. But those in charge of state universities are used to such anomalous situations, and don't get too excited when they're caught.

As for the students however, this may aid their political "education."

Czech Students Demand Concessions from Regime

By MICHAEL HARRINGTON

Reports coming out of Czechoslovakia in the past few weeks have made it clear that the Czech student youth have seized on the "let-up" in police repression to state their hostility to the Stalinist regime.

The first story appeared in the United States some three weeks ago. It told of the traditional May Festival parade in Prague. Marching students carried banners and wore costumes which were pointedly aimed at the Stalinist government.

One group wore formal clothes and top hats and carried a sign reading "Theory." Behind them marched a contingent of students in rags bearing a sign inscribed "Practice." Another group of students carried a bookcase which had a banner across the front, "On the Index."

In some cases, the Prague students confined themselves to the issues of university life in Czechoslovakia. A girl with a bandaged head symbolized the fate of anyone who agitated for elective courses; a group dressed like children jibed at the academic "reform" which they contended was turning the school into a kindergarten. Other slogans called for a return to academic freedom.

But some of the signs went far beyond this. They were aimed at the Stalinist regime itself.

A dozen students were gagged and blindfolded: they represented the editors of *Mlada Fronta*, the Czech Stalinist youth newspaper. Another poster read, "We are young, but we remember a lot." One group of students carried a coffin labeled "Bureaucracy," and still another band of students carried a sign proclaiming, "We hope that the governing of your affairs is returning to your hands."

As they marched, the students called out political slogans to the people along the street. During a halt in the parade, some students called out, "Prepare yourselves, cadre masters. You will have work tomorrow."

The "cadre masters" are the Stalinists assigned the job of keeping political dossiers on all citizens in that country. This remark was particularly ironic, since the students were all but surrounded by the police.

SERIOUS THREAT

Within the last week, however, it has become apparent that the Prague demonstration was not an isolated incident of student hostility to the regime. Similar protests have been reported at Bratislava University in Kosite Nitra, in Banka Bystricia, and in other educational centers.

In some cases, these student manifestations came out with resolutions embodying political demands. One group demanded the right of existence for an opposition political party!

According to a *New York Times* dispatch of June 1, the demonstrations throughout Czechoslovakia were coordinated by "an aerial shuttle service" and by "motorized liaison men." This would seem to indicate that there is some degree of organization among the students, and on a national level.

The regime itself regards the whole business as a serious threat; according to the *Times* article, there has been heated discussion in the top levels of the Czech Stalinist movement about these developments among the youth.

The inevitable repression is, of course, being prepared. This was more or less bluntly stated in the May 26 issue of the Slovak weekly *Cultural Life*. The article spoke of a Stalinist resolution which has been in the works for over a year.

Failure to come out with this program on academic reform was cited as the main reason for the emergence of an organized youth opposition to the regime.

This situation, said the article, allowed the "reactionaries" to exploit the legitimate demands of the university students. To anyone familiar with even the most superficial characteristics of Stalinist semantics, this means that all opponents of the Stalinists (i.e. "reactionaries") are in for a difficult time.

The *Cultural Life* article then went on to describe how the nationwide demonstrations arose. "While the Bratislava students were holding their famous carnival process, there also was a great stir in Prague, where such elements skillfully exploited the party's failure to publish its resolution." These elements, the magazine continued, added "a demagogic ultimatum and created a resolution of their own."

Among the planks in the Bratislava Resolution were demands for large-scale student exchange and for opportunities for Czech students to take tours abroad.

MILITANT MOOD

Clearly, the Czech Stalinists—like Stalinists in power everywhere—are faced with a considerable problem. The Twentieth Party Congress has evidently been interpreted as a concession by the masses, and rather than quieting them, the "relaxation" has developed a mood of militancy and a certain attitude of independence.

In Russia, the repression has already begun with the campaign against "rotten elements" in the party. This is probably not far behind in Czechoslovakia itself.

There the party report on the Twentieth Congress warned, "Our enemies would like to persuade us that with the lessening of international tension, peaceful coexistence should also find its expression in the field of ideology. They would like us to demobilize ideologically so that they could defeat us."

The meaning of this, like that of the Russian Stalinist denunciation of the "rotten elements," is clear enough: the party will crack down on anybody or any group which takes the talk of relaxation and freedom at all seriously.

By striking out militantly, the Czech students may have hastened a repression—after all, the only way to real freedom in Czechoslovakia or anywhere else in the Stalinist Empire is through an overthrow of the regime. But that is the short run.

In the long run, they have borne an eloquent witness to the irrepressibility of democratic, anti-Stalinist sentiment, even after almost a decade of Stalinism.

They have once more made the point that all Stalinist talk of being in power with the consent of the people is a mockery—that this tyranny, in Czechoslovakia and in all Stalinist lands, has raised itself over the people and, all talk of relaxation to the contrary, can only maintain itself in existence by continuing that tyranny, by denouncing the "rotten elements" and the "reactionaries" every time the masses speak out for themselves.

YSL FUND DRIVE

Close to Goal, but It's Uneven

By MAX MARTIN

As this report is being written, some ten days before the closing date of the Young Socialist League's 1956 Fund Drive, the League is only a few percentage points away from reaching its goal. To date we have collected \$1431, which represents a shade above 97 per cent of our \$1475 national quota.

Since our last report two weeks ago, \$236 arrived in the National Office: \$199 from New York, \$17 from Pittsburgh, \$10 from Chicago, and \$10 from "At Large and National Office."

Pittsburgh's contribution lifted it from fourth to second place in the relative standings of the various units, this being the only change in the standings since the last report. The Pittsburgh comrades deserve commendation for their success.

The excellence of the showing is in

large part the result of the phenomenal record achieved by New York. Despite the fact that it had a high quota to meet, New York has not only met it, but has surpassed it by close to 50 per cent. Moreover, it promises that more will be forthcoming; the comrades have set themselves an informal goal of raising \$1000, or as close to it as possible.

The shortcoming in our success lies in its unevenness. With the exception of New York, all of the units which have reached or surpassed 100 per cent have small quotas. On the other hand, some of the units with larger quotas have not yet done as well as they should.

Los Angeles, for example, should be closer to 100 per cent than it is right now. Albany, Berkeley and San Francisco are far behind. And while we appreciate the difficulties which Chicago is having, we are certain that it can raise more than has yet come in.

Fortunately, there is yet time to remedy this deficiency. The drive still has ten days to go. If all units reach or come close to 100 per cent, then the drive as a whole will go over by a large amount, given the record of New York.

All units and comrades should dedicate themselves to this during the next few days. A final fund drive report will appear. Readers of *Challenge* can do their bit by sending their checks and money orders to YSL, Third Floor, 114 West 14th Street, New York City. Make them payable to Max Martin.

WHAT'S THE SCORE ?

City	Quota	Paid	%
Total	\$1475	\$1431	97.0
New York	600	887.50	147.6
Pittsburgh	50	52	104
Dayton Area	25	25.50	102
Cleveland Area	25	25	100
At Lge. & N.O.	100	78	78
Los Angeles	150	101	67.3
Chicago	350	217	62
Albany	75	25	33.3
Berkeley	75	20	26.7
San Francisco	25	0	0

Gov't Rests Case on ISL — —

(Continued from page 3)

Our readers may remember that the case actually began two years ago with the presentation of a "Statement of Grounds and Interrogatories" of the Attorney General. [See LA, Sept. 28, 1953.] It was these to which the organizations replied and which composed the background upon which the hearing was based.

Yet, aside from the first two paragraphs of the "Statement of Grounds" which referred to declarations made by the organizations at one time or another regarding their adherence to the "teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky," or following in their "tradition," the government did not refer to or make out a case on the "grounds," which numbered 28 in all. At the beginning of the hearing in 1955, ISL attorney Groner had moved to strike these grounds and his motion was denied.

Now the government had presented its case for seven days without reference at all to the "Statement of Grounds" except those paragraphs already admitted by the organizations. And that is understandable because the government could never make out a case on their own premises.

As we have been reporting, the sole witness put on the stand by the government has been Professor Geroid T. Robinson, a so-called expert on Leninism and "Soviet Communism," although he has written little or nothing about either subject, and so far as can be learned from a study of the literature, is no authority whatever.

His testimony was permitted even though he knew nothing whatever about the organizations involved—indeed, had not even heard of them—on the premise that the government would connect up his testimony to the organizations themselves.

By inserting into the record a number of exhibits of writings of the organizations the government then claimed it was

making the "connection" between Robinson's testimony and the positions and activities of the organizations. They were establishing, their counsel contended, the general areas of agreement between Lenin and the WP, SYL and ISL.

On the opening of this morning's session, Joseph L. Rauh presented a motion to strike the testimony of Professor Robinson on the ground that no such connection had been made by the government. He reminded the hearing examiner that he had ruled the testimony would be admissible only after such a connection had been made.

Rauh pointed out that none of the quotations cited by the professor, on which the government had relied, could be found in the literature of the three organizations and that none of their activities corresponded to the selected readings.

POLITICAL JUDGE

The government contended in reply that while it could not tie up each single quotation to the organizations, it did show the "general areas of agreement; that the professor had established what were the kernel thoughts of Leninism and these had been shown to be accepted and advocated and taught by the organizations.

There is, of course, their broad assumption that the professor's statements as to what constituted Lenin's ideas were correct and universally accepted. Of those cited by Maddrix for the government, many were quite ludicrous as examples of Lenin's original thinking (most had originated with Marx and Engels, and, indeed, with thinkers before their time) and others were just plain commonsense statements that public figures make during their lives and which do not possess any special theoretical or political virtue; they are said by persons of various political persuasions and have nothing specific to do

with socialism in general or Leninism in particular.

This, however, is one of the points involved in the hearing: the government has set itself up as the judge of the meaning of doctrine—in this case, socialist doctrine—and is ready to pronounce sentence on the basis of its own verdict.

Although the organizations never made a secret of their Marxist character, the government has hardly mentioned Marx and his lifelong companion Engels. Relatively little mention was made of Trotsky in the hearing, aside from a few irrelevant readings. The government concentrated the great bulk of its "proof" on Lenin. Much of the argument on the motion to strike revolved around the meaning of "Leninism" and the extent, if at all, to which the organizations adhered to it. No wonder the hearing assumes such a strange character.

Hearing Examiner Morrissey denied the motion to strike the testimony of Professor Robinson. That would seem to imply that he feels a connection had been made between that testimony and the exhibits which the government introduced. Clarification of that issue can come now only through the testimony which the organizations will present later.

Upon this ruling, Rauh presented another motion, proposing that—

"... the Hearing Examiner make a finding and recommendation to the Attorney General as follows:

"(1) The Government has failed to prove that the Independent Socialist League is Communist or communist within the meaning of Executive Order 9835 and 10450.

"(2) The Government has failed to prove that the Independent Socialist League seeks to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means within the meaning of Executive Order 9835 and 10450.

"(3) The Independent Socialist League was wrongfully listed under the Executive Orders 9835 and 10450... should now be removed from said list for any and all purposes."

WHAS ISM?

A sharp debate followed the presentation of this motion as well as two identical motions for the Workers Party and the Socialist Youth League.

Which Leninism are they talking about? Rauh asked. He reminded the hearing that the government's expert had said that any organizations which did not support Russia or the Czech Stalinist seizure of power were not Leninist in those important respects. The professor considered these two references as important criteria. Did the government rely on that testimony?

Also, Rauh pointed out, the professor had given three definitions of communism and that his co-counsel, Groner, and he had both given a definition of communism as "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs." The organizations affirmed their adherence to the latter definition.

"Are they being charged with that? If so, let us end the hearing and go to court, because that is what we stand for," said Rauh.

Rauh continued by saying that he had tried many times to get a statement from the Government on just what it meant by the charge of "communism," capital C or small c, but he could not get a reply to that, any more than he could get a reply to the demand for a specific spelling out of the charges against the organization that they advocated the "overthrow of the government by force and violence." In the 8th day of the hearing, the government had not yet made that charge against the organizations, that they had advocated force and violence.

"If the organization advocates force and violence," said Rauh, "then prosecute the organization under the Voorhees Act. ... They won't prosecute the way they did the Communists. In a private room they libel the organization. In a hearing of this kind, without even telling us what the charges are, they try to make it stick. Well, they aren't going to."

Rauh went on to examine the kind of evidence the government introduced: one exhibit for 1956, a letter of greetings to a socialist conference in Paris among whose leading figures were Fen-

ner Brockway and C.D.H. Cole, both of the British Labor Party; an exhibit for 1955 containing an ad for books; 1954, zero; 1953, a speech by Shachtman on the 25th anniversary of the Trotskyist movement; 1952, zero; and 1951, a statement on the Korean war.

CHALLENGE TO GOV'T

At this point, Rauh read from the *New York Times* a lengthy and strong denunciation of the Korean war by President Eisenhower, to show that political opposition to the war, justifiable under any circumstances, was held by a wide cross-section of people.

What, he added, had all of this to do with the "overthrow of the government by force and violence?" Nothing! For these reasons, Rauh urged the examiner to find for his motions on the more general ground that the government had not made out a case against the organizations.

The reply of government counsel Maddrix was a reiteration of his morning remarks, namely, that the testimony of Professor Robinson had been connected up with the exhibits introduced which showed that the organizations had in general accepted the "teachings of Lenin" and urged their acceptance in the United States. They had lots more "evidence" of this kind, he asserted, and he would be glad to produce it, if necessary. (Remember, the government had already rested!) Moreover, the government was willing to rest its case on any definition Rauh wanted; they would even accept his own.

In that case, replied Rauh, let us end it now and go up the courts to try this case. Closing the discussion, Rauh once more stated: if the government believes it has a case, it should indict the organizations under the Voorhees Act. They don't do that because they know they have a bad case. They don't want to go to court; they prefer the present situation because they don't know how to get out from under a bad act of the Department.

The hearing examiner then adjourned the hearing so that he might study the motions overnight in order to make his ruling.

Denies Rauh Motions

Washington, June 5

Openings today's session, Hearing Examiner Edward M. Morrissey read his decision on the motions which ISL attorney Rauh had introduced at the close of Monday's meeting:

"Upon a review of the record, the Hearing Examiner is of the opinion that the evidence presented, standing un rebutted and unexplained, is sufficient in this proceeding to establish *prima facie* the principal allegations of the Attorney General against each of the organizations.

"Accordingly, the findings and recommendation requested by the designated organizations by motion filed June 4, 1956 should be and hereby are denied."

With the reading of this finding, Rauh then rose and declared:

"The organizations now move separately for a finding and recommendation that the organizations are not Communist within the meaning of Executive Orders 9835 and 10450 for the reasons stated yesterday.

"The Examiner's opinion is not clear whether he is ruling a *prima facie* case has been made on both, or only one or the other [see yesterday's story]. In view of that, we move now for a finding and recommendation that the organizations are not Communist within the meaning of those orders."

After handing Rauh a copy of his order, the examiner then asked whether he was still pressing the motion:

Rauh: "Yes. I clearly press the point. ... I am simply trying to clarify the record. I am moving that the examiner find on the question of 'Communist.' It is possible to interpret your order for a *prima facie* case on one or the other of the two. ..."

MORRISSEY: "Are we distinguishing between large C or small c [in the word communist]?"

RAUH: "Not now. I am using the word in the Executive Order, however

(Turn to last page)

IS THIS CARTOON "SUBVERSIVE"?

How ridiculous can you get? ... LABOR ACTION reported last week that, at the Washington hearing of the ISL, the government introduced this brilliant Carlo cartoon as one of its exhibits purporting to "prove" the subversive character of the ISL. It appeared as an illustration in the pamphlet by Max Shachtman, *Socialism: The Hope of Humanity*.



CAPITALISM WILL DESTROY US UNLESS WE DESTROY IT!

RIGHT, LEFT AND CENTER IN NORTH AFRICA

The Fight Inside the Algerian Liberation Movement

By ANDRE GIACOMETTI

Our first article (last week) brought the Algerian story up to the political pattern which obtained in the country after the end of the Second World War: a powerful proletarian nationalist movement, the MTLD, successor to the Etoile Nord-Africaine and PPA, led by Messali Hadj; two fairly influential petty-bourgeois movements, the UDMA and the association of Moslem ulemas; and two isolated sects, the Communist Party and Socialist Party.

This pattern began to change in the course of 1953, as a crisis broke out in the MTLD.

Since the end of the war, the political situation had remained stagnant, and the nationalist movement had made little headway. The reasons for this must also be sought in the particular social structure of the country. With no factor of compromise and moderation present to mitigate the clash of imperialism with the working class, a situation developed where imperialism had to concede all or nothing.

As we know, it conceded nothing.

Unlike the British or the American bourgeoisie, the French ruling class has never been strong enough to develop a leadership for its common interests, capable of making concessions at the expense of one clique in the interests of the whole. Each clique has ruled unopposed in its field; when in government, it has furthered its own interests alone. If another clique succeeded in displacing it from power, it did the same.

In Algeria, policy is made by the Algerian capitalists alone: perhaps the most ruthless, reactionary, fascist-minded clique of all. All nationalist activity was met with reprisal or with deceit; practically every election was falsified in a grotesque manner.

The reformist elements were hardest hit by this policy. Their situation was very well summarized by Ferhat Abbas in April 1954, at a conference of UDMA cadres. He said:

"We must admit that the gigantic hoax and the cynical imposture, of which Algeria has become the victim since the reform bills have been passed, has almost caused our disappearance. It is evident that a progressive party which has oriented its action toward the respect of legality and towards a 'revolution by means of the law,' cannot advance when the public powers turn arbitrary rule into an official institution. . . . every one of us will easily understand why our action among the people has been paralyzed. When our popular masses see an administrative apparatus which, at every rung in the hierarchy, associates itself with illegality, how can these masses support a party for which the respect of the law is the cornerstone of political action, the basis of its political doctrine and the instrument of the social progress which it aims to achieve?"

IDEOLOGICAL CRISIS

Ideologically and organizationally, the MTLD was better equipped to withstand a situation in which all perspectives of "normal" political life were blocked. Nonetheless, a crisis developed in its ranks and in its leadership, which proved neither firm nor experienced enough to create a perspective for the movement and to take the political initiative away from the French government.

The Etoile Nord-Africaine and the PPA had been founded on a revolutionary socialist ideology and perspective. They had looked to the French working class as an ally without whom no solution to the Algerian problems was possible. The experience of repression in 1937 and, much worse, in 1945, both times under governments dominated by the SP and the CP, disoriented the movement to a certain extent.

An alliance with the major parties of the French working class proved fruitless; in its search for new allies, the movement oriented itself toward the Arab nationalist movements of the Middle East.

Instead of working out a socialist program on its own, consistent with the needs of its social base, and one which could have oriented this social base in

its day-by-day struggles in Algeria as well as in France, the MTLD began stressing traditionalist, pan-Islamic and pan-Arabic themes in its propaganda. Nationalist rhetoric took the place of a clear social program.

The shallowness of the political thinking of what was then the MTLD leadership is reflected in the main document of that period, the program adopted by the Second Congress in April 1953.

FLOUNDERING

The program starts out with a few correct concepts that could have provided the basis for a genuine revolutionary approach. For the first time it attempted to situate the action of Algerian nationalism in the context of world politics: the world is divided into two blocs, against which the Algerian nationalists must maintain an attitude of "vigilant neutrality." The colonial policy of Russia is correctly analyzed as determined by purely tactical considerations, and related far less to the interests of the colonial peoples than to those of Stalinist policy.

Then the writers of the document flounder. *

They expect help from the U. S. government against French colonialism; they praise the efforts of the Asian governments to contain Stalinism by "mitigating class differences;" they think the Arab-Asian bloc can constitute by itself a third camp that can "counterbalance the two blocs" because of its "different spirit from that of communist materialism and capitalist materialism." They view the struggle in Asia as a "racial antagonism which has opposed the Asians for a long time to the white people."

As far as concrete steps, demands, activities are concerned, nothing. On trade-union policy, nothing. Industrialization and nationalization of the major means of production continued to be included in the program, but without elaboration. On the all-important agrarian question, a vague sentence: "reorganization of agriculture in the general interest of the Algerians."

No transitional demands, no strategy, no tactics: just a general demand for independence.

Thus the program left the cadres of the party unarmed. They were left to fend for themselves as best as they could and they did—each according to their particular situation, each reacting differently to the different pressures they had to face.

RIGHT WING FORMS

Consequently, the crisis of the party became sharpest on the level of daily politics.

In spite of the falsification of the election results, the MTLD was able to get a large number of its candidates elected, especially on city councils. In the absence of a program and of a strategy, these representatives oscillated between a policy of sterile boycott and of class-collaboration.

In Algiers in particular, where the French mayor was a liberal of sorts, a reformist tendency developed, which advocated limited collaboration with the administration in order to gain limited concessions, in the same sense as the UDMA.

In early 1954 this tendency, which represented the majority of the CC of the MTLD, called for the formation of an "Algerian National Congress," directing its appeal mainly toward the ranks of the UDMA, the ulemas, Moslem boy scouts, independents, etc. The proposed program for this congress made no mention of independence nor of the more radical economic demands of the

MTLD; it advocated reforms such as the "struggle against unemployment and illiteracy," in vague and general terms.

As a whole, it represented an adaptation to the reformist perspective which, in the Algerian context, was doomed in advance. Moreover, it was put forward at a time when the MTLD needed more than ever a determined policy, based on a clear and radical program, to establish its leadership in Algeria for good—the time had come for more radical demands, not less.

This neo-reformist tendency, led by Khouane, Lahouel, Yazid and others, was based on the mood of the tiny middle class composed of intellectuals and professional people who had followed the MTLD and who, in an atmosphere of social and political stagnation, were sliding back to the positions of the UDMA.

HALF UNDERGROUND

At the same time, however, the repression which had begun in 1945 never really stopped for a large mass of the younger, secondary cadres of the MTLD. Constantly threatened by arrest, torture and imprisonment, they had to live a life of semi-legality, often of illegality. Thus, much of the party organization in Algeria functioned half underground long before November 1954.

For these people, political discussions seemed to have little meaning, little relation to their immediate needs. Since 1945, all perspectives had seemed closed to them except direct action. Their spokesmen outside the country were Khider, a MTLD deputy who had fled to Cairo to escape arrest in 1950, and Ben Bella, a former junior officer in the French army who is now in charge of the military operations of the partisans of the FLN.

The socialist content of the MTLD's politics remained most alive in the industrial working class, which was concentrated in the Algerian cities and especially in France. Among the workers, a conception of political action continued to exist that was socialist as well as revolutionary.

However, the lack of a clear orientation of the party as a whole paralyzed even these most conscious sections. For example, the lack of a trade-union policy explains the amazing fact that the most advanced North African nationalist party should have been least active in trade-union organizing, that the 400,000 Algerian workers in France should have played no independent role whatsoever in French trade unions, and that the control of the Algerian CGT should have remained in the hands of the Stalinists, while the Stalinist leadership of the French CGT remained unchallenged.

The sharpening of the struggle in Morocco and Tunisia, the increasing tension in Algeria, caused the conflicting tendencies of the MTLD to clash and to split apart. The main conflict took place between the neo-reformist or "centralist" tendency (Lahouel, Khouane, Yazid) and the proletarian, socialist tendency led by Messali, Mezerna, Merbah.

SPLIT

We need not go here into the complicated faction fighting that took place and which we reported on at the time. It is only necessary to recall the political positions as they emerged after the split.

The "centralist" tendency confirmed its reformist orientation. Accusing Messali, among lesser things, of "verbal leftism," it picked up the UDMA slogan for the "construction of a democratic and social Algerian Republic," without specifying the ties of this "Algerian Republic" with the French republic. It reasserted the need for an Algerian National Congress, which was to be a "union created by the masses," ignoring the fact that the masses had been following the MTLD all along and that the MTLD alone was responsible for providing them with an organization and with political leadership.

Finally, on the Moroccan and Tunisian question, the "centralists" advocated abstention: "The party bears a heavy responsibility and cannot stake the future of the Algerian people and of North Africa on sentimental reactions."

The "Messalists," on the other hand, were moving to return to revolutionary tactics and to the orientation of the ENA and the PPA. In a statement to *Le Monde*, Moulay Merbah declared:

"It is evident that the end of the crisis in the party will also end the stagnation that was one of the causes of the crisis. This means that the party will now conform to the principles of struggle that have always guided it since its creation."

In an internal document, the Messalists elaborated on this point as follows:

"... The Tunisian and Moroccan questions have been internationalized since 1950. To recall briefly the practical means which favored this internationalization, let us note that the situation in Morocco and Tunisia verges on insurrection. . . . From the tactical point of view, the moment is extremely favorable for linking the Algerian question to the question of Arab North Africa and, by this means, to internationalize the Algerian question. . . . This is a matter of diplomacy but, in order to succeed, it has to be backed by a revolutionary policy within the country."

At the same time, the Messalist organization began to organize mass demonstrations in the French industrial centers, a tactic which has been dropped while the "centralist" tendency had been in the leadership.

The split occurred in September 1954; by October, the Messalists were solidly in control of the party organization in France, and had succeeded in isolating the "centralists" in the main centers of Algeria.

CRUA EXPLODES

However, within a few weeks, the situation was completely changed, in an unexpected way, for both groups, by the insurrection that broke out in November in the Aurès mountains.

This insurrection had been prepared without the support (in fact, without the knowledge) of either centralists or Messalists by what had crystallized as a third tendency: that part of the organization which had been driven underground and was seeking to break the deadlock by direct action.

In the preceding months, they had ignored the political discussions which seemed irrelevant to them and had set up the "Comité révolutionnaire d'unité d'action" (CRUA), a rank-and-file organization which included also disgruntled members of other parties and previously unorganized people.

Their ideological basis was even more tenuous than that of the "centralists": they relied almost entirely on primitive nationalist rhetoric and their revolt within the party was directed less against the "reformism" of both Messalists and centralists, as one of their statements said, than against political attitudes in general.

The armed struggle soon brought about a series of realignments. In the beginning of 1955, an "Algerian Liberation Front" was formed in Cairo by representatives of the three tendencies of the MTLD: Ahmed Mezerna for the Messalists, Hussein Lahouel for the centralists, and Ahmed Ben Bella and Mohammed Khider for the CRUA.

Soon, however, the Messalists were eliminated from the "Front" (according to some reports, Mezerna is imprisoned in Cairo), while the ex-CRUA leaders and the centralists were jointly taking the leadership of what had become the "National Liberation Front" (FLN).

Soon national-reformism had completely disappeared in its traditional form and as an independently organized current—but only to re-emerge in a new shape.

The first to disappear were the centralists. They had arrived at a gradualist position at a time when this position had become untenable, and when the traditional reformist party, the UDMA, more solidly organized than they, was compelled by events to publicly recognize its bankruptcy.

In July 1955 Khouane, the centralist leader, was still calling for an "autonomous" Algerian Republic; by November, he wrote in *Combat*:

"A year ago, I could have told you precisely what we stood for. This is no longer possible. If the French government appealed to us for negotiations, we could not easily answer its appeal, as

(Turn to last page)

Partners in Crime: Basic Politics — —

(Continued from page 1)

monumental History of the Russian Revolution down to the brilliant Stalin on which he was working when he was felled by the assassin's pick-ax, his work was a model of painstaking accuracy combined with penetrating insight and an unsurpassed grasp of the sweep of history.

When his last book, Stalin, was published after his death (and after it had been suppressed during the war years by a State Department which feared it might offend the gallant democratic ally, Stalin), there was a tendency for the critics—good, solid bourgeois experts on Russia and its "Communism"—to treat the book with condescension. In virtually every anti-Stalinist review, there was a combination of praise with the hint, or assertion, that the book was basically flawed by the "personal bitterness" of a writer who had been defeated by Stalin.

Khrushchev's revelations indicate that Trotsky, far from exaggerating Stalin's narrowness, vindictiveness and brutality, bent over backward to give as cautious and conservative an estimate of this side of Stalin's character as was consistent with the verifiable historical material at hand!

TYPICAL FALSIFICATION

Given the general character of Khrushchev's speech, perhaps the most striking and even amazing portion of it was that in which, in a few paragraphs, he brushed aside the whole rationale for the Stalinist purge-system and for the police-state in general which has been standard for the world Stalinist movement and its vast periphery for twenty years.

"We must affirm," he said, "that the party had fought a serious fight against the Trotskyites, rightists and bourgeois nationalists, and that it disarmed ideologically all the enemies of Leninism. . . . The party led a great political ideological struggle against those in its own ranks who proposed anti-Leninist theses, who represented a political line hostile to the party and to the cause of socialism. This was a stubborn and difficult fight but a necessary one, because the political line of both the Trotskyite-Zinovievite bloc and of the Bukharinites led actually toward the restoration of capitalism and capitulation to the world bourgeoisie. . . ."

"Worth noting is the fact that even

during the progress of the furious ideological fight against the Trotskyites, the Zinovievites, the Bukharinites and others, extreme repressive measures were not used against them. The fight was on ideological grounds. But some years later when socialism in our country was fundamentally constructed, when the exploiting classes were generally liquidated, when the Soviet social structure had radically changed, when the social basis for political movements and groups hostile to the party had violently contracted, when the ideological opponents of the party were long since defeated politically, then the repression directed against them began."

The assertion that the fight against Trotsky and his allies was won in a clean-cut ideological struggle, and that the repressions against the opposition began only in 1935, is a typical Stalinist falsification of history.

Thousands of oppositionists lost their jobs; thousands were exiled. The press was closed to opposition writers, and meetings at which they attempted to speak were invaded by truck-loads of Stalinist gopps who broke them up. The only kernel of truth to Khrushchev's assertion was that wholesale murder was not yet used.

But the real point which Khrushchev is making in the above passage and what follows it was that there was absolutely no objective political justification for the vast purges which followed in 1936-38. By that time the oppositions had been defeated and isolated, by fair means or foul. The "Soviet social structure had radically changed," in the sense that the bureaucracy had clearly established and consolidated its rule over the rest of the population.

Khrushchev does not even bother to mention one of the chief "arguments" in the arsenal of Stalinist apologetics for the great purges: the "capitalist encirclement."

He simply ridicules Stalin's "theory" that the closer Russian society gets to "socialism," the more it will be endangered by the internal subversion of desperate "hostile elements."

But if there was no "justification" for them, even in the way in which a reactionary regime may seek to justify its repressions by reference to the revolutionary ferment which surrounds it, what

Gov't Rests Case on ISL — —

(Continued from page 6)

it may be. We are asking you to find that the organizations are not Communist within the meaning of the Executive Order."

MORRISSEY: "It is my judgement it is covered in the order and in order that you will have the record, your motion will be denied on that part."

The question did not rest at this point, however. Rauh continued to press on clarification of the meaning of Morrissey's ruling:

"To complete the record, I make the same motion with respect to the words 'seeking to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means,' within the meaning of Executive Orders 9835 and 10450."

MORRISSEY: "The motion will be denied for the same reasons as the denial on the first motion."

REVIEW DISPUTE

This opened up the original discussion raised by the organizations' attorneys at the very opening of the hearings in 1955, namely, just what definitions was the government relying on in charging the organizations with being Communist.

Rauh asked that in view of the finding, the examiner tell the organizations which definition of Communist he relied on, or what he meant by Communist. Morrissey responded by saying: "Well, I think I will call on counsel for the Government to make that definition for the purposes of the record, if it is not already in there."

But the government attorneys would not state any definition except to refer to the early record of 1955 when the first conflict broke out over the meaning and definition of "large C" and "small c" Communist. Government attorney Madrix claimed that the government had

already defined it enough.

He then cited from a dissenting Supreme Court decision written by Chief Justice Vinson in the Joint Anti-Fascist Committee case that under the procedure of the attorney general, it is not necessary to have precise definition as in a court procedure:

"The description 'Communist' is adequate for purposes of the inquiry and listing and not as much precision of definition is necessary as criminal prosecution might require."

This, of course, was not the point of the view of the Supreme Court majority in that case when it ordered that hearings be given organizations before listing them. But in accordance with the entire procedure of the attorney general's office in this matter, the government relies precisely on weak and loose definition, just as it has relied upon imprecise, misread and misunderstood "evidence."

Following further discussion of the matter, the hearing examiner finally closed the matter by saying: "The record may show that the examiner refused to comply with counsel's request."

And thus all the preliminary matters were disposed of and the organizations proceeded to present their case with their chief witness, Max Shachtman, national chairman of the Independent Socialist League.

In the time that remained for the session, the direct examination of Shachtman was largely biographical, both personal and political. In this part of the testimony Shachtman went over familiar material on his expulsion from the Communist Party, the formation of the Trotskyist movement, the split in 1940, and the formation of the organizations now listed.

The heart of the testimony begins tomorrow.

is Khrushchev's explanation for the introduction of the purges as a standard feature of Stalinism? Where were Khrushchev, Molotov, Mikoyan, Kaganovich, Bulganin, Voroshilov and the rest while the regime was torturing and slaughtering both its opponents and tens of thousands of its ardent supporters?

Khrushchev handled this delicate question as best he could in the speech. His story has one major devil in addition to Stalin—Beria. The picture he tries to paint is one of a top leadership cleverly divided and intimidated by Stalin and Beria, kept in ignorance of much that was going on, and the like.

But even while making his apology, Khrushchev admitted far more than he thought.

He placed the period at which Stalin "rose above the party" and its top committees at the exact time when he had liquidated the last vestige of the opposition. Khrushchev said that many of the leaders were not able to appreciate what was going on because, after all, "Stalin, after Lenin's death, especially during the first years, actively fought for Leninism against the enemies of Leninist theory and against those who deviated. . . . At that time Stalin gained great popularity, sympathy and support. The party had to fight those who attempted to lead the country away from the correct Leninist path; it had to fight Trotskyites, Zinovievites and rightists, and the bourgeois nationalists. This fight was indispensable."

BOUND BY COMPLICITY

The truth of the matter is clear enough for those who can read and remember. Stalin bound his clique to him in the struggle against the oppositions. He saw to it that all were implicated in the fabrications, falsifications and repressions directed at the party's revolutionary minority.

Those Communists who were weary of the struggle for socialism had been moving imperceptibly in the direction of the consolidation and institutionalization of the role and privileges of the bureaucratic stratum of Russian society. They rallied around Stalin as their most able and ruthless leader in the fight to liquidate the democratic vestiges and the ideological heritage of the October revolution.

Thus they were bound to Stalin by their own crimes against the revolution and the revolutionaries, and by their class-conditioned support of the fundamental premises and direction of movement of Stalin's regime.

When, as is quite possible, this one or that one was horrified or revolted by some particularly brutal and senseless measure proposed by Stalin, or was made fearful that his head might be next on the chopping bloc, he was in no position to resist. Personal safety lay only in the direction of doing Stalin's bidding with a will. And safety for the regime of the bureaucracy lay only in the perpetuation of the suppression of the majority, of the mass of the people.

Stalin loved this repression with the sensual delight of a Hitler. Others may have found it an unpleasant necessity. The fact is that neither Khrushchev in his speech, nor any of his colleagues, has even hinted at the idea that this repression should be ended.

ROLE OF AN IKON

While deposing Stalin, Khrushchev knows very well that a class regime such as he heads in Russia needs an ideological cover if it is to remain in power. Lenin—a shadow-Lenin, not the real Lenin—is the new godhead to which all are to pay homage henceforth, and in whose name the ruling class will promulgate its edicts of the future.

His speech is sprinkled with references to Lenin and Leninism. All of Stalin's crimes flow from the fact that he departed from Leninism. His "contributions" in the early days were made in "defense of Leninism." And the speech ends with the peroration: "Long live the victorious banner of our party—Leninism!"

The Stalinist bureaucracy is not without its slyness. They know that any serious revolutionary opposition in Russia is likely to appeal to the masses in the name of a "return to Lenin." Many of the student oppositional nuclei whose existence became known after the great strike in the

Vorkuta concentration camps had some such idea in their organizational titles. Khrushchev hopes to pull the sting from such an approach in advance by making the name of Lenin the iconographic symbol of his own regime.

Thus Stalin began too.

Clever as this device may be, it will not suffice to guarantee the stability or longevity of the Khrushchev era of the Stalinist system. The demotion of Molotov, hints scattered throughout Khrushchev's speech which can easily be used in the future against Molotov, Kaganovich, Voroshilov, Malenkov and others, give empirical evidence of the continued struggle for power inside the top bureaucracy.

If this bureaucracy presided over a stable and contented society, the probability would be that the struggle for power at the top could be resolved without major social and political repercussions. To resolve it in this manner is the objective of the bureaucracy, and the revelations about the Stalin era are made in pursuit of this objective.

But they reckon without their host. In the satellites, the pressure has already led beyond the strict bounds which the Russian bureaucracy is seeking to place on the re-evaluation of the past. The pressures against the bureaucracy may build up more slowly in the imperial center, but may prove far more explosive in the long run.

Algeria — —

(Continued from page 7)

we do not know any longer what we represent. We have been completely outflanked by the partisan leaders."

Within the same month, the centralist tendency ceased to exist officially and its leaders had joined the political leaders of the partisan army.

Little by little, all other tendencies that could be described as "national-reformist" of one kind or another, followed the same evolution.

REALIGNMENT

First all the "moderate" representatives in the Second Chamber of the Algerian Parliament, which in the past had supported the French administration on all important issues, resigned one after the other and declared that the partisan leaders were alone qualified to represent the Algerian people.

Then, in January 1956, the association of ulemas published a manifesto which declared that the responsibility for the Algerian war rested with the colonial system and its supporters, and concluded by declaring that "it is not possible to solve the Algerian question in a lasting and peaceful manner except by solemnly and unequivocally recognizing: the free existence of the Algerian nation, its specific personality, its national government, its sovereign Legislative Assembly, within the framework of respect for everyone's rights."

Finally, at the end of April, the UDMA which had held out longest, spectacularly joined the "National Liberation Front" in the form of its two leaders, Ferhat Abbas and Ahmed Francis, taking a plane to Cairo to join the FLN.

Ferhat Abbas declared: "There are no more parties, no more tendencies in Algeria, only a united people which fights and resists colonialism. I am part of this people."

Ahmed Francis declared: "There is no longer any possibility of mediation by moderate groups. There is only a national front including at the same time the soldiers of the Liberation Army and the representatives of the old Algerian parties or groups. No one shall succeed in dividing us."

With the leaders of the UDMA were sheikh Tawfik El Medani and sheikh Abbas, both of the association of ulemas, which thus formally joined the "Front de Liberation Nationale." This completed the evolution by which the national-reformist elements had merged, within the FLN, with the direct-actionist tendency of the CRUA.

Next week — André Giacometti concludes this picture of the Algerian Liberation Movement with an up-to-date account of the current struggle between its two wings.