

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

AUGUST 1, 1955

FIVE CENTS

Beginning a Full Report on the Hearing: *ISL vs. the 'SUBVERSIVE LIST'*

... page 6

MOROCCO: U. S. Stake and French Terror

... page 2

FRANCE: Inter-Stalinist Fight in the CGT

... page 3

GUIANA: Behind the Split in the PPP

... page 2

Federal Court Hits 'List' 3rd & 4th Time

A third and a fourth blow against the attorney general's "subversive list" system have been struck by the federal Court of Appeals in decisions directed against the government's witchhunt activities. These follow on the heels of the Shachtman passport case ruling and the decision last week on the National Lawyers Guild.

The more notable of the two new rulings reversed a lower court's decision that a family could be evicted from a housing development because of refusal to deny membership in a listed organization.

This struck against the witchhunt use being made of the subversive-list system against tenants who live in federally aided housing and who therefore come under the Gwynn Amendment. In various parts of the country, test cases have been under way by tenants who refused to sign the police-state type of document called "Certification of Non-Membership in Subversive Organizations."

The case acted on by the Court of Appeals was that of John and Doris Rudder of Washington. Judge Edgerton wrote the court's opinion, which was unanimous, concurred in by Judges Washington and Bazelon.

The decision declared that eviction on the grounds proposed by the government would be "arbitrary action" contrary to due process of law. The Rudders "refusal to deny that they were members of any organization on the consolidated [subversive] list was not proof that they were members. Even proof that they were members of, e.g., a 'totalitarian' organization, knowing nothing of its character, would be an arbitrary ground for an administrative decision to evict them from public housing."

The Rudders had never been given a hearing, the court pointed out. It added

that the attorney general's list had been set up for use in screening government employees, not tenants.

Just one day before, in the city of Los Angeles, exactly the same type of test case had come before a municipal judge, in the case of five tenants versus the City Housing Authority. The defendants were represented by A. L. Wirin of the American Civil Liberties Union.

The defendants won. The judge, Vernon Hunt, "ruled for the defendants," reported the Los Angeles Times, because of an Appellate Court reversal of a lower-court ruling here last January. Judge Hunt pointed out that there had been no showing that the defendants were subversive, merely that they had refused to sign the requested statements.

In New York City, however, the local Housing Authority is proceeding with its own eviction program despite pending test cases in the state.

The other new Court of Appeals ruling, also unanimous, came on a case dealing with adoption of a minor. *I. F. Stone's Weekly* reports:

"Judge Bazelon [writing the court's opinion also for Danaher and Bastian] reversed the District Court's denial of a petition for adoption of a natural child filed by its white mother and her Negro husband. The petition had been denied on two grounds: (1) the couple's refusal to sign tenants' loyalty oath that they did not belong to any organization on the attorney general's list, and (2) that the boy 'might lose the social status of a white man' because his adopted father would be a Negro. Judge Bazelon held the refusal to sign the oath was no 'adverse reflection' on the couple and that denial of the adoption could not 'rest on a distinction between the 'social status' of whites and Negroes.'"

What the 'New Friendliness' Means for the Cold War

By BERNARD CRAMER

The Geneva Conference has come to its end, with the various delegations roping down from the "summit" to report back that the climate up there had been very sunny. This seems to be a genuinely complete account of the affair. President Eisenhower has assured us that Geneva is not Yalta—no secret agreements were made, he insisted. No secret agreements because there were no agreements.

The accomplishments have been preparatory, it is insisted on all sides. Eisenhower gave his word as a general that he was against war; and Bulganin-Khrushchev let it be understood that they did not mind if it was hinted that they tolerated the rumor that there was a possibility that there were now almost as few Fascists in Washington as in Belgrade.

So polite were the Russians, indeed, that they did not even bother to point out the slightly comical aspect of Eisenhower's headlined proposal for arms control by mutual aerial reconnaissance, considering the fact that the Russians do not need an international agreement to spot U.S. military installations.

DEALS TO COME?

Yet, despite the fact that nothing more substantial than these airy nothings came out of the conference deliberations, things are not quite the same as before. In the first place, of course, this is not due to the conference itself. It is not the conference which produced the talk about "new friendliness" which has been brought home as the substitute for bacon. It is the "new friendliness"—i.e., the new soft line of the Russians, primarily—which produced the conference.

Secondly, now that the conference has given this new relation a formal point of crystallization, the Foreign Ministers' conference in the fall will see whether any second-string agreements can be worked up, say, on trade or cultural relations, to give some substance to what still remains merely an "atmosphere." That is, any practical imperialist deals

that may be worked out can be ascribed to the "good relations" established by the confrontation in Geneva, rather than to any changes of policy at home. Each side can maintain for domestic consumption that it has not changed its mind about the other fellow.

Thirdly, it is reasonable to ask why the Russians were so anxious for this "summit" conference, if they had no new deal to propose. We can ask this question about the Russians since it is well known that the Americans were not burning to have this conference at all.

Do the Russians leaders need their side of the tale about the "new friendliness" in order to sell to their cadres back home a turn toward cutting down on the economic sacrifices necessitated by constantly jacked-up war preparation, an economic pressure that is becoming intolerable?

INTERLUDE

It is speculative, of course, to believe that the Russians are being forced to reduce the pace of the armaments race by economic pressure at home, and are therefore willing to seize on the play-acting at Geneva as the peg on which to hang a turn at home. It is yet to be seen whether they will get serious about armament limitation (leaving aside the myth of "disarmament"). Or whether the U.S. will, for that matter, pressed on its side by desires for tax-cutting and budget-balancing as well as by political pressure from its allies and the uncommitted world.

But in one form or another, the breathing-spell that is signaled (not caused) by Geneva is a welcome interlude which has been imposed on the cold-war blocs, and is not a boon which is being conferred upon us mortals by beneficent imperialists who have suddenly turned "friendly."

COLD WAR GOES ON

It is a breathing-spell from the sharpest fears of war, but it is not an end to the cold war, which goes on—in new forms, as we headlined last week. The Russians are preparing to deal directly with the Germans on the unity question, a negotiation which is bound to make the Western cold-warriors feel a little less of that sunny friendliness which is being touted in all the capitals now. In Vietnam, the election which is due puts the West on the spot. In China, the Peiping government's drive for entrance into the UN will not suffer from the new stage of détente, and whether the U.S. yields or not, the outcome is an integral part of the cold war.

The fact is, that in its most basic meaning, the cold war is not simply a series of angry thrusts and counter-thrusts in a tense atmosphere but, rather, is the fundamental contest for world imperialist supremacy between two rival social systems, capitalism and Stalinism. Even a period of international smiles and curtsies, of deals and attempted deals, is a stage in this cold war.

ISL Hearing Is Trial of the 'List' System

On page 6 of this issue we begin publication of a full report from Washington on the first hearing that has been held by the Department of Justice for any organization on its notorious "subversive list."

The Independent Socialist League succeeded in gaining this hearing after eight long years during which it (and its predecessor, the Workers Party, as well as its then youth organization the Socialist Youth League) vainly sought such a hearing from the department. For eight years they had met either with outright denial of such a hearing, or with evasion and procrastination by the attorney general. Finally, buffeted by repeated court rulings which cast doubt on the validity of the list, or on its uses by the government and others, or on the procedures under which it was drawn up and administered, and particularly after the blow to the government position in the Court of Appeals decision on the Shachtman passport case, the attorney general's office arranged the hearing.

Since it is the first such hearing to be pried out of the Department of Justice, it provides the first public view of

how the government decides on and justifies inclusion of organizations on its national blacklist. From this point of view the behavior and methods now being exhibited by the attorney general's men at the hearing are a token of what goes along hand in hand with such institutions as "subversive lists."

As Joseph L. Rauh Jr., ISL attorney, has been indignantly declaring at the hearing, the proceedings have threatened to be a "farce" in which the Department of Justice is refusing to follow some of the most elementary requirements of a fair hearing. But the recent court decision on the Lawyers Guild case made it clear that it is necessary to go through this administrative hearing in order to be able to bring the whole shady subject of the "subversive list" before the courts directly, for the first time since President Truman established the institution by presidential ukase.

Central in the proceedings so far has been the curious fact that, although the government is setting out to prove that the anti-Stalinist ISL is "communist," it steadfastly and stubbornly refuses to define the charge. If it is Communist

(with a big C), then it means association in some way with the Communist Party—but the government does not claim that this is true of the ISL. If it is communist (with a little C), then it means a set of ideas about a new society under common ownership—which the ISL and its attorney spelled out further at the hearing—but the government refuses to say whether such socialist ideas are "subversive."

One recalls "The Trial" as Franz Kafka described it in a fantasy—complete with a charge which is never defined and "witnesses" who slink about in the grayness.

NEXT WEEK

we continue our detailed report on the ISL hearing in Washington on the "subversive list," when it resumes on Monday, August 1.

MOROCCO THE 'INDOCHINESE PATTERN' IN NORTH AFRICA

French Terror and U.S. Stakes

By PHILIP COBEN

"Morocco is another Indochina in the making. Unless French policy is reversed and drastic reforms introduced, Morocco will explode with a violence that only Africa knows. And if the explosion occurs, the management of the revolutionary forces in Morocco may have passed into the hands of the Communists. Today it has not. Today, Nationalists, not Communists, lead the struggle for independence from the French. . . . The French have fastened a milking machine on Morocco and operated it for the benefit of the French. The Moors are the victims. Though their natural resources are being exploited, they get precious few dividends."—Justice William O. Douglas in *Look* magazine of October 19, 1954.

Leaving aside this still non-existent menace from Stalinism, Morocco is another Indochina in this sense at any rate: it is inevitable that the French will be pushed out, and the question for French imperialism is only how much of its interests it can save. But for France's ally, the U.S., there are two other questions which inescapably will begin to take precedence in Washington's considerations. One is: saving Morocco as a war base for U.S. atomic-war preparations. The other is: replacing France at the "milking-machine."

Just as these two considerations, with the first leading, operated as the drive behind U.S. replacement of France as dominant outside power in Vietnam, in proportion as France's power waned away, so also in Morocco (as in the rest of French North Africa) the pushing-out of France means a more active policy by the U.S.

This should prepare one for U.S. policy-tacking as the conflict in Morocco gets rougher. Up to now, by and large with vacillations, French blackmail has forced Washington to be its accomplice in its suppression of North African independence. In Algeria, for example, troops which are formally under control of an American general (in other words, French NATO troops) were sent in to suppress the people. American training has been given to French paratroopers who are readied for a military massacre of the liberation movement. The U.S. has generally refused to allow the UN to take up France's crimes against the North Africans.

THREE PRESSURES

Now this U.S. policy, of course, is not due to the fact that France's terror in North Africa makes Washington happy. Far from it. The financial rewards for this terror (which protects the "milking") go to Paris, not Wall Street, whereas an independent nationalist North Africa would be free to welcome American businessmen. And as a result of this terror, the "Communist menace" looms ahead, as Justice Douglas' warning emphasized. But an intransigent attitude by the French colonialists presented Washington with the choice: go along with them or U.S. "Good relations" with Our Noble Ally France required that sympathetic and understanding fellow imperialists should suffer their sins, even though holding their nose.

Insofar as France's hold on the colony becomes more and more untenable, as a practical proposition, because of explosive national-revolutionary pressure by the Moroccan independence fighters, to that extent the U.S. can also press France to get out of the way and let a better man step in, lest all be lost for both. This is the "Indochinese pattern," whereby American imperialism tends to flow into and take over the channels of older and now lesser capitalist imperialisms.

France has been under pressure from three directions, then: (1) from the national-revolutionary explosion in the colony, which threatens to throw it into the sea; (2) from economic troubles at home which make it less practicable than of yore to expend money and men to bring the rebels to heel; and, as a reflex of both of these which in turn has its reciprocal effect, (3) from the reaching out of American imperialism.

SOURCE OF TERRORISM

Hence it is not only a Mendès-France who moves toward irreversible concession to national revolt, but now it is also a Faure. When Faure became premier he pledged himself to continue the North African policy of his predecessor, in spite of the fact that the latter met his troubles on his North African line; and Faure has indeed made efforts in this direction.

This is the source of the most recent wave of terrorism and counter-terrorism in Morocco. The outstanding thing about this wave is that it was touched off by underground French-colonial terrorism aimed against Moroccans, not the other way around.

"In recent weeks," reported *Time* magazine on January 31 of this year,

"there has been an increase of European terrorism aimed at the natives. Often the activities of the 'counter-terrorists,' as they call themselves, are conducted with the tacit complicity of local cops, who have little patience with the slow-moving machinery of French justice. 'What?' bellowed one indignant Casablanca policeman recently. 'Arrest Frenchmen for killing these Moroccan pigs? They ought to be given the Legion of Honor!'"

This outburst of terrorism by the local French *colons* was at bottom in response to fears of softness in Paris. We have here a now typical split (cf. Kenya too) between the several intersect-

ing considerations of the metropolitan imperialists, which we have sketched, and the interests of the local European exploiters, which is a single one—profit and exploitation only and to the devil with the broader outlook of the Paris politicians, who have other things to worry about in the world besides the incomes of the *colons*. In Paris, the problem of policy is a complicated one; but for the Casablanca cop who reflects the thinking of the milkers-on-the-spot the problem is simplicity itself. Give these nationalists a finger, and they'll wrench our arm off!

HOLDING HANDS

And so Grandval, as French representative in Morocco, has been forced to take measures against the "loyal" French colonials and their police and terror groups, including dismissing the Casablanca police chief and deporting leaders of *Présence Française*, the "counter-terrorist" group, which has been trying to force Paris's hand by precipitating a situation where the troops have to step in to "preserve law and order", i.e., massacre and suppress the nationalists.

BRITISH GUIANA BEHIND THE SPLIT IN THE PPP

Non-Stalinist Left Regroups in Guiana

The following document is of great interest, or should be of great interest to readers, I think, because it is the first one I've run across in which we can hear directly from the leader of the NON-STALINIST section of the British Guiana PPP.

It will be remembered that, at the time of Britain's shameful suppression by force of arms of the legally and democratically elected government of this colony, the governing People's Progressive Party was headed by its two leading Stalinist sympathizers, Dr. Cheddie and Janet Jagan. LABOR ACTION was one of the few American publications which denounced this act of imperial terror by Britain, and which also denounced as false the imperialist tale that the PPP was simply a Communist Party, spearhead for Moscow, etc.

Rather, in our very first issue on the crime against British Guiana, we pointed to the more heterogeneous makeup of the PPP, particularly the antagonism between the Jagan (Stalinist) group in the leadership of the PPP and the non-Stalinist leaders and militants headed by L. F. S. Burnham.

In the PPP split following the suppression, the Burnham and Jagan groups separated. From those reports which we saw, it was hard to tell what had really happened. Two hypotheses naturally leaped to mind, among others: (1) The split was essentially between Stalinists and non-Stalinists; (2) the

split was essentially due to the Burnham group's weakening in the face of British imperialist pressure and seeking to make a deal with it at the expense of militancy and anti-imperialism. The Stalinists were obviously interested in pushing the latter explanation, rightly or wrongly.

In the April issue of the London anti-colonial and quite non-Stalinist magazine *African & Colonial World*, the editor published an article of his own on the PPP split which quite strongly implied the second explanation also. But although there was plenty of opportunity to do so, he cited no evidence and pointed to no facts of this sort. In the June issue, the magazine printed a reply by Burnham. It is this communication to the magazine by Burnham that we publish below.

It will be noted that Burnham vigorously repudiates any implication of diminished anti-imperialist militancy, and ascribes the split (which he deprecates) to the "adventurism" of the Jagan-Stalinist group. He refers only once, but intelligibly, to the difference on Stalinism; his thought is that Jagan's line would tend to narrow the independence struggle to pro-Communists.

Publication of this letter by Burnham does not, of course, settle the question we raised about what happened, but it may give a useful insight into the present political state of mind of the Guianese leftists who are trying to distinguish themselves both from Stalinism and imperialism.—H. D.

LETTER BY BURNHAM

In the first place in the article you state that PPP is essentially a creation of Dr. Jagan and his wife, Janet. This is one of those fallacies which have gained wide currency. The party was actually formed in 1949 after my return from my law course in Britain and I was one of the founder members. While I lay no claim to creating the party it is inaccurate to describe me as a later adherent. On my return from the U. K. in 1949 I discussed with Cheddie the necessity of forming a party and together with others like Ashton Chase, Ramkarran and Sydney King, we held exploratory meetings and eventually the PPP was formed.

I notice that in describing the difference of approach between Cheddie and myself you state that "he passionately believes in the immediate amelioration of the condition of the masses (while) Mr. Burnham if left to himself, would be content to wait for a gradual development in the change of conditions." I regret that you gathered that impression of my approach. I do not believe in the gradual change of conditions for I am not British nor am I a reformist or Fabian Socialist believing in the glories of gradualism. I am not impatient of a long-drawn out struggle and I realize that is what faces us.

The difference between Cheddie and me on this point as I see it—I may be wrong—is that I do not see the necessity of complicating the issues nor do I be-

lieve in giving the British imperialists an excuse which they may give to a large section of the world for their brutal and undemocratic policy in B. G. Further I feel that we must take into account the objective facts of our situation and not isolate our movement nationally and internationally by narrow sectarianism.

I am not an anti-communist witchhunter as some of my friends and detractors seek to allege. I merely see the necessity to appeal to all sections of Guiana who may not be all communist or communist sympathizers to rally to the cause of independence. And even in doing this I refuse to compromise my original principles and convictions.

It has been suggested that I am interested in ministerial office. This is hopelessly untrue as it is well known that in 1953 after the elections I intimated my unwillingness to take a ministry. Office in a colony means little to anyone who understands colonial constitutions and how they are geared to give the shadow of power. Financially also a ministry is a loss to me. Acceptance therefore of any ministerial post so far as I am concerned is dictated entirely by a desire to serve my people and take advantage of any opportunity to carry on the struggle for liberation at a further level. This holds good for most of my colleagues.

It is true that I have fought Jagan for the leadership of the party on a previous occasion, but leadership has never been the real issue, which is one of tactics and approach. I consider that the em-

Meanwhile the Americans tremble for their bases in Morocco. They can well understand that insofar as they identify themselves with the French, they will suffer with the French on the day of reckoning. But why should we suffer for French sins, i.e., for French profit? Is this not very unreasonable of the French? Why aren't they sensible and simply give up their milking-machine, so that we can take it over and protect our bases at the same time? This solution is so eminently reasonable, from the American point of view, that only French pigheadedness can account for their course. We American empire-builders, you understand, always find it hard to empathize with other exploiters' evil penchants.

But thus far, this annoyance has not persuaded Washington to break with the pro-French course. In January, in fact, at the demand of the French—who do not want the Americans to operate their own bases their own way (the Moroccans might "get ideas")—the American forces in Morocco turned over the administration of native civilian personnel working for the bases to the French quartermaster corps. "Wages and salaries will be calculated on a new basis," reported the *Tangier Gazette* on January 29.

French imperialism may be dying in North Africa, but the American cousin is still holding its hand on the deathbed, waiting for the inheritance.

phasis at this stage of our struggle must be on the achievement of independence and the improvement of the workers' conditions. Meanwhile knowing how the masses have been ill-treated since the suspension I feel that we must take every advantage of each gain we can make.

I am not so empty as to imagine that accepting the suggestions and mode of thought of our masters will achieve anything but on the other hand it seems suicidal to the movement to show what some call "courage" by indulging in mere adventurism. I have seen the effect of this on the masses. I have seen their disillusionment and confusion, and feel that they cannot hold out forever. According to my analysis the objective result of Cheddie's approach will lead not to the immediate amelioration of the masses' conditions but to further repression for some time.

I have noted Dr. Soper's "praise" of me and his reference to the fact that I was a Methodist. He has also mentioned that I have been agitating for the deportation of Cheddie and Janet. The latter allegation is absolutely unfounded. I have my differences of opinion with the two individuals, but the way to prove whose line is correct is certainly not to oblige Britain by seeking the deportation of one's opponents. After all Cheddie and Janet are Guianese, the one by birth, the other by adoption and they have a right to remain here; it is not for me to play the imperialists' game by asking for their deportation.

Soper's support for me because I am from a Methodist family is irrational even if honest. I do not appeal to Guianese on the basis of Methodism but patriotism. The majority of our population as statistics go is neither Methodist nor Christian. I hope to persuade Guianese regardless of their religion or absence of religion, that mine is the correct approach and more likely to achieve the agreed goal of freedom. Meanwhile what are their individual religious persuasions are their personal concern.

There has been the allegation by Cheddie and his supporters that the Conference of February 13 and the Congress of March 27, were allowed by the police because the latter expected decisions favorable to our masters. If this argument is valid it would apply with equal force to the Conference called by Jagan and his group, at Buxton, on March 27. Arguments like that are shallow and hypocritical and are only likely to confuse the people and obscure the main issue—all of which we cannot afford.

As it is at the moment, I appreciate that the split is undesirable, for no movement like ours has ever benefited from division. The difficulties are great but not unsurmountable. Surrender is out of the question. The British government may imagine that it can play one group against the other, but so far as I am concerned, I will not be used for that purpose. The major enemy still remains British colonialism and our ammunition will not be wasted on lesser opponents.

L. F. S. BURNHAM

FRANCE UNCERTAINTY IN LINE PRODUCES A 'NEW LOOK'

Inter-Stalinist Dispute in CGT

By A. GIACOMETTI

PARIS, July 18—The recent congress of the CGT, the Stalinist-controlled labor federation, attracted a great deal of attention by an unexpected innovation: a seemingly free discussion on two distinct programs. Though belated, it is important to examine the nature of the disagreement, which involves more than CGT policy alone.

On April 1, Pierre Le Brun, technician, member of the CGT Bureau and leading member of Union Progressiste, opened the discussion in the CGT weekly *Le Peuple* with a strong critique of the official "program of action," adopted by the Administrative Commission in preparation for the congress. This program reflected the current line of the CP, which holds that the living standards of the working class have been continuously decreasing since the thirties, and that no improvement is possible in this respect under the capitalist regime. The CGT leadership, endorsing this theory of "absolute pauperization," proclaimed by Thorez, confined itself to a series of immediate demands in its action program.

The general economic program which had been adopted at the congresses of 1951 and 1953 was eliminated from the draft proposals. The main defender of the economic program had been Le Brun; it is a detailed outline of economic policy, based on measures like the controlled development of investments, reorientation of foreign trade, full employment, support of technological improvements, industrialization of depressed regions—in short, measures oriented toward satisfying the immediate needs of the working class. In his discussion articles, Le Brun demanded that the economic program be again adopted by the congress, and that the nationalization of cement, oil, steel and of the chemical industries be included in the program.

The spokesmen for the Stalinist leadership, first and foremost Frachon, the president of the CGT, replied that in the past the economic program had only confused the workers by leading them to believe that reforms were possible in a capitalist regime. It is not the place of the CGT, they said, to formulate long-term programs; this is up to the parties of the coming "united front."

LE BRUN DEFEATED

Rouzaud of the civil servants' union, a supporter of Le Brun, attacked this position by saying that "one must not walk into the future backwards. Since the parties will each have their own program, we will be left on the sidelines and unable to participate in the debate, if we do not have a carefully thought-out program of our own. . . . Events move quickly; the outline of profound changes is becoming visible on the internal and on the international level. The present legislature is coming to an end, the old political formations are deeply shaken, the movement for unity is gaining ground. Shall we remain passive in the face of these developments? Shall we hesitate to pick the ripened fruit that we are offered, the late fruit of the August strikes of 1953?"

Shortly before the congress, Le Brun and Rouzaud had amended their original proposals in an attempt at a compromise. Nevertheless, they were attacked in the strongest possible fashion as "Mendesists" and reformists, first by the leaders Frachon, Mauvais, Le Léop, then by the vast majority of speakers representing the various industries, all taking up the theme of "absolute pauperization" and sometimes driving it to exceptionally absurd extremes. The representative of the building trades declared that construction workers had been better off in the 13th century; the representative of the railwaymen came out against electrification of the railroads on the grounds that it only increased capitalist profits, etc.

Besides the civil servants, represented by Rouzaud, only the printing trades and the seamen backed Le Brun—both unions which had not been affected by the split of 1947 when F.O. left the CGT.

When it came to voting, Le Brun and Rouzaud were overwhelmingly defeated. The official Stalinist leadership had insisted that the question of the economic program be not voted on separately, as Le Brun had requested. His supporters were therefore only able to express their position negatively, that is, by voting against the majority proposals. The report of the Bureau, reflecting the majority position and presented by Frachon, was thus accepted by 5334 votes

against 17, 114 abstaining. In fact, the strength of the minority is greater: about 1700 votes were not counted, representing unions known to be favorable to Le Brun's theses.

The next day, however, the customary unanimity was re-established: Le Brun and Rouzaud rallied to a slightly modified version of the "program of action." The new conclusion states that the CGT is determined to bring about a coalition of popular forces in order to impose a general change in policy, and that demands such as Le Brun proposed would become useful if and when such a mass movement would arise.

Le Brun and a supporter of his tendency, Jean Schaefer, secretary of the CGT's small office workers' union and treasurer of Union Progressiste, were included in the new Bureau.

What is the significance of the two positions?

ALTERNATE CP POLICY

To begin with, it should be stressed that we have here two Stalinist tendencies; Le Brun's position is neither "reformist" in the traditional sense, nor is it a revolt against Stalinist policy within the CGT. From the beginning, Le Brun and Rouzaud made clear that they had no intention of forming some kind of tendency, or even an organized minority, and stressed their loyalty to the CGT, i.e., to its Stalinist leadership.

Le Brun, like Le Léop who attacked him at the Congress, is an official "non-Stalinist," who has always served the CP's purposes. It is therefore farcical to assert, as Gilles Martinet has hastened to do, that a democracy has triumphed

in the CGT. The disagreements were too muted and the final vote too crushing to make such a fiction convincing.

Furthermore, the issue of "pauperization" is not in itself as important as would appear from the debate. Under the form it is being put forward by the CP, the theory of "absolute pauperization" is contrary to fact: average real wages have unquestionably increased over the decades. Profits, of course, have increased even more; in other words, real wages have not kept up with the development of production. What has taken place is a "relative pauperization."

But the theory of "absolute pauperization" is more than anything else the basis for a policy, and what is being debated in the CGT is a political alternative open to the CP and to its allies. If no meaningful reforms are possible in a capitalist regime, this means that participation in or support of a bourgeois government is impossible. It implies a "hard" policy, oriented toward capturing the base of the SP instead of coming to terms with its leadership; it means supporting a militant strike movement, particularly if Mendès-France were to return to power.

Le Brun's economic program, on the other hand, assumes that its proponents will have influence in government, that is, will participate in a parliamentary combination of the Popular Front type, such as France has seen in 1936, in 1945 and, under different circumstances, within the resistance movement.

While it is true that, as far as the CP is concerned, these alternatives will not be decided primarily in France but in Russia, it is wrong to assume that the

CGT congress has been merely an act of shadow-boxing. Le Brun's position enjoys the support of a strong minority in the ranks of both the CP and the CGT, and it will continue to do so even if the CP definitely adopts a "hard" course. The difference between the two positions is real, even though confined to the framework of Stalinist politics.

REFLECTS CRISIS

It is one aspect of the growing differentiation taking place within the CP. As of now, one can distinguish a "soft" wing, whose positions coincide with those of the Stalinist wing of the New Left, and which aims at a Popular Front; the "orthodox" leadership (Duclos, Servin, Billoux, etc.) which is committed to carrying out Russian policy in any event, provided they know what it is; a "hard" wing, determined to follow a militant course even if it should contradict Russian policy.

The leadership is at present offering a "united front" to the SP, while preparing to block any "Mendesist" coalition in the offing. The "hard" wing has found a spokesman in André Marty, and the bulk of its supporters are still within the CP. A similar differentiation has appeared in the Italian CP, and in the smaller Stalinist organizations of Belgium and Switzerland.

This public appearance of "unorthodox" tendencies is a sign of growing political consciousness in the ranks of the CP. It is the product of the steady loss of strength over the years, and it is greatly favored by the recent developments in Russia. While the "hard" wing is incomparably more healthy and more important, the other non-official positions may also lead out of the CP's orbit, given favorable circumstances.

The public discussion at the congress of the CGT reflects in part this crisis. It has not brought democracy to the CGT; it means, however, that the CP leadership is compelled to allow some freedom of discussion in the periphery while seeking to regain its bearings.

BRAZIL FROM JANIO TO JUAREZ

Socialist Opportunists Rally to Tavora

By J. R.

SANTIAGO, July 1—The course that the Socialist Party of Brazil has been following in the whole past period is truly an object lesson in the consequences of opportunism. Dispatches to LABOR ACTION have described the process from the beginnings of the SP's *Janismo* to the recent debacle. Now a new act in this drama is beginning and it is worthwhile looking back for a moment.

The Brazilian SP supported and virtually created a previously unknown provincial politician in the industrial city and state of Sao Paulo, Janio Quadros. SP support opened up to Quadros the career of, first, mayor of the city and then governor of the state; and the state of Sao Paulo, it must be understood, is the most important in the Brazilian federation.

It was the SP which worked up the legend of *Janismo*, giving it a minimum program of demands and the myth of a new anti-totalitarian populism. This was the banner under which Janio Quadros won the governorship of Sao Paulo by defeating the candidate of the "rascals," Adhemar de Barros.

This policy of the SP provoked an internal crisis in the party, and a section of the best elements opposed it in the name of socialist principles. But the initial success of Janio seemed so impressive, and the collaboration of the SP in the municipal government had such a bureaucratizing effect in penetrating the party, that the "Janists" took over the majority control of the party, supplanting the Marxist elements who had founded the party as a result of disillusionment with Stalinist and Trotskyist policy.

So great was the alluring influence of seeming "practical success" that even leading elements of the left wing went over to the banner of collaboration with Janio; and so the left wing was divided and its position in the party weakened. The Sao Paulo victory seemed to confirm the wisdom of the pro-Janist majority. In reality it only deepened the party crisis; the old leading committee of the Sao Paulo state organization was replaced by bourgeois, nationalist and Stalinoid elements; the socialist left which had founded, built and led the party was shoved aside.

Though this development, which took place at the state convention of the SP, was of apparently minor import at the time, it had great political consequences.

In the latest city election in Sao Paulo, the leader of the pro-Janist majority,

the man who had brought about the above-mentioned defeat of the old socialist leadership in the party, Roger Ferreira, ran for the mayoralty. The party committee opposed his candidacy because it wanted a more popular candidate, one who could win the support of Janio and the whole Janist front. Because of this division of the pro-Janists between different candidates, Ferreira was defeated by the "rascals' candidate," Eino de Mattos, a follower of the same adventurer Adhemar who had been defeated in the previous election.

In this contest, Janio Quadros, as governor of the state, refused to participate or take sides; and Quadros also withdrew from the presidential race, as we have reported before. As a result the Janist movement collapsed. The results were: crisis in the SP; decomposition of Janism; victory for the Adhemarist "rascals"; and a big defeat for the SP and Janio. From its previous mark of 100,000 votes, the SP was able to get only 40,000 for Roger Ferreira.

TAVORA GAINING

The defeat of the left in the SP was, thus, followed by the defeat of the party's opportunist candidate and a disaster for Janio Quadros. It is evident how big a role the SP played in the inauguration and growth of Janism. We have paid so much attention to the details above, including the personalities involved, because in the backward conditions of Brazilian politics many social and political antagonisms appear in personal forms.

Now the situation looks as if it is changing again. After its defeat in the Sao Paulo municipal elections, the SP went out to conquer a new national position for itself, by presenting as its candidate for the presidency General Juarez Tavora in a common front with the small Christian-Democratic Party, after Tavora accepted a minimum program.

Juarez Tavora's candidacy is very popular among the anti-Getulist (i.e., anti-Vargas) middle class, the only candidate capable of defeating Juscelino Kubitscheck and Adhemar de Barros, the two pretenders to the mantle of Vargas. Tavora's personal prestige as an honest and anti-totalitarian general, and his social-reformist program, could organize and give voice to a new democratic-populist movement, as against the Getulist "populism" which goes under the leadership of Kubitscheck and Jango Goulart.

Furthermore Janio Quadros, fright-

ened by Adhemar's victory in Sao Paulo and the subsequent decomposition of his movement, has again become politically active, collaborating in the organization of the movement for Juarez Tavora on a national scale. Expected now is a joint declaration of 13 state governors in favor of Tavora; this could be very important because the electoral influence of the state bureaucracy in Brazil is very great, if not decisive.

It seems that the cadres of the defeated and disintegrated Janist movement are looking for a new and higher form of expression on a national scale, in the "Juarez movement," with the collaboration of the SP, the Christian-Democrats and other forces. For the first time Kubitscheck's candidacy seems to be in danger.

"PRACTICAL" POLITICS

Under the pressure of developments, the rightist UDN (National Democratic Union) withdrew its own candidate, Etelvino Lins, and promised its support to Juarez Tavora. This could mean support to Tavora not only from the liberal capitalist right but also from the conservative military chiefs, who play a very decisive role in Brazilian politics in moments of crisis.

In this way, the "socialist" candidacy of Juarez Tavora has been transformed into the banner of "national union" against the Getulist "populism" of Kubitscheck-Goulart and against the Adhemarist "rascals' camp."

In a purely parliamentary sense, the SP has overcome its immediate crisis and won political credit as an important national party which showed itself able to launch a presidential candidate as a serious contender, against the Getulists and the "rascals." But in launching this national crusade for a democratic solution of the political crisis, it made common front with the rightist UDN and lost all the "socialist" and even reformist content of its fight. Besides, Janist populism also lost its "social" patina in this alliance with the UDN. The "practical" politics of the Socialists turned out to be on a completely bourgeois and pro-capitalist level.

On the other side of the picture, the left wing of the SP repaired its cohesion and unity and at the last convention of the party gained 40 per cent of the party vote for its slate. But it is too bad that this left wing does not openly criticize the majority policy with the necessary militancy and ideological clarity; only this can lead to reconquest of the party for it.

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

The Ford-GM Settlement And the UAW's Problems

To the Editor:

I must admit that I've been somewhat perplexed and disturbed by LABOR ACTION's presentation of the UAW's recent contract with Ford and General Motors. Most specifically, I refer to the quite apparent differences between Jack Wilson (whose articles have been of a more critical tone), and the quasi-eulogistic rhapsodies of Ben Hall, whose point of view has dominated the pages of our paper.

At the outset, let me state that my criticisms are presented within the context of a general acceptance of the contractual agreements, and that I generally agree with many of the premises that Comrade Hall has used to buttress his arguments—that the UAW 20-cent package has been a pace-setter for many other negotiating unions (and was most likely largely responsible for the Steelworkers' recent 15-cent wage rise); I also believe that Comrade Hall is correct in his emphasis on the principle-setting importance of the Guaranteed Annual Wage plan, in spite of the plan's obvious inadequacies.

However, the fact that the UAW agreements should be supported—however critically—is no justification for Comrade Hall to ignore many of the danger spots that may very seriously impede or negate a good deal of what has apparently been gained in the package.

This was most cogently brought out in the July 11 issue by Jack Wilson when, in his dispatch from Detroit, he made the telling point (ignored by Hall, who has in previous issues taken many of Wilson's comments on the discontent of the ranks and in his own articles instilled these bits of information with his own roseate analysis) that, as far as the ranks are concerned, "the one thing bothering the workers more than any other issue" has been, not the pace- and principle-setting value of the package and GAW plan, not Reuther's social foresight, but their own working conditions.

And, we are informed, the Ford and GM agreements are—to be a bit euphemistic—severely lacking on this point, a fact that caused the most disappointment and disillusionment over the contracts.

This raises a very serious problem for radicals and labor militants, among others.

When, at a recent New York meeting of the Young Socialist League on the UAW situation I raised a point about the ranks not being as "hopped up" about GAW as most socialists, radicals, labor militants, and intellectuals, Comrade Hall replied that this fact was a perfect indication that in the UAW leadership we have a group of unionists with a really impressive and progressive social outlook—comparatively speaking—and that we socialists, of all people, should support them in their attempt to educate the more conservative rank and file.

But is the case really as cut-and-dried as all that if, as Wilson avers, for five years "the auto workers have been limited in improving many of the injustices, inequities, work standards, and other shop issues . . . [and that, despite some improvements] nothing decisive enough has been done to convince the

ranks that the victory won't be taken out of their hides in speedup and harder work standards."

Also, since Comrade Hall is on a pace-setting kick, as far as his analysis is concerned, to the virtual exclusion of any other important aspects involved, what does he have to say about the pace-setting involved in this situation, in which, as Wilson informs us, every other management is demanding of union officials that they meet GM standards on operations and labor productivity?

Would he concede that one need not necessarily be of a sectarian frame of mind in maintaining that, if the above be true, there is some cogency to the argument that, in this case at least, the ranks have a little more on the ball than Reuther, and are correct in their refusal to be decisively convinced that this danger spot won't be responsible for taking out of their hides in speedup and harder work standards the fruits of their apparent victory?

Would Comrade Hall concede that the ranks—not a few wild-eyed sectarians—have at least a modicum of justification in their gripes and wildcats against this pace-setting aspect of the contracts?

PAUL GERMAIN

Thanks to Comrade Germain for a chance to explain some of the aspects of my articles on the auto settlements.

But what did I write? Let me prod his memory a little, for he has gotten such a mental bulldog grip on an irrelevancy that he has forgotten. To summarize:

(1) The Ford GM contracts represent a victory for the UAW and a stimulus to the American working class. The workers didn't win their emancipation; they did not even get justice. But in the context of the given situation the settlement was a victory for the union.

(2) This victory was won not by social-engineering and class peace but through the class struggle.

(3) Many difficult problems remain. They too will be settled in the class struggle.

(4) My essential criticism of the union leaders is not that they accepted this

contract but that they (and liberals generally) write off the class struggle and talk nonsense about labor-management peace and class harmony. If any union militants are impressed by this lesson in liberal sociology (and very few are) they will be thrown off guard in facing the struggle to come.

Germain ignores three of the four above points. He seems perturbed by point 1, which is all he discusses. Let us ask: was the settlement a victory? Germain can't make up his mind, and that is the crux of his difficulty, not any difference in tone between Wilson's articles and mine.

For example: He writes "within the context of a general acceptance of the contractual agreements." And he agrees that the UAW has been the "pace-setter" and was "largely responsible" for the steel workers' gains. He also believes that "Hall is correct in his emphasis on the principle-setting importance of the GAW. All this makes a queer preliminary for what is to come. Yet he goes on to speak of what has "apparently" been gained and then of the "apparent victory." And he accuses me of being on "a pace-setting kick." To say nothing of his derogatory terms "roseate analysis" and "quasi-eulogistic rhapsodies." Perhaps he is ready to admit the gains to himself but he doesn't like to see them emphasized in LABOR ACTION. Why is he so diffident?

Socialists should welcome every step forward, every victory of the working class. Socialist criticism and analysis of the labor movement as-it-is should not degenerate into a captious, carping rejection of every practical step. A sectarian sees a working class externally betrayed—sold out—misled; a labor movement which never wins; one which is always defeated, crushed, or set back. (Yet he expects this working class, which in the real class struggle he sees in a constant state of retreat, to rise up with high self-confidence and morale and put an end to capitalism.)

But the class struggle of the workers is not such a pitiful impotent force. Even without socialist leaders, even with a bourgeois political consciousness, even

with pro-capitalist leaders, the working class fights and often wins. To recognize this fact—more, to proclaim it—is not a concession to the pro-capitalist official ideology. It is a tribute to the power of the class struggle which transcends it. And it is this power of the working class which is the real basis for socialist optimism.

Germain somehow feels tricked because I took Wilson's reports of rank-and-file discontent and "instilled" them with a "roseate analysis." Let me explain a simple idea: The contracts leave many questions unsettled. Under certain conditions (rapid automation, unemployment) a critical situation can develop. I simply point out that a union like the UAW, with its militant traditions and union-conscious cadres, can be relied upon in one way or another not to capitulate but to fight. What is so "roseate" about that?

Our Detroit correspondent Jack Wilson has reported a widespread dissatisfaction among UAW members with the failure of the new contracts to do anything about speed-up. Germain wants to know if I "concede" that the ranks have "a modicum of justification in their gripes and wildcats"—as though for some unexplained reason it is necessary to prettify speed-up in order to recognize the contracts as a victory. He (Germain) also learns that the contracts are "severely lacking" on speed-up.

He could have gone much further. The UAW, neither in this contract settlement nor in any other, has ever won a substantial right to a decisive voice on production standards. The best it has done is this: the union reserves the right to strike in any dispute over speed-up. Over the years, the companies have exerted a constant pressure for more and more work from each man and little by little they gain their end. But this is not a new problem; it has not been settled by the new contract; neither has it been created by it.

Speed-up (the most important of the "working conditions") remains one of the chief unsettled grievances of auto workers. In my opinion, the UAW has never even worked out an effective pro-auto workers in a better position to fight gram to combat it. But I ask: are the speed-up as a result of their contract victory or not? Will their morale be higher or lower in any future struggles? I think the answer is obvious.

BEN HALL

BOOKS AND IDEAS

Two Nigerian Novelists Picture Africa

PEOPLE OF THE CITY, by Cyprian Ekwensi.—Andrew Dakers Ltd., London.

THE PALM-WINE DRINKARD and MY LIFE IN THE BUSH OF GHOSTS, by Amos Tutuola.—Grove Press, New York; \$2.75, 130 pp., and \$3.50, 174 pp., resp.

By PHISCILLA CADY

More and more we are in a position to learn about Africa not from observers of its people but from the people themselves. Cyprian Ekwensi and Amos Tutuola are two Nigerian novelists whose work has recently become available. Yet the two aspects of African life with which they provide us could not be more different.

Ekwensi's *People of the City* portrays the newly urbanized Africans—people coming to terms, or failing to do so, with a new culture, complex, impersonal and dynamic. The sense of isolation is acute. The hero, Amusa Sango, has a great variety of experiences, many of them unconnected but all derived from a central point: he is trying to make his way in a city, and this is difficult.

The author puts great stress on the African proverb that "Wrongdoing is a hill; everyone mounts his own and decries that of another," but it is hard to see why he does. There is no central moral issue involved. Moral issues come up from time to time, but unconnectedly.

To be sure, as a novel, it is not very good, but as a pioneer work in the field of the African novel it is valuable; and as a picture of city life in Nigeria it is highly interesting. Amusa Sango may well be representative of the sensitive, intellectual African today, and *People of the City* gives us insight into his problems.

Tutuola's books, the *Palm-Wine Drinkard* and *My Life in the Bush of Ghosts*, are not actually novels but delightful recordings of African folklore, highly reminiscent of European fairy tales and

Homeric epics, although imbued with their own national character and spiced with such modernisms as imagery involving telephones, cameras and even television. Tutuola, although he claims merely to set down what is in existence, is clearly vital to the process of creating these books. For he has chosen the particular tales he tells with obvious discernment, unified them with craftsmanship, and stamped on them his artist's feeling for words. These are no mere collections of isolated folk-stories—Tutuola has taken the existing material and made it his own.

The existing material is, to begin with,

very good. The grotesque and the ordinary are woven together in great flights of the imagination, involving (for instance) quarter-mile-high total strangers and a complete and beautiful gentleman who turns out not to be so complete (or beautiful) after he returns all the parts of his body to the original owners, from whom he had merely rented them for a trip to town.

These books are examples of that subtle blending, frequently observed in the early literature of a country, between the individual artist and his people. In this case the union is a particularly happy one.

Beau Geste in Indochina

By BRUCE BAIN

Nobody who reads *In Order to Die* [just published in Britain] is likely to keep any illusions about the French Foreign Legion; he may still preserve from the high romance of P. C. Wren and *The Desert Song*.

Henry Ainley—son of the famous actor—joined the Legion five years ago, because—he claims—he was disgusted "with everybody else's inertia about Communism." He wanted to go out to Indochina and fight the Reds himself. But the Beau Geste found that his crusade turned into a different kind of campaign: the free world didn't seem to have chosen its Christian warriors very wisely.

"Rape, beating, burning, torturing of entirely harmless peasants and villagers were of common occurrence in the course of punitive patrols and operations by French troops, throughout the length and breadth of Indochina," Mr. Ainley writes, and his book is packed with evidence of the degenerate corruption and brutality with which this campaign was often fought.

Officers with courage and integrity could—and did—stop the rot. But, only too often, "official language was good at camouflage: rape, murder, torture, loot became questioned, killed in combat, interrogation of suspects, recovery of rebel material . . ." An interesting sidelight on the present anarchy in Vietnam is provided by Mr. Ainley's description of the private war which the Cao Dai troops waged with the French.

It is curious that, after all this, the only moral which Mr. Ainley draws is that "The men of the Foreign Legion were first-class soldiers, but they had nothing whatsoever to do with a mission of pacification and political reeducation.

"The Foreign Legion was brilliant at two things—killing and dying well, both of which the Legionnaires did frequently and with *éclat*. But that had little to do with protecting the quiet, little yellow men who surrounded us, hated us cordially and occasionally got round to murdering us when they saw the chance."

—From book review in London Tribune.



LABOR ACTION

August 1, 1955 Vol. 19, No. 31

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

EDUCATION BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN

II—The Totalitarianization of the Schools Under Stalinism

(Continued from last week)

"Organization of university or institute was taken out of the hands of the students and placed in the hands of the director and staff. Brigade laboratory work was abolished and individual work with individual responsibility introduced. Lecture by the professor was restored. Students were reprimanded for being late at lectures and persistent lateness or absence leads to expulsion from a higher education institute for 5 years."

Following this came a series of measures which produced a complete break with the educational perspectives laid out in the early years of the revolutionary government. Elasticity in syllabi allowing for individual initiative of the instructor was replaced by a uniform syllabus fixed at the center for compulsory adoption by the teacher. Experimental schools were abolished and today function merely as demonstration or model schools.⁴ Examinations were reintroduced by decrees in 1932. Polytechnic education, a method which combines handiwork with the scientific principles underlying them, was abandoned in 1937. Thus, the class dualisms which were becoming realities in Russian economic and social life were reflected in education. The re-establishment of a separation in education between scientific principles and mechanical operations reflected the development in society of a gap between the privileged specialist and the manual laborer, with lessening opportunity for the latter to enter the strata of the former.

Discipline, obedience and punishment achieved great prominence as educational standards. The American sympathizers of the Russian regime who send their children to progressive schools would be the first to withdraw them from these schools if a pattern modeled on the Russian were to be adopted.

"In the third place, discipline is firm, that is, it is unquestioned obedience and submission to the leader, the teacher or the organizer. Without this there is no discipline; submission to the will of the leader is a necessary and essential mark of discipline."⁵

"The teacher first of all makes exactions of the pupils during the recitation. He does not coax pupils, he demands obedience."⁶

REACTION RAMPANT

Some Rules for School Children—adopted by the Soviet of People's Commissars, Aug. 2, 1943—to be fully formed in children as early as the first grade:

"Rule No. 3—To obey without question the orders of the school directors or teacher.

"Rule No. 9—To rise as the teacher or director enters or leaves the classrooms.

"Rule No. 12—To be respectful to the school director and the teachers, to greet them on the street with a polite bow, boys removing their hats.

"What the rules require is a reverent behavior toward the teacher—not just a courteous or correct one, but precisely a reverent behavior, an absolute submission to the orders of the teacher."⁷

And if the pupils do not conform to these demands . . . ?

"Exemption from punishment demoralizes the pupil's will, it corrupts him, frees him of the unalterable necessity of concentration upon the tasks he has been set. Punishment provides obedience."⁸

"The pupil ought to know that no offenses can be left unpunished and that serious misdemeanor will result in serious punishment, even expulsion from the school and handing over to a court."⁹

Children in Russia under the age of 16 are forbidden to visit movies on weekdays without the permission of the head of the school.

Internationalism and the elimination of patriotic teaching from the school system was one of the highest achievements of the revolutionary regime. Its replacement by the extreme nationalism of the Stalinist regime is example enough of the fundamental disparity between the present rulers and the early government of 1918. Its place in education?

"The foundation of Soviet education was the objective of inculcating in a child a love of his country. . . . It is quite obvious that along with this is developed deep love and affection for the Communist Party and its leaders who are building a happy life for the country."¹⁰

"The cultivation of the spirit of Soviet patriotism in the younger generation is the most important task of moral education in the country."¹¹

LIKE THE NAZIS

The leader-worship cult built around Stalin was amply demonstrated to the world on his recent 70th birthday, particularly, if we compare it to the modesty with which Lenin's birthday was celebrated by his compatriots. The man whose appearance, according to the poem *Soviet Land*, produces the effect of "a ray of summer sunshine," who has been compared by other eulogists to a sun god, has "permitted" an adulation of himself that is unparalleled in history.

The reversal in educational methods which took place in Russia after 1930 present a startling parallel to the "innovations" introduced by the Nazis in German education. Germany had been fa-

mous for its experimental schools. Hitler abolished them. Flexibility in curriculum was likewise eliminated. As under the Stalinist totalitarian state, discipline and obedience were demanded in the schools.

"The characteristics which the Nazi state requires and which the school must produce: Orderliness, obedience, comradeship, leadership."¹² For the word "behavior" hitherto used, "obedience" was substituted.

Patriotism and leader-worship are too well-known attributes of Nazism to bear much comment. Their attitude toward patriotic education is identical with that of Russian educators. "The cultivation of the spirit of Soviet patriotism in the younger generation" as "the most important task of moral education in the country"¹³ expresses, if we replace the word "Soviet" with "German," precisely the aim of Nazi education. The teaching of religion in Nazi schools was replaced in actuality by a secularized religion of the state emphasizing the glories of Germany, its war heroes and its supreme hero, Hitler.

As we have learned from Mr. Pavlenko, "It is quite obvious that along with this [love of country] is developed a deep love and affection for the Communist Party and its leaders."¹⁴

The similarities between Nazi and Russian education are not accidental. They mirror the similarities between two totalitarian dictatorships. Discipline and obedience in school, patriotism, reverence for the teacher and the leader constitute excellent preparation for life under totalitarianism. We learn that one of the purposes of

" . . . the cultivation of discipline in children is . . . the preparation for organized and disciplined labor in the higher schools, in production and in the service of the Red Army."¹⁵

CLASS DIFFERENTIA

Perhaps the most significant development in Russian education was the introduction in 1940 of tuition fees in secondary and higher education. Primary education, which is available to the masses of people, is a necessity concomitant with the development of an industrial society. The complexities of industrial and urban life make literacy a social requirement. Proof of the fact that an industrial society affords its citizens educational opportunities can only be found when leaving the primary field we find an accessibility of secondary and higher education to the masses.

From the early years of the regime efforts were made to maintain a large proletarian nucleus in the higher schools. After 1932, however, this emphasis dropped out of official pronouncements. By 1938 the proportion of salaried employees, specialists and their children at higher schools was 42.2 per cent.¹⁶

On October 2, 1940, a decree, Laws and Ordinances 1940—637,676, was passed fixing tuition fees for secondary schools and higher education as follows:¹⁷

Secondary Classes—8th, 9th and 10th grades: 200 rubles per annum for schools in capitals of republics; 150 rubles per annum for schools in all other towns and villages.

Higher Education: 400 rubles per annum for colleges in capitals of republics; 300 rubles per annum for colleges in the provinces; 500 rubles per annum for theatrical, art and music colleges;

The average monthly wage in Russia in 1938 was 287 rubles.¹⁸ The realistic possibilities of a Russian worker sending his child through high school are obviously very slight.

Stipends are granted only to those students who maintain an average of 4.67 points (5 is the top mark) but who receive no "Fair" rating in any subject. There are no scholarships in secondary schools. Exemption from payment of fees on the secondary level is granted

only to children of sick or disabled parents, to those who have lost their parents, and to children of parents of junior rank in the armed forces. There is, thus, very little chance of a poor child receiving a scholarship since very few of them manage to complete secondary school. According to an article in the Moscow press, reported in the *Herald Tribune*, there were in 1949, 29 million children in Russian primary and secondary schools. Of these, 213,000 were scheduled to graduate. Estimating on the basis of ten grades, there should be an average of 2.9 millions in each class. The graduating class of 213,000 is therefore only seven per cent of the average class. This means that more than 90 per cent of Russian children do not finish secondary school.¹⁹

STRATIFICATION

According to Beatrice King, pro-Stalinist English writer, "For the majority the decision [for a career], never irrevocable, is taken at 14 years while for those who will pursue higher education the choice is made at 17 years."²⁰

An attempted justification is given for the introduction of tuition fees:

"The decision of the Council of Peoples Commissars was most conducive in consolidating the Soviet school and in improving the quality [sic] of secondary education."²¹

The needs of economy have been given as a basis for justifying fees as a necessary selective measure. But the selectivity, in practice, meant limiting higher education primarily to the rich and squeezing out sons and daughters of working class families. Genuine socialist policy in such a case of scarcity would have limited itself to deserving students. Today, for the most part, it is social origin which determines your education and consequently your career in Russia. Higher education is of major importance for the attainment of high position in modern life. Rich managers and salaried officials have thus hereditary perpetuation of their status since it is primarily their children who will be able to obtain the necessary training. Consequently, the educational decree of 1940 introduces a permanent class stratification into Russian society. High position, privilege and career are, for the most part, sealed off from children of the masses.

What happens to these children? According to the Labor Reserve Act of 1940 (the same year as the tuition decree) compulsory vocational education was introduced. One million boys aged 14-15 are recruited annually for a training course in one of the major industries. Responsibility for their board lies with the industry. After completing their training courses they are directed to work three years in an industry run by one of the ministries.²² The law was later widened to include girls. Students in high schools and colleges are, of course, exempt from this law.

Any such measures as described above would be received with horror in the United States, particularly by Stalinists

(Turn to last page)

Reference Notes

- See Slavonic and East European Review, July 1938.
- See Changing Man by Beatrice King, 1937.
- Taken from *Sovietskaya Pedagogika*, Oct. 1943. Reproduced in *I Want to be Like Stalin*, by George Counts.
- Ibid., p. 101.
- Izvestia*, Sept. 4, 1944. A. Mostovoi, director of 330th School for Boys in Moscow.
- Pravda*, Jan. 16, 1944. Article by A. Protopopov.
- Sovietskaya Pedagogika*, No. 7, 1943.
- New York Times, Dec. 6, 1949. Interview with Pavlenko, director of Moscow Boys School 315.
- Sovietskaya Pedagogika*, 1943.
- Frankfurter Zeitung*, Nov. 18, 1936.
- See above.
- See above.
- Sovietskaya Pedagogika*, 1943. See above quoted book by Counts, p. 35.
- Cultural Construction in the USSR, p. 114.
- See *Secret of Soviet Strength* by Dean of Canterbury, Press Department Voks, 1940 and *Russia From A to Z* by Freund.
- Problems of Leninism* by Joseph Stalin, p. 642. Annual wage is given as 3447 rubles for average industrial worker.
- The attempt to gauge the effect of the tuition fees on school attendance was very unsatisfactory given the contradictions in Stalinist figures. The population in Russian primary and secondary schools in 1937 is given as 38 million by Maisky, then Russian ambassador to England, in a speech made in 1938 reprinted as a pamphlet, *Soviet Youth: Its Training and Opportunity*. For the following year the Dean of Canterbury reports a figure of 31.5 million! (See *The Secret of Soviet Strength*, p. 85-97.)
- Choosing a Career in Soviet Schools, B. King, p. 16.
- Press Department Voks, 1940.
- Russia From A to Z*, by A. Freund and *Russia Goes to School*, by B. King.
- Soviet Politics At Home and Abroad*, by F. L. Schuman.
- Changing Man*, 1937. Soviet Child in Wartime, 1943.
- The Primary School*, *Nachatnyia Shkola*, Aug.-Sept. 1943.
- Sovietskaya Pedagogika*, 1943. (See *I Want to be Like Stalin*, by Counts, p. 68.)
- Russian women are not discriminated against in higher education. This applies, as we have seen, to daughters of the bureaucracy. Sexual equality functions predominantly for daughters of the rich who can afford higher education.

YSL CLASS • NEW YORK

Perspective on History & Revolution

TUESDAYS at 8 p.m.

- Aug. 2—ABE STEIN
Germany, 1924-1934
 - Aug. 9—ANNE RUSSELL
The Spanish Revolution and Civil War
 - Aug. 16—GORDON HASKELL
Revolution in Asia—I
 - Aug. 23—GORDON HASKELL
Revolution in Asia—II
- 114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

NEW YORK YSL

New Summer Class

THE FUNDAMENTAL IDEAS OF SOCIALISM

WEDNESDAY EVE'S at 8:15

- (4) Aug. 3
Why a Labor Party?
- (5) Aug. 10
How Socialists Work for Peace
- (6) Aug. 17
Democratic Socialism and the Future

All sessions will be held on consecutive Wednesday evenings at 273 Madison Street, Apt. 3A (Lower East Side), New York. Take D train to E. Broadway sta.

BEGINNING A FULL REPORT ON

ISL vs. the 'SUBVERSIVE LIST':

The Department of Justice Holds a Hearing

By GORDON HASKELL

WASHINGTON, July 25—If the first day's session of this "hearing" is a sample of what is to follow, it is clear that the government has no intention of ending the evasive tactics which have permitted it to keep the ISL and over two hundred other organizations on the "subversive list" for all these years without having to prove its case against any of them.

So crude and arbitrary were the "positions" taken both by the Justice Department's attorneys and by Hearing Examiner Morrissey that Joseph L. Rauh, the ISL's chief counsel, had to announce after the noon recess that the ISL was going to go through with the "farce" only because the Court of Appeals has made it clear in the National Lawyers Guild case that no organization can hope to contest its listing in a court of law until it has exhausted its administrative remedies, regardless of any other considerations.

Most of the morning session on July 25 was taken up by the ISL's attorneys in a forlorn-hope attempt to force the government to define the basis on which for all these years they have listed the ISL under the headings "communist" and "seek to overthrow the government by unconstitutional means."

This effort must be described as a "forlorn hope" since the hearing had been preceded by both formal and informal efforts to obtain clarification on what the government means by these rubbery terms, as well as to obtain rulings on the procedures to be followed and the type of evidence to be admitted in the hearing.

All these efforts have been in vain. Not only have the government's lawyers refused to give the definitions requested, and to state whether or not they intended to rely on the statements of unknown and unsworn informers, but the Hearing Examiner has dismissed or overruled all motions made by the ISL's attorneys without exception.

QUESTION OF RULES

The first motion made by Rauh was that the Fund for the Republic be permitted to make a documentary film of the proceedings, in view of the fact that this is the first hearing to be granted any organization on the list. After asking who or what the Fund for the Republic might be, Hearing Examiner Morrissey ruled that though this was an open hearing and no one would be barred from the room, he would not permit any pictures, motion or otherwise, to be taken of the proceedings.

Next, Rauh pointed out that although the Justice Department's attorneys had refused to state previously whether they would rely on evidence given by unknown informers, but had said only that they would not introduce such evidence unless it were "absolutely necessary" to their case, he would like to know at this point, when the government's case must surely be fully prepared, whether they would or would not use such "evidence." For the government, Alderman asked the question be ruled out of order, on the ground that it had been ruled on the previous Monday, and he went on to say that although the government does not "intend" to use secret or classified information in presenting their case, they reserve the right to do so.

Morrissey stated that under the Department of Justice's rules governing this hearing such evidence is admissible. He claimed that since the government says it does not intend to use such evidence, the issue might never arise, and that the ISL and its counsel should wait until there was something concrete on which to protest.

Rauh pointed out that this leaves him and his client in a position in which they

could win their case in the hearing hands down, knock the government's evidence into a cocked hat, only to lose on the basis of "evidence" or "testimony" which they have no right to see or cross-examine!

He demanded that the hearing officer rule on whether this hearing was to be held under the rules laid down in the Administrative Procedures Act or not. (This act bars the use of secret information in such proceedings.)

Morrissey ruled that "as far as possible the Administrative Procedures Act rules will be applicable," but also the rules set forth by the attorney general for hearings relevant to subversive listings.

Rauh: "You don't think we are entitled to know the rules under which we are proceeding?"

The Hearing Examiner replied only that he stood on the ruling he had just made.

WHAT ARE THE CHARGES?

Having failed to get any clarification on the rules of evidence under which the hearing was to be held, Rauh now turned to an attempt to find out exactly what the ISL is charged with by the government. He stated that the ISL believes "in a society based on a common ownership of the means of production and distribution, which aims at establishing the principle, 'from each according to his ability, and to each according to his needs.'"

He stated that if such belief and assertion is sufficient to put the ISL on the list, the hearing could be terminated immediately, as the ISL would not dream of denying that it believes in a complete socialist society. He moved that the Hearing Examiner rule whether or not the advocacy of such views by an organization is sufficient to get it on the list. This was one of the few motions on which Morrissey withheld a ruling rather than denying it immediately.

At this point Alderman, chief of the Subversive Organizations Section of the Internal Security Division of the Department of Justice, intervened to say that this hearing had been called to establish whether the ISL had been properly designated as "communist" and "seek to alter the form of government by unconstitutional means," and that the government had made it clear that the latter means "force and violence." He said that the ISL is not charged with being socialist, and that its attorney knows this very well.

"You know that your statement is incorrect," Rauh shot back at him. It should be recalled at this point that a number of the "grounds" and interrogatories sent to the ISL by the attorney general in 1953 state merely that the ISL wants to establish a completely different form of government and socio-economic order.

"FARCE"

"If believing in a complete socialist society is enough to put us on the list, say so now so we can go to court," challenged Rauh. Alderman replied that the statement of grounds sets forth what the ISL is charged with.

This became the standard, though unenlightening, reply of the government attorneys to any further attempts by the ISL's counsel to get them to state what criteria the Department of Justice used in putting the organization on the list.

At this point, Rauh, who had been visibly struggling to control his righteous indignation at the manner in which the hearing was being conducted, exploded:

"My statement for the record is that this hearing is a farce.

"We have been called Communist when we are anti-Communist. Now we are charged with force and violence. Is there any time limit to this charge, or does it include predictions going into eons of time? Does the clear-and-present-danger doctrine even as interpreted by the courts apply? . . ."

Alderman replied that the ISL had received amplification of the charges in the "grounds" and that "we feel that is enough amplification."

Rauh: "The ISL waited for eight years and was met with silence. Now it is treated with silence at the hearing."

After an interruption he went on: "What is the purpose of the list?"

Waterman: "Object."

Morrissey: "Sustained."

WHAT CRITERIA?

At this point a heated exchange took place between Rauh, Morrissey and Waterman. Waterman claimed that the list itself was not up for question in this proceeding, but only the inclusion of the ISL on it.

Rauh pointed out that the uses to which the list are put must have some bearing on the criteria employed in designating an organization on it. Different standards would necessarily be used, depending on the uses to which the list was to be put. In the pre-hearing session the government attorneys had claimed that the sole use of the list was in connection with the Federal Employee Security Program, that is, with regard to hiring and firing government employees. But the Department of Justice itself has used the list to deport people, to try to deny them passports, to get people evicted from federal housing for failure to sign an oath denying membership in any of the listed organizations, and for much else. How can the department claim, in the hearing room, that the list is used only for the Federal Employee Security Program when it itself has sought to enforce application of the list in other fields, and the Coast Guard and the armed forces use it too?

As usual, Morrissey overruled all motions made in connection with this demand to get the government to describe its use of the list and the standards used to compile it which would justify such use.

BIG OR LITTLE C?

At this point Isaac Groner, Rauh's associate counsel, took over. He stated that the government attorneys had repeatedly said that the ISL was listed because it is "communist, small c," and not because it is "Communist, big C." He said that he had taken their word for it that this was the term used in Eisenhower's Executive Order 10450, but that on a careful examination of the order he found that this was not so.

He then quoted from the executive order in question, from the portion which instructs government officers on the use to be made of the list in hiring and firing government employees. And there it was, so big and clear that even government lawyers could not pretend its absence:

"The investigations conducted pursuant to this order shall be designed to develop information as to whether the employment or retention in employment in the federal service of a person being investigated is clearly consistent with the interest of the national security. Such information shall relate, but shall not be limited to, the following. . . ."

"Paragraph 5. Membership in, or affiliation or sympathetic association with, a movement, group or combination of persons which is totalitarian, fascist, Communist, or subversive or which has adopted or which has a policy of advocating or approving the commission of acts of force or violence, to deny other persons their rights under the Constitution of the United States, or which seeks to alter the form of government of the

For introduction to this report, see front-page story on the hearing in Washington.

It should be borne in mind that the attorney general's "subversive list" includes not only the name of the Independent Socialist League but also the ISL's predecessor, the Workers Party and its one-time youth group the Socialist Youth League (which no longer exists, having merged with the YPSL to form the present Young Socialist League, an independent youth organization). The current case and hearing is on all three together. Therefore, in this and subsequent reports, although only the ISL is referred to, the case of the three organizations is understood as involved.—ED.

United States by unconstitutional means."

This led to another heated exchange. The government attorneys claimed that although Eisenhower's executive order, on which they say they are relying for the listing, did not include the use of the term "communist," it incorporated a section of Truman's Executive Order 9835 (which set up the list in the first place) which did use it. Groner pointed out that in the section of Executive Order 10450 instructing government officers on the use of the list, although the rest of the language had been taken over bodily from Order 9835, this word had been changed from the "small c" to "big c," and that this must have been done intentionally.

MORRISSEY'S QUERY

At this point, two almost unbelievable things happened.

Hearing Examiner Morrissey, who had already denied or overruled at least half a dozen different motions which sought to get the government to define what it means by "communist," turned to the ISL's lawyers, and with a friendly though seemingly bewildered smile, said: "Could you, Mr. Groner, tell me what the difference is between big and little 'c' on this question?"

Though he is a self-possessed man, it must be admitted that at this point Groner also looked, if not bewildered, then at least shocked. Both he and Rauh pointed out that the whole case of the ISL must necessarily turn on the apparently "little" difference between a small and capital "C" in this proceeding. Either then or later, it was pointed out that if the Hearing Examiner had made all his previous rulings without understanding the difference, one could only believe that he is so hostile to the ISL's case that he cannot possibly conduct a fair and impartial hearing.

Rauh was compelled to state that the Hearing Examiner was acting more like a part of the government's staff than an impartial adjudicator. Morrissey could only retort lamely that perhaps he knew the difference but only wanted to be clarified on what the ISL thinks the difference is.

TYPO, THEY SAY

When the situation calmed down enough to permit a return to the question of just exactly what the designation on the list is, Oran H. Waterman, the government's attorney who had done most of the talking, declared that the use of "Communist" in the text of Executive Order 10450 must be a typographical error.

Groner pointed out that the president of the United States does not sign his name to typographical errors and promulgate them for the guidance of government officers.

On the basis of this whole exchange, Groner asked the Hearing Examiner to dismiss the government's charge that the ISL is "communist" as this has no basis in Executive Order 10450. Morrissey, as usual, denied the motion. The only reason he would give for the denial was that since both the government and the ISL had presented their positions for the record, and since the substance of the matter would be subject to demonstration as the hearing proceeds, no ruling was required at the moment.

The government, even at this point, refused again to state what they mean by "communist" except that it had been set forth in the "grounds," while reiterating that it is on this term that they rely for the designation of the ISL on the list. They were willing to state that "Communist" means to them what "Stalinist" means to readers of LABOR ACTION, and added that "there is no charge that the ISL is

Rauh Assails Tactics of Government Attorneys and Biased Rulings of Examiner...

related to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in any manner."

On returning from the noon recess, attorney Rauh declared that the ISL would continue with the hearing only for the reasons stated above, namely, to show a court that "administrative remedies" were exhausted.

He added that the Hearing Examiner had shown such hostility and prejudice in his conduct of the hearing that he would like to request him to consider at this time whether he should not disqualify himself from conducting it further. Rauh pointed out that, unlike the Department of Justice, the ISL would not move to disqualify a judge or examiner solely on the basis of his attitude as shown in the proceeding, since a basis for demanding disqualification can only be proof of a personal interest of the judge or examiner in the matter at issue. Morrissey refused to disqualify himself.

"CHEESY TRICK"

The government then announced that it would proceed to present its case against the ISL without an opening statement. Rauh requested that he be permitted to make such a statement for the ISL, but was told by the examiner that he could make such a statement only when the ISL begins with its defense. This despite the fact that Waterman had said the government would have no objection to the ISL's attorney making an opening statement at the beginning of the presentation of evidence.

At this point, the government finally

introduced its first exhibit, the pamphlet by Max Shachtman *The Fight for Socialism*. They sought to include only selected excerpts starting on page 138 (the section entitled "The Principles and Program of the Workers Party").

Waterman stated that the section he would introduce "is being introduced for the purpose of indicating positions taken by the Workers Party" with special bearing on the government's grounds 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 18, 19, 23 and 26, and as constituting evidence on the charge both that the ISL is "communist" and "seeks to overthrow the government by unconstitutional means."

Further effort was made by the ISL's attorneys to get the government to indicate the relevance of the passage they were trying to quote to the charge of "communist" or "unconstitutional means," all of which was frustrated by the silence of the government's lawyers and the adverse rulings of the Hearing Examiner. Then a section of the pamphlet, ending with the words "which is known to every worker," was read by Waterman.

He then sought to skip to page 142, to the section which begins "The revolutionary socialists are not bloodthirsty maniacs..." but was interrupted by Rauh, who accused the government of one of the "shabbiest tricks" he had ever encountered in a court room or hearing. He pointed out that the sections omitted described the need of workers to prepare themselves to defend their democratic rights against fascist and other reaction-

ary attempts to suppress them or overthrow a government they had legally won, by force and violence, while by its omission the government sought to make it appear that the ISL advocates offensive action.

After a brief recess during which the Hearing Examiner looked over the deleted passages, he mildly suggested that perhaps when the government quotes a part of any article they should quote the whole, even though he understands that they may want to emphasize certain sections. The government attorneys

thus felt themselves compelled to read into the record the entire chapter involved, ending on page 155.

The ISL attorneys protested the inclusion of the sections read or the book as a whole into evidence, in the absence of any demonstration of its relevance to the actual charges. Morrissey, as usual, sustained the government position, and admitted "the whole book and specially the sections read for emphasis," as the government's exhibit No. 1.

At this point, the hearing recessed for the day.

Second Day of Hearing Sees Demand For Disqualification of Hearing Examiner

By GORDON HASKELL

WASHINGTON, July 26—On the second day of the Department of Justice hearing of the ISL's contest against its inclusion on the subversive list, ISL attorney Joseph L. Rauh moved to disqualify Hearing Examiner Edward M. Morrissey. Upon denial of his motion, the hearing was adjourned to the following morning to permit the ISL to appeal its motion of disqualification to Attorney General Robert Brownell who appointed Morrissey. (The full text of the ISL's motion to disqualify is published on this page.)

This dramatic action was based not only on the developments in the hearing this morning, but on the whole record of the proceeding in which Morrissey has acted consistently more as an agent of the gov-

ernment than as an "impartial" hearing examiner.

Much of this was reported in the story covering yesterday's proceedings and is contained in the text of the ISL's appeal. The events which capped Morrissey's conduct at the hearing follow.

At the opening of Tuesday's session, attorney Rauh asked the Department of Justice's representative whether the "typographical error" in Executive Order 10450, referred to on Monday, had been corrected. He pointed out once again that unless the ISL knows whether it is being charged with being "Communist" as described in the executive order, or "communist" as claimed by the Department's lawyer (while they continue to deny a definition of what this latter term means to them), it is almost impossible for it to proceed with the hearing "as it has no way of knowing what the government is trying to prove."

Needless to say, he was informed that Executive Order 10450 had not been amended and that such amendment was beyond the purview of this hearing. Morrissey simply insisted, "We are proceeding under the executive order as it stands" and refused clarification on what that means.

"MYSTERIOUS STRANGER"

Rauh then turned to a matter which had developed at the end of the previous day's hearing.

At one point he had introduced himself, his associate Isaac Groner, and the three representatives sitting at the "defense" table. He had asked the government to identify all members of their side in the case. Alderman had introduced all the government attorneys.

At the end of the first day's hearing, Rauh had observed that a middle-aged man who had sat at the back of the room throughout the proceeding was talking to the government's lawyers. He had asked them who this man was. The mysterious stranger then began to scurry from the room and Rauh was only able to overtake him in the hall. But he staunchly refused to identify himself, claiming he was a "private citizen."

On Tuesday, Rauh demanded that the government state whether this man was a witness for them. The government attorneys finally admitted that he would appear as an "expert" witness but refused to give his name, and they were automatically upheld by Morrissey, as usual.

"Rauh: I move not only that this witness be excluded from the room but that he not be permitted to testify in this hearing. I was deliberately misled by Justice Department counsel into thinking that we had the names of all people in the room connected with their case."

At this point Alderman, who seemed to have taken over from Waterman the chief's role on the government's side, made a statement in which he attempted to show that the Department had sought to be "cooperative" with the ISL attorneys from the beginning.

After the latter finished, Morrissey denied the motion that the mysterious "expert" be prevented from testifying in view of the fact that he had been in the room from the beginning, but invoked the "exclusion rule" against all witnesses both for the Department and the ISL, except for Max Shachtman, who is a "principal" in the case. (The "exclusion rule" simply means that witnesses may

(Turn to last page)

The Case Against the Hearing Examiner

Following is the text of the telegram sent to Attorney General Herbert Brownell on Tuesday, by the ISL's attorneys, Joseph L. Rauh and Isaac Groner.

(Subheads and paragraphing are editorially added. The all-capital telegraph style used in the original by-passed the question of big C or little c for the word communist.—ED.)

Part I.—Independent Socialist League respectfully requests that you remove Edward Morrissey as Hearing Examiner in proceedings concerning designation of ISL on attorney general's list on ground of bias and prejudice. Examiner has evidenced bias and prejudice in the following ways:

1. Examiner has refused to put into record complete text of his letter of designation from your office and substance of his conversations with Department of Justice representatives held outside presence of counsel for ISL.

2. On opening day of hearing, examiner ruled immediately and subserviently as Mr. Alderman, ranking government attorney, indicated. R. 14-5, 18, 19-20, 55, 59.

3. Examiner has shown basic unawareness of fundamentals of fair hearing. He stated, "I frankly don't know what you mean by standards" when this was explained many times over as "some idea of what communist means for the purpose of ultimate determination in this proceeding," "what definitions or meanings the attorney general will use in order to make his decision," and after ISL counsel repeatedly made point that statement of grounds was not equivalent of standards because the standard was required to explain how the grounds and the proof were to be evaluated in reaching end labels, examiner has continued to uphold Department of Justice line that the standards are clear because of the statement of grounds.

4. Examiner has refused to indicate standards by which he will judge ISL, thus making fair hearing impossible.

"RULED AUTOMATICALLY"

5. Examiner has ruled against ISL automatically and without consideration of issues involved. Major issue in case is meaning of word communist and whether big C or little c is intended. If word communist means organization directly or indirectly connected with Communist Party, there can be no question that ISL is not such an organization since its opposition to Communist Party, Communist International and Soviet Russia are well known and admitted by government. If word communist means a group of believers in society based upon common ownership of means of production and distribution aiming at establishing principle from each according to his ability and to each according to his needs, then the ISL proudly pleads guilty and no hearing is necessary. Examiner overruled several motions of the ISL to

require government or examiner to state which of the above meanings of word communist was applicable at hearing and if neither of these, what the meaning of the word communist was. After overruling several motions seeking to clarify meaning examiner asked counsel for ISL what the difference between the small C organization and the large C organization actually was. In other words, records demonstrate that examiner ruled against ISL several times on crucial issue in the case without understanding or trying to understand basic issue being raised by ISL.

6. Examiner has shown lack of minimum substantive knowledge of field required for independent and impartial ruling.

7. Examiner has denied some ISL motions on the ground that views of both parties "have been fully explained and argued and are a part of the record." When counsel asked for definition of "communist" examiner said, "My ruling on that is that it is all in the record from both sides." These refusals to make responsive rulings are certainly not unbiased reasons for denying ISL motions.

"AS THEY SEE FIT"

8. When counsel for ISL pointed out that defining standards was duty of government and that government, not ISL, should state difference between small C and large C organizations the examiner stated, "I am going to request the Department to do it, because I would like to know," but the examiner never did ask the Department to do so. Also, he did not have Department counsel specify the language or the place in the Executive Order where the standard was recited, although government counsel stated flatly, "The standard is set forth in the Executive Order," and ISL counsel repeated requests for reading language.

9. Examiner is allowing Department to proceed without explaining theory of its case. Examiner overruled motion to require government to make opening statement setting forth theory of case. ISL is therefore being forced to proceed to a hearing without knowing what standards will apply and what the theory of the government case is.

10. Examiner has made hostile remarks to counsel for ISL. For example he has stated "I am not going to sit here... and let you people expound your political views for the purpose of this record." He has accused counsel of seeking to "indirectly do what I ruled against you doing directly" when all that coun-

sel was trying to do was to explain an objection to the admission of evidence. He has implied cases cited may be "false." He has admitted evidence without even hearing our objection. Probably the best statement of examiner's views is following: "Let's let the Department proceed as they see fit."

11. Examiner repeated several times that counsel for ISL had agreed to certain matters that record will show were never agreed to.

In the case of Judge Youngdahl your Department filed an affidavit indicating that he had a fixed opinion on guilt or innocence. There is no question in our mind whatever that Mr. Morrissey has a fixed determination to justify your listing which is fixed opinion on guilt in this case. We cannot believe that Department of Justice will apply one standard in trying to disqualify a distinguished federal judge and another standard for its agents.

The case for disqualification is ten times as strong as that in case which government brought against Judge Youngdahl. Here there is a withholding of conversation with government. Here there is clear evidence of hostility toward ISL counsel. Here there is deliberate concealment of standards of judgment. Here there is a fixed opinion on guilt.

The ISL has fought for a hearing for 8 years. If Morrissey is not removed only hearing which ISL will get will be farce. Having waited 8 years for this hearing, ISL feels that decent, fair and American thing to do is to provide an examiner with an open mind.

"FOND HOPE"

Part II.—Government attorneys flatly stated on record that Executive Order 10450 used the word communist with small C. Counsel for ISL checked Federal Register and found this was error. When confronted with this point representatives of the Department announced this was "a typographical error if anything," and referred to the "confusion over the possible typographical error" and said he might discuss with you amending the order.

We request an answer to this question: Is Executive Order 10450 to be amended to change capital C to small C?

PART III.—We recognize apparent futility of appealing to you to disqualify examiner who has simply ruled like an automaton in favor of positions taken by your representative. It is our fond hope, however, that you will turn this matter over to an independent representative of Department so that the hearing for which ISL has waited for 8 years will not be meaningless. We request right to be heard orally by you or such independent representative.

JOSEPH L. RAUH JR.
ISAAC N. GRONER

ISL vs. Subversive List — —

(Continued from page 7)

not hear the proceedings before they are called on to testify. It was made clear that of the ISL representatives present, only Shachtman would be called on to testify.)

Rauh then read into the record the long, dogged effort he had made before the hearing to get the government to define their case, to submit a list of witnesses, and the like. This was in reply to Alderman's claim that they had been "cooperative."

Alderman then countered by pointing out that although at the beginning of the proceeding on Monday the government had given the ISL a list of the exhibits on which they intend to base their case, Rauh had "refused" to give the government a similar list. Rauh replied that since the government has refused to tell the ISL what its theory of the case is, it has been impossible for the ISL to know what exhibits they will introduce to refute the government.

REFUSE STATEMENT

Alderman pointed to the huge pile of bound volumes of LABOR ACTION, the *New International*, bulletins, books and pamphlets on the table where the ISL's representatives were sitting, and commented that the "notations" (markers) sticking out of these volumes would seem to indicate that the ISL knows what it is going to present.

Rauh replied that the ISL had been compelled to bring down everything written by, about or for the ISL precisely because "we have no idea of the theory of the government's case" and had to come prepared for any and all eventualities.

He said that he could not know what

the exhibits would be until the theory of the government's case is known, and moved that the Hearing Examiner direct the government to make an opening statement as to just what they propose to prove in this hearing. "Why play with a stacked deck under the table?" he asked.

Morrissey referred to a previous ruling. Rauh pointed out that there could have been no previous ruling as the ISL had made no previous motion asking that the government be directed to make an opening statement, "as is customary in any administrative or legal proceeding, and essential to an orderly procedure."

Morrissey politely asked the government lawyers whether they wanted to make an opening statement. At this point Waterman again referred to the "grounds" presented to the ISL by the Attorney General in 1953, and read into the record grounds 1 through 15 or so.

Morrissey: "Motion denied."

Rauh: "Let the Hearing Examiner read the letter of his designation for this hearing into the record."

Morrissey: I have made a statement on my designation for the record. There is no need to read the full letter. Motion denied.

Rauh: "Is there something you are afraid to make public in that letter?"

Morrissey stated that there was not, and that the matter had been taken up between the Department of Justice and the Subversive Activities Control Board for which he is a regular hearing examiner.

Rauh: Have there been any conversations, subsequent to your designation, between yourself and representatives of the Department of Justice?

Morrissey: This whole line of questioning is irrelevant, immaterial to the proceeding, and I refuse to discuss it with counsel.

MORRISSEY UNDER FIRE

Rauh then pointed out that although on the preceding day he had refused to make a motion of disqualification against the Hearing Examiner, he would do so now, and he would base his motion on the position taken by the attorney gen-

eral in the Lattimore case. (This was the "outrageous" motion to disqualify Judge Youngdahl because of his adverse rulings in the first trial.)

Rauh stated that Morrissey's prejudice was indicated by his refusal to read his letter of designation into the record and to state whether or not he had had conversations with the other side pertaining to the case in the absence of defense counsel. He stated that Morrissey "had ruled as a reflex action and without consideration of basic factors," against the ISL in virtually every instance since the beginning of the proceedings, and that he had refused even at this late date to require the government to state its theory of the case.

He pointed out that although he does not agree with the Department of Justice's theory in their attempt to disqualify Judge Youngdahl in the Lattimore case, Brownell must believe in it, and must be anxious to apply it to hearing examiners in his own department, even if he had been unsuccessful in applying it on the outside.

Morrissey then stated for the record that at no time or under any circumstances had he consulted with representatives of the Department of Justice in matters pertaining to this case, and denied the motion of disqualification.

Rauh then asked for a recess until the following morning to permit him to draft an appeal to Brownell and to get a reply from him, pointing out that the Justice Department's own rules specify "that the hearing shall be conducted in an orderly and impartial manner." The department's attorneys asked for a fifteen-minute recess in which to consult their superiors, and their motion, as usual, was granted.

On returning from their phone calls to the higher spheres of Justice, Alderman stated that as the entire record of the proceeding would be submitted to Brownell together with any recommendations by the Hearing Examiner, the attorney general would be able to judge the fairness of the procedure himself. He added, "in our opinion the charge of bias and prejudice is unwarranted and

JUSTICE JACKSON ON THE 'LIST' AND FBI

In reviewing the recent posthumous book by the late Supreme Court Justice Robert H. Jackson, published by Harvard under the title *The Supreme Court in the American System*, few commentators noted that the author hit at both the attorney general's "subversive list" and the role of the FBI.

Of the former, he wrote that though the Supreme Court in 1951 "cast serious doubt upon the legality of the attorney general's list it has never ceased to be used in the press, in the executive department, by and before congressional committees, and even in courts to prejudice individuals in their liberty, position and good name."

With regard to the FBI Jackson ironically enough approached the question from the unexpected angle of the FBI's activities in enforcing civil-rights statutes in the Southern states. What Jackson looked on with suspicion was the development of a national police which had power over local agencies, could investigate everywhere, and in particular get involved in political questions of any sort.

"I cannot say," he wrote, "that our country could have no central police without becoming totalitarian, but I can say with great conviction that it cannot become totalitarian without a centralized national police."

—Adapted from
I. F. Stone's *Weekly*

for these reasons we feel that the motion is improper and oppose it at this time."

On Morrissey's request, Rauh then repeated his motion of disqualification and his request for a recess until the attorney general's ruling on it was obtained. He assured Morrissey that he intended to present specifications to the attorney general in support of his motion.

The hearing was then recessed until the following morning.

[On Wednesday, no reply to the ISL telegram was received from the attorney general. The hearing was adjourned to the following Monday.]

Modern Times

For years sociologists have wondered whether rhythmic movements on the assembly line are a help or a nervous strain on workers. In its last issue, the *Journal of the American Medical Association* reports a study by British psychologist P. C. Wason of 15 soap-wrappers working for Manchester soapmaker Cussons, Sons & Co. Ltd., who do a strange little jig to music piped in over the plant intercom.

Wason's findings: jiggling on the job is a big help both in speed and efficiency. Wrote Wason:

The movements consisted of a rhythmic swaying of the trunk backwards and forward, with rapid folding of the ends of the papers and tapping and shaking of the soap. Rotation of the head was also observed. These movements were absent in new employees . . . however, the habit gradually developed after training. It was found that the greater the jiggling the greater was the women's efficiency . . . Rhythm is a help in any kind of repetitive work, and the rhythm in this occupation probably develops in an attempt to increase speed (since workers are paid a bonus for work over a basic output). The newcomers, anxious to increase output, imitate the others and join in the jig. Some dislike it, others try to stop it, but without success . . . The correlation between jig and efficiency only means that working to rhythmic movements is more efficient than working without them.

—Time, Apr. 25

World History—Year by Year

The bound volumes of LABOR ACTION

are an invaluable record of the social and political issues of our day, and a socialist education in themselves. Completely indexed from 1949 on.

1950-53.....\$3 per vol.

Bound volumes of LA are also available back to, and including, 1942, at somewhat higher prices depending on the year. Prices on request. A complete set of bound volumes for the 11 years from 1942 to 1952 is available for \$40.

Independent Socialist Press
114 West 14 Street, New York City

Education Behind the Iron Curtain — —

(Continued from page 5)

whose outcries would be in direct proportion to the warmth with which they defend its existence in the USSR.

A set-up similar to the Russian for charging fees at the secondary level existed in Nazi Germany. Here, too, a few scholarships were granted to excellent students. Higher education under Stalin and Hitler depends in the main on "which side of the state you live on."

The introduction of coeducation in Russia after the 1917 revolution was a measure of extreme significance. Women in Russia had for centuries held a chattel status. The abandonment of coeducation in 1943 for primary and secondary schools signaled a degeneration in the position of women in Russian society and a major reversal of educational policy.

Coeducation is today taken for granted by modern educators. Its abandonment always signifies a social regression. Separate schools existed in Nazi Germany. If we examine the reasons for its abolition in Russia we find again striking parallels to the aims of Nazi education.

The abandonment of coeducation was one in a series of decrees since the '30s affecting women in Russia. Others were the legalization of abortion, the establishment of stringent fees for divorce, putting it beyond the reach of working-class families, and the institution of awards to women for bearing large numbers of children. The latter originated in Mussolini's Italy and was also copied by Hitler. The abolition of elementary rights for women signified that for the Russian state a prime role for women became what it has always been for reactionary regimes: a child-producing animal, supplying future soldiers for the motherland.

An admission and attempted justification by a Stalinist apologist:

"They [departure from coeducation, changes in attitude toward family, etc.] . . . have been widely interpreted abroad as evidence of reaction and restoration of class privilege in the U.S.S.R. They are more simply and accurately explained in terms of the desire of the party leadership to foster a larger measure of individual and family responsibility in education . . . to interest Soviet womanhood in homemaking and child rearing as well as in career and profession. . . . But the motivation of the new policy of

glorifying marriage and the family is quite simple; a chronic labor shortage, aggravated by colossal war casualties, calls for more babies. . . . Few thoughtful Western observers will regard the results as an instance of intolerable despotism or a return to Puritanism or prudery."²³

The significance of the reversal on coeducation can be gauged from the following quotations from the pro-Stalinist, Beatrice King:

"Equality of the sexes is an axiom of the communist faith. In the educational field this expressed itself first and foremost in coeducation which is the universal law."²⁴ [Emphasis my own—G. B.]

The same writer somersaults six years later:

"Soviet educators and thinkers have come to the conclusion generally that at this stage separate education is necessary to produce the best citizens who will create the finest families."²⁴

The claim by Russian educators that separate schools were established because girls are different from boys, that they mature faster, etc., can easily be discounted. This fact has been known for years and adjustments can be made easily within a flexible school system. Its significance is slight when we consider the advantages of combined schooling. The increased emphasis on the importance of the family as given above and the consequent necessity for motherhood training is a real and important reason. Also—

"What are the demands of life which raise this question [separate schooling]? One is the improvement of the military physical training of young people of the different sexes. . . . Separate education of boys and girls will be extremely important in strengthening of school discipline."²⁵

FALSE VERBALISMS

The importance of the childbearing family, the stress on military education (boys on the junior high school level receive two hours of military training daily) and the strengthening of discipline provided the actual reasons for the elimination of coeducation.

The analogy with Nazi education here is quite obvious. For the Nazis a woman is primarily a childbearer and the first

obligation of man is his military duty.

A Nazi nursery rhyme:

"What puffs and patter—
What clicks and clatter—
I know what, oh what fun,
It's a lovely Gatling gun."

The Russian prose version:

"Already in the primary school, work is conducted for the purpose of equipping the pupils with those elements of general knowledge which are closely related to the military preparation of future warriors."²⁶

The difference between the German and Russian attitude is that in Germany the inferiority of women was an open and expressed doctrine while in Russia equality of women is the official doctrine while inequality is the functioning one.²⁷ The reason for this is a political one. Stalinism appeals to progressive sentiments; therefore, it must cloak its reactionary actions with progressive verbalisms. In Russia, working-class women must not only bear and rear children for the state but must also share the burden of factory labor. The equality which Russian women share with men is the equality of greater sacrifice. Those realms in which women have sought traditionally to express their rights, namely, the right to divorce, abortion and coeducation, are closed to them.

We have presented above the depressing realities of Russian education. A whole generation of Russians is being reared to become obedient and patriotic automatons. It is essential to remember, however, that formal education is only one aspect of the education and development of a human being. His own experience is, in a sense, far more powerful in shaping his attitude and determining his actions. The power of the printed word is extensive but is still limited by the naked fact.

The iron dictatorship which the Russian bureaucracy maintains over the masses, its totalitarian control of art, literature and the sciences is proof enough of the confidence of the state in the efficacy of its educational methods. Education is truly "learning through experience" and the misery of the Russian people may evoke a hatred of their rulers which will determine, in the long run, the fate of the dictatorship.