

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

AUGUST 24, 1953

FIVE CENTS

SPOT-LIGHT

Marchisio Fiasco

The Liberal Party's fiasco with its candidate for City Council president, Marchisio, does not move us to say we told you so for a number of reasons, but it does point up a moral.

The Liberals experienced the humiliation of having its candidate withdraw from the race under fire, and under a cloud. First Walter Winchell sniped at him with the report that he had been associated with Kamp, the well-known fascistic anti-Semite. Then the bar association criticized the fact that he was running for office while still on the bench. To this Marchisio replied (a) that he had had no political dealings with Kamp but only a renting relationship; and (b) that he was not the first to run for office from the bench. But he resigned from the candidacy because of the stink that had been raised.

Now we are ready to assume that Marchisio is not politically tarred with Kamp, that he is not sympathetic to anti-Semites, etc. Anything else would be really too incredible. But the object in life of the Liberal Party is not to run candidates who are innocent of any association with fascists. Such innocence is no recommendation for running on the slate of the party which presents itself to the people on the program of the Liberals.

The fact is, as was pointed out in LABOR ACTION's article on the Liberal Party conference which chose Marchisio, the man simply has no liberal or progressive record to speak of. The leaders of the Liberal Party had not been bothered to sell him to their membership on the ground that he did have any record on important issues of policy and program. He was put forth as a "good" independent Democrat.

It couldn't have happened with George S. Counts. It couldn't have happened if the party had run one of its own men, a real Liberal. It could happen only when the party went fishing in other waters. This particular fish smelled bad to many people, and apparently even the N. Y. Post wrinkled up its nose; that this was so in the particular case may have been an unfortunate accident; but such "accidents" are bound to crop up now and then as long as such a policy is pursued.

Idea from Japan

According to a report to the New York Times of August 16, anti-war and anti-American films have become highly popular in Japan. A number of them have recently been produced on an independent basis by people who had been purged from the Japanese movie industry on charges of Stalinism.

As the Times reports it: "Although the leftist films have been successes, they are only a small percentage of Japan's total screen production. Nevertheless, the giants of the Japanese entertainment world—Toho, Shintoho, Shochiku, Daiei and Toei—are climbing on the bandwagon. They are the distributors of some of these independently produced leftist films and are now rehiring the craftsmen they fired for Communist affiliations back in '49 and '50.

(Turn to last page)

Washington Has No Peace Plan For the Korea Peace Conference

By HAL DRAPER

The United Nations is now in the process of organizing its delegation for the political conference which, following the truce, is supposed to grapple with a settlement of the issues raised by the Korean situation. The interest which attaches to this need not be accompanied by any illusions that such a political conference can really "settle" the cold war or prepare a lasting peace.

Such cold-war conferences—including the proposed Big Four conference—can have either one of two purposes, realistically speaking: (1) they can either be stage-settings whereby some temporary deal is arranged, whenever the parties get ready to do so, or (2) they are stages on which each camp makes a play for world support and sympathy—"propaganda," in other words, as it is called when the other side does it. In actual fact, both are always tentatively on the agenda at the same time.

No "deal" between the imperialist camps will settle the war crisis in any permanent fashion, though a good old-fashioned horse-trade in spheres of influence and such could provide a reasonable facsimile of peace for a short while. This is the kind of solution to which many peace-loving liberals and neutralists of various shades look with hope, especially in Europe—though none of them have ever explained to themselves, let alone to others, what peoples they would be willing to swap over the bargain counter with the Russians; what spheres of influence for Moscow's totalitarianism they would be willing to sell at cut rates for the sake of an illusion; whose rights and interests they would be happy to bargain away in order to appease the Kremlin.

BÖGGING DOWN

What the political conference—as well as the current UN arguments—will boil down to, in all likelihood, is the now-familiar tug-of-war in political propaganda. But political propaganda is dependent on a PROGRAM. This is what Washington does not understand: Eisenhower's self-confessed conception of political propaganda is typified by broadcasts by Arthur Godfrey in which the same charm is used to sell the American Way of Life as is so successful in selling breakfast cereals, cigarettes and brasieres.

The United States comes to the question of the political conference without a program. That is the essence of the matter. It has nothing to make political propaganda for except hearty generalizations; and its representatives, for their own reasons, claim that they exclude a deal.

In effect, all that the U. S. has to say is that the Russians ought to lie down and die; capitulate on all questions; thus demonstrating their "good faith," and

(Turn to last page)

What Moscow Fishes For On German Unity Issue

By GORDON HASKELL

The Russian government has delivered a note to the governments of Britain, France and the United States, in which it once more outlines its proposals for the unification of Germany. As in the past, the essence of the note is that a provisional government be set up by the East and West German parliaments "with wide participation of democratic organizations." This government is to prepare "free elections" in the country, and in the meantime to have limited jurisdiction over transport, economic coordination and the like.

There is nothing really new in the Stalinist proposal. Essentially the same scheme has already been rejected not only by the Western occupying powers, but by both the German Social-Democrats and the Adenauer government. Hence it is clear that in putting it forward again at this time the Kremlin is engaged in a maneuver which has nothing to do with the unification of Germany, but seeks to pursue other aims altogether.

(Continued on page 7)

Mass French Strike May Oust Cabinet

On two fronts, at home and in Morocco, French reaction and its government is at bay before aroused mass movements.

At home the Laniel government faces the widest and most militant mass strike movement since the 1930s. This is in France, where up to now a spirit of apathy has reigned in the working-class movement, both in the political and economic fields. But touched off by the spark of a government policy which sought to squeeze the workers harder in order to pay for its inability to keep the economy afloat while still carrying on the war in Indo-China, the French workers demonstrated once more the untiring capacity of their class to struggle. The movement exploded when the

Laniel cabinet let it be known that one of its first economic measures would include the dismissal of post-office workers and postponement of their retirement age. The union that is strong in this field is the most right-wing and reformist of the three main labor federations, the Force Ouvrière.

And it was this F. O. which detonated the mass strike of over a million when it called the post-office workers out. Strikes in sympathy by other government workers followed; then the Stalinist-controlled CGT jumped in as Jeancome-lately by calling out production workers in other industries. The strike is spreading in the mines, on the railways, other public utilities, the metal industry, and others.

The fact that it was the F. O. which

(Continued on page 7)

A Red Views the White Man's Society

A Cherokee Indian boy won an essay contest (reports a UP item from Knoxville, Tenn., last Sunday) with the following dissertation. The subject of the contest was a pair of pictures, one showing a dilapidated house and the other a washed-out field. We quote the boy's response without comment on its economic concepts:

"Both pictures show white man crazy. Make big tepee. Plow hills. Water wash. Wind blow. Soil, grass all gone. House

rots down. No hog. No corn. No potato. No cow. No pony. Squaw gone with papoose.

"Indian no plow land. Keep grass. Cow eat grass. Indian drink health-giving milk. Buffalo eat grass. Indian eat Buffalo. Hide make tepee. Moccasins too. Indian no make terrace. No build dam. No hunt job. No hitch-hike. No shoot pig. Great Spirit makes water. Also sunshine. Indian no waste anything. Indian no go on relief. White man heap crazy."

After All That, the AFL 'Calls' For Democracy in the ILA...

By BEN HALL

A rare performance was enacted this week. The highest officials of a powerful American labor federation acted to bring a little decency into one of its affiliates by moving against a former colleague who had disgraced the union movement; and they offered encouragement to the ranks and lower leaders of his union to throw out the administration identified with him and replace it with a new one.

It was the case against the Ryan officialdom of the International Longshoremen's Association which began in February of this year when the AFL Executive Council ordered the union to clean house, and reached a climax last week when the council suspended the ILA from the federation.

Perhaps the real beginning was more than a year earlier, at the end of 1951, when a powerful rank-and-file longshore strike movement tied up New York piers starting as a movement for a better contract and ending with outspoken demands for the eradication of gangsterism and racketeering which had riddled the ILA. In the months that followed, public hearings underlined these demands.

The ILA in the port of New York had in fact fallen into the hands of gangsters who ran its locals as private preserves, exacting tribute from members, merging union funds into their own personal accounts, and enjoying payoffs from shipping companies in return for "labor peace" and degrading working conditions. Joseph P. Ryan, president of the ILA, is now under indictment as a result of these hearings, which heard testimony that he had received money from the companies and had misused union funds.

AFL ACTS

Theft, extortion, bribery, shootings, knifings and killings were the humdrum routine in the life of the ILA officials in the port of New York. In some locals, membership meetings and elections were curiosities heard of but never experienced.

In February, 1953, the AFL Executive Council finally acted. It demanded of the ILA, under threat of expulsion, the following:

(1) Ouster of all union representatives with criminal records; (2) removal of all international and local officers who had accepted gifts and bribes from employers, or who had appointed former convicts to their posts; (3) end of the shape-up system of hiring; (4) establishment of democratic practices inside the union "so that the members who work on the waterfront will be able to select true and capable trade-union leaders who will serve the best interests of the AFL and be free from the taint of crime and racketeering."

Ryan was revealed as a pitiful and corrupt figure. His reputation as a man of power in New York labor circles disappeared when it became clear that he was the helpless puppet and tool of racketeers, that he was incapable of decisive action of any kind, and that he was mired in filth himself. Outside of New York-New Jersey the union is relatively clean and will undoubtedly stay with the AFL no matter what; inside the New York area gangster officials rule their own petty principalities.

Ryan went through the motions of complying with the AFL edict but it was a farcical act. After a series of running internal squabbles, the ILA officialdom in New York agreed to end the shape-up system of hiring; but long before their action became final, it was clear that the New York and New Jersey legislatures would outlaw that method of hiring in any event. The racketeers and gangsters remained.

IT'S NOT SO EASY

Ryan went out of his way to enact in public a comedy performance of his own impotence: the ILA "ordered" Tony Anastasia, gang ruler of the Brooklyn docks, to surrender the books of his local to the international and to prove to a board of administrators that he had been legally and democratically elected to local office.

Anastasia thumbed his nose at the decree and thus ended the ILA campaign against criminals.

In a last-minute try, the ILA administration sought to gain time by devising an involved procedure for investigating charges against its officers and it announced that it had set up a special committee of three to see that locals were run democratically in the future.

But the AFL Council waved all this aside. It had no confidence in any administration headed by Ryan or in any self-purge of the racketeer elements. It had obviously decided that nothing less than the end of the Ryan regime was satisfactory.

In February, its order was shaped in the novel form of an "open letter" addressed to the "officers and members" of the ILA. This was an obvious hint to the ranks that any efforts to overthrow Ryan from within by honest union elements would be supported.

The action last week was a continuance of this strategy of stimulating or attempting to stimulate a movement within the union. By suspending the ILA instead of expelling it from the federation, the Council hopes to give time to AFL loyalists within the union to organize and to act against Ryan.

A simple order from above is not enough to bring a clean new union into existence on the New York waterfront. Practically all observers and commentators agree that the rank and file must be mobilized for the job of ending racket rule. For six months various plans were rumored: the AFL waterfront council would simply set up a new union from above; or some other AFL union (teamsters, perhaps) would just take over the longshore jurisdiction and supplant the ILA. But as the situation unfolds, cold bureaucratic arrangements seem inadequate.

In this crisis, where unionism has been encrusted with racketeering, the enthusi-

asm, idealism and courage of the rank-and-file union worker must be stimulated and enlisted.

It is not so easy. For decades the whole labor movement and its membership is taught to reconcile itself to bureaucracy, to refrain from action or even criticism of higher officials. In one union after another, members are expelled or fired for organizing oppositions to their leaders or for opposing officials.

THE REAL WEAPON

And nowhere has this been more true than in the waterfront unions. Longshoremen have seen AFL seamen beaten up and driven off their ships for opposing the officials of the AFL Seafarers International Union; they have heard of CIO members of the National Maritime Union driven out of the industry and their elected local officials expelled for the "crime" of opposing the administration of their international. And neither the AFL nor CIO has intervened in behalf of these victims of high-handed rule.

And now, when the atmosphere of compliance, of obedience to union authority, of let-well-enough-alone has become stifling, after pounding into the heads of their own members and members of other unions that it is virtually treasonable to organize in opposition caucuses and movements, the heads of the AFL suddenly call out to the longshoremen, harassed for decades by thugs, "REVOLT!" (It is also presumably understood that once this revolt is successfully concluded, all others will be illegal.)

Nevertheless, dock workers have already given every proof that they are capable of building a clean and militant union. Oppositions have arisen time and time again and were suppressed only by brute force. In Brooklyn 1,200 longshoremen organized a rank-and-file movement in 1939 that could be repressed only by the murder of their leader Peter Panto. Where the ILA membership was hogtied by a corrupt leadership, it broke through in unauthorized strikes and "wildcats" year after year to win better working conditions.

Three times in six years they shut down the port of New York in rank-and-file strikes: in October 1945, in November 1948, and in October 1951. It is this militancy which can be turned into a weapon against Ryan and racketeering.

Speaking of AFL Union Democracy

Now that the AFL Executive Council demands that the ILA adopt "recognized democratic procedures . . . so that members who work on the waterfronts will be able to select true and capable trade union leaders," it is fitting to mention another AFL union: the Masters, Mates, and Pilots of America. Democracy has been violated more flagrantly in many other more important unions but this case has a special significance: it is so recent.

In December 1952 the administration of this union met opposition in the election for national officers. Two members of the elections committee contested the count as fraudulent. Nevertheless the incumbents installed themselves in office once again.

Soon thereafter, the opposition announced the formation of a caucus which would remain unswerving in its loyalty to the union but which would oppose the policies of the administration and its control over the union. The platform was elemental, almost naive. In brief it demanded democracy, defined simply as "honest democratic elections" and the "right of a minority to disagree with those in power."

The leaders of the opposition caucus were the same men who had just run for office. In a few brief weeks they were whisked out of the union—expelled. The dissenting members of the balloting committee were expelled. All former opposition candidates were expelled or suspended, and by February and March of this year, just as the AFL was demanding democracy in the ILA, democratic rights were wiped out in the Masters, Mates, and Pilots of America.

Now members of another AFL union, the ILA, are asked to rise in opposition to their leadership and to demand democracy. If some of them have become cynical and fail to jump in response to the AFL appeal, who is to be blamed?

YOU'RE INVITED

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

Britain Intensifies Its Terror in Kenya

The British government, led by the white settlers in Kenya, has transformed the "police action" to suppress the Mau Mau terrorist-nationalist movement into an attempt to crush all efforts of the Kikuyu tribe to gain equal political rights in their own country.

The extent of the British-settler repressive measures against the Kikuyu are graphically presented in an article by Fenner Brockway in the July 24 issue of the Bevanite paper *Tribune*.

By November of last year, the Mau Mau had killed a total of four Europeans and 24 Africans whom they considered to be collaborators with the Europeans. The number of Africans killed by the government's security forces at that time was 30. According to Brockway, at the time his article was written, the number of Europeans killed by Mau Mau had risen to 17; the number of their African victims to 500; and the number of Africans killed by the security forces to 1,300 with an additional 514 believed to have been wounded and 2,673 taken prisoner.

He reports that whereas last November the Mau Mau was only a fractional movement within the Kikuyu people, European leaders estimate that now 90 per cent of the Kikuyus have taken the Mau Mau oath, and the movement has spread to other tribes.

AGAINST AFRICAN RIGHTS

It is evident that the spread of Mau Mau ideology and influence has been caused not only by the brutal reaction of the British government and the European settlers in Kenya to Mau Mau, but

by the clear indication they have given that they are equally determined to ignore or suppress any peaceful movement which demands recognition of the political and economic rights of the African majority in Kenya.

Thus Brockway reports that "last November officials of the Kenya African Union circulated among their 100,000 members an appeal against Mau Mau and violence," issued by himself and Leslie Hale when they were in the colony. "Now the Kenya African Union has been proscribed and its president, Legislative Councillor Odede, is in a detention camp."

He reports that the authorities in Kenya have refused to "enlist against Mau Mau any African who was not their 'yes-man.'" Thus the "Africans have been given only one of two choices: the government or Mau Mau. No place has been allowed for the self-respecting African who feels the injustices of his people, yet deplures Mau Mau. If he doesn't forget his wrongs and side with the government, he is regarded as Mdu Mau."

Fenner Brockway charges that before the suppression campaign got under way, the Kenya government held out against the demands of the extremist white settlers, but since then they have yielded to them in imposing suppressive measures on the whole Kikuyu people.

Although Brockway condemns the brutal acts of Mau Mau terrorists, he charges that the "total of suffering imposed" by the whites on the Kikuyu "has been great."

He describes "the collective punishments, which involved uprooting of Africans within a 25-mile radius of one murdered European, the destruction of their homes, the confiscation of their cattle, and deportation to the congested Kikuyu reserve.

"The 'scorched earth' destruction of crops on African land bordering the Aberdare Mountains.

BRUTAL SUPPRESSION

"The rounding up of African villages and townships, the arrest of the whole African population, men and women, for screening and searching.

"The destruction of all African huts in the suburbs of Nairobi and the eviction of hundreds of African families.

"The closing of over a hundred African schools.

"Brutalities in the reserves, in detention camps, in prisons.

"Most disquieting of all are the reports of how the 'shoot to kill' order—when Africans refuse to halt or attempt to escape or to resist arrest—is being applied."

Brockway states that he "makes no charge" against the majority of the soldiers brought to Kenya to suppress Mau Mau. "But there is a minority in Kenya," he continues, "who regard Africans, and particularly Kikuyus, as less than human. Even in normal times they deny to Kikuyus all the human virtues. It is to be expected that in this time of enflamed passion they will regard them as legitimate hunting."

"This temper appears to have let loose a terror which the Africans fear more than the atrocities of Mau Mau. Africans themselves have suffered most from Mau Mau."

Brockway charges that the colonial secretary has refused to allow the formation of a commission of inquiry to go to Kenya so that the full story may be made public to the British people. He proposes that the Labor Party form its own commission to inquire into the situation and to propose measures to bring peace and justice to Kenya.

Imperialism Plays Out a Hypocritical Farce — France Uses a Puppet to Enflame Morocco

In Morocco, French imperialism is trying to pull off one of the most disgraceful maneuvers since the days when the British in India tried to set Hindu and Moslem against each other while the foreign overlords posed as peace-makers.

In this country, the press—free and unbought—is retailing the version which the French are circulating. According to this, the Berbers and Arabs in Morocco are at each other's throats in an internal struggle, while France, pitifully embarrassed and troubled by it all, is standing by trying to maintain peace and order, bear the white man's burden nobly, and bring quiet to a strife-torn country, even going so far as protecting the sultan who opposes it.

This story is a lie and a farce. The name of El Glaoui, which has figured so prominently, is enough to give it away.

The Moroccan nationalist movement, led by the Istiqlal party, has the support

of the overwhelming mass of the people of all classes, Arab and Berber. The sultan of Morocco is, as is well known, sympathetic to it. The French colonialists, under the Resident-General Guillaume, has been following the same policy with respect to the sultan as the French have followed in Tunisia with the bey: they have been using every species of pressure and threat against him, as nominal ruler of the country, to issue decrees which would cut the throats of the nationalist movement.

Their methods failing, they have resorted to a long-time quisling of theirs, the pro-French pasha of Marrakesh, El Glaoui, who is no new figure just arrived on the scene. He has no significant popular support. His only mass base is among the 400,000 French who seek to rule the nine million Moroccans.

El Glaoui's attempt to oust the sultan is a bare-faced imperialist comedy, acted out with straight face. He does not speak even for the mass of Berbers, let alone for the people of Morocco in general.

UNITED AGAINST FRENCH

The demonstrations which the papers have vaguely reported have been demonstrations in support of the sultan and against the French and the French puppets like El Glaoui. Even in Casablanca, which is Berber in its majority, the popular manifestations have been anti-French. The same thing is even true in El Glaoui's own bailiwick, which is also Berber of course.

"There has not been one demonstration in favor of El Glaoui," reports the Moroccan Office of Information in New York, which represents the nationalists' interests. France, it says, is clearly responsible for the bloody events. It is not a question of Berber versus Arab but of all the Moroccan peoples versus the French.

The French colonialists' immediate aim is not to put El Glaoui, the pretender, in the sultan's place. They know that this outrage would mean an explosion which they could not control. It is to use Glaoui's movement as blackmail

to force the sultan to "compromise" by signing a number of decrees which the French want.

They have demanded that the sultan do the following:

(1) Delegate all legislative power to the prime minister. Why the prime minister? This Mokri is a French quisling appointed by the French in 1912—he is supposed to be about 108 years old—who can be expected to do just what Guillaume wishes.

(2) Declare the UN incompetent on the Moroccan question. This would get rid of the French imperialists' fear that the Moroccan nationalist delegation to the UN (unofficial) would embarrass them by emulating the Tunisians in seeking to make a world issue of their plight.

(3) Give the French colonialist population in Morocco, the country's exploiters and bloodsuckers, the same vote in the country as the Moroccan people themselves, although they represent a tiny minority.

While the French authorities have announced that the sultan has signed the decrees demanded, the nationalists have released an appeal from the sultan, sent to Washington via Tangiers, asking the world for help against French reaction. The sultan's appeal charged that the real conflict in the country is a "desperate one between us and the French Resident-General" who had "hourly" tried to make him sign the French decrees.

"I have—and shall continue—to refuse to sign these French decrees, for to do so would be to sign away the sovereignty of my country and the future of my people," the sultan added.

AMERICA'S STAKE

The spokesmen of the Moroccan Office of Information in this country are of the opinion that the El Glaoui trick is being tried by the Guillaume regime at this time on its own initiative, rather than on the initiative of Paris, which is having troubles enough of its own with the general strike movement that has broken out.

Lewis Corey Victim Of Gov't Witchhunt, Up for Deportation

The latest victim of the government's witchhunt is Lewis Corey.

Corey faces deportation to Italy because he was a member of the Communist Party 30 years ago. (He figures in the history of the early Communist movement in this country as Louis Fraina.)

But for at least a couple of decades, Corey has been publicly and vigorously a well-known anti-Communist. His rightward development landed him, some time ago, somewhat to the right of the pinkest socialism. He is anti-Russian enough to suit the State Department, he has been all for the State Department line on foreign policy and the cold war, etc. Not only that but, we understand, he has been fairly approving of the government's purge system directed against the Stalinists. Now he is its victim.

When the government arrested Corey, he was the educational director of the AFL Meat Cutters Union, which has been concerned (it said) about fighting hysteria, McCarthyism, etc. As soon as the cops put the arm on Corey, this valiant union promptly dismissed him.

The scheme to deport Corey is an outrage and should be fought as such. That Corey himself has sanctioned and justified the system which has now victimized him is not the point, as far as that is concerned. That is his personal tragedy, and also an ironic but grim lesson for others who think that the witchhunt can be localized to combating only Stalinists.

Labor Action FORUM New York

Russia, What Next?

Speaker:

Abe Stein

Thursday, Aug. 27

Forums start promptly at 9 p.m.

LABOR ACTION HALL

114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

EGYPT Will Britain Be Forced to Compromise? Naguib Is Firm on Suez and Sovereignty

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, Aug. 13—In 1856, Her Majesty's government under Britain's greatest imperialist, Disraeli, signed an agreement with the ruler of Egypt. By its terms, Britain gave 2 million pounds to this bankrupt to clear up his unhappy financial position. It also guaranteed British support for his somewhat weak government and attempted implicitly to define relations with the Mahdi and the Sudanese.

In return for these concessions Britain was allowed to station an unspecified number of British troops and technicians in a strip of Egypt adjoining the Suez Canal. These troops enjoyed extraterritorial privileges and were under British military government. At this date relations between the imperialist British government and its weak-kneed protégé were very good. The gateway to the British empire was in good repair.

The Suez Canal itself had been built largely with French money and technicians; it added to the great French influence already in that country, reflected today in the fact that most educated Egyptians speak French as well as English and Arabic. Besides having a minority percentage of the shares of the company, Britain had the military and economic control of this strip of territory, while the French enjoyed the profits; this was because the territory was strategically far more vital to Britain than to France.

In 1936 the British and Egyptian governments by mutual consent agreed to revise the Anglo-Egyptian treaty. The number of British troops and technicians based there was fixed, and British influence on the Egyptian government was severely limited to grant Egypt sovereignty for the first time in her history. Nevertheless the sovereignty was limited by the necessity for Egypt's corrupt regime to depend on the moral force of British arms which would have been forthcoming had the Egyptian nationalist movements shown signs of success.

In 1941 British troops surrounded Farouk's palace with armored cars and threatened him with deposition unless he stopped negotiating with the Germans, who were at the gates of Alexandria. It must be admitted that this situation was somewhat anomalous. Egypt was officially neutral, but her towns were being defended by one belligerent from another, and she was unable to negotiate with the latter.

For Egyptian business the war was an extremely good thing. Britain owed Egypt, after payment of most current accounts, some one billion dollars at the end of the war. Much of this debt is still outstanding today.

The year 1948 saw the war with Israel. Britain supplied all the arms to Egypt, but because of corruption and inefficiency they were not used effectively. Egyptian authorities had to blame someone, so they said that Britain had given them obsolete arms. It was as a result of the "Palestine scandal" that a few Egyptian army officers under General Naguib decided that a change had to take place.

NAGUIB COMES IN

In 1952 in a coup d'état General Naguib and his dozen army officers took power. They pledged themselves to the amelioration of the Egyptian lot, the abolition of corruption, and promised there would be no personal aggrandizement. Most of them have remained anonymous.

The British government was comparatively impartial about the change. It knew that Farouk had often used the Sudan and Suez issues to divert people's attention from domestic corruption. It thought that the new regime would be too involved with Ali Nahas and other ex-power-manipulators to bother them. Here it miscalculated.

Besides consigning the old politicians to the oblivion of discreditment, the new Naguib regime immediately started on land reform, industrialization, etc. This,

A frank avowal of American interest in upholding the hand of French imperialism against the Moroccan people is given by the N. Y. Times' chief foreign correspondent, C. L. Sulzberger in an August 17 dispatch. What Sulzberger emphasizes is that the United States' main interest is that France remain a "great power" capable of doing its duty by the NATO commitments it has made.

In this connection, he reminds us that "In Morocco . . . the United States maintains its principal strategic bombing bases, which, together with similar bases in Britain, back up the North Atlantic Treaty Organization armies." He laments the fact that France has had to strip its NATO forces in order to send troops to Indo-China, replacing them with North African troops, who now may also be immobilized by "trouble" in Morocco.

"Thus France is very much in the forefront of Western military minds. It is clearly recognized that the French hold incredibly valuable pieces of real estate—not only in Europe but in Africa and Asia." He does not say that the pieces of real estate do not belong to France but to the peoples who happen to live on the real estate, Morocco for example. When the denizens of the real estate begin to become "disorderly," the "Western military minds" become annoyed.

Sulzberger continues: "What is sincerely hoped by France's friends and allies is that the French will demonstrate that, as a nation, they have not only the physical but the moral authority—the élan vital—to confirm their claim to be regarded as an important world power."

Surely this will be encouragingly demonstrated to France's friends and allies in Washington and Times Square if Laniel carries out his implied threats to force the strikers at home to work at the point of bayonets, and if Guillaume in Morocco implements the élan vital with a blood bath.

Independent socialists are 100 per cent supporters of the Moroccans' demands for self-government and independence in their own land.

of course, was none of Britain's business. When, however, Naguib tackled the Sudan issue, it was taken aback.

Slowly but clearly the British negotiators gave way on every point. Hoping that this would prevent agreement, it insisted on Sudanese self-government. All right, said Egypt, but the Sudan must not be under Britain's influence. As soon as the agreement was signed, both sides started interpreting it, and the question remained: Would the Sudan be allowed to join the Commonwealth? Yes and no were the respective answers, but events had proceeded far enough consequent on the Sudanese treaty for the answer to this question not to require expedition.

TALKS REOPEN

The last and biggest problem then appeared on the agenda. Britain assumed that she was staying in the Canal Zone. Naguib was emphatic that this denied Egyptian sovereignty. Sir Ralph Stevenson and then Robert Hankey tried their public-school diplomacy, but Naguib put his cards on the table. With German technicians the country had built an efficient arms industry.

Egypt, Naguib boasted, could expel Britain from the Canal Zone when it wanted to, but it would rather carry out the change without fighting. Britain complained that the attempt to expel her was illegal, since the Anglo-Egyptian treaty had been entered into freely. The Egyptian negotiations answered that Britain was keeping a military establishment seven times that allowed by the treaty. The formal talks collapsed. The specific issue was British technicians—how many were going to maintain the \$1300 million base, and for how long?

Last week at a reception given by the Pakistani charge d'affaires in Cairo, informal talks were reopened. No statements were made to the press. Many other meetings have occurred; it looks as if a compromise might be reached in the end. It is clear that Naguib means business.

BOOKS and Ideas Michener: *The Bridges of Toko-Ri*

The State Dep't Line in Fiction

By JAMES M. FENWICK

The exceptionally perceptive French critic, Henri-Pierre Simon, opens an essay on Camus with the following observations:

"Man is perpetually on trial, and the great writer in some fashion always serves as a witness for him: it is therefore always legitimate to examine his testimony. This is true in all times but a little more so when an epoch of crisis, of abrupt and vast changes in social and spiritual structures renders the trial more pathetic and more dramatic. In such times writers themselves turn away from the game of pure esthetics, they become serious and timely, and it is to the extent that they do this that they find fervent and numerous readers.

"... Therefore, before a work of the mind, the question to be posed always ought to be the following: does it lead to the elevation of man or to his ruin? Does it give him a more exact idea of himself, of the circumstances of his destiny, of the scope of his powers, of the roads leading to his self-improvement and to his salvation? Or, on the contrary, does it plunge him into illusions which lead him astray, into a pride which maddens him, or into a despair which annuls him?"

The profundity of insight yielded by such an approach is, of course, dependent upon the critical criteria employed.

Simon achieves brilliant and moving effects using "a positive criticism which can be defined as follows: the defense of the human in man." In an epoch characterized by a constant erosion of progressive moral values this humanism can play the same healthy role in literary criticism as does the bourgeois democratic program incorporated in modern socialist platforms. His method can be especially effective when applied to writing whose presuppositions are unstated—or even unknown to the author himself.

It is no less productive in analyzing writing which has an explicit orientation toward political or social problems. Faulkner's *Intruder in the Dust*, with its obvious polemics on the Negro problem, belongs in this latter category.

On a lower level, James A. Michener's *The Bridges of Toko-Ri*, recently published in *Life*, is an even more clear representative of this type. Moreover, since the story is completely banal in content and treatment, its sole interest is its propaganda intention.

BEWILDERED

Blundered into without any serious recognition of the consequences involved, conducted empirically on the basis of immediate events, the Korean war threw into the boldest relief the involuted historic problems of the last stronghold of world capitalism confronted by the bureaucratic-collectivist Stalinist system. The articulation of a rounded capitalist policy has proved not only difficult but even when enunciated it has demonstrated itself to be singularly unpersuasive. The desultory interest in the Korean war was felt by Michener.

"In Korea," he states in a prefatory note to his story, "our nation has undergone a new and sometimes bewildering experience. It has been our first taste of exercising the responsibility thrust upon

us by our unsought leadership of the free world."

"This novel tries to explain our experience in Korea. . . . I believe that often in the years to come our nations will face problems similar to those we met for the first time in Korea."

It should be of some interest to students of the sociology of art to note that the divine afflatus was tempered by sessions with the editors of *Life* before the story was written down. Nor should it be surprising that Michener did not, as he informs us, have to change a comma. He was one of the most crudely patriotic of the American writers to deal with World War II.

It is symptomatic that every major character in *The Bridges of Toko-Ri* is an American of Anglo-Saxon derivation. None of the second-generation Jews and Italians, for example, who appear in the more serious war novels are in evidence at all.

The central conflict in the story takes place between Harry Brubaker, a carrier jet pilot, and admiral George Tarrant. Brubaker, a twenty-nine-year-old lawyer, married, with two children, is sore because he has been recalled to combat while organized air units remain in the States. "It would be easier to take," he says, "if people back home were helping. But in Denver nobody even knew there was a war except my wife. Nobody supports this war."

Brubaker's wife, who came to Japan to be near him, is even more forthright: "If the government dared to ask women like me, this stupid war would end tomorrow."

DYING INSIGHT

This is an honest sentiment, felt by many people unwilling to accept war as an inevitable datum of existence. It was a sentiment reinforced by the Korean war, which began almost arbitrarily, was prosecuted with limited efforts, ended inconclusively from the point of view of previously expressed aims, and having ended, left little promise for the orderly development of world society.

Even Tarrant observes, "Militarily this war is a tragedy."

When Brubaker then asks, "Then why don't we pull out?" Tarrant "felt that his nation did not realize it was engaged in an unending war of many generations against resolute foes who were determined to pull it down. Some of the phases of this war would no doubt be fought without military battles. Whole decades might pass in some kind of peace, but more likely the desultory battles would stagger on and from each community some young men would be summoned to do the fighting."

It is a bleak perspective. Small wonder, after the long discussion, that the next day, "Harry Brubaker and his wife still had no explanation of why they had been chosen to bear the burden of the war."

All this—expressed in fictional form—will be recognized as the containment policy of the Truman and Eisenhower administrations, that is, a policy of military riposte *ad infinitum*, until something gives on the Stalinist side. Nothing more positive.

Brubaker is sent out to bomb the bridges at Toko-Ri. It is Tarrant's hope that on the Korean scale the successful accomplishment of this mission will persuade the Stalinists to give up. "Then reason might come into the world." It is a hope, of course, which the whole bombing experience of World War II had thoroughly deflated.

Brubaker is shot down and killed by enemy ground troops. "In the millionth of a second" just before dying "Harry Brubaker understood in some fragmentary way the purpose of his being in Korea. But the brief knowledge served no purpose, for the next instant he plunged face down in the ditch."

It is a pity that we are denied this last insight of Brubaker's. It would seem to be Michener's elementary obligation to force his way, if need be, before some congressional committee with this invaluable, if fragmented, morale knitter-upper. Alas, that he too seems to be showing the effects of these times of transition when Yankee initiative is giving way to the congressional subpoena.

Not unnaturally, in this story which has an explicit propaganda aim in which military considerations are primary, Stalinism as an ideology is never even cursorily discussed. It is brushed off in a dialogue between Brubaker and Forney,

a non-com helicopter pilot sent to rescue Brubaker when he is shot down. In this relatively simple dismissal the story is following State Department practice—with *Life* magazine's Catholic overtones.

Forney refers to the enemy as "those apes", and Brubaker asks, "Why do you hate them so much?"

"Simple," Forney replies, "one Sunday morning in the cathedral I heard the cardinal explain it all."

Almost all aspects of the story harmonize with the capitalist mythology subscribed to by the majority of the readership of *Life*, which is stated to number twenty-six million a week. It is a group which is overwhelmingly petty-bourgeois in orientation.

It is not fortuitous that Brubaker, the central figure, is the civilian white-collar hero fighting in the white-collar service, the air corps. He is an individual, furthermore, not the anonymous army serial number of ground warfare. In fact, he is the hero of our times, one of those very few whose efforts and sacrifices, Tarrant points out, hold together any society. This is their fate and their glory. Though they do not really understand the reasons behind what they are required to do, and though they go through crises of nerve, they do not chicken out, nor do they actively rebel.

INTELLECTUAL MEANDER

This is something less than 100 per cent patriotism but it is the going norm. In itself it is tacit proof of the difficulties of establishing an airtight motivation for support of the war.

Non-coms like Forney and Gamidge, less exquisitely organized and a little slow-witted, exist almost solely to serve Brubaker. They even tell him so. On the other hand, Tarrant, the admiral, is dealt with by Brubaker almost as an equal. A permissive, father-son relation subsists between them.

Nor is Tarrant the consequent-exempt big brass of popular legend: for example, his two sons, wife, and daughter-in-law were all victims of World War II. And he too is a victim—he has been reprimanded by the president during the inter-service debate on air-power and has been frozen insofar as promotion is concerned.

In casting Tarrant in this fashion the myth of the inviolability of the petty-bourgeois individuality—Brubaker's in the particular case—and the myth of the classless American society are preserved.

In this, as in all other respects, issues are never really probed. Pat answers are given to profound questions. There are no grand negations, no burning convictions. There is an ambience of apathy and of intellectual meandering.

All this may even bear a dessicated resemblance to actual carrier life. But it is not the type of story referred to by Simon in which the author in hammering out a reassessment of our epoch fulfills the role of portrayer, interpreter, or prophet traditionally associated with significant writers.

Actually, an extraordinarily large proportion of the story deals with the technical aspects of carrier operation. This is in part, of course, a commentary on Michener's inability to seize human beings and not unrelated to the American propensity for a displacement of the self into gadgetry. One has only to think of St. Exupéry, who also dealt with flying, to point up the contrast.

But in his stress on the technological aspects of carrier life, the cost of the equipment, and the emotions evoked (for example, by the misuse of piston engines) Michener reveals the real values placed on things, to which human beings become more and more assimilated. It is typical of our Pulitzer Prize winner's mediocrity that even in dealing with machinery he is unable to match the apocalyptic vision of the role of matériel achieved by Juenger in his book based on World War I.

Homer, the earliest great figure in Western literature, likewise elaborately described the arms employed by his protagonists. But that was before 3,000 years of literary history, the concentration camp universe, the hydrogen-cobalt bomb, psycho-analytic theory, and scientific socialism.

We have a right to ask for a little more from those who would be our literary masters than a point by point rationalization of current State Department policy.

Padmore's Book on Africa's First Socialist State

Few socialists are sufficiently aware of, or acquainted with, the independent Negro republic in Africa which is also militantly socialist. This is the Gold Coast, under the premier Kwame Nkrumah.

Its story has now been written by George Padmore, the well-known British socialist writer, himself the son of an African slave from the Barbados, educated in the U. S. It is *The Gold Coast Revolution*, published in England by Dennis Dobson, London, price 12s. 6d.

His book is undoubtedly one of the most important on any phase of the new uprising Africa. In it he traces the career of Nkrumah as leader of the Convention Peoples Party, which controls the government of the ex-British colony, and the record of his movement.

Nkrumah became secretary of the native movement and immediately came into conflict with the intellectuals and petty-bourgeois leaders in it who stood for compromise. Eventually breaking with them, he formed the CPP and gained the allegiance of a mass following. When Britain allowed an election, he was in prison for participation in a general strike, but his party won in a sweeping victory. At its conference, the CPP adopted a socialist program. Nkrumah, who is of working-class origin, had been a distinguished student in America and London before going back to the Gold Coast.

The spirit of Nkrumah's socialist movement is thoroughly internationalist and anti-imperialist. On taking office the government ministers decided to accept only a minimum portion of their salaries, giving the rest to their party, and to live in simple homes rather than in the mansions placed at their disposal.

Padmore traces the history of the CPP, the program of the movement, its record in office, the special problems it has faced, its attitude on working with the other nationalist and anti-colonialist movements of Africa, etc.

Read the NEW INTERNATIONAL America's leading Marxist review

2nd New England Anti-War Camp And School

SEPTEMBER 6-12
HARVARD, MASS.

Faculty will include:

George Houser, Gordon Haskell, Lewis Coser, etc.

For reservations and further information, write to: DOT BONE, 230 Prospect St., New Haven, Conn.

Joint SYL-YPSL Forum New York City

HAL DRAPER

on

Social Ends and Social Means

FRIDAY, AUGUST 28

at 8:30 p.m.

LABOR ACTION HALL
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

Jointly sponsored by the Socialist Youth League and the Young Socialists (YPSL)



LABOR ACTION

August 24, 1953

Vol. 17, No. 34

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, 1974.—Subscriptions: \$2 a year; \$1 for 6 months (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canadian and Foreign).—Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

Editor: HAL DRAPER. Asst. Editors: MARY BELL, BEN HALL, GORDON HASKELL. Bus. Mgr.: I. G. SMITH

MARXISM for TODAY

B. Kautsky Depicts Austro-Marxism Today

By PHILIP COBEN

In the old Socialist International—"old" in this case means up to the Second World War—Austro-Marxism had a special place. It was special because, while most other socialists divided with varying degrees of clarity between the reformist revisionists of Marxism, who frankly made no bones about throwing out the basic propositions of Marxist politics and theory, and the revolutionary Marxists who above all took their starting point in Marx's theory of the state, the Austrian Social-Democrats claimed to represent "orthodox" Marxism while bitterly fighting the Leninist "interpretation."

In actuality, as could be shown, Austro-Marxism adhered verbally to Marxist formulas while in political practice following in the footsteps of its German revisionist brother.

But what has happened to Austro-Marxism today?

A picture of it is painted by the son of Karl Kautsky, Benedikt Kautsky, in an article which we read in a recent issue of *Janata* (May 24).

The article reviews the whole situation in Austria and ends with a discussion of the question: "to what extent the theoretical structure of Austrian socialism has been forced to adjust itself to the changed picture of the post-war world." We will quote Benedikt Kautsky's description in some detail, because it largely speaks for itself.

First, says B. Kautsky, it is "a fact widely and regretfully admitted by most Austrian socialists" that "very little and certainly no very serious effort" is being made in their ranks to think about contemporary theoretical questions. The "administrative type" has been brought to the fore and dominates the party. (It may be added that the same is largely true of the German party and of the world social-democratic movement.)

"The second answer . . . is that Austro-Marxism has de facto been emptied of its entire concrete content," he writes furthermore. He ascribes this to the loss of "certainty." The Austro-Marxists now regard Marxism as "little more than a method, a viewpoint, an approach to the study of society." This, of course, sounds a bit peculiar, since all Marxists have always regarded their theory as just this; but what B. Kautsky undoubtedly means is that his subjects have thrown out everything else outside of the most general and vague terms.

The situation, he says, "has given rise to the justified question (in the pages of the monthly publication put out by the Socialist Party and devoted to high-level discussion) 'whether we are still Marxists?'—a question which the outside observer . . . would answer with a fairly unqualified no were it not for the lip-service which is being paid at least to Marxist terminology and, among a rather small group of mostly young 'leftists' in the party, to Marxist doctrine. The core of these complex and divergent attitudes may perhaps best be found in the various attitudes expressed to the problem of the state and of parliamentary democracy."

B. Kautsky could not be expected to observe that what he is describing is still the old Austro-Marxism, though in a more advanced stage of decline. But it has become franker. As he notes, "the great majority of socialist leaders reject today the Marxist-Leninist formulation of the state as the 'executive organ of the ruling class,'" but this is not new. The Austro-Marxists used to reject it by "reinterpretation"; now they reject it with more candor.

Continues Kautsky: "It is still necessary, out of loyalty to the Marxist tradition (and strategic wisdom toward those still deeply and believably attached to it) to use, more or less frequently, such terms as 'class struggle,' the 'class enemy,' etc. And an attempt is being made, probably unsuccessfully, to show that the old concepts and the old terms were not wrong—to admit that they were would amount to an outright repudiation of the past, which is inconceivable—but that they continue to exist with a content changed to fit the changing conditions. The class struggle is now declared to be taking place 'behind the upholstered doors of the Cabinet Council Room' in which decisions are not reached through negotiation or 'deals,' but are 'wrested from the class enemy' in tough mental struggle."

For anyone who knows the spirit of the "old" Austro-Marxism, it will be clear that nothing of the spirit has been changed.

But to do him justice, B. Kautsky makes clear that he is speaking of the "great majority of the socialist leaders,"

and, though with a sneer, he reveals that a not inconsiderable group of the "leftists" in the Austrian social-democracy are thoroughly Marxist and refuse to go along with this castration of the movement's theory. Unfortunately we cannot expect from him much further information about the genuine Austrian Marxist current, nor do we have any.

The significance of this group, he further admits, is based on "the very widespread 'spirit of discontent in the party which is a source of strength to them.' More power to the spirit of discontent."

The extent to which B. Kautsky himself understands anything about Marxism, in spite of the advantages of heredity, is indicated by his concluding jibe at the Marxist "leftists." What the Austro-Marxists (which translates as pseudo-Marxists) have lost, he says, is any belief in Marxism as a "fighting faith," any "conviction to be engaged on a great crusade which would overturn the old order with every vestige of its evils." And he applauds because in this respect Marxism was "utopian" and "a direct descendant of the French Encyclopedists with their belief in the perfectibility of mankind." The trouble with the Marxist leftists is that they still hang on to this "fighting faith" and this "conviction."

It is as clear as noon-day that his type of socialist leader has left no fighting faith and no burning conviction whatsoever; hence, incidentally, the rise of the "administrative type," who does not need it any more than a file clerk. Thus they have emancipated themselves from the follies of Marxism. . . .

BOLIVIA

Gov't Plans Weak Land Reform

By JUAN REY

SANTIAGO, Aug. 14—After a long period of "study" by a specially named commission, on August 2 the Bolivian government published a bill providing for agrarian reform in the country. Here in "Alto Peru" (the ancient name of Bolivia) the Indian peasants are to cease to be slaves of the big landowners of the estates and are henceforth to be paid for their labor. So the bill presumably provides.

The land cultivated by the peasants now belongs to them, but they must pay the former proprietors over a period of 25 years. The state will aid the peasants in paying for the land, opening up a small bank credit for the Indians. This is the government's agrarian reform with compensation—pro-capitalist, moderate and reformist.

The government bill is permeated with respect for private property for capitalist and industrial enterprise in the country, for the small and middle farmers. It gives the administration a free hand to save capitalist property from peasant pressure in the distribution of the land.

If a big landed estate is worked even partially by a system of wage-earners, then it is to be exempt from the agrarian reform. Every industry in the country is preserving its estates from the peasants' land distribution. It is enough if the proprietor can prove that he is producing butter or cheese, that he is operating his estate with wage-workers; then his land is not to be touched by the distribution.

In addition, cattle-raising lands are exempt up to 50,000 hectares, if they have 10,000 cattle on them.

UNDER PRESSURE

The agrarian-reform bill is directed against the unproductive feudal landed estates, and it is directed toward creating a bigger stratum of capitalist farmers, small peasant farmers, protecting and developing medium and big capitalist property. It is an expression of the

Youth and Student Corner

SLID CONVENTION HEARS ANTI-WAR VIEWS

By C. T.

Militant third-camp and civil-liberties positions were presented to the Summer Institute of the Student League for Industrial Democracy at Camp Three Arrows last weekend. As *LA* goes to press, a full report on the last two days of the conference is not available.

About forty students, mostly from eastern colleges, gathered at Three Arrows, a co-op founded by socialists in the thirties. Both the speakers and the audience reaction showed a growing criticism of American foreign policy. In general, the third-camp position was constantly presented as a live, current issue, in discussing the Western bloc's split at the UN, the East German uprisings, the French general strike and developments in Asia.

THIRD-CAMP TREND

At Saturday's forum, Walter Weitzman made a formal presentation of the third-camp approach. He was joined in his characterization of American imperialism by Terence McCarthy, Socialist Party member, who disagreed with Weitzman on other issues, particularly the nature of Russia. At this forum, the presentation of the American State Department line was weak, and despite some sharp right-wing criticism from the floor, a critical attitude toward American leadership of the Western bloc pervaded the session.

Panels which met Saturday night split mainly on the issue of a very critical support of American foreign policy and an out-and-out third-camp position. In general, the whole mood of the discussion of international relations was marked by hostility toward the role of American capitalism.

After the Saturday panel (and each panel in the institute), a discussion of panel and forum techniques was held. Despite a tendency toward a heavy schedule, SLID attempted—and achieved—a high degree of participation on the part of all present. Workshop projects

on parliamentary law, publicity, radio work and organization were also held.

CIVIL LIBERTIES

The theme of Sunday's discussion was "The Challenge to America." Samuel Friedman of the Socialist Party presented a generalized statement on the challenge of fighting Stalinism without using McCarthyite methods. Mike Harrington of the Workers Defense League analyzed the civil-liberties issue in terms of the bureaucratization of the New and War Deals, and the consequent effect of secret, administrative procedures of the attorney general's list, loyalty program and the like, on the right to work. Harrington concluded with a demand that socialists make a principled defense of the rights of Stalinists even while exposing Stalinism.

The panels on the civil-liberties issue were almost unanimous in their criticism of current procedures. Most of the students present favored some kind of principled stand in defense of the rights of Stalinists.

The Institute was characterized by excellent planning—though perhaps it tried to accomplish a little too much. Nevertheless, the prevailing mood of the students present, considerably more to the left than might be expected, opens up the very real possibility of a more open field for third-camp, civil-libertarian socialists on the campus this fall.

Get acquainted with the SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE

Write to the SYL at
114 West 14 Street, New York City

The working class is backing the government, in spite of crisis and miserable conditions, because no party and no Left group has raised the banner of a new workers' program different from that of the Nationalists. The workers' unions are absolutely controlled by Lechin's people now, and the "workers' minister" Lechin is the principal prop of the regime. The Central Obrera Boliviana (COB) began as a representative federation of all the unions but today it is absolutely subordinated to Lechin's group and therefore to the Nationalist regime, serving the purpose of making a show of support for the government.

The best proof of this statement is the position which the COB has taken on the agrarian problem. It had demanded agrarian reform without compensation; it had demanded the distribution of all land to the peasants, the creation of collective cooperatives, etc. But when the government bill was put out, this same COB applauded the moderate pro-capitalist reform, offering unconditional support to the government.

For this whole situation, the "Left" is primarily responsible politically, it is a prime reason for the political stagnation which is growing daily in the country, and which is sure to lead to the next defeat of the workers and peasants and the rise of political reaction. Both the Stalinists and the Trotskyist POR are backing the government unconditionally, not in the name of their own political programs nor as independent political forces but only in order to gain a bit of toleration from the regime and to get third-rate posts for their people.

The Nationalist government is sitting pretty in this respect; it gets very good and cheap servitors among the "Leftists," who support the regime at very low salaries. Most shameful is the role of the POR, whose leaders are serving the regime in third- or fourth-rate minor posts. This policy of the "Left" will make the defeat of the workers' and peasants' camp inevitable, and the growth of the capitalist and feudal reaction will not be able to be contained.

government's pro-capitalist policy compromising with the pressure of the Indian peasant working masses exercised on the regime for the achievement of economic and social reforms.

While even this agrarian reform is a progressive step for so backward a country as Bolivia, it is clear that it is not a revolutionary step nor a revolutionary means of solving the country's basic problems.

The Nationalist government of the MNR decreed this bill under the pressure of the Indian peasants and the working masses and also as a means of destroying the Rightist opposition formed by the big landowners. It is interesting to note the fact that the study commission on the agrarian problem was composed in its majority of "leftist" representatives, Stalinist as well as Trotskyist, and that these people patched up so moderate and pro-capitalist a reform.

COB GOES ALONG

The strength of the Nationalist regime is not so much based on its own party, the MNR, as on the uncritical support which it receives from the whole "Left," such as the workers' unions, dominated by the Juan Lechin caucus; from the Stalinist camp, which is divided into the old PIR and the Communist Party; and finally from the Trotskyist POR, with its representation in the trade-union federation, the Central Obrera Boliviana. The political stability of the Nationalist regime, in spite of the economic crisis in the country, in spite of inflation and devaluation, in spite of the growing bourgeois opposition, is based on the support of the "Left" to a decisive extent.

A Forgotten Novel: Ilya Ehrenburg's Satire Against Stalinism

By GABRIEL GERSH

It is not easy to understand why Ilya Ehrenburg should have remained prominent for so long as one of Russia's official spokesmen. By education and background, he is an intellectual who belongs to that element in the Russian Communist Party which Stalin had always hated and distrusted, and which he decided to destroy in the 1930s. In the parvenu circles of the new Stalinist officials, cosmopolitanism has been something of a crime, but Ehrenburg is essentially a cosmopolitan.

He has memories of Russia before the revolution; he has lived for many years in Paris; he has a profound understanding of Jewish life; and his early satirical writings did not spare the Soviet Union. Under these circumstances, how does he feel in the atmosphere of crude Russian nationalism which has been reasserting itself in Moscow?

Or what does he think when he examines the Soviet Encyclopedia and learns that it has been entirely rewritten so that for example a "cosmopolitan" in the 1935 edition was "one who asserts he belongs to no single nationality, but regards the whole world as his home," while in the 1952 edition he had become "a person of anti-patriotic, bourgeois opinions who asserts hypocritically that the whole world is a single fatherland and refuses to defend his own country?"

The question arises because Ehrenburg was once a writer of distinction. Certainly, his earlier works bear no resemblance to his present output. His articles in the Russian press, in which he extols the Kremlin dictatorship, are sheer nonsense, and his war novel, *Storm*, was a hack piece of journalism which has almost passed into oblivion.

Master and Disciples

But some clues to the real outlook of Ilya Ehrenburg may be gathered from his earlier and far superior *Julio Jurenito*, which he wrote in the early 1930s when he was living in Paris. Since the Communist Parties have not republished it in any of its various editions and translations, *Julio Jurenito* is difficult to obtain and even its name is not well known. Few readers will still know that it depicts with great power the horrors of the totalitarian regime, and often reads like a forerunner to George Orwell's 1984.

Julio Jurenito represents Ehrenburg's attempt at a modern version of *Candide*. Julio Jurenito, referred to as the "Master," is a fanciful character, a well-educated Mexican revolutionist, tired of successive Mexican revolutions and of revolution for mere narrow political and economic aims. He is engaged in another course of action—a revolution against the entire fabric of civilization and against the Leviathan of the modern state. He reasons that only after their overthrow can mankind advance toward a happier world.

The opening scene of the satire is set in 1913, a year before the outbreak of the Great War. The forces of distraction are already at work. Julio Jurenito, acting on behalf of mankind, is talking and preaching to accelerate the historic process.

Julio Jurenito surrounds himself with other fanciful characters. First, there is the narrator, a character to whom the author gives his own name, Ilya Ehrenburg, a young Russian Jewish poet, waiting in a Paris cafe for some friends to pay for his cup of coffee. The second disciple is Ercole Bambucci, a handsome Italian, and expert in spitting, eating, sleeping, begging, stealing and a foe of every authority that would interfere with his noble activities.

The third disciple is Mister Cool, an American of uncertain morals and unlimited wealth, out to prepare the world for the American Century. The fourth is Alexei Spiridonovich, a typical ineffectual Russian nihilist who resem-

bles Bazarov, the hero of Turgenev's novel *Fathers and Sons*.

The fifth is Aysha, a Senegalese Negro, a former hotel groom, carrying with him three wood-carved god statues which he worships. The sixth is M. Delhaie, a middle-class Frenchman with a passion for the art of French good living—French wine, French women and French opportunities for profits. The seventh and last is Kurt Schmidt, a young German with a mania for organization, in whose house hang pictures of Karl Marx, Kaiser Wilhelm and a Herr Aschinger who owned 270 well organized restaurants in Berlin.

Vision of Permanent War

With this entourage, Julio Jurenito sets out on a tour of Europe, North Africa and Russia preaching, talking and speeding up the inevitable course of history. The eight pilgrims are caught by war, deeply involved and mobilized, separated and united again. When the French threaten to shoot them as spies, they are rescued by M. Delhaie, who is living in surroundings of comfort with good French food and a new French mistress; and when the Germans threaten to hang them, they are saved by Kurt Schmidt, who is employed in introducing proper German order and efficiency into the hanging of civilians. Throughout their long journey, Jurenito, discourses constantly—on love making, on the stupidities of marriage, on money, on the state, on the Negro question, on the Jewish question and a wide range of other subjects.

It is a very diverting satire and it is remarkably prophetic of the shape of things to come. As I mentioned before, in some ways *Julio Jurenito* reads like a precursor of 1984: the Ilya Ehrenburg of 1924 and the George Orwell of 1984 might well have found several points of agreement.

For instance, Ehrenburg had foreseen the coming of this age of conflict and war. Here is Jurenito's grim prophesy: "Those who started the war, the diplomats, the chiefs of staff, the big industrialists, the kaiser, the doubtful financiers, can no longer end it. This war will last decades, perhaps centuries. Don't laugh at me: in its pauses you may have peace treaties and all kinds of bucolic interludes. Like a stream which at times runs underground, this war will change its form and sometimes assume a loathsome resemblance to sentimental peace. This war will no longer be a proper war: it will skillfully infiltrate into our hearts; every city wall, every garden-fence, every doorstep will become a new front. . . ."

Satire's Crystal Ball

There is an excellent bit of satire in the chapter where the disciples attend peace meetings in neutral Holland, only to learn that there is no such thing as "peace," but only an Allied peace or a German peace, each with its supporters; and where Ehrenburg pokes fun at those who seek to "civilize" mass slaughter by proposing a ban on inconvenient weapons. There is an extraordinary passage where Ehrenburg makes Jurenito predict that the horror and misery of war must inevitably bring as aftermath a blind, ruthless persecution of the Jews. "Jewish blood will flow, the guests invited to the performances will applaud, but according to ancient precedent, such bloodletting can provide no medicine for a sick world, but can only poison it more bitterly."

Again, Ehrenburg prophesies the crimes that were committed by the Nazis in World War II. There is a passage where Kurt Schmidt, the Master's German disciple and in 1917 a German military judge, protests that he does not like having people shot and loves children as much as anyone else. But Schmidt says, foreshadowing the Nazis: "Whether you execute one single lunatic or a million people for the benefit of hu-

manity—that is only a quantitative difference. But unless you start executing, all people will continue to lead stupid and senseless lives . . . for the benefit of Germany tomorrow and of humanity the day after tomorrow, I had to order the sinking of all 'Lusitanias' and the liquidation of hundreds of thousands of people. On that basis, is there still any point in talking about cities or churches? Though, of course, their destruction is rather a pity."

The climax of the satire comes with Jurenito's trip to revolutionary Russia. Shouting "Down with freedom and beauty!" at a workers' conference, the Master and his disciple Ehrenburg are arrested and brought before a Communist interrogator, a sort of prototype of Vishinsky. They are told that because of the amnesty proclaimed to honor the arrival of the Siamese Communist delegation they will not be shot so quickly.

Whips and Violets

And the Communist asks Jurenito this question—strange, ironical wording from the pen of Ehrenburg: "Are you now still so blinded by your hate against the republic of workers and peasants that you cannot see nor grasp the simplest truth—that the USSR is the true realm of freedom?"

Even more ironical, and significant are the paragraphs that follow. Smilingly, the Master disavows any blindness and goes on: "You Communists are destroying freedom: therefore I greet you. . . . You are the greatest liberators of mankind, because the splendid yoke you are placing on its shoulders is not of gold, but of solid iron, and properly organized. The day may come when the word 'freedom' will resound as a genuine revolutionary call before which the garments of the world being created today will scatter to the winds like feathers. . . . Today, however, the idea of 'freedom' is a counter-revolutionary concept. . . . If I greet you Communists, it is because in the course of a year you have so ruthlessly knocked the notion of 'freedom' out of the head of every idler, dreamer or lickspittle. . . . But that you are not aware of this process, that's not at all funny."

At this, the Communist interrogator flies into a rage, opens the Alphabet of Communism, reads out a passage on surplus value and shouts: "Now, I trust, you have understood that we have progressed from the realm of serfdom into the realm of freedom."

But Jurenito, unconvinced, replies: "Dear comrade, I don't doubt that the reign of freedom will dawn one day (though perhaps only when the last men have been exterminated). But at this moment we are entering straight into an age of naked slavery in which political rape will no longer be distinguished by the benevolent smiles of English gentlemen. I implore you Communists: don't beautify your whips with violets. You are charged with a grand and complex mission: so to accustom men to their chains that they will regard them like a mother's tender embrace. To this end, you have no need to approach men cautiously, hiding the chains behind your back. No, we must create a new pathos for slavery. In spite of your intellectualism and your weakness for quotations you appear to be an efficient and energetic man. Therefore, let the syphilitics in the cafes of the Montmartre chatter about freedom, while you get on with what you will do in any case."

And Today . . .

At this, the Communist interrogator shouts that because Jurenito is evidently incapable of grasping that the Communists form the vanguard of freedom, he and Ehrenburg are to be sentenced to forced labor in a concentration camp, where they may come to see the folly of their thinking.

The sentence is carried out; but once again the Master and Ehrenburg are saved, this time by the intervention of disciples who have become Communist Party members. However, the end is near; the Master feels that his personal mission for the destruction of the world is almost concluded. In a small Russian town he deliberately commits suicide by a novel method. He goes alone to a park, wearing brand-new boots; half an hour later he is found dead—without his boots.

The pilgrims scatter; the sorrowing disciple, Ehrenburg leaves Russia and returns via London to his beloved Paris and his favorite cafe in the Montparnasse, where he can reflect on the Master's genius and on the sad fact that the Master would have been considered a traitor by all the courts of the world, "including the wisest native judges of Africa or the Revolutionary Tribunal of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics. . . ."

That roughly is the plot of *Julio Jurenito*. Since the time of writing, Ehrenburg has changed sides. It is he who is today beautifying the Stalinist whips with his violets; it is he who is today, like the Communist interrogator of his satire, proclaiming that the Soviet Union is the true realm of freedom and that its opponents are blinded by their hatred of the "regime of workers and toilers."

Moscow Fishes on German Unity Issue—

(Continued from page 1)

The first point that should be borne in mind is that the position of the Stalinist government in Eastern Germany has been radically altered by the June uprising of the German workers. Whatever prestige it may have had prior to those events has been shattered. The German workers demonstrated to themselves and to the whole world that the East German government is a hollow shell, and that only the presence of Russian tanks gives it any power whatever.

On the face of it, to propose that this discredited "government," together with the participation of "democratic organizations," none of which exist except in the illegal underground in Eastern Germany, be the organs through which a "democratic election" is to be organized in that territory could only evoke laughter among the German people. The Kremlin knows this as well as anyone else. But, strange as it may seem, that is precisely one of the chief reasons they repeat this proposal now.

The uncertain juggling of power within the Stalinist high command has raised the problem of the permanence of all of the regimes in the satellite countries. No one knows from one day to the next where a purge will strike, and how deep it will go. In the case of Eastern Germany, this simply adds to the worldwide speculation, and the very intense speculation within the whole of Germany, as to whether the Kremlin may not be preparing to dump its East German puppets and seek to re-establish their control through some other, less discredited group.

REASSURING PUPPET

In fact, the speculation has run to the extent that some "experts" have concluded that the Russian army is urging the Moscow government to pull out of those countries where there appears little likelihood of their being able to establish a really stable regime for a long time to come.

One thing that the Stalinist proposal does is to proclaim to the world that the Kremlin continues to back its puppets in Eastern Germany no less than it did before June 17. This does not mean, of course, that as individuals the leaders of the East German government have any guarantee that they will not be purged. But it means that as a group, as a political formation, they are not going to be sold down the river in the interest of some kind of cold-war bargain between Russia and the United States. At least, not at the present time.

Whatever they may have believed before, the Stalinists know now for a certainty that any free election in Eastern Germany would constitute an overwhelming and disastrous defeat for them. Yet they cannot abandon the appearance of being for the unification of Germany, for that would give the West a powerful political weapon against them. With this proposal, they seek at the same time to reassure their henchmen in Eastern Germany, and to continue the game of pretending to be champions of the reunification of the country.

HOPES FOR ELECTION

The timing of this diplomatic note is also calculated to have some effect on the West German elections scheduled for the first week in September. Actually, the Stalinists have little to hope for in these elections. If the Adenauer government receives a heavy popular vote of confidence, it would mean that the American policy of rearming Western Germany and integrating it into the American military alliance will have got a new lease on life. If the Social-Democrats gain heavily, it will be a serious blow to American policy, but at the same time will strengthen the workers' movement which is the strongest political threat to the Stalinists on both sides of the iron curtain.

From the Stalinist point of view, the best result of the West German elections would be a stalemate in which neither Adenauer nor the Social-Democrats gain heavily. This, along with the general trend of events in Western Europe, could be counted on to delay German rearmament

and the creation of the European Defense Community indefinitely.

If the Social-Democrats do not gain decisively, it is likely that their leadership will continue on the relatively timid political course which they have been following ever since their party was reconstituted after the war. In that event, only the extreme neo-Nazi groups in Western Germany would benefit, if not immediately, then later on. And from the Stalinist point of view, this would not be the worst thing which could happen in Western Germany.

It must be borne in mind that although the Nazis are violently anti-Russian, they are not pro-American. A strengthening of the extreme right in Western Germany would tend to isolate that country from the other nations of Western Europe. And it would certainly give the Stalinists additional justification in the eyes of the peoples of the world for maintaining their own imperial dictatorships in Eastern Europe.

UNITY IS THE ISSUE

All sections of German society are for the unification of the country. The Social-Democrats have drawn strength from the fact that they have put this demand at the top of their program, and have refused to subordinate it to the American program of integrating Western Germany into the West European military alliance. The Adenauer coalition, on the other hand, has profited by the rapid economic recovery of the coun-

try, and by its ability to get American financial backing for that recovery.

The Stalinist proposal keeps alive the hope of unification, even though it is no more acceptable, in its present form, to the Social Democrats than to anyone else. Hence it may aid them in the electoral struggle, but only very slightly and indirectly. At the same time, the Kremlin knows that West German recovery is a very shaky thing, and that if the political stalemate can be continued for a while, it can be counted on to weaken and collapse in due course.

If it were not for the workers' actions in their own section of Germany, they could confidently continue to bide their time until rising unemployment and political frustration make the country ripe for the plucking. And even though their position has been terribly weakened by the June uprising, that is what they propose to do, even though with much less confidence than they had before.

The key to the situation rests in the hands of the people of Western Germany, and in the first place, in the hands of its workers. Their brothers in Eastern Germany have already given the Kremlin's appeal an upset from which it may never really right itself. A powerful gain at the polls by the Social-Democrats in Western Germany would not only give encouragement to the valiant fighters in the East, but could also be the beginning of a new political surge throughout Europe which would set the governments both in Moscow and in Washington back on their heels.

Social-Democrats vs. Adenauer: Two Kinds of Accusations

The campaign for the September 6 elections in Western Germany is beginning to heat up.

Last week, the Social-Democrats issued a "Yellow Book" which claimed that West German industry and business had raised a fund of between \$25,000,000 and \$37,000,000 to obtain the re-election of the government coalition parties headed by Chancellor Konrad Adenauer.

At a meeting at Frankfurt on August 15, Adenauer admitted that his party had received money for its campaign fund from big West German industrialists. He insisted, however, that the money had been given without strings attached.

And to deflect attention from this charge, Adenauer made one of his own. He told his audience that certain Social-Democratic district leaders had received campaign funds from East Germany, to the extent of 10,000 Deutsche marks (about \$2,500) each.

Adenauer said that the Social-Democratic party headquarters was not aware that some of its local leaders had taken the money from East Germany and that he was prepared to supply their names to the party leadership. He added that

East German Stalinists have 100,000,000 Deutsche marks (about \$25,000,000) available for "subversive" activities in Western Germany, obtained from East-West trade.

In this electoral struggle, the American government is openly on the side of Adenauer, as his party not only represents conservative capitalist circles in Germany, but because he is also the primary advocate of German rearmament and integration into the proposed European Defense Community and through that into the American military alliance.

As to the Stalinists, although they have no use for Adenauer and are of course anxious to block West German rearmament, they regard the Social-Democrats as their main political enemy in both East and West Germany.

Adenauer no doubt hopes to gain acceptance for his slanderous charge against the Social-Democrats from the fact that it is a notorious practice of the Stalinists in all countries to attempt to bribe and otherwise corrupt individuals among their opponents. The Social-Democrats have hotly denied his charges, and can be expected to seek to force him to prove them or to eat his words.

French Strikes — —

(Continued from page 1)

launched the movement has made it difficult for the press to follow the usual line on "Communist-inspired" strikes. But it may well be true, as reported, that the reformist trade-union leaders—who undoubtedly did not bargain for the whirlwind they unleashed—have been afraid to push back-to-work orders for fear that in that case the CGT would simply fall heir to the movement. Laniel has refused to make things easy for them by agreeing to a satisfactory-looking compromise on the basis of which the workers could be called back. Instead the premier has made every preparation to resort to a solution of blood and anti-working-class violence.

He has issued a declaration of war, which may become literal warfare. The indications are that he is prepared to crush the strike by force of arms and police terror.

The motor force behind the vast surge of the strike movement is not, of course, the post-office issue by itself. This merely symbolized the intention of French capitalism to balance its economic affairs by making the workers pay for its imperialist adventures and rearmament, the post-office employees being the first victims. Behind the strikes is the fact that the wages and living conditions of the French masses are miserable.

In implication, the movement is a political strike, of wider scope than merely the demand for the withdrawal of the post-office item from the government's plans. Its weakness is that there is no clear objective of a limited kind which it sets itself and whose achievement would be its definitive victory. Actually, the only solution it looks to would be the fall of the cabinet and its replacement by some kind of "left" coalition of the Socialists, MRP and other left groups of deputies. It may force this outcome too.

But while for a week it was daily expected to peter out, as we go to press it is gathering even more force. There is no doubt that it is in part a spontaneous outburst of resentment and hatred against the lot which the working class has been forced to suffer. Whatever its ending in the immediate sense, it may give an impulse to militant socialist political organization, which France needs so badly, and which alone could have a permanent effect on the workers' future.

Not in the Headlines

Spit and Polish

The railroad labor weekly *Labor* notes that a few days before the Republicans picked him as their candidate for New York City's mayor, Acting Postmaster Harold Riegelman had issued an order that riled the letter carriers.

Riegelman, an ex-army colonel, decreed that the postmen must report for work in complete uniforms, cleanly shaved and with their shoes shined. The president of the AFL Letter Carriers, William C. Doherty, commented that he agreed that all postmen should be models of neatness, and added:

"We have no objection to Riegelman's 'spit and polish' order, even though it was couched in terms which no one but a former army colonel would use. But I wonder if he knows that the United States is practically the only civilized country in the world where the government refuses to pay for postmen's uniforms."

Tax-Sheltered

An advertisement in the *Wall Street Journal* boasts about the tax loopholes that the moguls have put through for the moguls. The ad was entitled "Profits in Oil," and said:

"At last investors anxious to profit from the special advantages of oil operations can now quickly check on the why and how of building up tax-free income in oil. A new research study on Tax-Sheltered Investments provides the answers."

And that's no fake, since the ad refers to what is a fact: the "depletion allowance" loophole for profits in oil, which has been a boon for Tax-Sheltered Millionaires.

Freedom

The U. S. embassy in Tokyo runs an American Cultural Center at which the Japanese International Students' Association holds regular semi-monthly discussions on current events. A writer in the *Nation* (July 18) describes what happened on the evening of June 16, 1952.

No American official had previously taken part, but that evening the American librarian of the center attended, to inform the students that henceforth it had been decided that no critical remarks could be made in the discussions about the Japanese government; therefore no internal political questions could be discussed.

It was soon found that darned few other questions could be discussed, since naturally the Japanese young people were interested in any domestic sides of international issues. Finally a topic for the day was decided on: "What was gained and lost from the occupation."

The first speaker mentioned the winning of freedom of speech and assembly. There was an outburst of giggles.

Anti-Franco Committee Issues Monthly Bulletin

The Chicago Committee to Defend the Labor Victims of Franco has begun publication of a monthly information bulletin, mimeographed, to keep its supporters informed on development in Franco Spain and the fight against Spanish fascism.

Entitled "Free Labor in Spain," its first issue summarizes recent atrocities against labor men by the Falangist regime, beginning with the case of Tomas Centeno, as well as a description of the work of the committee.

The bulletin is available from the offices of the committee at 127 N. Dearborn Street, Chicago 2.

WEEK by WEEK . . .

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

A sub is only \$2 a year!

SCREEN the NEWS with Labor Action

A sub is \$2 a year—subscribe now!

Washington Has No Plan — —

(Continued from page 1)

become reformed characters. At the same time, the U. S. proclaims that it has no intention of reforming itself, or of insisting that any of its noble allies reform. It has an ironbound decision against withdrawing its troops from Germany no matter what; France is even at the moment conducting a dirty game of intrigue against the Moroccan people; the British are conducting massacres in Kenya; etc.

And while it would be a very good thing if the Russian tyrants were to throw up the sponge and jump off the Kremlin roofs just because their American imperialist rivals demand it as evidence of peaceful intentions, no one is really optimistic that this is likely to happen.

Even before the political conference gets organized, even while the UN just begins the process of organizing the Korean parley, things are already bogging down in the "procedural" questions which American policy helps to create as a substitute for politics.

NO, NO, NO

The present substitutes for politics are: What nations shall sit in on the political conference, and what points shall be on its agenda? In both cases the U. S. betrays its essentially negative role.

It does not want India around the table. It objects, to any point on the agenda not directly concerned with Korea.

In this it runs afoul of the openly expressed or privately held desires of its own allies. Instead of a dynamic program to consolidate forces against Stalinism, its policy continually leads it into clashes with its own camp, or those nations which it wants to consolidate in its own camp. This is not due merely to stupidity but, more important, to the barrenness and sterility of its policy. It has no program; and so the narrower the agenda, the more restricted the audience, the happier its diplomats are.

Why limit the agenda so narrowly to Korea? The world awaited the truce be-

cause all peoples hoped that, once the fighting ended, the war tension could be settled, a peace could be arranged not only for Korea but for the world. Can anything be solved within the narrow confines of Korea—even for Korea? Not a soul in the world believes that. Yet the U. S. puts itself in the position of refusing to discuss, or letting the UN discuss, any of the questions which do have a bearing on the question about which alone the world is concerned—war or peace for our generation.

Under these circumstances, the Russians do not have to invent their own propaganda. The Americans do it for them.

SPECTER

The U. S. objects to seating India at the conference, and many believe that this is because it is afraid India will raise inconvenient questions—the recognition and seating of Stalinist China by the UN, for example. But if only India will have the independence to raise this openly, it will do only what all the other states are aching to do and would do if they were not afraid of Washington's arm-twisting.

The question of seating Peiping is the specter which haunts the State Department. Haunted, the American delegation launches the UN session with characteristic blackmail: a threat of withdrawal if the UN dares to touch the question. Senator Wiley, a member of the delegation and chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, issues a statement of warning against seating Stalinist China in any organ of the UN: this would be "a very serious matter as far as the American public and the Congress of the United States are concerned," he says. He threatens:

"The president, acting upon the advice of Congress, could withdraw from the United Nations, but we must realize that if it ever became necessary for us to resort to such drastic action, it would undoubtedly mean the end of that organization and a serious setback for the cause of world peace."

What an inaugural! On the eve of trying to forge a united UN front against the enemy, the leader of the UN

talks about withdrawing, blandly assumes that with its withdrawal this "international parliament" could not exist, and warns, threats, blackjacks. . . . But there is an explanation: Wiley's statement "somewhat bewildered" the UN delegates "until it was discovered that one of the purposes of the statement was to take issue with GOP Senate Leader Knowland (Calif.) who had said Sunday night the U. S. should withdraw from the UN if it seats Red China." (N. Y. Post, Aug. 18.) This no doubt made everything clear. . . .

CHINA AND UN

Now the question of Stalinist China's entrance into the UN is of piddling importance in itself, from the point of view of the prospects of peace, or for that matter from the point of view of the prospects of the UN as a force for peace. But it has been raised to great symptomatic importance—not by the cleverness of Russia's propaganda but by the sheer stupidity and sterility of U. S. policy.

Ordinarily we, as socialists, would not be much concerned about whether the UN talking-shop did or did not include Peiping. And we most certainly are not concerned about it from the point of view of so many liberals and neutralists who look upon it as a key question in itself. Many do so because they have real illusions about the UN as a world parliament; they think that the inclusion of China is necessary in order to make the UN "effective," for how can it be "effective" if the actual government of a great nation is outside of it? Peace be to such souls, but we cannot approach the question so softheadedly. The UN has been a farce as a world organization without Mao, and the entrance of Mao's men into its councils will not change that a whit.

Actually, the importance of the China-UN question does not stem from what it could mean for the UN but from what it does mean for the going U. S. policy. Washington is so frenzied on the subject because of its pro-Chiang Kai-shek policy, and not from considerations of either morality or policy. This is what is involved and nothing else.

It is a fact that the Stalinist government rules China, and it is a fact that the Formosan warlord does not rule China. Objectively speaking, there is no case whatsoever for not recognizing the Peiping government. The formal objections are without exception examples of utter hypocrisy. The U. S. has not hesitated to recognize dictatorial governments if such recognition benefited its interests—for example, Latin American dictatorships born of military putsches but which were properly tender of American capital.

But we are not advisers to the State Department on its interests. We can only note the indubitable fact: that Washington's grim determination to bludgeon the UN into keeping Peiping out of the hal- lowed ranks is the other side of its equally grim determination to hang onto the Formosan butcher as its ally. And for this it gives the Stalinist camp all its cards and spades and isolates itself even in the West.

A government which had a progressive PROGRAM, a dynamically democratic foreign policy which it could counterpose to the Stalinist demagogic appeals, would have no fears about opening the UN talking-shop to Mao's men.

ISOLATION AGAIN

The admission of Peiping to the UN would solve nothing, not a single solitary thing. To "demand" it as a "step toward peace"—in the spirit of so many European neutralists—is possible only on the basis of the "peaceful coexistence" myth. But while China's admission to the UN (or for that matter, its recognition by the U. S. government) would solve nothing by itself, the contrary policy of keeping out the Peiping regime by every species of threat and cajolery is quite another matter.

This policy of exclusion is based four-square on Washington's continuing ties to Chiang, it has meaning only as part of the U. S. policy of relying on reactionaries everywhere for its allies: it gives the Russians a powerful and even legitimate lever of propaganda on its own behalf; it convinces all the peoples of the world that the U. S. is not interested in peace but in using the UN for its own devices and blocs.

And so this teeth-rattling question becomes the specter over the coming Korean political conference, while the U. S., with a genius scarcely paralleled in world history, isolates itself from every democratic opinion and force. It looks once again as if that, and little else, will be the positive accomplishment of the Korean talks.

The ISL Program in Brief

The Independent Socialist League stands for socialist democracy and against the two systems of exploitation which now divide the world: capitalism and Stalinism.

Capitalism cannot be reformed or liberalized, by any Fair Deal or other deal, so as to give the people freedom, abundance, security or peace. It must be abolished and replaced by a new social system, in which the people own and control the basic sectors of the economy, democratically controlling their own economic and political destinies.

Stalinism, in Russia and wherever it holds power, is a brutal totalitarianism—a new form of exploitation. Its agents in every country, the Communist Parties, are unrelenting enemies of socialism and have nothing in common with socialism—which cannot exist without effective democratic control by the people.

These two camps of capitalism and Stalinism are today at each other's throats in a worldwide imperialist rivalry for domination. This struggle can only lead to the most frightful war in history so long as the people leave the capitalist and Stalinist rulers in power. Independent Socialism stands for building and strengthening the Third Camp of the people against both war blocs.

The ISL, as a Marxist movement, looks to the working class and its ever-present struggle as the basic progressive force in society. The ISL is organized to spread the ideas of socialism in the labor movement and among all other sections of the people.

At the same time, Independent Socialists participate actively in every struggle to better the people's lot now—such as the fight for higher living standards, against Jim Crow and anti-Semitism, in defense of civil liberties and the trade-union movement. We seek to join together with all other militants in the labor movement as a left force working for the formation of an independent labor party and other progressive policies.

The fight for democracy and the fight for socialism are inseparable. There can be no lasting and genuine democracy without socialism, and there can be no socialism without democracy. To enroll under this banner, join the Independent Socialist League!

SPOTLIGHT

Continued from page 1

"A new and strong trend is the union movement's financing of productions. The Japanese Teachers Union has put up the money for *Hiroshima*, which was released in August and which is a shocking portrayal of the havoc and ravage of atomic bombing. If the film prospers, other unions will push their plans for full-length features to (1) spread their gospel, (2) make money, (3) bring artistry to motion pictures which commercial companies allegedly ignore."

The union movement in this country could take a leaf out of the book of the Japanese unions. As far as we know, the only union here which has attempted to produce a film on anything but a strictly trade-union subject has been the Stalinist-controlled Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers who were shooting a film on the plight of the Mexican and other minorities in the Southwest. Production on this was stopped, at least temporarily, when immigration authorities deported a Mexican actress who was starring in the film.

Why should good ideas like that be left the property of the Stalinist unions?

The Faceless Informer

The U. S. Supreme Court, before it recessed in June, held in a 5-3 decision that the contents of a Federal Bureau of Investigation report, used by the Department of Justice in making its recommendations to an appeal board of the Selective Service system, can be kept from the draft registrant. The court held also that the registrant need not be informed of the names of persons interviewed by the investigators.

Chief Justice Vinson, writing for the majority in the Nugent and Parker cases, reversed two decisions of the U. S. Court of Appeals of New York, which had held that the Selective Service Law's requirement of a hearing before the Justice Department included the right to examine the FBI report. He reasoned that the Justice Department takes no decisive action, that all it does is recommend to an appeal board, and that Congress could have dispensed, in any event,

with the advisory action of the Justice Department, which is provided for in selective-service cases, only where conscientious objectors are involved. It was further held that the due-process requirement of the Fifth Amendment did not require such a hearing, since the law was an exercise of the war power in times of peril and that these procedures were adequate.

Justice Frankfurter, joined by Justices Black and Douglas, dissented. He argued that "The enemy is not yet so near the gate that we should allow respect for the traditions of fairness, which has heretofore prevailed in this country, to be overborne by military exigencies." Though the majority had held that the registrant, in effect, had a fair hearing because he was supplied with "a fair résumé" of the FBI report, Justice Frankfurter pointed out that no one could tell whether the résumé was fair when it was not known what it contained. "In a country with our moral and material strength, the maintenance of fair procedures cannot handicap our security. Every adherence to our moral professions reinforces our strength and therefore our security."

Justice Douglas, joined by Justice Black, added a short dissenting opinion pointing out that no one should be deprived of the right to confront the faceless informer "whether the life of a man is at stake, or his reputation, or any matter touching upon his status or his rights." Justice Jackson did not participate in the case. The case had the full support of the American Civil Liberties Union, which reports the case in its *Feature Press Service*, August 3.

Thus another battle has been lost in the fight to force the government, in its administrative procedures, to conform to the rules which have been devised for the protection of the innocent in all court proceedings.

The government's refusal to make the FBI's evidence available to the accused is not confined, of course, to selective-service cases, but extends to "security" proceedings against government workers and workers in industries having government contracts.

Get Acquainted!

Independent Socialist League
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, N. Y.

- I want more information about the ideas of Independent Socialism and the ISL.
- I want to join the ISL.

NAME (please print) _____
ADDRESS _____
CITY _____
ZONE STATE _____

The Handy Way to Subscribe!

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

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

NAME (please print) _____
ADDRESS _____
CITY _____
ZONE STATE _____