

# Where's the Proof Of Nagy's 'Guilt'?

See Page 3

# THE MILITANT

PUBLISHED WEEKLY IN THE INTERESTS OF THE WORKING PEOPLE

Vol. XXII—No. 26

222

NEW YORK, N. Y., MONDAY, JUNE 30, 1958

Price 10c

## Debate Over Socialist Political Action

By Harry Ring

One central issue dominated the United Independent-Socialist Election Conference held in New York June 13-15. Should socialists stand in clear-cut opposition to the Republicans and Democrats or should they support and work inside the Democratic party? The great majority of the conference sponsors and delegates recorded themselves in favor of militant socialist opposition to the two capitalist parties. In taking this stand the conference collided with the policy advocated by the leadership of the Communist party which strongly favors trying to work inside the Democratic Party.

The fact that the conference took a decisive stand on the issue by no means ends the debate. The CP leadership is continuing to marshal arguments against the idea of independent socialist political action and in support of its pro-Democratic party "coalition" policy.

The case for "coalition" has been put forward in a discussion article by Clarence Hathaway in the June 22 Worker and by Arnold Johnson in the June issue of Political Affairs.

Hathaway poses the issue as "a real and serious" one that "involves the question of the effectiveness of the entire Left in working among the broad masses of the people to win them away from the old parties and for a socialist solution to present day problems . . ." The starting point of his analysis is the fact that the labor, Negro and farmers' movements "are pretty well tied to the

apron strings of the old parties, mainly the Democratic, by tradition and through their conservative leaders."

This is a fair enough statement of the problem. The labor movement and its allies are presently tied to the capitalist parties. How then are socialists to help break them away and win them to a socialist program? According to Hathaway, while popular sentiment for a break with the capitalist parties is at its lowest ebb, there is a new and progressive development now beginning to take place which can provide the basis for an ultimate mass break away from the capitalist parties. The "new" ingredient presented by Hathaway is a "growing (but still only 'growing') feeling that labor must have more voice in formulating the platform and selecting the candidates of the Democratic party." (Emphasis in original.)

If socialists will only forget the idea of acting like socialists in the elections, he argues, and devote their energies to seeing that this "new" sentiment "is developed and encouraged," then on the basis of the fight for a greater voice in the Democratic party, "the quicker will come the disillusionment of these people in the old parties and real foundations laid for

(Continued on Page 2)

## Who Says "It Can't Happen"



This air view shows the gaping pit left by the accidental explosion of eight Nike missiles in Middletown, N. J. Seven persons were killed instantly when one of the missiles exploded and touched off seven more in a chain reaction. Previously, officials had assured that the set-up was accident-proof.

## War Threat In Lebanon Continues

By Myra Tanner Weiss  
JUNE 25 — The civil war in Lebanon grows sharper. The U. S. Sixth Fleet hovers menacingly nearby in the Mediterranean with marines ready for combat. U. S. helicopters flutter about Beirut, the capital. And United Nations "observers" slink around the Lebanese borders looking for Arab "infiltrators."

John Foster Dulles, June 23, briefed a Senate committee on the crisis in Lebanon. According to Senator John Sparkman (D-Ala.), the Secretary of State said that "almost daily for three weeks there has been the fear that the spark might come which would ignite a chain of events which might involve our forces." According to Sparkman, Dulles "obviously hopes we will not have to intervene."

What will U. S. marines be fighting for in Lebanon if Dulles "hopes" are not realized and the U. S. goes to war in the Middle East, either in its own name or under the U.N. banner as in Korea?

The Lebanese crisis was precipitated by President Camille Chamoun's announcement of his intention of changing the Lebanese constitution so that he could serve another six-year term. Chamoun, however, isn't that popular. He is an agent in the Arab world of U. S. foreign policy. On May 10 opposition to the President expressed itself in street battles. Today the country is torn apart with civil strife.

**ATTACK EXPECTED**  
The Lebanese government expects a major attack from the rebels tomorrow. The N. Y. Times reports today, "For four days women and children have been moving out of areas along Basta Street in the center of the city (Beirut). This is the area that harbors most of the rebels. Barricades that have barred the Basta area since the revolt began have been supplemented by concrete pillboxes . . . Hundreds of armed men have filtered into the Basta area from outside Beirut recently."

"Kamal Jumblatt, rebel leader of the sect of Druses a few miles southeast of Beirut, is said to have sent in several hundred men," the Times report continues. "Traveling as simple workmen or peasants, they can carry pistols inside their belts . . ."

In growing desperation, Chamoun is expected to ask the U. S. or the United Nations for troops to keep him in power.

The UN Security Council debated whether or not partisans of the United Arab Republic were "infiltrating" across the Lebanese borders to add to Chamoun's woes. But there can be no debate over threatened U.S. intervention into a civil war within an Arab country and among the Arab people.

## Lebanon's Civil War



Rebel in Tripoli resists assault of government troops. On June 7 a pitched battle raged in this section of the city, controlled by the rebels. The government of Chamoun attacked with tanks, planes and artillery. The United States has been supplying weapons to the unpopular regime.

## U.S. Military Bases Abroad

An Editorial

Efforts of the U.S. military to further encircle the Soviet Union with a world network of long-range missile bases is meeting strong popular opposition abroad. More than 48% of the people in six European countries and Japan are against having these bases in their countries and only 22% are in favor of them, according to a recent survey by the New York Herald Tribune World Poll.

In West Germany, 54% of those queried opposed the bases. Seven percent were in favor of them and 29% were undecided.

In Japan, the poll ran 44% against the bases and 9% in favor. In Denmark, 58% said "no," and 18% "yes." In Sweden it was 46% against and 23% for. In Italy 39% opposed the bases and 30% favored them and in Great Britain the poll showed a 40-40 split, with 20% undecided.

The main reason why most of those queried were opposed to the bases is that they recognize that the missile buildup serves only to increase the war danger. They obviously have not been convinced by the U.S. propaganda claim that missile bases are needed to deter the Soviets from allegedly launching war.

Equally significant is a further reason given in all countries polled for opposing the bases. This is the fear of becoming a U.S. "satellite." In fact, in Sweden this was found to be the principal reason for wanting no part of the bases.

This strong sentiment against the suicidal arms buildup is obviously cause for concern for the cold-war architects in Washington. But it should be warmly greeted by the American people who have no more stake in the plans for war against the Soviet Union than do the people of the rest of the world.

In fact the American people should reinforce this world peace sentiment by demanding that the international network of U.S. missile bases be dismantled and that the American troops be brought back home.

## Court Restores Jim Crow in Little Rock HS Gives Legal Formula That Can Nullify Supreme Court Decision

JUNE 25 — On June 21 Federal District Judge Harry J. Lemley ordered the expulsion of all Negro students from Little Rock's Central High School and the "postponement" of any integration moves in that city until 1961. This decision comes against the background of a steady slow-down in school desegregation.

The high point of desegregation came in 1955 when school districts covering almost 6% of the Negro children affected by the Supreme Court decision took desegregation steps. Next September the figure dropped below 3%. September 1957 saw it slump to 1%. Moreover each mid-year there had been some desegregation for the second term. But this past mid-year not a single school district announced second semester desegregation.

### JIM-CROW WEAPON

Judge Lemley's decision, if allowed to stand, will give the white supremacists the legal weapon for killing all school desegregation attempts in the Deep South and for possible re-segregation in the border states. The Little Rock decision simply puts into legal language the racist vows that "You can't force integration on us," and Eisenhower's argument that "First you have to change the hearts of men." It declares the opponents of integration in Little Rock had prevented normal education at Central High, therefore integration must be ended for at least two and a half years.

Heretofore whenever opponents had obstructed the operation of a law or Constitutional provision, U.S. judges have ordered them punished and the



Ernest Green, first Negro to graduate from Little Rock High School, Ark. Unless reversed, the federal district court decision restoring segregation means the other eight Negro students will have to return to a Jim Crow school.

law upheld. In this case of Negro children's rights, the court has upheld the law's opponents and ordered the law (school desegregation) suspended.

Judge Lemley's formula would give the racists a fool-proof system for stopping

school integration. Where Negro children finally made their way through the jungle of legal obstruction into a lilywhite school, the racists would merely have to stage riots and disturbances within and without the schools. This would constitute legal "proof" that the normal educational process was being disrupted because of integration. At the end of the two-and-a-half years suspension, the same procedure would be repeated to "prove" integration still impossible.

### RACISTS JUBILANT

No wonder Gov. Faubus, the White Citizens Council and the Democratic Party machine throughout the South are jubilant. Last September they suffered defeat when nation-wide, indeed world-wide, pressure forced Eisenhower to open the doors of Central High to nine Negro students with federal troops. Now they believe that defeat has been canceled out.

The Little Rock case was watched carefully by everyone — white or colored — in the South. It became the test of the Supreme Court decision. Defeat of integration in Little Rock cannot but tremendously embolden all racists. The lessons they have drawn from it already is that it pays to riot and beat and kick Negroes as was done before Central High.

(Continued on Page 4)

## New Strikes Break Out At Chrysler TV Networks Fire Two For Defying Witch Hunt

By Henry Gitano

JUNE 25 — Members of the United Automobile Workers took "unauthorized" strike action last week against two Chrysler Corporation plants. The union's contract with the company expired June 1, and work has proceeded without contract since then. The Corporation's Maywood assembly plant in California was shut down when 200 workers walked off the job. They protested foremen's reports to the company against 23 workers who had left their posts to complain against a line speed-up from 38 to more than 40 cars per hour.

Tom Smith, president of UAW Local 230 whose members work at the plant, said other grievances were also involved including a three-day suspension of chief steward John Seko, who led the protest against speed-up and against management attempts to cut down grievance-handling time previously allowed to plant committees.

About 400 members of UAW Local 1245 of the Redstone Jupiter missile plant in Detroit, struck in protest over company attempts to freeze out the union through discrimination in hiring and overtime procedures. The 400 are the only union members out of about 4,500 working at the plant. Picket lines were placed at 16 entrances to plant parking lots, causing a traffic jam which backed cars up for a mile or more in the area.

The strikers have refused the request of their local president, Milan Matich, to return to work. The union's Chrysler department, temporarily under the direction of Walter P. Reuther, UAW president, ordered the workers back on the jobs. Emil Mazey, secretary-treasurer of the UAW, has threatened to place an administrator in charge of the local.

NEW YORK, June 25 — All 18 witnesses appearing here before a subcommittee of the House Un-American Activities Committee on June 18-19, boldly defied the witch-hunters who attempted to pry into their alleged political beliefs and associations; most refused to give more than their names, one refused to give the committee the time of day, all the witnesses used the First (free speech) or Fifth (no self-incrimination) amendment in refusing to answer questions.

Because they refused to cooperate with the inquisitors, headed by Rep. Morgan Moulder (D-Mo.), Charles Dubin, a director at NBC and Joseph Papp, a stage manager at CBS were immediately deprived of their livelihood by the networks.

Joseph Papp, stage manager of the Garry Moore TV show "I've Got a Secret" and founder-producer of the widely acclaimed Shakespeare Festival was asked by Moulder if he had the opportunity to inject communist ideas into his Shakespearean productions.

**DID SHAKESPEARE CARRY A CARD?**  
This evoked a burst of laughter from the spectators in the hearing room and a vigorous reply from Mr. Papp: "When Shakespeare says, 'This above all: to thine own self be true,' would that be subversive? His plays speak for themselves."

Acting outraged, Richard Arens, chief counsel and hatchet man for the committee, blustered: "No suggestion has been made here that William Shakespeare promoted a Communist line. You are trying to twist the questions to make it appear that Shakespeare might be listed as a subversive."

Papp was asked "If communism is not subversive, why is it wrong to name them?" His ready reply was: "There is a blacklisting in industry which keeps people from working and this is terribly unfair."  
After the "hearing" Papp reported for work at CBS. A superior handed him a plain

(Continued on Page 4)

## Cold-Warriors Exploit Murder of Nagy

By Herman Chauka

Speared by the bi-partisan cold warriors in Washington, world capitalism is utilizing its propaganda machine to capitalize to the fullest on the international revulsion and indignation created by the Kremlin-ordered murder of Imre Nagy in Hungary.

At his press conference following the announcement of the execution, Eisenhower, who has constantly sought to resist world pressure for a liquidation of the cold war, was quick to piously declare: "The whole thing has been a very great setback to my hopes . . . I think the whole sense of shock to the free world is going to be a very great obstacle to further [summit negotiations]."

### SELWYN LLOYD SMIRKS

In Great Britain, where the Tory government has also stubbornly bucked strong popular pressure for summit negotiations, Foreign Secretary Selwyn Lloyd cynically asserted: "Our caution is now, perhaps, a little better understood."

Back in the U. S., both houses of Congress joined in seizing on the execution as a new stick for pounding the anti-Soviet drum. A resolution

jointly sponsored by Hubert Humphrey (D-Minn.) and William F. Knowland (R-Calif.) hypocritically declared "deep indignation" at the "barbarism and perfidy" of the killing. The resolution was unanimously adopted by a Congress that has given billions of dollars with open hesitation to aid blood-stained despots across the globe.

While pretending horror, U.S. politicians could scarcely conceal their glee at the manner in which the Nagy affair had offered them a handle to repair some of their devastated international prestige. Increasingly, in the past several years, millions of people throughout the world have come to recognize the U. S. ruling class as the real source of the war danger. Its claims of defending freedom everywhere have rung hollow to these millions because of the brutal suppression of Negro rights in America.

According to a June 25 Washington dispatch to the New York Times, "United States government specialists believe the execution . . . may have turned the tables in the East-West propaganda war in favor of the West."

"In many areas," the specialists note, "the Soviet Union

succeeded in projecting a picture of itself as reasonable and peace-loving, and of the United States as belligerent and unwilling to negotiate. . . . The United States Information Agency is therefore publicizing the execution of Mr. Nagy and related events by every possible means."

### SOCIALIST OPPOSITION

As opposed to the imperialists who seek to exploit the affair as a cold-war weapon, increasing numbers of Soviet partisans have denounced the executions as gross violation of socialist principle. They are convinced that this crime can only encourage further Kremlin outrages and slow American imperialism to capitalize on the crimes for its own reactionary, anti-Soviet objectives.

In this country, the pro-socialist weekly, the National Guardian, in its June 23 issue, declared editorially: ". . . we can only regard the execution of Imre Nagy and his colleagues in the October uprising as shocking and appalling. We have long campaigned against the death sentence and political death sentences certainly seem to us no exception. That the men should have been tried,

convicted and executed in secret . . . is appalling to us in another sense. To portray the Hungarian people as 'unanimously and deeply satisfied' with the executions is barbaric journalism. We reject the argument that comment such as this may be unwarranted interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign state. Such an argument might just as easily have been raised in the fight to keep Ethel and Julius Rosenberg from going to the electric chair . . ."

"The first job is to fight against the pessimism being peddled by the hypocrites in high places . . . as to the possibility of dealing with 'those whose hands are stained with blood.' All hands are stained with blood — whether they have triggered napalm bombs in Korea, electric torture in Algeria or in the rifles of a firing squad in Budapest . . ."

An article by staff writer Elmer Bendiner on "The 'Crimes' for which Imre Nagy was killed" declares in part: "It was dismaying to find the socialist countries still using the methods of secret trial and secret executions after the 'excesses' of earlier years had

been so thoroughly condemned. It was still more disheartening to find socialists seeking to kill ideas by killing those who hold them."

### 'DANGEROUS THOUGHTS'

In a dispatch from Britain, Konni Zilliacus, Labor member of Parliament, writes in the same issue: "In practice, the Soviet, Chinese and other Communist leaders are, in the long run, hardly more likely to be successful in stifling 'dangerous' thoughts . . . and imposing limits to freedom in their own countries than Dulles, Macmillan and the other defenders of the old order will be in the west."

This reaction by Zilliacus seemed to express a general seething indignation in the British labor and radical movement. The most dramatic reflection of this sentiment came when Arthur Horner, a long-time Stalinist die-hard in the British Communist Party leadership, and general-secretary of the National Union of Mine-workers, vigorously assailed the execution in public statements.

"This is horrifying, absolutely horrifying," Horner is reported as declaring. "I can't keep quiet any longer." Stating

(Continued on Page 3)

# 'State-Department Socialists' Fuse

By Frances James

The Socialist Party-Social Democratic Federation at its national convention, May 31-June 3, finally decided to recognize that the Independent Socialist League is acceptable in the circle of "democratic socialists." The majority resolution on unity recommended taking the ISL membership into the party-federation. (Final decision on unity was referred to a national membership referendum.)

By "democratic socialist" these people mean lending "socialist" cover to a pro-State-Department program. The SP-SDF 1957 convention resolution demanded "no appeasement of the Communist imperialism" and came out for "democratically established military agencies" to "guard against the military drive of the Communist dictators."

The 1958 convention resolution contains essentially the same program and is touted as the means "to restore worldwide confidence in our American concern for peace."

Essentially the same line is presented in an article, "For A Democratic Foreign Policy" printed in the May 19 Labor Action, newspaper of the ISL. It criticizes the State Department for its "negative anti-communism" and complains that "the struggles of the subjugated peoples of Eastern Europe for freedom from the Stalinist empire" have not resulted in their "flocking to support of U. S." It complains further that "Even at the time of the great crisis in the Stalinist empire — Hungary — American policy was helpless to exploit the crisis." The ISLers do not fight American Big Business as the source of the war danger, but oppose its policies as not effective enough in combating what they consider to be the main danger in the world — namely, the Soviet Union.

The June 16 Labor Action pretends that the 1958 SP-SDF position is a development to the left from that of 1957 — a "change from one spirit to another, totally different in tone." The ISL needs to claim a "change" in the SP-SDF program to help justify its dissolution into the SP-SDF. Actually, the only noteworthy change is the acceptance by the SP-SDF of the ISL's pledge to dissolve its organization, put its paper, Labor Action, and its magazine, New International, at the disposal of the party-federation and work loyally for the program of State-Department socialism.

## ISL Electoral Policy

To advocate a "democratic foreign policy," ISL style, means to advocate "democratic socialism" at home, too — Democratic Party "socialism," that is. For a number of years, the ISL has ceased to consider socialist electoral activity as an important function of the socialist movement. Instead, it has advocated activity within such organizations as Americans for Democratic Action, the Liberal Party in New York and the AFL-CIO's COPE even though the major attention of these organizations has been on electioneering for Democratic Party candidates.

As a result, in June 1957, the ISL adopted the policy of not placing themselves "in the position of campaigning among workers to reject the advice of their unions in the midst of a political campaign." Concretely, the ISL holds that if the union leaders say "Vote for Mr. Democrat," socialists should not reply by saying "Do not vote for Mr. Democrat."

The electoral policy adopted by the recent SP-SDF convention endorses participation in primary elections of the capitalist parties — with the convention discussion emphasizing particularly the Democratic Party. The objection raised by the ISLers is not that this violates the principle of working class political independence. They object to socialists trying to run in the primaries as socialists. Labor Action is for getting into Democratic Party politics in support of the AFL-CIO bureaucracy's maneuvering rather than "finding some new device" for the SP-SDF's own electoral activity. With this line the ISLers find themselves supporting the right-wing of the SP-SDF in the electoral policy debate.

As can be seen, it isn't lack of political agreement that held up formal unity of the ISL and the SP-SDF. It was the question of renunciation of "Leninism." Those in the SP-SDF who opposed admission of the ISLers held that the ISL has not sufficiently repudiated Lenin, especially his conception of the character and role of a revolutionary party in the struggle for workers power. The majority held that the ISL has proved in action that it is anti-Leninist and that it can work in "comradely harmony with social democracy."

The ISL began its break with revolutionary socialism when its tendency, led by Max Shachtman, split with the Socialist Workers Party in 1940 over the question of defense of the Soviet Union and formed the Workers Party. Leon Trotsky and the SWP predicted at that time that their break with the first workers' state would lead them to abandon class-struggle politics and head them into the camp of social-democratic reformism. They have arrived at this point in their political evolution. They have proved to the satisfaction of the majority of the SP-SDF convention delegates that they are full-fledged social democrats. The SP-SDF referendum is expected to approve the unity.

# Nat'l Review Publisher Wiggles Out of Debate

NEW YORK, June 20 — The Socialist Party-Social Democratic Federation last night cooperated with the ultra-rightist National Review against other socialists to keep a spokesman for the anti-labor extremist magazine off a socialist platform. The Young Socialist, a monthly published at 144 Second Avenue, Manhattan, had scheduled a debate between its editor, Tim Wohlforth, and William Rusher, publisher of the National Review, on the subject: "Which Road for France: Gaullism or Socialism?" Rusher backed out of the debate at the last minute with the endorsement of the SP-SDF's state chairman and the editor of the Socialist Call.

Rusher sent a telegram to the meeting at the Great Northern Hotel reading: "I accepted the invitation of the Young Socialist to debate this evening under the impression that it was an organization approved by the Socialist Party, with which I violently disagree but whose good faith I have never questioned. I have never been advised, however, by Samuel Friedman, the state chairman of the Socialist Party, and Herman Singer, the editor of the Socialist Call, that the Young Socialist is not approved by the Socialist Party and in fact has no greater claim to the name 'socialist' than the Communist Party or the National Socialist of Germany. Accordingly, rather than participate in a debate that cannot be depended upon to meet

the ordinary tests of intellectual candor, I regretfully decline to debate at all." William Rusher.

Mr. Friedman verified by telephone that Mr. Rusher had quoted him correctly.

The debate was nonetheless held, with a chair on the platform left open for any who cared to defend the Gaullist point of view.

The meeting's chairman, Richard DeHaan, member of the Young Socialist Editorial Board and chairman of the Young Socialist Alliance, read a statement including the following: "On May 28, more than three weeks ago, James Robertson, Business Manager of the Young Socialist, and myself, met with Mr. Rusher in his office, subsequent to a telephoned proposal from us for this debate."

"Rusher asked specifically whether we had any connection with the Socialist Party-Social Democratic Federation. I specifically replied that we did not. Indeed, so emphatic was my reply, that Rusher felt obliged to comment on it. When I spoke to Rusher on the phone a little while ago, he could not manage to recall this incident."

Prof. Saul K. Padover, scheduled moderator of the debate, also absented himself after consultation with Mr. Rusher.

The report quotes party leader Benjamin Davis' statement to the conference that "Regardless of the outcome of the conference, the Communist Party would continue to fight for unity of the Left in association with all those who want such unity."

The Worker then infers that the possibility of achieving unity with the CP in the campaign was cut off when the conference registered its stand in favor of a full ticket rather than a single candidate on a platform limited to the peace issue such as the CP had urged.

The Worker says that "The die was cast Friday night in the opening session when Vincent Hallinan . . . urged a full slate of candidates on a 'socialist' ticket and launched a bitter attack on the Communist Party." And again "A heavy concentration of Trotskyites among the participants was the decisive factor in closing the door on unity of the left in the campaign."

(The June 23 National Guardian estimated the conference composition as follows: "Independents made up some 300 of

# They Favor a Full Socialist Slate

(We print below excerpts from speeches by three members of the presiding committee at the United Independent-Socialist Election Conference, held in New York, June 13-15. Speeches by Henry Abrams, a co-chairman of the conference, and by Muriel McAvoy were made at the opening session, Friday, June 13. John T. McManus' speech came at the Saturday morning session in presentation of the presiding committee's recommendation that the conference nominate a full slate of candidates for state offices.—Ed.)

## Muriel McAvoy

We are meeting here tonight, typically enough, to launch a new venture. Some of us are strangers who have never worked together on a common project. Some of us are old friends. Some of us are old enemies. We have all been through a period of defeat and of confusion, doubt and distrust. Probably all of us at one time or another have been guilty of bad temper, and hot words. Probably all too many of us have been equally guilty of not having fought hard enough for what we believed in.

We have all spent, in the last few years, a great deal of time at forums and symposiums, discussing with people of different views where we've gone wrong in the past, what different things we should do in the future. I think that many of us here tonight feel we should continue this debate about why we differ, but we should also act on the basis of the many points on which we are in agreement. For this is a time of mounting unemployment and social stress. And the mushroom shaped clouds are still hanging over the horizon. This is a time when the American people need to have pointed out to them the solution that socialism offers to the problems that we all face.

### AN IMPORTANT TEST

And there is no better way to reach Americans, no other way half as good, really, than through the medium of the old-fashioned radical election campaign. We in the Socialist Unity Forum, of which my husband was chairman, have long stubbornly believed in two things: in independent political action and in socialist unity. We are proud and happy tonight to see the launching of

this conference. It is the culmination of what we, along with many others, have been working for. For this is a highly important conference. Much depends upon the outcome of this first serious attempt to unite the left in a socialist campaign. We face an important test this weekend — the test of whether or not the left is yet ready to join in bringing our beliefs before the people of this state. Of whether, in spite of varying points of view, we can join to challenge the two old-party machines head-on. Of whether we can say to Tammany Hall as well as to Big Business, "You shall not have our connivance in your lies to the people of New York State."

We will vote tomorrow on matters as to whether or not we will have a full ticket, of which we all share the honor as well as the hard work before us. Is it possible that even now, even here, a majority will vote to sit out this campaign except perhaps in one or two Congressional districts? Or to reduce the campaign to a mild protest that will not offend the Democratic Party?

I have of course, thought a great deal recently about what my husband would have thought of this conference. But I think none of us who knew Cliff and worked with him could really doubt that he would have expected and wanted us to be here tonight. As well as most people, Cliff knew the self-sacrifice that goes into such an effort as the realization of a meeting like this. Specific tactical errors I am sure he would forgive us. But he would expect us to try to do all we can, to fight as hard as we can, to keep at it.

For if this conference fails in doing what it was called to do, if it is beguiled down the primrose path of coalition, let us face the fact that this will be a serious setback for us. If we fail, we disappoint people all across the country who are watching with eager hope. If we fail, we prejudice efforts for some time to come, and cast a shadow for forthcoming election years. And so we must not fail to achieve our goal for a full ticket of independent-socialist candidates.

## Henry Abrams

Friends, we are gathered here tonight and over the weekend to reach an agreement as to how we can in the



Muriel G. McAvoy and John T. McManus were members of the Presiding Committee at the United Independent-Socialist Election Conference held in New York June 13-15. Mrs. McAvoy was an early organizer for the Progressive Party. McManus is general manager of the National Guardian.

1958 election give the voter in New York State a chance not only to express his dissatisfaction with the two major parties and their Liberal Party replica but also to cast a positive vote on the great issues that face us. . . .

To clear up any misunderstanding as to our purpose, we are not trying to build a farmer-labor party. There is no sign that this is a realizable goal for 1958. Nor are we trying to form a new ideological party of socialism. We are trying to create, however, for those who have a basic agreement that our country would enjoy a happier, a more peaceful and more fruitful life under socialism, an organization where such people — regardless of doctrinaire differences of past decades — can act in concert around issues on which all can agree, leaving them free to discuss their differences in some other medium.

The committee in the course of the conference will submit some proposals arrived at with substantially unanimous consent. Matters on which no such consent was forthcoming were discarded. We proposed to challenge the two major parties at the polls with a socialist-oriented platform, with hard-hitting planks on immediate issues. The future of these proposals rests on your decision.

We believe that the people of our state deserve a better choice than a Rockefeller or a Harriman. . . .

In California, the Holland Roberts campaign proves that it can be done. Let us show our brothers in California that New York can do it too.

In closing, let me repeat that we are not here to settle longstanding doctrinal disputes. If anyone insists that he is the sole repository of political wisdom, he will not serve the best interests of this conference. But if everyone approaches our problems with tolerance, for views of others and with a flexibility designed to reach an agreement we can present the platform that not only gives immediate answers but also begins to indicate the only lasting cure for the nation's problems — socialism. . . .

## John T. McManus

For the benefit of the many who may not know the genesis of this effort [the United Independent-Socialist Conference], my temporary co-chairman, Mr. Henry Abrams and Mr. Morris Goldin, former executive officer of the American Labor Party, began to call

meetings in the early part of 1957 with the purpose of resumption of independent political action at some level. . . .

At the beginning of this year, my two colleagues resumed these conferences hoping to lead to independent political action. To the meetings were invited a wide spectrum of individuals, [as well as] members and leaders of the Communist Party, the Socialist Workers Party, the Socialist Labor Party and rank-and-file members of the Socialist Party and many others. . . .

In discussing what would go into the call and what would be taken up at this conference, the sponsoring committee felt that there was overwhelming proof that the machine parties had no difference on brink-of-war world positions and neither could or would establish the rights of the Negro people, the Puerto Rican people, the Mexican people or others making up our country's population to equal participation in the bounty and wealth which their labor produces and in the freedom which should be enjoyed equally by all.

### HARRIMAN RECORD

Both machine parties have been and are now parties of the witch hunt. This is specifically true of the present Democratic governor, Averell Harriman. It is also true of Harriman that he was one of the earliest architects of the cold war and that he has used the position of the office to which he was elected with the votes of independents and by the slimmest of margins to oppose a summit meeting and a coming to an understanding for peaceful competition between the reigning social systems in the world. He is a banker and a capitalist, and he has not been a traitor to his class. He is furthermore a true and unyielding anti-Soviet, unlike some at this conference who have been accused of this in some of the pre-conference polemics in our left press.

Correctly, I believe, assuming this situation in the machine parties, the sponsoring committee turned to the question of how to challenge the machines. All arguments were aired. But the final unanimous view was that the machine parties must be challenged where it hurts, where the contest between them is close, and where the independent voter holds the balance of power. . . .

In considering a single candidate — say for the post of

U.S. Senator — and the question of a full ticket including especially a candidate for governor, it was the considered opinion of the sponsoring committee that if the effort undertaken for one candidate were undertaken for all the candidates, [it would] thereby provide the voters of the state for future use, if they so desired, with a political instrument of their own, independent of the machine parties, devoted to the development of a socialist program for this country, inviting — not rejecting — the participation and concurrence of all the socialist groupings in the state.

### DISRESPECT FOR VOTERS

I now cite my own opinion . . . that a lesser effort — an effort for example to seek to put a single candidate on the ballot, that for U. S. Senator — in effect has embodied in it a kind of disrespect for the independent voter in the state.

It is as if to say that we do not dare or venture to put before the independent voter an opportunity to dislodge either one or the other political machine from power because he might use it, [because] he might create a political instrument to unbalance the present machine balance in the state.

Therefore it seems to me that the effort required to put on a campaign such as we would like to put on should not be limited to a single candidate as has been proposed but should be devoted to putting on the ballot alternatives that the voters of the state can be trusted to use with the great wisdom they have always shown, and this goes especially for the independent voters.

## London Bus Strike Settled

JUNE 20 — The strike of 50,000 London bus drivers came to an end today after nearly seven weeks of struggle. About 36,000 men will receive an increase of \$1.19 a week, allotted in arbitration before the strike. A new concession won will be a pay rise, unspecified as yet, for 700 drivers. In addition the pay of other drivers and conductors will be reviewed for "an upward trend in wage levels." Settlement of a London dockworkers strike is expected soon.

# ... CP Opposes United Socialist Election Policy

(Continued from Page 1)

a new party truly committed to the peoples' interests and to socialism.

In fact, Hathaway grandly promises, "By the Left staying with . . . such progressive forces . . . substantial progress could be made this year and by 1960 the forces of progress and Socialism could be a real power."

### NOTHING NEW

Before examining this promissory note, it is worth getting the facts straight about the "new" incipient demand by labor for a greater voice in the Democratic party. The fact is that the labor movement — or more precisely, its top leaders — have been making this demand for more than 20 years. They have responded to every proposal for independent political action with the argument that this would isolate the unions politically and that the only realistic course is to try to gain greater influence within the Democratic party. And, appearances in certain brief periods notwithstanding, the CP leadership has promoted this

view of the labor bureaucracy since 1936.

This policy of political class-collaboration is today known officially as the "people's anti-monopoly coalition." In 1936, the same course was pursued under the title of "people's front" or "popular front." How well has it worked up to now?

The CP's adoption of that policy in 1936, coinciding with a similar turn by the right-wing of the Socialist Party, marked a qualitative change in the state of the radical movement. What happened, in essence is that these tendencies swung behind the official labor leadership which had entered into a coalition with the Northern wing of the Democratic Party as part of the "New Deal."

The CP-Social-Democratic turn came as a sharp break with the long established tradition of the radical movement. Previously, regardless of all other differences, the movement was united on the elementary principle that socialists did not support capitalist

politicians. The break with this principle did not coincide with any dwindling of popular sentiment for independent working class political action. On the contrary, such sentiment was at its peak in the 1936-40 period.

In fact it was so deeply imbedded that in New York it was necessary to line up radical votes for the Democratic party by forming a new organization — the American Labor Party.

While many in the ALP saw the new organization as the first step toward a national labor party, this was by no means the views of its initiators who included Sidney Hillman of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, David Dubinsky of the International Ladies' Garment Workers as well as many union leaders who followed the line of the CP.

That Hillman saw the ALP as a device for coralling otherwise unavailable votes for Democratic nominees is candidly explained by his biographer, Matthew Josephson, who wrote:

# The Worker's Report of N.Y. Conference

The June 22 issue of the Worker carries an account by Erik Bert of the United Independent-Socialist Election Conference held in New York, June 13-15. The article seeks to portray the conference as one where the Communist Party fought for socialist unity in the coming New York election campaign but was defeated in its endeavors. Headlined, "CP presses for Unity of Left at N. Y. Election Conference," the article opens with the statement: "Unity of the left on a minimum basis in the 1958 New York election campaign was urged strongly, but in vain, by the Communist Party. . . ."

The report quotes party leader Benjamin Davis' statement to the conference that "Regardless of the outcome of the conference, the Communist Party would continue to fight for unity of the Left in association with all those who want such unity."

The Worker then infers that the possibility of achieving unity with the CP in the campaign was cut off when the conference registered its stand in favor of a full ticket rather than a single candidate on a platform limited to the peace issue such as the CP had urged.

The Worker says that "The die was cast Friday night in the opening session when Vincent Hallinan . . . urged a full slate of candidates on a 'socialist' ticket and launched a bitter attack on the Communist Party." And again "A heavy concentration of Trotskyites among the participants was the decisive factor in closing the door on unity of the left in the campaign."

(The June 23 National Guardian estimated the conference composition as follows: "Independents made up some 300 of

the attendance, with leaders and members of the Communist Party, Socialist Workers Party and Young Socialist Alliance estimated to make up the rest.")

Before that the Worker article states: "The conference, however, went on record for a full slate of candidates . . . on a 'socialist' program. It thus in effect closed the door on the further discussion the Communist Party had urged."

The crucial point of the conference, according to the Worker report, came when the delegates voted against an amendment that would have avoided registering the stand of the conference on whether to run a full state ticket or only one candidate. The Worker says: "Following defeat of the amendment a Communist spokesman reiterating the position presented earlier by Benjamin J. Davis . . . indicated

that the decision had closed the door on further discussion."

However, as the Worker itself reports further down, the conference took a clear-cut stand in favor of keeping the door open to negotiations with the CP and others to enlist their support for the campaign. In electing a continuations committee, the conference voted unanimously that the committee be empowered to add to its own membership and to "explore all avenues of enlisting the participation of additional socialist and independent forces in a united independent-socialist campaign."

If, as the Worker seems to say, the door is really closed to unity, it is the Communist Party leaders who have closed it. This, notwithstanding Benjamin Davis' statement that the Communist Party would work for unity of the Left "regardless of the outcome of the conference."

inating capitalist-party candidates on its line.

In the final days of the ALP when other forces pressed successfully for independent candidacies, the CP leadership gave formal endorsement while actually throwing their votes to the Democrats. The bid by Clifford T. McAvoy for Mayor in 1953 and John T. McManus for Governor in 1954 are cases in point.

In all basic respects, the CP attitude toward the Progressive Party was the same. Originally it viewed the PP as a means of bringing pressure on the Democratic party through the candidacy of Henry Wallace, who, like all other capitalist politicians, quickly proved he had no intention of turning against his class.

After Wallace's desertion, the CP leaders rejected the argument that, since those remaining in the PP were virtually all pro-socialist, it should adopt a pro-socialist program. By the time of the 1952 presidential campaign for Vincent Hallinan, the CP had lost all enthusiasm for the PP because it failed to hold the capitalist elements represented by Wallace and gave but token support to Hallinan while again hustling votes for the Democrats with the double-talking slogan that the Republicans were the "main danger." Shortly afterward the CP leadership decided the PP experience was a "left-sectarian" adventure, moved in to scuttle it along with the ALP, and announced the need for concentrating on the Democratic Party to build the "anti-monopoly coalition."

The result of this 22-year experience in "coalition" politics is painfully clear. From the time when the New Deal turned into the war deal in 1938, labor has not won a single major piece of progressive social legislation. But it did get Taft-Hartley and the current anti-labor drive. With the support of the labor leadership in its vast pocket, the northern liberal wing of the Democratic party has felt free to continue its alliance with the Dixiecrats thus blocking the movement for civil rights. Korea, the cold war and the witch hunt

round out the score.

The results in terms of educating the workers and Negro people to the need for a break with the two-party system has been equally dismal. The wide socialist sentiment of the 1930's has been largely dissipated, and the strong rank-and-file demands of that period in the UAW and other unions for a labor party has also been beaten down.

This 22-year period of the stifling of the consciousness of the working class clearly dictates not a course of more of the same but a complete break by all those who are serious about building a socialist movement. The socialist movement has the opportunity of again becoming a meaningful force in this country. But experience shows that it won't do it in the Democratic party.

## Stalin's School Of Quotations

Both Clarence Hathaway and Arnold Johnson try to smear independent sponsors of the united independent-socialist ticket as linked with "anti-Soviet Trotskyites." Johnson goes so far as to make the vile charge that in the SWP program "one finds the infamous, 'Project X' and Allen Dulles' program!" As "proof," he offers the following: "This Socialist Workers Party placed an ad in the National Guardian calling for a United Socialist Ticket and listed planks including 'aid to the countries of the Soviet orbit who are fighting for their freedom.'"

This is the text of the plank as it appeared in the Feb. 3 National Guardian: "Replace the bi-partisan, cold-war, imperialist foreign policy of the Democrats and Republicans with a socialist policy of friendship and aid to the countries of the Soviet orbit and the colonial peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America who are fighting for their freedom."

Subscription: \$3 per year; \$1.50 for 6 months. Foreign: \$4.50 per year; \$2.25 for 6 months. Canadian: \$3.50 per year; \$1.75 for 6 months. Bundle orders: 5 or more copies 6c each in U.S.; 7c each in foreign countries.

THE MILITANT

Published Weekly in the Interests of the Working People THE MILITANT PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION 116 University Pl., N.Y. 3, N.Y. Phone: AL 5-7460 Editor: DANIEL ROBERTS Business Manager: BEATRICE ALLEN

Signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the Militant's policies. These are expressed in its editorials.

Entered as second class matter March 7, 1944 at the Post Office at New York, N.Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.

Vol. XXII—No. 26

Monday, June 30, 1958

Hungary: 1. Where's the Proof?

A communique by the official Hungarian news agency announced the executions of Nagy, Maletier et al, and detailed charges of subversion, treason, conspiracy with fascist and imperialist elements, etc., etc. ad nauseam, of which they had been found guilty.

But who can believe in the truth of the charges or the justice of the verdict? The trial was secret! (A fact that the Worker article (June 22) reporting the executions "neglected" to mention.)

After the Moscow Trials, after the Rajk, Slansky, Kostov frame-ups in East Europe, after the "irrefutable" evidence of the Jewish Doctors' Plot repudiated at the last moment, and after the Khrushchev revelations, could any politically conscious worker anywhere in the world help but scrutinize carefully a political trial in the Soviet orbit? Such suspicion would be justified in the case of a public trial. What could then be a greater admission of frame-up on the part of the Kremlin and its stooge regime in Hungary than a secret trial?

Towards the end of the communique from Budapest detailing the "crimes" of Nagy and the others this paragraph appears: "All this has been proved by irrefutable evidence in the course of subsequent investigations and at the present trial." On the contrary not one thing has been proved. It may well be that the defendants effectively disproved the charges; or that they had no opportunity to cross-examine their accusers; or even that no trial actually was held. The

2. Dulles Gets An Assist

As loathsome as vultures circling a human corpse is the sight of Secretary of State Dulles and other imperialist spokesmen running around flapping their arms in pretended grief at the deaths of Nagy and Maletier. The true unconcern of capitalist rulers over frame-ups and human lives is symbolized by the graves of their victims in every land (here at home from the Haymarket martyrs, Sapiro and Van-zetti down to the Rosenbergs) as well as by the mountains of corpses of Hiroshima, Nagasaki, Korea and Algeria.

That the perpetrators and accomplices of such wholesale murder are now able to derive world-wide political advantage for their cold-war plans and H-bomb diplomacy is devastating evidence of the terrible cost of the Kremlin bureaucracy to the Soviet Union and to the struggle for a socialist world.

But because Dulles and his ilk hypocritically make a big propaganda show of deploring the secret trial and execution of Nagy and the lack of the most elementary freedoms in the Soviet bloc, does this mean that opponents of the cold war and defenders of planned economy in the Soviet bloc, should be silent? Or worse, try to justify the executions?

The problem is not as complex as it might seem. Right here in the U.S. we have unions which are run dictatorially by corrupt bureaucrats. Class-conscious workers instinctively defend such a union when the employers move to smash it. In so doing the workers are not defending the ruling bureaucracy of that union, but the union itself — that economic organization which is to the material advantage

11 Years of Taft-Hartley

June 23 marked eleven years since Congress enacted the Taft-Hartley Act. The authors of this law did not hope to legislate the powerful American labor movement out of existence. They knew this could not be done. But they did aim to shackle labor, tie it up with red tape and weaken it for the final kill.

The late Senator Robert A. Taft in defending his law claimed, "There is a public demand for compulsory arbitration and a complete prohibition of strikes." Taft resisted this imaginary "public demand" and insisted that a regimented economy was not desirable. "It may be that in time the world will become so complicated that a free economy can no longer be maintained," he pointed out. Then presumably the workers would have to be enslaved.

Taft gave another reason for not openly outlawing the right to strike: "In the last analysis," he said, "it is difficult indeed to prohibit by law a nation-wide strike if all the men in the industry really want to strike. The leaders can be restrained. The strike can be discouraged. But no democracy can put a million men in jail or put them to work at the point of a gun."

The slow process of weakening labor by restricting the right to strike, threat-

"proof" boils down to mere assertion by the executioners.

Merely by literary evidence some of the accusations in the communique have already been disproved. Allegedly "secret documents" written by Nagy in 1955 and 1956 are cited as calls to overthrow "people's democracy" and place Hungary "in the hands of the imperialists." Far from being secret, these documents were originally circulated by Nagy in the two years preceding the October 1956 Revolution to all the members of the Central Committee of the Hungarian Communist Party. Their meaning, when put back in context, is not what the communique pretends, as any person can readily verify since they have been available for a year in the book "Imre Nagy on Communism." (Published in New York by F. Praeger.)

Why did the Kremlin prefer a secret to a show trial? Certainly one important reason was the memory of Poznan. The trial of the Poznan rioters was prepared by official statements about "provocateur imperialist agents in the pay of foreign governments" and defendants who "had been inspired by foreign sources hostile to Poland." But in the courtroom the frame-up fell to pieces: confessions were repudiated, the foreign agent and foreign inspiration charges shown to be flimsy fabrications. Since the frame-up of Nagy and the others was basically the same as the unsuccessful one against the Poznan rioters, the Kremlin wisely decided on a secret trial — hiding even the date from the Hungarian and world public.

of the workers and which is historically progressive.

At the same time class-conscious workers try to throw out privileged bureaucrats who have usurped control of the union and to restore it to the rank-and-file. This is not merely an optional task but a fundamental necessity.

The Russian Revolution may be compared to a trade union winning state power. Under Lenin and Trotsky there was workers' democracy. External and internal difficulties resulted in a degeneration of the workers' state and the rank and file were stripped of political rights. Now the rank and file are beginning to stir and exert pressures for cleaning up the organization and restoring internal democracy.

The Kremlin's denial of the most elementary democratic rights to the population and such crimes as the execution of Nagy furnish the imperialists with powerful cold-war advantages. Those in the U.S. who defend these crimes help Dulles and the imperialists by discrediting socialism. The true and effective opponents of the imperialist campaign against the USSR are those who deprive Dulles of his ammunition by showing that frame-up is an excrescence, removable by the Soviet workers, rather than an organic part of the Soviet system.

The idea that falsehood and injustice can serve the workers' movement or build socialism comes from Stalinism. Marx and Lenin taught that truth was an indispensable weapon for socialism — a weapon that in our era can serve no privileged caste or class other than the working class.

ening the workers with injunctions, tying the unions' resources up in long litigations — this was the smart strategy of Big Business. The Taft-Hartley Act was a beginning.

Fred A. Hartley, co-author of the act, explained that this legislation was only designed to "equalize the positions of management and labor in this nation." A pretty piece of double-talk. Before the mass production workers won the right to organize in the 1930's, no one in the capitalist government was interested in "equalizing the positions of management and labor." The New Deal only recognized what labor had already won on its picket lines.

When the government intervened to change labor-management relations, it passed Taft-Hartley to weaken labor and pile more advantages in the hands of the boss.

Ever since that defeat in 1947 labor bureaucrats have begged for repeal or at least amendment of T-H. They have been given lavish promises — in election campaigns — from President Eisenhower on down. But none of the promises were kept. Isn't it time labor stopped begging for its freedom? Isn't it time to build a labor party that will wipe the Taft-Hartley Act off the books?

London Busmen Prevail Over Strike-Breaking

By Philip Maghri LONDON, June 20 — In an unprecedented display of independence and militancy, the 50,000 London bus workers who have been on strike for six weeks have rejected a proposal by their official leadership to return to work on terms scarcely better than those offered before the strike began. Their strike remains solid and this sprawling metropolis remains without bus service except for a few near-empty scab buses being run by an organization jocularly calling itself the "People's League for The Defense of Freedom."

This long and bitter fight was forced upon the busmen by the Tory government, acting as the militant leader of the British capitalist class. Government policy is to cut the living standards of the workers by freezing wages while prices continue to rise. Their aim in resisting the bus strike so tenaciously has not been to save a few hundred thousand pounds, but to show the entire

working class that they mean business. They found that the working class could get tough, too.

More than nine months ago the busmen put in their claim for a 25 shilling (\$3.50) a week increase. This very modest amount would only partly make up for the loss in real wages due to the inflation and would only narrow the gap between the wages of busmen and those of industrial workers.

Nevertheless, the "publicly owned" London Transport Executive (an exact British counterpart of the New York Transit Authority) opposed a stony refusal to the busmen's plea. "We don't have any money for a wage increase," they incessantly repeated. And to underline the desperate financial plight of the LTE, Chairman Sir John Elliot and the other seven members voted themselves wage increases amounting to 8,500 pounds (\$23,800) a year, retroactive to the previous July.

Negotiations dragged out over months and months, the busmen gradually reducing their demand to 10 1/2 shillings (\$1.47) a week, just 3 1/2 cents an hour, the LTE repeating, "We don't have any money." Finally, the question was referred to the mediation of a government-appointed "Industrial Court." The "Court" proposed a settlement giving 36,000 Central London drivers and conductors three cents an hour, and giving nothing at all to the suburban drivers and maintenance workers. Even this measly increase was to be taken out of the workers' hides in the form of "economies" (i.e., speed-up and worsened conditions).

STRIKE OR SURRENDER Faced with this insolent provocation, the workers could only strike or capitulate. They chose solidly to strike, with the official support of their union, the giant Transport and General Workers Union. The Tory government was prepared for a fight. Its kept press (called collectively "The Harlot of

Fleet Street") opened a vicious campaign against the "leftist" leader of the TGWU, Frank Cousins, and against the busmen. This didn't disturb them, they knew what to expect. As one militant bus driver put it, "All I want from the Tory press is vilification and slander." The scab buses, too, were an occasion for ridicule, not worry.

The government had far more serious weapons, and it has used them to the full. Sir John Elliot said he was willing to let the strike last till Christmas — a long time for strikers to keep their families on three pounds (\$8.40) a week strike pay. And this was no empty threat. By adding extra cars to its subway trains the LTE has been able to handle most of the normal London traffic and make up much of its loss in revenue.

The only thing the government had to fear was the extension of the strike to the subway workers. If both rail and bus services were shut down, the LTE would be forced to its knees. Against this threat, the government had to call on its "loyal opponents," the trade-union officials. First the railway union bureaucrats were bought off with a 3% increase for the subway workers — even less than the busmen were offered and also to be paid for by "economies."

Then the Trades Union Congress, while giving verbal support to the busmen, strongly opposed extension of the strike. (This convinced some busmen that the initials TUC should stand for "Traitors, Underlings, Cowards," or "Tory Union Council.") Another cause for workers' scorn was the number of knights and candidates for knighthood on the TUC — "they seem more loyal to the bosses than to the workers they are supposed to represent," one driver said.)

COUSINS GIVES IN The official leader of the strike, Frank Cousins, wavered for a time and then he too gave in to TUC pressure and opposed extension of the strike to other sections of the TGWU, notably oil-truck drivers and subway powerhouse workers. He succeeded in blocking this extension by a narrow majority of the busmen's delegate conference only because of his immense personal prestige among the strikers.

Abandoned by the entire official union leadership (including the "Communist" leaders of the Electrical Trades Union) the busmen nevertheless got powerful help — indirect aid from the successful dockers' strike against scab labor (to be reported on in next week's Militant) and direct help from an "unofficial" group of London subway workers who held a one-day token strike (which was only partly successful) and who threatened more and better organized strikes in the future if the bus strike went on.

The situation was clear from the beginning — if the strike was extended it would be won; if not, it would be lost. When Cousins and the official leaders finally renounced extension they had to try to end the strike as an acknowledged defeat. And when the group of "unofficial" subway workers threatened to end the strike on their own, the LTE had to make some concessions to try

Paratroopers Active

Fascist forces in France have stepped up their anti-labor provocations. On June 17 paratroopers in the Pyrenean town of Pau sacked the office of a labor organization and installed a "Committee of Public Safety." On June 19, 200 soldiers prevented a Committee of Republican and Anti-Fascist Defense from placing a wreath on a war memorial just south of Paris. On June 20 explosions in Toulouse damaged three buildings that housed an anti-fascist newspaper and anti-fascist organizations. Broadcasts from the Algerian Public Safety Committees, June 21, called for a press boycott of "subversive minorities" and asked each Frenchman to "make of France a water in which the Red fish will be asphyxiated."

and end the strike right away. The result was last week's settlement proposal, accepted by Cousins and the delegate conference. The Central London busmen were to get the original three-cent an hour offer, the suburban drivers and maintenance men were to get an increase whose size would be determined unilaterally by the LTE several weeks after the strike was over.

SURPRISE FOR BOSSES

The Tory press greeted this agreement with exultant headlines — "Busmen Surrender," "Strike Crumbles." Sure of its victory, the LTE posted notices of new and harder work schedules in the garages. The first garages to vote showed a heavy lead in favor of a return to work. And then the tide turned. Only after 100 garages had voted did the "no's" get the lead, but the trend piled up to a 64-54 majority, many garages rejecting the agreement by near-unanimous votes. "Sitlock," "Sensation," cried the Tory press. Papers which once denounced Cousins for dragging "unwilling" busmen into a strike now denounced him for letting the busmen vote on the settlement offer. Given their chance in a democratic vote, the workers had produced a tremendous surprise, overruling a leadership which had enjoyed their complete confidence in order to continue a bitter strike.

At this moment a new settlement proposal has been negotiated, and seems certain to be accepted by the busmen. It is clearly an advance over the rejected proposal and, while not a real victory (that chance was destroyed by the official leaders' refusal to extend the strike), it looks like an honorable settlement, not a capitulation. In any case, whatever has been won is due to the militancy and determination of the rank-and-file busmen, the democratic conduct of the strike, and the solidarity of other workers — in spite of the treachery of some leaders and the weakness of others. And one decisively important victory has clearly been won — the Tory government failed to break the strike despite all its efforts. Other sections of the British working class will follow up the busmen's success.

Paris Fascists Demonstrate



Scene above shows fascists in Paris on May 17 as they marched on the French National Assembly. This assault followed close on the heels of the successful coup in Algeria of the "Committees of Public Safety." The demonstrators demanded war to the end against the Moslem population's national independence revolution.

What Is DeGaulism?

By Trent Hutter

(Trent Hutter has been a close student of European politics for 25 years. The following is a letter to the Militant setting forth his views on de Gaulle's rise to power.—Ed.)

(1) Charles de Gaulle, in my opinion, is not heading toward a fascist dictatorship. Not only is de Gaulle not a fascist (he favors a kind of bonapartist republic with a strong executive, yet preserving many of the traditional liberties of capitalist democracy), he is definitely not the instrument of the various fascist elements who helped him seize power. On the contrary, there exists a lot of tension between him and the fascists. And he undoubtedly means business when he is attempting to keep them out of the government. The composition of his cabinet corresponds to the present needs of the French bourgeoisie: They are not yet backing fascism but need a more stable government — a "strong" leadership.

THE FASCISTS

(2) A potential fascist danger now exists in France. It is represented by the French "colons" in Algeria and their "Public Safety Committees," by Soustelle's maneuvers, by General Massu's paratroopers, by various fascist groups in metropolitan France that are, however, much weaker as of now than the French fascists in Algeria, although they might soon try to organize on a larger scale. But the French capitalist class, with a relatively prosperous economy, does not yet need fascism to stay in power. Of course, all this may change, but I am briefly analyzing the situation as of now.

The catastrophic leadership of the working class is also a great help to the capitalists. The ruling class may find the existence of General Massu and Monsieur Delbecq quite useful: "You never can tell how you might use them some day..." But at present, the policy of the French capitalist class as a whole is certainly not identical with that of the "Public Safety Committees." The capitalists prefer the less costly method of democratic rights, or "republican legality," as long as they do not really need fascism to preserve their rule.

(3) In the broadest sense, de Gaulle is undoubtedly the agent of the French capitalist class. This does not mean he is anyone's puppet. He is and has always been a very independent figure; and while he again takes care of French capitalism's interests, he does so in his own way, on his own terms which the capitalists finally found to roughly correspond to their needs after the political bankruptcy and financial distress of the Fourth Republic. (These financial problems of the state coincided with an industrial boom...)

De Gaulle wishes to serve the interests of "France," that is, capitalist France as a whole — not the particular interests of the French "colons" in Algeria. If saving the French Empire, saving Algeria for France implies sacrificing some of the special privileges of the French "colons," he will not hesitate to do so. Hence his opposition to the political line and role of the "Public Safety Committees." Nor does he want to share power with a second government in Algiers.

De Gaulle is willing to make concessions to the Algerian Moslems that go beyond anything his predecessors ever offered. He makes these concessions in order to stop the costly Algerian war and to weaken the Algerian independence movement. Let us not believe de Gaulle is just a clumsy, brutal militarist: He is a very clever politician, far more intelligent than most of France's parliamentarians. And he is a very stubborn one (as witness his attitude toward Roosevelt in World War II).

It is a mistake to see in de Gaulle the lackey of any clique and an even bigger mistake to see in him a lackey of the fascists.

COMPARISON WITH SPAIN?

(4) Is there a comparison with Spain in 1936? If Massu and Company are potential Francos, de Gaulle hardly is. Moreover, the Spanish working class of 1936, with its revolutionary committees and strong anarcho-sindicalist movement, was different from the French working class of 1958, with its mass organizations under the Communist Party's bureaucratic control and its reformists collaborating with de Gaulle. And

let us not forget that the Spanish Republic meant something to the workers. It had introduced important social reforms, while the Fourth Republic gave the workers little more than had the Third Republic.

The French workers are not eager to fight now, in my opinion, although an actual fascist danger might change their attitude. The big demonstrations against de Gaulle were not too turbulent — a warning, but not a political action of decisive importance, not an offensive. For the moment, the French workers prefer to wait and see what de Gaulle will do. They have become cautious and do not yearn for battle.

What should they have fought for? The crumbling, impotent Fourth Republic with its scheming politicians, its ever changing cabinets all doing and neglecting the same things, its bloody colonial wars? The slogan raised by the Communist Party leadership of "Defending the Republic" had no meaning to the workers at all. It might have been different if the CP leadership had injected a socialist content into the campaign, had made an issue of life class character of the state, or had urged an offensive against the rule of the capitalist class as such.

The French workers think twice before actually going into action because they have been betrayed and disappointed too often. Their energies have been partly spent in the CP's foolish "rotating strikes" and in demonstrations with false slogans and false promises. Thus the mood of the working class seems to be one of sceptical patience (for the time being). There was no question of an uprising for a resurrection of the completely rotten Fourth Republic.

Every Test Kills

By Linus Pauling The Nobel prize winning scientist speaks out against the nuclear bomb tests. 10 cents Order from: PIONEER PUBLISHERS 116 University Place New York 3, N. Y.

... Murder of Nagy

(Continued from Page 1) that he was still a member of the CP, Horner added, "But I refuse to be gagged by anyone when I see folly and futility. I am determined to speak out."

Among the British unions scoring the execution were two in which the CP has exerted considerable influence, the Amalgamated Engineering Union and the Fire Brigade Union.

The killing was also sharply hit by the prominent independent socialist weekly, the New Statesman, which has been in the forefront of the demand for an end to the cold war. And the left-wing Labor weekly, Tribune, bluntly characterized

the executions as "another black crime." Yugoslavia, which was directly linked to the frameup charge against Nagy of "conspiracy with imperialism," roundly condemned the charges as "untrue and staged from beginning to end."

In Poland, where the government is deeply alarmed over the threat to its own future presented by the present turn of the Kremlin, official denunciation was withheld, but a series of "leaks" to the press made clear their condemnation. The day after the executions were announced, the Chopin concert on the state radio offered Chopin's funeral music.

Introductory Offer A 6-Month Subscription To the Militant Only \$1.00 The Militant 116 University Place New York 3, N. Y. Name City State Street Zone

