

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

AUGUST 31, 1953

FIVE CENTS

How the French Strikes Grew

... page 3

Jenner's 'Plot' Theory of History

... page 6

The POUM Spells Out Its Program

... page 7

A Union's Formula for Democracy

... page 2

SPOT-LIGHT

The Basic Rights

A striking example, which deserves to become classic, of the American Way of Thought which rules public opinion today is provided by the N. Y. *Herald Tribune's* editorial on the Moroccan question. The *Trib* approves Washington's decision to uphold France's hand in the UN, against the proposal that the Security Council discuss the matter. It puts its approval in these words:

"The case against UN intervention in Moroccan affairs is very strong, and it would be tragic if by mistaken idealism or by attempts to appease certain national blocs, we were to be misled into disregarding the basic rights of France."

"Disregarding the basic rights of . . . France"! Could the imperialist mind express itself more forthrightly or concisely? The editorialist does not say which of the Human Rights embodied in the UN Declaration would be disregarded by the U. S. if it voted to discuss French imperialism's brutal imposition of a feudal-reactionary ruler on the Moroccan people. It has a sneering word—"mistaken idealism" and appeasement—for any thought of the basic rights of the Moroccan people.

But the basic rights of France—that is another matter. So much another matter, in fact, that the basic rights of France turn out to be the basic interests of the

(Continued on page 5)

Moscow Makes a Play to Bag Germany—U.S. Stacks Chips on Adenauer Victory

By A. STEIN

The opposite reactions of Washington and Moscow to the approaching September 6 elections in Western Germany are a rich study in political contrasts. While Washington now maintains a studied silence on all matters German, Moscow has suddenly embarked on a frantically "dynamic" course.

Speaking in the name of the Kremlin regime, Malenkov alternately threatens and cajoles the voters of the German Federal Republic. With one breath he proposes the formation of an "All-German Provisional Government" as the first step in the creation of a united Germany; with the next he thunders against the Adenauer regime that is "taking the German people down the dangerous road of militarism and war."

And on August 22 the Kremlin granted a number of concessions to the East German puppet government, one of which cannot but have its effect on the West German people, i.e., the release of an unspecified number of German war prisoners.

It should be noted that Moscow's bag of tricks is by no means exhausted. It can announce the withdrawal of part of the occupation army; or it can declare itself in favor of reopening the question of the Oder-Neisse territory which was given to Poland. These are concessions, and there are others, which might have an important effect on the coming elections in the Federal Republic.

For its part, Washington views Moscow's efforts with ill-concealed contempt and dismisses them as unworthy of attention. (A Washington correspondent of the *New York Times* describes the American government's attitude as "casual.") The State Department informs the press that Moscow's proposal to set

up an "All-German Provisional Government" to supervise elections throughout Germany as the first step toward real unity is a fraud; that Moscow's various concessions to the East German puppet regime are long overdue, and that it is doubtful they will be of real benefit to the people of Eastern Germany.

Why is Washington so complacent? On the surface it would seem the Eisenhower regime is convinced Adenauer's Christian-Democratic Party will win by a heavy majority, and that the American policy—of incorporating Western Germany (and its twelve fully armed divisions) into the

European Defense Community will triumph on September 6. The truth is, however, that even if Adenauer barely squeezes through or can rule only with a coalition as in the past, Washington will carry through its plans to rearm Western Germany.

The Eisenhower regime is basing its calculations on these facts: that the present economic prosperity favors the Adenauer regime; that the Moscow regime is internally divided since Stalin's death, and that the seemingly formidable military strength of the satellite armed

(Turn to last page)

France Finds Quislings in Feudal Lords of Morocco

The French colonialist administration in Morocco, with the consent of the Paris cabinet obtained in spite of some grinding of teeth by the ministers, has taken hold of the bear by the tail and deposed the sultan in order to install a feudal-reactionary puppet.

No more cynical imperialist step has been taken since the Second World War on either side of the Iron Curtain.

As we mentioned last week, citing the opinion of the Moroccan nationalist (Istiqlal party) representatives here, the indications were at first that the French thought to use El Glaoui's movement simply as blackmail pressure on the sultan to force him to sign new French-inspired decrees directed against the independence movement. This was the kernel of truth to the French claim that they were acting as "mediators" seeking to arrange a compromise between the Berber pashas and the palace.

That is, up to a certain point, whatever the aspirations of El Glaoui himself, the French were not anxious to overthrow the sultan but to tie him up with his signature, extorted under threats created by themselves.

As far as can be seen in the news from Morocco as filtered through the French censorship and the wariness of the foreign correspondents to displease an Atlantic Pact ally, the French decided to go through with the graver move either (1) because of the sultan's refusal to sign on the dotted line, or (2) because the feudal pashas, France's only "friends" in the country, went beyond France's own strategy, in the interests of their own power, and convinced the foreign colonialists that such a "compromise" with the sultan, however much it might satisfy Paris, would tend to alienate their own affections. This could have presented the imperialist maneuvers with a dilemma.

It seems likely that both reasons operated, in view of the fact that for days the sultan refused to sign the French decrees.

Incidentally, it is now clear that the French were openly lying when they claimed that he had done so last week, while only the foreign representatives of the underground Istiqlal told the press that the sultan was holding out. On Wednesday a *Times* dispatch from Paris (where Resident-General Guillaume was convincing the cabinet to back him up) finally quoted Guillaume as making only the claim that the sultan "had signed a protocol outlining an accord with France on governmental reforms but that he had not signed decrees relating to its application."

In view of the Residency's previous falsifications, even this has to be taken with a grain of salt, but at any rate it is an admission that the previous claims were fabrications.

FRENCH MOTIVES

After the announcement of the deposition, the French seem to have taken the stand that although the sultan had finally signed, it was "too late." Why "too late"?

First, perhaps for the reason previously mentioned, Guillaume's feeling that the feudal pashas could not be restrained or held loyal to France if France now turned to "protect" the sultan against them just because he had capitulated to Paris—while El Glaoui was left holding the bag.

Secondly, perhaps because by that time Guillaume had succeeded in convincing the home cabinet to go all the way with him, and he no longer felt the

(Turn to last page)

Titoists Launch A Party Purge

By GORDON HASKELL

The beginnings of a purge in the Titoist Communist Party are reported from Yugoslavia. So far, it does not appear that this is a full-scale purge, Russian style, in which a struggle for power inside the bureaucracy, or the fear of such a struggle, results in the extermination of thousands of people, including men at the very top of the bureaucracy. Whether highly placed heads may roll eventually, only time will tell.

The purge, as reported by Jack Raymond in the *New York Times* for August 23, is now taking place at the lower levels of the party. And the people who are being purged are party members who have become "confused" by all the propaganda talk in Yugoslavia about democracy, and particularly by the decision at the Sixth Party Congress last year which changed the name of the party to "Communist League" and announced the intention to abandon direct control by the "League" over the state, in favor of a program of ideological agitation.

Tito has issued a letter to the party, couched in vague terms, in which he orders the membership to tighten up its work. The letter is now being "interpreted" to the membership by party lead-

ers throughout the country in "discussion" sessions and in articles in the press.

According to Raymond, the "discussions" are intended to bring the following principles home to the rank and file of the party:

"Members of the Communist League must be prevented from holding varying attitudes on questions of principle 'under the slogan of freedom of opinion.'

"A struggle must be started to eliminate 'petty-bourgeois' forms, such as the growing use of 'Mr.' and 'Mrs.' instead of 'Comrade.'

"In addition, a halt must be put to the playing of jazz music, which the Communists contend is flooding the Yugoslav musical repertoire, and to what *Kommunist*, the official political maga-

(Continued on page 5)

UAW Political Line at Low Ebb in Detroit

By M. J. HARDWICK

DETROIT, Aug. 19—Coming back to this automotive center after a month's absence provides an observer with a fresh look at the situation, and suggests the swift changes in mood and temper that characterize all developments here.

It would be an exaggeration to say that a complete depression outlook prevails among many auto workers and perhaps other strata of Detroit, but things are mighty gloomy compared to just one month ago.

The total destruction of the General Motors Livonia plant—a vital feeder unit—and the resultant sudden unemployment of over 75,000 auto workers, has added to the slight case of jitters. The GM plant, by the way, had totally inadequate fire precautionary measures and systems, according to the state fire marshal.

Walter P. Reuther, UAW and CIO president, has urged Governor G. Mennen Williams to call an emergency session of the state legislature to increase unemployment benefits—a very good idea; but, it remains to be seen what happens along this line. After all, Governor Williams may not want to antagonize business interests who might otherwise favor him for senator in the place of incumbent Senator Homer Ferguson.

What gives so much cause for concern

in Detroit is creeping unemployment, to paraphrase a current term. Again this week, without so much as a word in any Detroit newspapers, other major layoffs have taken place. Short work-weeks seem to be the order of the day in many plants, especially in one of the big three.

In contrast to this turbulent economic picture and almost, a mockery of it, is the complacent outlook on the political scene, even though Detroit's mayoralty election comes up this fall.

For the first time in years, the union movement, notably the UAW, is abstaining from that race. In fact, it has been put in the position where it publicly denies giving left-handed support to incumbent Mayor Albert Cobo, who has been bitterly opposed by organized labor in the past.

HANDS OFF

It may be recalled that two years ago the CIO, through the Wayne County CIO organization, supported Democrat Ed

Branigan against Cobo. Shades of a radical past!

At that time, a sarcastic critic suggested that the road which the UAW and the CIO were following in Detroit would lead logically to avoiding defeat by not contesting the mayoralty election. The trouble with sarcasm is that it should be labeled—else it is much misunderstood...

Now it wouldn't be fair to say that the CIO didn't try to get a candidate. It did urge Blair Moody, the ex-senator, to run, but he has other things in mind. It did urge a liberal or two, privately to be sure, to enter the race. This failed, so the CIO convention just said "Hands off the mayoralty race!"

This is not only a strange contrast to the whole violent character of Detroit's municipal elections, but it arises in a city which is the stronghold of the UAW-CIO, and where, according to union spokesmen, the labor movement showed the greatest political influence in America a scant 10 months ago in the national elections.

The plain fact of the matter is that the UAW's claims, as we suggested at that time, were highly exaggerated, and the UAW's political prestige and influence in Detroit is at such a recognized all-time low that no active "practical" politician in the Democratic Party is willing to run for mayor backed by the union movement.

It would be the height of futility even to discuss that perhaps labor ought to have its own candidate in these circumstances, and make a fight for a program. Such talk in Detroit is considered as a vestigial remnant of a long-forgotten past, by the UAW politicians.

PAINFUL EPISODE

Instead—and this is truly the crowning point of the bankruptcy of the policies pursued for five years by the Reuther leadership in Michigan politics—the Wayne County CIO convention endorsed only seven candidates for city council with 9 to be elected. They didn't even have enough councilmanic candidates.

The final insult to the voters of Detroit, who used to take the UAW-CIO program seriously, is that the CIO convention, over the vigorous protests of at least half the convention, endorsed Louis Miriani for the council. He had been the No. 1 target of the UAW-CIO for retirement from public life, just two years ago.

This painful development merits a brief rehash. Two years ago, some UAW politicians, primarily of Italian origin, wanted the CIO to endorse Miriani, who is Italian and who is a member of a million or so lodges, clubs, etc. The top UAW leadership felt strongly enough about this matter to send Roy Reuther, its PAC director, to the Wayne County delegate meeting, and he did a superb job of explaining what a phony and faker Miriani has been, especially on the question of FEPC. Miriani wouldn't go along with any move for FEPC.

The Reuther viewpoint prevailed, and to show how well the lesson was learned, when the CIO policy committee announced the proposed endorsement of Miriani at the recent convention, an explosion took place. It took the usual variety of bureaucratic maneuvers, evasive explanations, and a dubious vote to announce that Miriani was endorsed.

As against this record of confusion and failure in politics, it is good to be able to report that the UAW has been making remarkable progress in the general field of organization. Without much fanfare or boasting, the UAW has increased its membership to better than 1,600,000 dues-paying members, and it has maintained an average of over 1,500,000 for the past six months.

This fact is not only important in terms of the UAW-CIO development but it bears directly on relationships in the CIO, where—even if the improbable happened and John L. Lewis joined the CIO again to make a bloc with David Macdonald of the steel workers union—Reuther would still have a slight majority.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, New York City
specializes in books and pamphlets on the Labor and Socialist movement, Marxism, etc., and can supply books of all publishers.
Send for our free book list.

LABOR SCOPE

A Union Tries to Find Some Formulas for Internal Democracy

By BEN HALL

How to preserve democracy in unions? The officers of one labor union, the Upholsterers International Union (AFL), prepared a lengthy report on the subject, entitled "Democracy in the UIU," for its convention in June, where it was discussed intensively and finally adopted with the novel constitutional changes that were recommended.

These are hard days for democracy everywhere, even in unions, and the mere fact that these union officials see fit to raise the question for discussion is enough to mark them off from at least 90 per cent of their colleagues in the labor movement, who remain convinced that all problems of democracy were finally and fully settled the day that their membership installed them in power or permitted them to take it.

The one specific change adopted upon the recommendation of the UIU officials seems motivated by a genuine concern for the preservation of certain democratic rights even at the expense of cutting down some powers of the national leadership. That too is noteworthy.

In its staid and somber editorializing, the *New York Times* is quite pleased. *Business Week* gushes in praise, hailing the new step as one example of a hypothetical wave of democratization within the labor movement.

Our own enthusiasm is somewhat more restrained. A service was performed by the general executive board of this union in throwing the floor open for discussion of the key internal question, and weakness of the American labor movement. But its own view is unfortunately quite limited.

FOLLOW ACLU

In November 1943 and again in June 1952, the American Civil Liberties Union embarked upon surveys of democracy in unions, recommending in its reports the adoption of certain minimum democratic standards in all unions, and finding that these basics were frequently violated. Such simple practices as the right to vote, to fair trials, to run for office (except for Communists), to fair and equal treatment—these constituted this handbook for democracy; and it is a sad commentary on life in unions to report that these elemental precepts would constitute a big step forward for some unions.

It is obvious that the UIU leaders have been influenced strongly by the ACLU survey and their own report is, to a large extent, a paraphrase of the ACLU findings. With one very important omission, the UIU has adopted the ACLU recommendations. Of that omission, later.

A new trial procedure has been adopted, an almost exact copy of the ACLU suggestion. A special appeals board is set up "composed of reputable persons of some standing who are not affiliated with organized labor, appointed by the conventions for a reasonably long term and removable only by a convention and only for misconduct . . . any aggrieved mem-

ber can appeal to this Appeal Board after all other internal avenues and remedies have been exhausted and . . . the action of the Appeal Board should be legally binding upon all parties, including the union."

This unprecedented procedure aims to give union members who are disciplined and penalized inside the union recourse to a body completely independent of the union leadership and of the union membership, one which can render a decision without prejudice and above all without concern for power or clique demands inside the union.

In part, both the UIU and the ACLU argue that it is difficult to constitute and find unbiased trial committees from among local union members. They are too directly affected by the alleged crimes to be guided solely by evidence and testimony. But it is hard to take this seriously as an argument for their proposal.

NUB OF THE QUESTION

In the first place, most unions already provide for the right of appeal from a prejudiced local to a more impartial higher body which is usually capable of administering justice in the ordinary, humdrum, unimportant cases. But union discipline is closely, decisively and directly linked to union democracy only in cases where the victim has been an opponent of the policies or administration of the majority group in the union. Experience has demonstrated that local union memberships are usually the first defenders of the rights of opposition spokesmen. In destroying inner-union democracy and crushing the right of opposition, bureaucratic labor leaders move against the right of local bodies of workers to make a final decision on charges against local members.

It is the hard, closely knit machine of top union officialdom that invariably constitutes the gravest danger to inner-union democracy. This fact is conceded, in milder language of course, by the UIU:

"Furthermore, we also recognize another important weakness of union disciplinary procedures, namely, the possibility that because the judicial machinery is so closely interlocked with the political administrative machinery by which laws are made and policies formulated and established that discipline at least may be influenced by political forces and considerations, even if not made a deliberate weapon of political and administrative power."

That's putting it mildly; still, it is good to hear a union leadership inform the labor world of the "possibility" that the narrow interests of a union administration may make a fair trial impos-

And this brings us to the nub of the question and to the central weakness of the UIU report. Precisely because a union leadership has such power, such power that it could even warp union judicial procedures in its favor, more is necessary to preserve genuine democracy than a trial procedure. A far-reaching democratic spirit must be created and preserved. It is possible to devise the finest constitutional processes and still miss the mark. The fate of union democracy depends upon the attitude toward the right to form opposition groups inside the union to work for changes in policy or leadership.

The officialdom of a union does not need any special caucus or grouping. Its administration invariably is based upon a machine of paid functionaries and it is able to map out strategy and decide on general policies under the normal forms of union organization. It has its committees, its conferences, its conventions, its publications, its meetings, its speakers.

EVASION

But any dissenting tendencies that arise among the ranks are relatively unorganized. No opposition can enjoy the exercise of real democracy unless it too has the right to its own meetings, its own publications, its own conferences . . . all with the aim of influencing union public opinion.

This might seem simple and obvious. But there are only a few unions where such oppositions are allowed to live. Almost everywhere else, the top union officialdom gets ready for the most extreme and merciless action against a potentially organized opposition, seeing in them the only real possibility of effectual action against an entrenched administration.

And this is the problem of inner-union democracy. Sad to say, the UIU deliberately evades it. That becomes clear when we compare its report with the ACLU recommendations which it follows in almost every other respect.

In its 1952 report, the ACLU discusses the "Right to Free Political Action," emphasizing: "The right to vote may be a hollow right unless the members of the union are free to debate the policies of the union, criticize the conduct of the officers, form an organized opposition, and campaign during union elections."

The UIU report reads: "Unless union members are free to criticize the conduct of their union's affairs by their officers, to debate the merits of the policies of their union, and to run for election to union office and to campaign during union elections, the right to vote and to attend union meetings becomes a meaningless mockery of words."

Notice that the UIU cuts out completely from this section, and from its entire report, every mention of the right to organized opposition.

To do a little paraphrasing of our own: the right to a trial before an impartial body may become a hollow right and an ineffective device for preserving democracy without the stated right of union members to form opposition caucuses.

How the Mass Strikes Broke Over France

By A. GIACOMETTI

PARIS, Aug. 19—Almost from their beginning, the strikes in France have expressed far more than a protest against the government decrees affecting the status of public functionaries. The workers are striking against the decrees, but they are striking even more against the continuous lowering of their living standard, against the heavy burden of armament costs, against the succession of incapable right-wing political stagnation and the apathy of the masses to maintain themselves in power over a predominantly left-wing electorate.

The anger and the frustration that have accumulated in the French working class in the last years has come out in the open with a spontaneous strike wave which can be compared only with the mass movements that carried the Popular Front governments to power in the thirties. The nature of the strikes emerges best from a day-to-day description of the events.

July 11:

The National Assembly, before recessing for the vacation, gives the government "special powers" for an economy program, among which was the power to modify by decree the retirement age of state functionaries. The unions are trying to find out the contents of the decrees, but the government is keeping a tight lid on the debates, counting on the vacation period to put the decrees over with a minimum of resistance.

August 4:

It becomes known that the decrees will raise the retirement age of some categories of functionaries. The CGT (Stalinist-controlled) decides to call for a "protest day" and the CFTC (Catholic union federation) associates itself with the initiative. Meetings are held, resolutions are passed, one-hour strikes are called. Force Ouvrière stays away from the CGT-called demonstration.

Suddenly, in the evening, the Bordeaux postal workers affiliated to F.O. decide to call an "unlimited general strike." This is a serious matter, and unheard-of in France since the Stalinist strikes of 1947. Consequently, this unexpected action greatly alarms the F.O. leadership who try, unsuccessfully, to prevail on the Bordeaux federation to limit the strike. Three theories have so far been advanced to explain the decision of the Bordeaux postal workers:

(1) It was a maneuver inspired by the SP leadership to force the convocation of the National Assembly. The facts are that far from taking the initiative in the Bordeaux action, the leadership of F.O., which is in the hands of the SP, attempted to limit the movement as much as it could. Moreover, a letter by the SP deputies Depreux and Gazier demanding the convocation of the Assembly was sent only four days later, which would indicate that the SP was only exploiting a movement that it hadn't planned or even foreseen.

(2) According to some reports the decision was taken under the influence of the left-wing minority in the postal workers composed, in the words of a reactionary weekly, of "anarchist and Trotskyite elements," with the purpose of forcing the hand of the national F.O. and pushing it toward decisive action. This is a theory we would like to believe, but doubts have been cast on the strength of the minority in Bordeaux.

(3) It is also possible that the secondary leadership in Bordeaux decided that, in the face of the government threat, it had to fight or resign from effective leadership, and that it decided on the former course. In all probability, the decisive factors in the Bordeaux strike were a combination of the latter two.

August 5:

The leadership of F.O. has become aware of the popularity of the strike, reverses its position and issues nationwide "unlimited general strike" orders to the postal workers.

The exact content of the government decrees becomes known. They include a raise of two years in the retirement age; of five years for teachers and some postal workers; the dismissal of auxiliary workers and other "economy" measures at the expense of the workers.

August 6:

The CFTC and autonomous postal workers join the walkout, under pressure from their rank and file. F.O., then CFTC, extend the duration of the strike.

This article from Paris was sent before the Laniel government changed its line in handling the French mass strikes and brought about a settlement with the non-CP unions, which has since then also forced the CGT to begin sending its workers back. The article describes the development of the strike situation to its peak.—Ed.

The CGT postal workers also join. A joint meeting of postal workers demands the election of a nation-wide strike committee representing all federations, and the election of joint committees in the various services.

August 7:

The strike is extended to the gas, railroad, public service and mine workers. The time limit of the strikes is extended spontaneously by the rank and file. Two million workers are now on strike. CGT participation is still cautious and reticent.

August 8 and 9:

Over the weekend the government announces that the text of the decrees will be amended to meet the demands of the strikers. The leadership of F.O. and CFTC attempt to limit the strikes but are not successful in their attempts. On Monday the decrees are published, and it appears that no significant changes have been made.

August 10:

All postal workers are back on strike. The CGT is trying to catch up with the movement; the line is: "unity from top to bottom." Unity proposals are made by the CGT to F.O. and CFTC on all levels.

August 11:

For the first time two CGT federations, the railroad and the mine workers, are issuing "unlimited general strike orders."

August 12:

The CGT is trying to gain control of the strike by extending it to the private sector. The strike spreads to the Paris transport workers, to private gas works, power plants, shipyards, banks, insurance companies, shipping lines. F.O. and CFTC reluctantly follow the movement: Bothereau, secretary of F.O., leaves it up to the individual federations whether they want to continue the strike or not. The CFTC bureau asks its affiliates not to spread the strike movement.

Government repression begins. Postal

workers who have not responded to government "requisition" orders are arrested in Chambéry, Lyon, Toulouse, St. Etienne, later in Bordeaux and Algiers. Laniel refuses to call in the Assembly. The SP is collecting signatures of deputies to force the convocation of the Assembly and has collected 203 out of the 209 needed.

August 14:

The CGT metal workers issue "unlimited general strike" orders with a sit-down strike, and the CGT bureau demands the convocation of the parliament. CFTC withdraws from the subway strike and limits the functionaries strike. Almost 3 million workers are now on strike. The F.O. and CFTC leaderships seem to want to settle the strike before the CGT can get control of it.

August 17:

Bothereau, secretary of F.O., Boudaloux, secretary of CFTC, and Léon Jouhaux, president of F.O., meet with Laniel and demand the convocation of the Commission on Collective Agreements, which is the board on which the unions negotiate with the government on matters affecting the minimum wage and the living standard in general. The demands of the unions are now principally a raise in the living standard.

August 18:

Laniel declares that no concessions will be made at all. Negotiations with F.O. and CFTC are broken. The bureau of F.O. publishes strike demands, including first of all the convocation of the Commission on Collective Agreements. The CFTC bureau also publishes the following list of strike demands: improvement of the living standard for all workers; fiscal reform; convocation of the Assembly; cancellation of all measures taken against strikers. The SP has collected 215 signatures; the bureau of the Assembly meets to discuss the possibility of a convocation.

August 19:

The strikes in the private sector spread to chemical, construction, printing and steel works. In the Paris subway, the postal services, the railway and the municipal services, work has been partially resumed. The police are forcibly removing strikers from airplane factories and power plants in the Paris region where they had staged sitdown strikes.

Here is where we leave the events now. Whatever the outcome of the strike will be, it represents a prelude to a decisive change in French politics and the beginning of a period of increased activity of the masses.

The effect of the strike wave might well be the fall of the Laniel government. When the Assembly meets, Laniel will face strong political attacks. If he resigns, a new government will be formed which will probably be "left of center," i.e., based on the collaboration of the SP, the MRP and the left of the Radical-

Socialist Party (which, as everybody knows, is neither radical nor socialist but liberal bourgeois). If Laniel asks for a vote of confidence and loses, there probably will be new elections, with an expected advance of the SP.

The "left of center" government (or the "Front démocratique et social" as the SP would have it) that would succeed Laniel would be in a position to break the current deadlock in French politics. Having been carried to power by millions of striking workers, it would have the problem of initiating some of the essential measures that all preceding governments have dodged: complete withdrawal from Indo-China, reversal of the reactionary social and financial policy, reversal of the colonial policy in North Africa, some degree of independence from the Atlantic Bloc.

Almost as important as the strike itself, is the fact that it was started by the rank-and-file of the social-democratic F.O. and of the social-Christian CFTC—not by the Stalinist-led CGT, which is the most powerful federation (2 million members as against 800,000 each for CFTC and F.O.) and has usually taken the initiative in important labor struggles. Thus, for the first time since the war, the non-Stalinist left finds itself in the leadership of important social conflicts, which should strengthen both the position of the SP in French politics and the position of the "Bevanist" and revolutionary left in the SP.

BOLDNESS NEEDED

This is especially important in the light of the recent efforts of the CP and its CGT to resurrect some kind of Popular Front with the SP and the F.O. Needless to say, these efforts are seconded with enthusiasm by the small Stalinoid organizations like the Socialist Unity Party (PSU), the "Union Progressiste" and weeklies like "L'Observateur," which feel that their hour has come.

Under the present circumstances, the main effects of such a Popular Front would be to paralyze the independent working-class movement and to help the CP overcome its present crisis and its isolation. The perspective of the independent working-class movement must be, on the contrary a government based on the SP, the social-Christians and the farmers unions, united on a socialist program.

All efforts must be made to intensify the isolation of the CP and to separate the masses of the CGT from its leadership. In any event, when the unity of the French working class will be made, it will be made against the CP, not with it.

For such a perspective, it is essential that the independent working-class organizations (F.O. and CFTC) should rise to the occasion with a program that would correspond more nearly to the potentialities of this vast mass movement than does their usual framework of thought and action. Only decision and boldness such as the Bordeaux federation has shown will consolidate the gains of this strike wave and will prevent the Stalinists from diverting and paralyzing another legitimate movement.

Labor Party Challenges Churchill on Korea

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, Aug. 19—Last week the sporting inactivity of an English summer was suddenly shattered. Without previous warning to a country whose parliamentary representatives had gone into recess, the government announced that it had appended a British signature to the document issued on behalf of the United Nations on Korea.

This document, as is now well known, was a signed declaration by 18 nations intended to point up the serious consequences which would ensue if the Stalinist side broke the truce in Korea. What attracted most attention, however, was a clause stating that in such event it might not be possible to confine the war to Korea.

The Labor Party was taken aback by this declaration. "Why had not Parliament been consulted?" it queried. "Because it was already in recess," came the answer. "On whose authority was it signed?" "On Mr. Churchill's." "Did he realize the possible consequences of this?" etc.

This declaration was taken extremely seriously by the "Maoist-China lobby," as we might call it. Wyatt, Driberg, Crossman, Silverman and many others who had recently been campaigning for Mao's representation at the United Nations were abashed.

They wanted to see full representation of this government, not as a matter of political approval but rather as a recognition of its existence. In their singularly naive way, they take the view that, irrespective of Chou En-lai's strategy, he is sure to react favorably to the politeness of our offering him a UN seat. Unlike the State Department, which does not want any Chinese representation on any agency in order to punish its government's aggression, this group believes that one should offer it full international recognition regardless of its role in the Korean war and its Far East entanglements in Indo-China and Burma.

CHURCHILL TO BAT

For a different reason—presumably possible trade advantages resulting from peace—the Conservatives also favor a pacific and "reasonable" policy toward China.

The news of the signing of the UN dec-

laration by Britain thus came as an unpleasant surprise to the Tories as well. The Labor Party immediately issued a statement dissociating itself from the government's stand on China. It intimated that it would have no truck with such a war; that this grave move should not have taken place without consulting Parliament. Various union leaders expressed the same sentiments.

This stimulated Churchill into activity following seven weeks' rest that had been ordered by his doctor. He was his usual crafty self.

First, he said, the declaration merely embodied an undertaking that the Attlee government had given in 1951—which was irrefutable. Then, he said, the declaration, designed as a deterrent to China and North Korea, would not become effective if the South Koreans started the war. Finally, in order to take the wind out of his opponents' sails, he warned Syngman Rhee at the same time that if he started any funny business he would have to go it alone, as far as Britain was concerned.

So far, Labor has not reacted to Churchill's statement except to reiterate its opposition to war on a full scale in the Far East.

FILMS and Ideas

'From Here to Eternity'

Polishing Up the Brass

By L. G. SMITH

James Jones' best-selling novel of two years ago, *From Here to Eternity* has been made into a movie. It has been highly praised by the critics. And in a tough world, people with the movie habit could do worse than to see this exciting film, with its many excellent individual characterizations.

But the critics have also claimed that the movie is faithful to the novel. With this, we beg to take vehement exception. Although the story line is probably as close to that in the novel as it could be for such a tremendous work, instead of a bitter and illuminating commentary on army life, the movie amounts to a complete whitewash of it in the best Hollywood style.

In the novel, Prewitt, the "hero," is hounded to commit murder and to eventual death because he will not submit to the will of his commanding officer, who wants him to represent his company in the boxing ring. And although he loves the army despite all this, the whole meaning of the book is contained in depicting the struggle of an individual with an exceptionally strong sense of his own integrity and his own values against an institution which is organized in such a way that the individual cannot prevail against it except in death.

In the movie, the army is whitewashed. Instead of the army as the institution in which Prewitt wages his hopeless battle for his own personality, the movie makes it appear that Prewitt is combating a few particularly and exceptionally vicious individuals.

In the movie, Captain Holmes, Prewitt's commanding officer, is forced to resign in disgrace when his persecution of the private comes to the attention of higher officers. At the end of the book, Holmes has become a major and is on his way up the brass stairs.

In the book, Major Thompson, the commanding officer of the stockade, personally supervises the murder by torture of a soldier who refuses to stool on one of his buddies. In the movie, in which none of the brutal stockade scenes are shown, a soldier who has just come from that hellhole explains that Fatso, the sergeant, is beating up the men and "the C.O. don't know what's going on."

Thus it is not the army with which Prewitt is contending; it is just a few bad guys like Holmes, Fatso and the boxers in his company. When he is urged by one of his friends to file a complaint with the higher authorities, his refusal is not an expression of the feeling of futility a private has in appealing higher up against his own commanding officer, but a bit of stubborn bravado on the part of the hero.

Despite all this, the movie has its points. Especially for those who have not read the book, it has many. After all, what are one's alternatives? By this time one should be accustomed to what Hollywood does to books—and to authors. Perhaps the reason this particular emasculation seems a little harder to take than most is that one had expected a little more backbone in protecting his work from the creator of Private Robert E. Lee Prewitt.

YOU and SCIENCE

K-DAY: SCIENCE IS NOT A SACRED COW

By PHILIP COBEN

K-Day came and went last Thursday, raising the expected "storm of controversy," into which this column will not venture. On that day Professor Kinsey permitted properly briefed press correspondents and writers to release articles summarizing his factual findings on the sexual life of women.

The press flurry, of course, is transitory, and Kinsey's work will depend for its lasting importance on the degree to which it holds up before the review of competent scientific workers in the field. What deserves a comment here—really only a footnote—is outside the question of whether his work is reliable or not.

It is on the degree to which the mere attempt which Kinsey has made has served to arouse so much of the latent anti-scientific obscurantism of American circles.

There is a widespread myth that "science is a sacred cow" in America or in Western civilization, that it is worshiped uncritically and idolized. That is simply not true—or rather, it is a misunderstanding. The big kernel of truth in the allegation refers, first of all, mostly to the physical sciences, not to "science"; and, secondly, it refers to the visible and tangible products and results of science, not to the scientific method.

The "science" which produces miracle drugs, the A-bomb, new gadgets and gimmicks, or theories about the nature of space-time may be regarded with more or less uncomprehending awe, or this may be charged with some show of

truth; but the scientific method as such still sometimes has a pretty hard row to hoe when it attempts to grapple with problems in a clash with social taboos.

Now the main social taboo which stands in the way of a consistent application of the scientific method is NOT sex. As is well known, this has been decreasingly true; and this is shown by the very fact that a professor of an established university could carry on the work that Kinsey is doing.

OUT OF THE WOODWORK

But attenuated as the taboo is in the case of sex, it was enough to make influential circles write and talk as if they were back in the Middle Ages. Religious figures, especially some Catholic hierarchs, took the lead in this. One archbishop accused Kinsey of degrading science because he published his findings, instead of "circulating the findings . . . among the competent to weigh and apply them to the betterment of mankind." (It would be degrading even to argue against this seriously at this point.) A Protestant, executive secretary of the Indianapolis Church Federation, said Kinsey could do harm if his readers do not "test its truths . . . by Christian principles."

The New York *Journal-American* blared forth with a front-page headline charging that Kinsey's book is "arrogant bunk" and an "attack on basic morality." A St. Louis University professor loosed a broadside branding the Kinsey report "one of the most horrible indictments of modern women."

Now all this will not make a martyr out of Professor Kinsey, nor will he have to live a life of obloquy and scorn because of it. Far from it. He does not need our sympathy. He is not interested in monetary gain from his work, and so cannot be deprived of it; and there is more than sufficient scientific acceptance of his work as an attempt at a scientific treatment of perplexed questions (apart from one or another scientist's acceptance of his results in whole or in part) to assure him an honored place in the history of research in the field. To repeat: we are not condoling with him.

But the social taboo against the scientific method which Kinsey runs into is feeble and negligible compared with that which greets the scientific investigator in another field, when he comes up with observations or conclusions which are disrespectful to established institutions. That, of course, is in the field of social and political analysis. This does not only apply to Marxists. It is also not a thing of the past.

BEARD GOT IT

When, for example, perhaps the most eminent of contemporary American historians, the late Charles Beard, did a magnificently scholarly piece of research on Roosevelt's foreign policy leading up to the Second World War (in his last work *President Roosevelt and the Coming of the War*) it was not Catholic or Fundamentalist obscurantists who howled like heresy-hunters. We still vividly remember the review of Beard's book in the *N. Y. Times* by another eminent historian, well known moreover as a liberal but also an ardent New-Dealer, who devoted his longish review to virtually nothing but a defense of Roosevelt's foreign policy without letting out a syllable about Beard's weighty evidence; it was in essence nothing but a scream of anguish.

It was strictly comparable, with the proper amount of *mutatis mutandem*, to some of the comments on Kinsey's statistics for pre-marital coitus by "the woman on the street," as recorded tongue-in-cheek by the *N. Y. Post*—like: "I don't see how it can be true that so many girls are on the loose. It's against everything we're taught." Or: "I can't believe it. Any healthy young person, certainly my own daughters, would feel terribly guilty. What could she offer a husband?"

There were, of course, the other "women on the street" who told the inquiring reporter that they didn't need Kinsey's statistics to know what was going on in the world. But the two examples we have quoted are the naive analogues of the attitude taken to Beard by sophisticated men who knew all about the scientific method.

Relatively speaking, Kinsey has it easy.

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

Corrections

By A. Stein

To the Editor:

May I call attention to two errors in the second section of my article "Isaac Deutscher—Apologist for Stalinist Totalitarianism," which appeared in the August 10 issue of LABOR ACTION. The sentence which begins "It is no secret to Deutscher that Stalin literally beheaded the Polish Communist Party," should read as follows: "It is no secret to Deutscher that Stalin literally beheaded the Polish Communist Party, and attempted to demoralize the *Polish Socialist Party* in the thirties."

The second error occurs in the next sentence dealing with Stalin's assassination of Alter and Ehrlich, the two leaders of the Jewish Socialist Bund, and the imprisonment and assassination of 16 Polish leaders. Alter and Ehrlich were murdered in 1941, but the news was withheld from the world until world opinion forced the Kremlin to disclose the facts in the spring of 1943. The 16 leaders of the underground government were invited by Stalin, through one of his generals, to negotiate the formation of a new Polish government with the Stalinists. When these leaders emerged from illegality to take part in the conference with the Stalinists they were seized by the GPU, carried off to prison in Moscow, and later tried by a Russian

court for crimes against the USSR. This occurred in early 1945.

A. STEIN

Robert Taft

To the Editor:

Don Harris' article on the death and career of Senator Robert Taft was certainly shallow.

It was in fact precisely because he refused to act as tool for the cartels that Taft was denied the Republican presidential nomination.

Taft co-authored the famous, liberal, Taft-Wagner-Ellender slum clearance law. Taft dared to speak in the United States Senate, questioning the simultaneous four-dollar-a-ton price rise by U. S. Steel and the other cartel steel companies. It was probably his insistence on a Senate inquiry into steel price rises and steel price fixing that queered Taft with the top capitalists and lost him the Republican presidential nomination. Taft had the pledged delegates necessary for nomination, but the General Motors-DuPont-Chase National Bank financiers didn't want him. Since they, and not the elected delegates, decide who is to be president, Taft didn't get the nod.

Taft lost the Republican nomination by daring to stand up to the financiers who run that party, just as Kefauver—who was the delegates' favorite—lost the Democrat nomination by attacking the racketeers who are so powerful in that party.

Taft was not the tool or spokesman of top Wall Street finance capital. He was the friend and representative of those (comparatively small by Wall Street standards) Ohio Valley manufacturers

and fabricators who are much more immediately dependent than Chase National Bank on current consumer buying power.

Taft understood, respected, and worked within the framework of our constitutional government. He certainly had more inherent deference for the amenities of representative government than, for instance, an army general schooled within a frame of reference of "command" and "obey" rather than "vote" and "elect."

Ruth FAGAN

We're afraid our correspondent did not read Don Harris' article (LA, Aug. 10) very carefully. He did not at all paint Taft as a "tool of the cartels" or "Wall Street." It was a much more serious analysis. Specifically, Harris pointed to "the conservative forces of small business" as the elements especially attracted to Taft. Also, he referred to "the small business and agricultural interests which became fanatical Taft supporters." Again: "By position, association and training, Taft was the direct representative of the collective interests of Midwestern industrial circles." Finally: "Taft became the leader of a broad coalition of conservative forces within the party of big business."—As for our correspondent's view that Taft "queered" himself with the financiers and thus lost the Republican election, we would ask her to pay some attention to the more widespread view that (especially Eastern) high finance preferred Eisenhower primarily because of his foreign policy; "Wall Street" is not tinged with Midwestern isolationism. For the rest Harris' article speaks for itself.—Ed.



LABOR ACTION

August 31, 1953

Vol. 17, No. 35

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

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

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE has just received two copies of the out-of-print and hard-to-find

"FONTAMARA" by Ignazio Silone

Clothbound \$2.50

Paper-bound \$1.00

Orders must be accompanied by payment

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, New York City

ISRAEL: THE SHEIKH AND THE ZIONISTS

By AL FINDLEY

The problem of Jewish-Arab relations in Israel has been receiving more attention recently.

While the General Zionist Party (the conservative bourgeois party in the government) is pressing for the "normalization" of the Arab situation by abolishing military rule and other proposals, the main body of Zionists continues to regard the Arab citizens of Israel as enemies.

Unfortunately this latter point of view is dominant among the leadership of Mapai (the government labor party), who object to even the timid "normalization" proposals of the General Zionists.

Some months ago Sheikh Taher el Tabiri of Nazareth suggested an exchange of population between Israel and the Arab states. This was not to be a forced migration but was to be entirely voluntary, with each individual or family making its choice.

The proposal of El Tabiri was received with much satisfaction in government circles and given wide publicity by the Israeli and Zionist press in the country. With such encouragement the sheikh submitted his plan formally to the president of Israel.

The proposal then came to the attention of the foreign correspondents, especially the correspondent of the N. Y. Times, who proceeded to interview the sheikh.

In the course of the interview Sheikh El Tabiri gave his reasons for desiring

an exchange of population. He pointed out that Arab property was being confiscated under "various pretexts," there was taking place "the sale of Arab property to Jewish immigrants," and that the government of Israel "doubts the loyalty of Arabs in Israel."

The joy of some of the Zionists at El Tabiri's proposals cooled down considerably when his reasons were given international publicity.

The Yiddish press in the United States declared that sources close to the Israeli government were very much disappointed. They had thought, when the sheikh made the proposal for population exchange, that he was posing as a friend of Israel. (Why anybody who wants his people to leave Israel should be considered a special friend of Israel was not explained.) However, now that he gives as his motive the fact that Arabs are persecuted in Israel, he reveals himself as an enemy. . . . The moral, by implication, was: never trust an Arab.

In contrast with the preceding buildup of El Tabiri as an important figure, the sheikh was now declared to be only a minor figure in Nazareth, although more important among the local Moslems.

REACTIONARY SOLUTION

An exchange of population, with all its attendant miseries, is an extreme step that can perhaps be justified in cases where oppression and suspicion have created such a poisonous atmosphere between two peoples as to make impossible

any other solution. On the question of Arab-Jewish relations, such a low point has not yet been reached.

The Times correspondent reported that most Arabs canvassed declared that they would cling to their homes in Israel. This sentiment of the people was also that of other Arab leaders.

The Zionist leaders, who favor ridding Israel of a troublesome problem, the Arab minority, were blind to the self-accusing implications of their position: that the respective majority populations were mistreating their minorities.

Unfortunately, it was the British Labor Party which first proposed an exchange of populations in Palestine. The Zionist leaders now point to this labor-socialist "precedent" to support their policy. At that time, the Zionists were cool to the idea. Now that England can no longer be blamed for the ill-feeling between Jews and Arabs in Israel, the leaders of the state must assume full responsibility.

The reactionary implications of an exchange of population are so great, the resultant deterioration of mutual feeling between peoples who have common problems and needs also so great, that such a move is far from desirable.

The existing feeling of large sections of the minority peoples, to remain in the countries where they live and fight for equal rights, makes it mandatory that all efforts be directed toward measures to achieve full rights and privileges for all minorities.

SPOTLIGHT

Continued from page 1

U. S.: "The strategic interests of the United States are far too weighty to justify a course of action undermining the authority of France at this time; and even our traditional concern with the freedom of colonial peoples. . . ." It is not really necessary to go on.

At the same time that the U. S. votes to ignore the Moroccans, it is maneuvering like frenzy to force the UN nations to narrow the Korean conference, narrow the agenda, narrow the composition, narrow everything, ignore Stalinist China (which is nevertheless a fact in the world), keep out India, exclude . . . , ignore . . . , rule out of order. . . .

Isn't it clear that it is a pattern of complete political bankruptcy?

Shakespearean Question

Would Shakespeare or Thomas Jefferson, if they were alive today, have joined the Communist Party, or might they have been duped into membership in an organization on the attorney general's subversive list?

A publisher who wishes his books to be used as texts in any of the public schools in Texas must be prepared to take not only a stand but an oath on such elusive questions—in fact, he must sign a sort of oath-in-absentia for all his dead authors affirming that "to the best of his knowledge and belief the author of the textbook, if he were alive and available, could truthfully execute" the loyalty oath.

A new law, passed by the state legislature and signed by the governor, says: "The State Board of Education shall neither adopt nor purchase any textbook for use in the schools of this state unless and until the author of such textbook files with the board" a three-point all-inclusive loyalty oath. If the author is "dead or unavailable," his publisher must go to bat for him, to wit: "if the publisher of any such textbook shall represent to the board under oath that the author of any textbook is dead or cannot be located, the board may adopt and purchase such textbook if the publisher thereof executes an oath or affirmation stating that to the best of his knowledge and belief the author of the textbook, if he were alive or available, could truthfully execute the oath."

The publisher's best knowledge and belief may not be sufficient, however, for if the Board of Education does not agree with him, he is overruled. "If the board is not satisfied," the law says, "with respect to the truth of any oath or affirmation submitted to it either by the author or the publisher of a textbook, it may require that evidence of the truth of such oath or affirmation be furnished it and it may decline to adopt or purchase such textbook if it is not satisfied from the proof that the oath or affirmation is truthful."

Titoists Launch a Purge — —

(Continued from page 1)

zine, described as 'petty bourgeois-anarchist ideas of freedom and democracy.'

"Attention must be called to the increasing lack of attendance at party meetings, failure to pay party dues and deviation from party discipline.

"An end must be put to the concept that freedom and democracy are to be understood only in the right of disagreement and criticism and not in being duty-bound to anything.

"It is not a rare occurrence," complained *Kommunist*, "that members of the Communist League believe they have the right to protest against decrees and other measures that have been adopted by our socialist state in a democratic manner."

DANGERS OF DEMOCRACY

That should pretty well give a picture of the kind of things which have been going on in the Yugoslav Titoist party, which are described by party leaders as "negative occurrences" and which, again in the words of these leaders, constitute a "serious threat to all our efforts."

Just consider: here is a national-Stalinist bureaucracy, outside the sphere of Russian influence. They don't want to be like the Russians. So they go up and down the land proclaiming that in their country, unlike the land where Malenkov rules, there is freedom and socialist freedom at that. They don't want a police state, they want free discussions.

And before they have had a chance to turn their backs, what happens? Instead of a grateful population, rallying as one man behind the marshal and his top committee and all the other bureaucrats who are trying to run the country as it should be run and as only they know how to run it, the people start complaining. Members of the Communist League begin to hold "varying attitudes." They begin to disagree and to criticize. And to top it all, they think they have the right, and "not rarely" at that, even to "protest against decrees and other measures" proclaimed and enforced by these same bureaucrats!

It is a sad business, but it is a fact. Democracy is all very well, but it is clear that in Yugoslavia at least, the people, and even the members of the Communist League, are not really quite "ready" for it yet. Today they protest and criticize. Tomorrow, who knows, they may even demand the right to VOTE on these decrees before they are passed! And such is their backwardness that unless they are quickly educated in the real difference between the Communist (Tito style) and "bourgeois" concepts of democracy, they may even demand the right to elect people to represent them other than those who now pass the decrees and "other measures"!

This situation in Yugoslavia, on which we still have so little information, presents a classical example of the inability of a Stalinist-type society to be democratized from above. It should be studied

and pondered by all the socialists in Europe who have regarded the Yugoslav system with "sympathy," and who thought that we of the Independent Socialist League were "doctrinaire" in our contention, from the very beginning, that the Yugoslav and Russian Stalinist systems were of the same basic type, and could only be "made socialist" by revolution and not by reform from above.

Let us say that Tito and the bureaucratic class which he heads would really "like" to have "more democracy" in Yugoslavia. They are not bloodthirsty tyrants like Stalin, Malenkov and the others in the Kremlin. They would prefer not to have to wield a ubiquitous secret police, to run concentration camps and prisons full of political opponents, and so forth.

But at the same time, they have no intention of submitting their rule to the test of political democracy. Why? Because if the test should go against them, it would not simply mean that they lose office and go into opposition till the political tide turns again in their favor. They are not a political party; they are a ruling class whose ownership of the means of production in Yugoslavia, and the privileged economic position they enjoy as a result of that ownership, depends on their monopolistic "ownership" of state power.

DREAM

Since every Titoist bureaucrat in industry, in the unions, in the state apparatus owes his position not to influence among and election by the people, but to his status in the bureaucratic hierarchy which is controlled from the top by Tito and the tops of the "Communist League," no real democracy can be permitted at any level. To the extent that even the formalities of "elections" are gone through with, they have to be carefully supervised or rigged and controlled from above. For once the ranks get the idea into their heads that they can run "their own man" against the man chosen by the bureaucracy for any post, even a low one, the notion of the right to opposition, and to the right to political organization for the purpose of exercising that right, can become highly contagious.

To be sure, the bureaucrats, high and low, may dream of the day when they can "permit" democracy in the country. Up and down the bureaucratic structure, the members of the class themselves have grievances and complaints which they would like to voice. They are oppressed by their feeling of isolation, and by the hatred of the people for them (the same people who at the same time support or tolerate them as against the Russian imperialist menace). On the lower rungs of the state and party hierarchy, they are close to the people, feel their pressure directly, and in many cases feel more sympathy for the masses than they do for the tops of the structure.

But in the bureaucrat's dream, "democ-

cracy" is not a state in which people complain, criticize, demand and oppose. It is a state in which without any coercion, all the people with a single voice sing their praises and do their bidding.

But that is just a dream. The reality is much more unpleasant. The moment the straitjacket on the people is loosened the slightest bit, or even the moment rumors spread that it is going to be loosened a little, trouble begins to break loose. And the bureaucracy reacts with real class instinct. It cracks down on the people who have "misinterpreted" the meaning of democracy, and with particular vigor on those in its own ranks who have shown any leaning toward the masses which are ruled over.

THE VICTIMS

Writing about capitalist society, Karl Marx observed that the capitalists are, just as much a product of, and even in a sense "victims" of, that society as are the exploited workers. Even with the best of will and with the most humane intentions a capitalist who tries not to exploit his workers like all other capitalists will soon cease to be one.

Marxists of today must apply his insights to a new situation. Is it not amply clear that in a bureaucratic-collectivist society the bureaucrats are just as much the victims of their social role as are the masses? If, out of humanitarian or democratic considerations or simple political expediency, they should attempt to cease "acting" like bureaucrats, to permit the masses to exercise some degree of democratic rights, the result would be not just a decrease in their economic and social privileges, but the abolition of their social role, of their class position: the abolition of them as a class.

Marxists have long ago recognized the fact that the capitalist class cannot abolish itself by a process in which increasing numbers of capitalists decide to give an increasing share of the surplus value to their workers. It is equally true that no collectivist-bureaucratic class can abolish itself by giving increasing democratic rights to the workers. The moment it is attempted seriously, the workers will rise and take all the rights for themselves, that is, for the whole of society.

Read and subscribe to

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

The Marxist review for serious students of social issues

35 cents

\$2 a year

Deviation

A dispatch from Yugoslavia states that the organ of the Communist League (Titoist party) *Borba*, has apologized for deleting a criticism of Yugoslavia's political system from a speech delivered by Clement Attlee, leader of the British Labor Party.

In a speech delivered at Bled, Attlee had said that Yugoslavia was not a full democracy because it had a one-party system. The absence of rival parties makes political life rather flat, something like a race with only one entry, he said.

Borba later carried a letter by Vladimir Dediđer, a friend and biographer of Marshal Tito. He complained that omission of Attlee's critical remarks had led to press statements abroad that Yugoslavia does not dare to publish criticism.

Borba attributed the deletion to a copy-reader in the head office, who was alleged to have acted "on his own initiative and without consulting the editors."

We assume that the offending clerk has been purged. How better can the régime prove that it really believes in democracy. . . ?

Jenner Report Sees Conspiracy Everywhere—

Now the Witchhunters Rewrite U.S. History

By SAM FELIKS

The Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, headed by Senator William Jenner, has issued its report on "Extensive Communist Penetration in Government." It is an attempt to sum up the highlights of the work of the House Un-American Activities Committee as well as the Internal Security Committee when it was headed by Senator McCarran.

But it is also something more than that, and this is its main interest. It presents the broad implication that Stalinist infiltration into relatively high government positions and the main policies of the New and Fair Deals are closely connected, if not indistinguishable. This is the attempt to explain the history of the United States, both domestic and foreign, for the last twenty years through the red-tinted glasses of "Communist penetration in government."

This is the reactionary's way of rewriting the history of this period. All that has been wrong in American capitalism and the debacles in foreign policy are laid at the doorstep of Stalinist espionage, with the New Dealers, as such, being incompetents and willing or unwilling dupes in this conspiracy. Some have said that the New Deal was part of the "collectivist revolution" sweeping the world and was to be damned as such. Now this Senate report damns it as the plot of a little group of conspirators.

WITCHHUNTERS' AMALGAM

The Jenner report is a campaign document for the 1954 congressional contest and eventually for the 1956 presidential campaign. It demonstrates the real politics behind the hunt for Stalinists in government and in the schools. The McCarthys, the McCarrans, the Jenners and the Veldes are not merely interested in exposing Stalinists as spies and espionage agents in the traditionally accepted sense: filchers of military secrets and such. The "Communist conspiracy" means something more than this. It is a domestic and foreign policy that has been foisted upon the American people by a small group of plotters who have infiltrated into government positions close to the seats of power. And these activities have been carried out by the same group, the same persons were more or less engaged in both activities. The New Deal thereby is tarred with the brush of the "Communist conspiracy."

Of passing interest on the effect of this amalgam: Scott McLeod, the State Department's security chief, addressing a Republican woman's club, interjected at

one point, "I hate to have to say this to a Republican Woman's Club, but New Dealers are not necessarily bad security risks." And this from Senator McCarthy's representative at the State Department.

It is this latter part of the amalgam that is being emphasized by the reactionary press where it is hoped it will have the greatest effect on domestic politics.

The *U. S. News and World Report* leads off this way: "All through the years of the New Deal, in peace and in war, a little group of conspirators operated close to the seats of power."

"Their hands were manipulating labor policy in the strike waves of the 1930s. They helped each other climb near the top in the Treasury, where world economic policy is influenced. They tried to get hold of farm policy. They were busy as bees in relief programs. Their influence became great around the top in the Department of State, where diplomats set world policy for the U. S."

"The so-called Morgenthau plan for turning industrial Germany into a pastoral state was hatched in this group. So were moves that ended up with Communists in control in China. Members of this group moved to high positions in international organizations that were built after the war."

THEY'RE COMING THROUGH THE WINDOW

According to the Senate committee the "design of Communist penetration was the following:

"They colonized key committees of Congress. They helped write laws, conduct congressional hearings and write congressional reports.

"They advised cabinet members, wrote speeches for them, and represented them in intergovernmental committees which prepared basic American and world policy.

"They traveled to every continent as emissaries and representatives of the American people. They attended virtually every international conference where statesmen met to shape the future.

"... a group of these individuals influenced the State Department with disastrous results to American Far Eastern policy. In the present inquiry we found other nests in the Foreign Economic Administration, the Board of Economic Warfare, and those sections of the Treasury which formed American post-war foreign economic policy, particularly with regard to Germany. There had been nests in the original Agricultural Adjustment Administration, and the national research projects of the Works Progress Administration, both of which were supposed to help extricate the country from the terrible depression of the 1930s. There was an inter-

lacing combination of these people in almost every agency, both executive and legislative, which had to do with labor."

The Senate report slips back and forth between atom spying to the Triple A, from *Amerasia* magazine to the LaFollette Civil Liberties Committee, from the Morgenthau Plan for Germany to the NLRB, from Alger Hiss to the San Francisco dock strike and the migration from the Dust Bowl in the Thirties. It almost becomes difficult to tell where one begins and the other ends.

The technique is to present information on the different posts the known or suspected Stalinists held in the government, mention policies of these committees and agencies, and leave the inference that they were due to the Stalinists, going so far as to make the ludicrous suggestion that the reason that AAA and the WPA did not help to extricate the country from the depression was due to this conspiracy.

STALINIST TECHNIQUE

With the exception of the Morgenthau Plan for the deindustrialization of Germany, there is virtually no attempt to evaluate just what policy or program or act or investigation was due to this or that Stalinist. It is all left up to the fertile imagination of journalists, editorialists and congressmen. And it will be used to attack whatever liberal and labor legislative is still in the law books.

That the Russian government uses its native agents for spying and espionage work in the United States government, there can be no doubt, no more than one can doubt that the U. S. government is active along the same lines. All governments engage in what can be euphemistically called clandestine activities to secure by one means or another military, economic and political information not available through formal channels; that is, spying. But this is not the interest of the Senate committee. The latter wants to demonstrate that Stalinists were formulators of basic policy, and that this is the reason for the success of Stalinist policies. It is very simple: Stalin wrote policy on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

One does not have to be a friend or supporter of the New Deal to reject this monstrous conception. It should re-emphasize the necessity for standing up and resisting these congressional witchhunters and their allies in their assault on labor, liberal and (needless to say) radical viewpoints.

The main new note in it, however, is the rewriting of history in terms of conspiracies and sabotage centers, and in this American reaction shows once more that it has learned its own methods and habits of thought from the Stalinism it purports to abhor.

Bolivia: Peasant Discontent with Land Reform Grows

By JUAN REY

SANTIAGO, Aug. 18—According to information reaching us, the Bolivian government's agrarian reform law [see last week's issue—Ed.] has not satisfied the peasant masses. The Indian peasants demand all the land for themselves and want the expulsion of the big landowners from the soil. They want no compensation given for the land, which they consider their own legitimate property.

In various districts of the country, the peasants have taken over the haciendas and distributed the land among themselves. Since such revolutionary steps menaced the government's policy, the regime speeded up the issuance of the agrarian bill, in order to appease the peasant masses and in order to convince them that the government knows better than peasants about what to do.

But according to the POR (Trotskyist) organ *Lucha Obrera*, the new land law is only intended to cheat the peasant masses, calm them down, and thus stand in the way of the taking-over of all the big estates, that is, stand in the way of real agrarian revolution. According to the POR press reports, the law as definitively drawn up was the result of a conflict between the right and the "left" inside the commission charged with that task and also inside the cabinet. The "left" in the commission was represented by Ayala Mercado, well-known militant and theoretician of the POR, and the "left" in the cabinet was represented (still according to the POR organ) by Juan Lechin, the minister of mines. Poor "left"! and poor working class, to have such defenders!

In reality, the "left" representatives, counting the Trotskyist and Stalinist tendencies, were in the majority in the agrarian commission. And this "left" brought out a moderate, pro-capitalist and reformist law, designed not so much to hand the land over to the peasants as to protect the big landholdings (the productive ones, of course).

The land law gives the government a free hand with regard to the manner of land distribution and also gives it a legal

basis for saving the big estates from the peasants.

As we pointed out in our last report, exemption from the law and from the land distribution is given to "productive" estates, industrial enterprises, big agrarian properties which are cultivated by capitalist methods (wage workers), cooperatives (including also agrarian companies), small and middle holdings, and cattle-breeding estates. In this way the government can and will protect much of the land from peasant seizure, and it can also use its powers to expropriate the big holdings of political oppositionists as well as to save the property of political supporters.

As for those lands which go to the peasants, the latter must pay compensation to the owners over a period of years, and the peasants' soil, products and cattle are considered guarantees for the payments. The government has promised to extend credit to the peasants through its agrarian bank. In this way the government will control the Indians and tame them.

A DEFEAT

Now everything depends on the execution of the law, on whether the government is able to impose its decree on the peasants and make them obey it, on whether the peasants are strong enough to take the land themselves, distribute it among themselves and completely destroy the feudal estate system.

The POR organ says that the land law of August 2 raised the Indian peasants' struggle to a new stage and that this law is a "great victory for the POR." We think, rather, that the law is a great defeat for the POR policy of collaborating with the "left wing" of the Nationalist MNR, the government party, especially with Nuflo Chavez and Juan Lechin. The draft law proposed by the trade-union federation (the Central Obrera Boliviana) had been rejected by the government; the agrarian law in its present form is a victory for the MNR over the workers and peasants. The "left wing" of the MNR, led by Lechin, is a shadow and has no effective popular strength or

influence. The same COB which had adopted the "radical" draft of a land law forgot all about it as soon as the government published its own, and enthusiastically approved the pro-capitalist law put forth by the Nationalist regime.

CONSERVATIVE 'LEFT'

What is true is that the "Lechin caucus" has seized control of the unions and their federation, the COB, using this control in the interests of the Nationalist government and not in the interests of the working class and peasantry. Lechin also controls the state-nationalized mines, and so he represents the new ruling caste in the country, the new *patrones* and bosses.

The role played by the "left," including the POR, is critical in words but really amounts to subordination to the govern-

ment, forfeiting its independence for the sake of third-rank and fourth-rank posts at low salaries. It is a conservative role which drains the revolutionary energy of the masses, exhausts their revolutionary momentum and thus prepares the way for the rise of a new reaction, which began with the victory of the fascist Falangists in the universities.

Of course, very much depends on the revolutionary activity and energy of the peasants and on the steps that will be taken to put the land law into effect. But the "left" parties are with the peasants only in words; in reality they are with the Nationalist government, supporting it unconditionally. The Stalinists, for their part, are not interested in the Bolivian revolution but only in conquering political bases in Latin America for the Kremlin's imperialist policy as a rival of Washington.

Just released—

"SONGS OF THE WOBLIES"

The new LABOR ARTS recording of famous IWW songs, sung by Joe Glazer and Bill Friedland. On 33-1/3 LPs, unbreakable.

\$4.00

Now available on 33-1/3 LPs—
The first LABOR ARTS album

"BALLADS FOR SECTARIANS"

Song satires on the twists and turns of the American Stalinist movement

\$4.00

Above records available from
LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 West 14 Street, New York City
Mail orders will receive prompt attention. All orders must be accompanied by payment.

The Spanish POUM Spells Out A Third-Camp Program on World Affairs

At the end of May the Spanish left socialist organization, the POUM (Workers Party) held a party convention in Paris, which is the center in emigration for this active and militant anti-Franco movement. To a greater extent than ever before (as its organ *La Batalla* emphasizes in its report) the POUM utilized this occasion to define its position on the basic questions of international Marxist policy today, in resolution form.

It goes without saying, of course, that the central task of the POUM is the mobilization of the struggle against the Franco regime, and one of the main resolutions of the convention was devoted to "The Situation in Spain," summarizing its development and problems and laying down an orientation toward uniting the anti-Franco forces. This resolution did not propose any "new turns," but mainly set forth in earnest detail the course which the party has been pursuing, for approval by the representatives of the movement.

Independent Socialists

But, as mentioned, the new work performed by the convention, from the point of view of the POUM's past, was to spell out, in much more theoretical and general form than before, the political program of the party on the fundamental questions of international socialist policy. Several of the resolutions have already been published in the last two issues of *La Batalla*.

The documents permit us to observe what, of course, LABOR ACTION readers should already be aware of: that in the vital political respects, the POUM shares the ideas and policies of Independent Socialism. But this same fact makes the Spanish POUM a unique movement in the climate of present-day European socialism, which is so largely divided between elements and groups which have not broken their political umbilical cords with either pro-capitalist or pro-Stalinist illusions.

"To free the working-class movement from the chains of capitalism and Stalinism, to help it recover its total independence, is the most urgent task of our day," says the POUM, and its political program was developed at the convention under the sign of the Third Camp (to use our own term).

While these ideas as a whole are familiar to LABOR ACTION readers, many will want to know more concretely how the POUM itself develops them in its document. For this purpose the best resolution to describe is its general thesis on "Our Epoch and Its Problems," which attempts to sum up its program in overall terms.

The Two Systems

Man's society (begins the POUM's resolution) is going through one of the most dramatic epochs in its history. Crisis and decadence have reached the point where the conquests of civilization themselves are in danger. This is the result of three fundamental facts: (1) the survival of the regime of capitalist exploitation; (2) the monstrous degeneration of the Russian Revolution and the appearance in its place of a new system of exploitation; (3) the failure of the attempts at proletarian revolution since 1917 and the present subordination of the working-class movement to one or the other of the two big powers which are locked in struggle for world domination.

It sums up capitalism's role in the world today: the anachronistic survival of a system that has outlived its historical mission, now become an obstacle to economic, technological, political and social progress. The bourgeoisie, now reactionary to the core, is a permanent source of crisis, poverty, chaos and barbarism. Growing tendencies toward partial statification, to induce some order in the capitalist chaos, cannot reverse this.

It sums up the role of Stalinism, whose vic-

tory in Russia was determined decisively by the failure of the European revolution after 1917 and the great social backwardness of the country. Now the ruling regime is neither a socialist regime nor a regime in transition toward socialism. The workers' state has been destroyed and replaced by a "bureaucratic and totalitarian state," which the resolution calls "state capitalism." (This ambiguous designation may be worth a comment in another article but the question of the label is of very secondary importance in comparison with the political line which the resolution sketches.)

The Looming War

From this point on, the programmatic document centers around the question of the third world war.

Since the Second World War, with the decadence of the old European imperialist powers, the world has been polarized around two giants, Washington and Moscow. In the capitalist world, only the U. S. shows to any extent a picture of resistance to the disintegrative tendencies in the old system. In the rest of the world, capitalism grows more and more parasitic upon the wealth and strength of the one citadel of world capitalism.

The antagonism between these giants of imperialism dominates all international relations, and dislocates the world market. "The process of concentration of the productive forces leads to the unification of the world under a single economic system. Coexistence between American capitalism and the Russian bureaucracy is impossible in the long run."

But in spite of the terrible scars of the last conflict, scarcely healed, these two are preparing for the third world war. Both in the East and West, life goes on under the sign of militarization in every aspect of existence, economic, political and social, accompanied by increasing exploitation of the masses. In the East, the totalitarian terror manifests itself in purges and bloody trials; in the West, democratic liberties are under mortal attack.

The war would be inevitable but for the most fundamental reality of our epoch, the class struggle. Both war blocks are rent by internal schisms and insoluble contradictions. Hope for a way out stems from the potentialities of that social force which is the most progressive in society, the warrant of a revolutionary future, the working class. Before a new war can engulf the world, this force must first be definitively defeated.

Socialism or Barbarism

Today one part of the workers' movement is still tied to the chariot of Russian imperialism. Another—which the reformist bureaucracy controls—is still more or less docilely subordinating itself to the Atlantic alliance. Yet, within the movements dominated by the reformist and Stalinist bureaucrats, resistance does not fail to show up against subordination of the class to the interests of either Washington and Moscow.

Independent-class policy is the key to averting the danger of war, which is the central task. In this effort, the most powerful ally of the working class is the colonial revolution, the uprising of the oppressed peoples of Asia, Africa and the Americas against capitalist imperialism.

The war danger and the pressure of capitalism and Stalinism has brought about a state of extraordinary confusion in the working class movement generally and in the revolutionary organizations in particular. In such circles there dominate conceptions that the war is inevitable and imminent, and that any independent fight against it is condemned beforehand to sterility.

One such conception sees the basic choice today between "democracy and totalitarianism," and allies itself with Western capitalism against the greater danger of Stalinism. This is the dominant tendency in the reformist political and trade-union movement and also in certain anarchist circles.

Opposite is the political current which sees American capitalism as the greatest danger and which therefore marches at the side of Stalinism, consisting of various kinds of pro-Stalinists and so-called "left" socialists. For these, the "lesser evil" is Stalinist totalitarianism, which will lessen or disappear with its world expansion.

In the case of the former (pro-Western) tendency, their attempt at a diffuse and amorphous "leftism" runs into the incompatibility between their point of view on the war and the necessity of conducting an

independent class struggle. In the case of the latter (pro-Stalinist) tendency, the example given is the official line of the Trotskyist Fourth International, which declares that it is in "the camp of the USSR, China and the people's democracies."

But the alternatives of our day are not "democracy or totalitarianism" (that is, capitalism or Stalinism); nor "socialism or fascism" (or "Stalinism or fascism"). The choice is between socialism or barbarism, that is, the victory of the world socialist revolution or the relapse of the world into barbarism.

The New Reality

Before the rise of Stalinism, the proletariat had a single enemy: the system of capitalist exploitation. "In our epoch, the proletariat and the world socialist working-class movement has to face a new reality. Historical experience has shown that the transformation of the relations of production—the destruction of capitalism, statification and planning of the economy—is not enough to create a socialist society, nor a society of transition toward socialism. Even more: these measures—which constitute nothing more than the negative aspect of the socialist revolution—can establish, under determinate historical conditions, the bases of a new exploitive regime as implacable as the capitalist regime or more so. . . . Without the control of the state apparatus by the workers, there cannot be a workers' state."

"Present-day revolutionary socialism is defined, on the negative side, by its irreconcilable opposition, on principle and programmatically, to the capitalist and bureaucratic exploitive regimes; and, on the positive side, by its loyalty to the proletariat and the class struggle and by its fight for world socialist democracy."

We are opposed to the idea and practice of the "democratic" capitalist crusade against Russia and the "people's democracies," a crusade which aims not only at the overturn of the Stalinist bureaucracy but also at the crushing of the Russian workers. Liberation of the peoples of the USSR will be possible only by a new revolution which will put an end to the bureaucracy and its state, re-establish workers' power and workers' control in the economy, and resume the march toward socialism which was cut short by the Stalinist counter-revolution.

The workers of the West can help the overthrow of the bureaucratic tyrants. They can do this by fighting Stalinist influence at home and by intransigent struggle against their own capitalism. Every socialist victory in the West is a mortal danger for the Russian bureaucrats.

"For revolutionary socialism, the struggle against Stalinism is inseparable from the struggle against capitalism and for socialism. Stalinism is an anti-capitalist and anti-socialist current which was born, and which lives, inside the working-class movement but which is alien to all of the latter's traditions. . . ."

No Other Position Is Possible

"Stalinism, which has retrogressed considerably in almost all the countries of Europe and America during the last years, still occupies important positions in the working-class movement. This situation has its basis in the prestige of the October Revolution, in the policies of the social-democracy and the weakness of revolutionary socialism. The disintegration of the Stalinist movement, its destruction as a force capable of playing a role, will not be possible until revolutionary socialism can offer the working masses a concrete perspective of freedom. . . ."

"Revolutionary socialism can be the animator of an independent Third Front which holds as its program the extension and development of the class struggle, the independence of the working-class movement from both Washington and Moscow, the liberation of all the colonial peoples, the struggle against capitalism and Stalinism, for the revolutionary transformation of society, for world socialist democracy.

"Revolutionary socialism exists as an ideological and political tendency but its forces are weak and dispersed. The regroupment of these forces is an imperious and unpostponable necessity. . . ."

"The position of revolutionary socialism is difficult. To deny that would be to deny the facts. But no other position is possible. Only revolutionary socialism represents the historical continuity of the working-class movement and of a hundred years of struggle for socialism. It alone offers a genuine program for freedom. In the precarious peace of today as in the possible war of tomorrow, revolutionary socialism represents and will represent the only way out for the proletariat, the only hope for humanity."

It can be seen that, apart from any disagreements on relatively minor questions, this internationalist program of the POUM sets it apart from leftist currents of various shades and degrees in the European socialist parties, if only in the clarity of the over-all conception of the independent role of socialism in a world where two dominant imperialist systems are contending for mastery. Nor is this so because the POUMists are a "bunch of theoreticians" playing with programs. On the contrary, if anything, the tendency of the POUM has hitherto been to de-emphasize theoretical generalization.

In documenting its programmatic conceptions, it is to be hoped that the POUM has also put itself in a position to exercise some salutary effect on other socialist currents on the Continent.

Moscow's Bid for Germany — —

(Continued from page 1)

forces, including Eastern Germany, exists only on paper. In a word, Washington hopes to reap the political benefits of the June 17 uprising of the East German workers.

Weak and unstable as the European Defense Community is, Washington believes its Russian counterpart, the satellite armed forces, are even weaker and in case of war would be totally unreliable and worthless to Moscow. The inclusion of Western Germany in the European military machine which America has forced into being would create a stable and experienced military cadre prepared to fight a successful delaying action on its own soil in case of attack by the Russians. In such a case the Russians might have numerical superiority, but they would not have overwhelming military advantages.

U. S. LOOKS TO ARMY

Five months ago the situation was the exact reverse. Then it was the United States which was fearful of the East German army that Moscow was creating. Writing at that time from Bonn, Drew Middleton, the regular New York Times correspondent in Western Germany, wrote on March 8 "The steady strengthening of the East German army and air force in both numbers and equipment is causing serious concern among Allied military planners. Their feeling is sharpened by lack of progress toward rearmament in West Germany, the last manpower reservoir open to the Western allies."

Innocently unaware of the ironic parallel that history was to offer six months later, Middleton noted that the East German army was to consist ultimately of twelve divisions and that Russia had already completed delivery of 500 tanks, enough to equip three armored divisions. The army already was 100,000 strong and was to bring its total of men under arms up to 300,000.

That was five months ago. Today it is the United States which is pressing the political and military advantage. Even before Adenauer is re-elected, the United States has promised his government heavy arms.

On August 21, the New York Times chief European political reporter, C. L. Sulzberger, reported from Bonn that "Responsible sources said today that the United States had promised the West German Government to supply all the heavy equipment necessary for its twelve divisions as soon as the European army project became effective. Among the heavy equipment that would have to be furnished would be the 2,360 tanks listed on the table of organization for the West German contribution to the proposed European army."

Sulzberger goes on to report the following facts: Twenty months after the European Defense Community treaty has been ratified by all signatory powers (Italy and France have not yet approved the pact) one complete West German division would be ready, and all twelve within 24 months. The West German army officer staff will consist of a nucleus of 20,000 regular officers, 80,000 non-commissioned officers and a body of long-term enlisted men. The United States has already set aside the necessary material for the initial cadres that are to train Germany's twelve divisions.

LIKE MASTER, LIKE VALET

So far as the United States is concerned, therefore, the re-election of Adenauer is an accomplished fact, the rearmament of West Germany a technical matter (as soon as Italy and France have been forced into line), and the division of Germany a natural and permanent part of the European landscape. Diplomatic notes can be exchanged with the Russians an endless number of times, international conferences can be arranged on top or subordinate levels, but the integration of Western Germany into the European army will continue on schedule, or so Washington hopes.

Under these circumstances, Washington's studied silence as the German elections draw near is perfectly understandable. It has everything to gain and nothing to lose by a continuation of the status quo.

The attitude of the American government is faithfully reflected by its camp-follower, the Bonn regime. Like Washington, it does not, for understandable reasons, want to see anything more in the various proposals and concessions being made by the Russians than "mere gestures" to influence the elections. The stupidity and danger of this ap-

proach have been vigorously attacked by the Social-Democratic Party. The German Social-Democrats, be it noted, did not hesitate to condemn and reject Moscow's fraudulent note of August 17, which stipulated the inclusion of representatives of the East German regime in the "All-German Provisional Government" that was to prepare for free elections.

But the German Socialists see what the Bonn government refuses to see. The Russians are still pursuing their aim of detaching Germany from the Western bloc. Furthermore, the June 17 uprising weakened the Kremlin immeasurably by depriving it of an important bargaining point—the myth of the political and military power of the satellite countries. It can no longer bargain with Washington on an equal plane, and to restore the parity of bargaining power it must resort to the use of political and economic concessions to the German people.

And the importance of a Social-Democratic victory on September 6 lies precisely in this: Being neither the hand-

servant of Washington nor committed to participation in the Western military bloc, it can exploit this situation and push the Russians toward the ultimate concession—withdrawal from Germany.

SOCIALIST VICTORY THE NEED

The strength of the Social-Democratic Party lies not merely in its opposition to Washington's program—at times it has been very careful as to how it expressed that opposition—but in that it stands at the head of the democratic workers' movement both in Eastern as well as Western Germany. A socialist victory in Western Germany would be a victory for the underground workers' movement in Eastern Germany, and would make the position of the Russians and their puppets completely untenable.

The concessions granted the Ulbricht puppet regime by Moscow last week are insurance against a victory at the polls by Adenauer. If Adenauer wins, if the West German Constitutional Court finds the ratification of the European Defense

Treaty constitutional, and if the Italian and French parliaments also approve the treaty (and this is a very big if), Moscow will permanently establish the Ulbricht regime in East Germany. However, at each stage in the process, until Western Germany is completely tied to the American war machine, Moscow will offer some further concession. Tomorrow, if Adenauer wins and the constitutionality of the European treaty comes before the Constitutional Court, Moscow may effect a partial withdrawal of occupation troops in order to affect the decision; at the next stage, it may promise to restore the Oder-Neisse territories that it took from Germany and ceded to Poland.

The present "dynamic" policy that Moscow is following must therefore be considered as a two-pronged weapon. To the degree that it puts a brake on the Adenauer regime, Moscow will orient its concessions toward the West German people; to the degree that it fails, it will build up the Ulbricht regime still further.

France Finds Its Quislings — —

(Continued from page 1)

need for a more restrained "compromise" in order to keep the backing of the government for the harsh line adopted by the French colonialists in Morocco itself. The above assumes that the Moroccan nationalist representatives are right in their theory that the whole business was initiated not from Paris but from the Residency in Rabat.

Be that as it may, the upshot is perfectly clear now: with only the minimum pretense at the kind of impartiality that characterized their hand-out line last week, the French have replaced the native ruler with a new gang of reactionary feudal hangers on from the past, recruited from the most backward strata of a backward country. The pattern is a repetition of the one which typically characterizes Western capitalism's search for allies in its struggle to survive: the only allies it can find are living fossils still existing in the political mudflats of modern countries.

FRIENDS OF DEMOCRACY

The social nature of the new French-sponsored regime in Morocco is described adequately enough in the N. Y. Times dispatch from Rabat on August 24. As against the deposed sultan, who represented the "westernized city Arabs," the more modern sector of the native population, the new Sultan, Sidi Mohammed ben Moulay Arafa, represents "the feudal lords of the mountains." He was put forward as leader by "a movement of pashas and kaid led by the pasha of Marrakesh, El Glaoui, an archaic figure who derives his strength mainly from the unquestioning obedience of thousands of Berber tribesmen."

El Glaoui (continues correspondent Michael Clark) "was powerfully assisted by El Kitani, the aged leader of Morocco's Moslem confraternities. These associations have stubbornly resisted the encroachments of Wahabite orthodoxy, are citadels of local tradition and superstition and, as such, have been unremittingly attacked by Moslem reformers, including the former sultan."

The new sultan himself, incidentally, is a figurehead who "appeared to be bewildered by the turn of fortune that had made him the commander of the faithful overnight. Until last week he was an obscure landowner of Fez, who did his own marketing and occasionally was seen driving through the European quarters of the city."

Such are the only "friends" of the great Western democracy who can be picked up in Morocco. The deposed sultan was no great bargain as a democrat himself, although he was an ally (not a supporter) of the modern nationalist-democratic movement led by Istiqlal, but when it came to finding quislings, the French had to pluck them out of the sagebrush.

Although the press reports which passed the French censorship sometimes speak of the threat by the Berber tribesmen of a march on the palace, the actual scene of deposition of the old and the imposition of the new sultan did not take place under the menace of tribal spears. Quite the contrary. An armored troop column of 20th-century French soldiers was thrown around the palace compound, not by fossils but by advanced defenders of civilization, progress and French culture. "Tanks and armored cars, manned by troops in battle dress,

guarded all entrances to the palace. An army observation plane circled overhead."

The feudal lords of the mountains were solemnly inducted into power by wielders of the most advanced technique in modern warfare, while the French issued a statement about "progressive and forward-looking" reforms to be instituted under their aegis.

Simultaneously the French power decreed a curfew for Moroccans at 8 p.m. "The banishment of the sultan was carried out at lightning speed," which demonstrated the advantages of combining modern imperialist know-how with feudal tribalism.

ISTIQLAL LIES LOW

The whole outlandish farce did not fail to leave a bad taste even in the mouths of the cultured Frenchmen who make up the Paris cabinet. It seems that even in this far from anti-imperialist milieu, there was some objection. "President Vincent Auriol expressed his deep regret at the course of events," and there apparently were sharp words of criticism among the ministers on how the affair was "handled," but the Guillaume policy had to be backed up—otherwise what would happen to French "prestige" in the world?

One of the question-marks, meanwhile, is: What does the Istiqlal propose to do? On Monday a one-inch AP dispatch announced that "French authorities moved today to wipe out the Istiqlal (nationalist) movement in Morocco. More than 1000 Arabs were arrested, while others fled the country or went underground." Obviously the French are ready and willing to go through a bloodbath, roughshod, as they have done in Tunisia.

The press reports that the Istiqlal has not moved, outside of reporting a train wreck which may or may not have been connected with the events. The Moroccan

Information Office in New York informs us that it has no information on any popular manifestations of opposition in the country. There is of course the possibility that the nationalists may be lying low either awaiting the results of UN intervention or waiting to see what the promised French "progressive and forward-looking" reforms may turn out to be.

U. S. GOES ALONG

In the UN an Asian-African bloc of 15 states is bringing up the question of the French coup before the Security Council. As happened on Tunisia, the United States will again be put on the spot, whether to agree that the UN has a right to take up the question or to uphold the hand of French imperialism.

Also as in the case of Tunisia, there need be little doubt that Washington is not exactly pleased by its ally's brutality and open oppression in its own colonies—especially since the U. S. has no interest in desiring continued French monopoly over North Africa, where it has important bases, and where it would like to have more say-so itself—but the Atlantic alliance need not be "disrupted" for the sake of some people's freedom and independence when, after all, its main aim in life is to preserve freedom and civilization for all. Even the living fossils from the mountains of Morocco can make their contribution.

As we go to press, the U. S. delegation has announced that it will vote against putting Morocco on the UN council agenda. Up to now Washington has abstained on questions of taking up Morocco and Tunisia's complaints. As the chairman of the Asian-African bloc, Zeineddine of Syria, said, it is better for the U. S. to cast an outright negative vote so that it makes no bones about where it stands—that is, squarely with French imperialism.

Disorders Follow Price Rises in Ceylon

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, Aug. 19—Details of the situation in Ceylon reached us this week. After the rioting and business stoppages resulting from food price rises of from 20 to 40 per cent, the situation was comparatively quiet. All political meetings had been banned by the government.

An increase in the price of rice would be a serious blow in any Asian country. This one, which resulted from the abolition of a government subsidy, was accompanied by an increase of prices in postal services, railway fares and electricity. These things, it must be remembered, were occurring in the most literate, advanced and politically articulate country in Asia.

So great was the reaction to the government's moves that the left-wing parties took the initiative. The government acted quickly. Copies of the *Sama Sama-jist* and *Maubima* were confiscated from sellers in the street. Communist Party headquarters in Kandy were raided, and the police took away some documents. They claim that the Stalinists had organized a "National Liberation Army"

with plans to take over plantations and mines. If any resistance was met with, the planters were to be killed, the police allege. Raids were also supposed to be planned on planters carrying wages.

The troubles in Ceylon must be looked at with the following facts clearly in mind. There has been some decrease in prices of raw materials on the world market. It is these goods which Ceylon sells mainly. Sixty per cent of Ceylon's mines and plantations are still foreign-owned. The government has been in control some five years, and there has been little substantial improvement in the lot of the peasantry. A further factor is the attempt of the various opposition parties to gain the initiative after the unhappy election results of last time. The Korean truce was considered a good omen by the Satlinists.

Don't miss a single week of
LABOR ACTION
A sub is only \$2.00 a year!