

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

OCTOBER 5, 1953

FIVE CENTS

France's Candidate for Dictator

... page 6

Liberal Party vs. the Fair Dealers

... page 2

'Neutralization' for Korea?

... page 3

William Oatis: No 'Russian Soul'

... page 7

What's in the Secret Treaty That The U.S. Has Signed with Fascist Franco?



Fitzpatrick in The St. Louis Post-Dispatch

Saturday, September 26 was a dark day for the people of Spain and the people of the United States. On that day, the American government signed a secret treaty with the bloody dictator Franco which will long be remembered as a mockery and reproach to the American claim that this country stands for democracy and the defense of freedom in the world.

It has been publicly announced that in exchange for a number of air fields and naval bases, the United States has agreed to grant Franco \$226 million to bolster the economy of his bankrupt regime and to modernize his army. Thus, for the first time since Franco's fascist armies drowned the Spanish Republic in blood 15 years ago, his government has been formally introduced into the Western alliance as an integral part of its military and political opposition to the Stalinist part of the world.

But this public announcement is but the "innocent" eighth of the iceberg which juts above the water, while the rest is submerged in the murky depths out of sight of the American people. What military and political guarantees has the U. S. government given Franco in exchange for these bases? Under what circumstances has Franco agreed to permit their use against Russia or other nations? What promises has he given in turn for participation in a future war?

As Hanson Baldwin puts it in the *New York Times* for September 29:

"The terms of the accord gave no real clue to its exact meaning; indeed, there have probably been few accords among nations in history that have been couched in so many generalities and qualified with so many restrictions, limitations and ambiguities. The commitments the United States has assumed in return for the right to use unspecified bases are nowhere clearly spelled out in the published documents, and the obligations of both countries in case of actual war apparently are mentioned only in secret codicils. Thus, the base agreement commits the United States to

courses of politico-military action unknown to the American people at an unestimated cost in men, military equipment and dollars without the ratification of the Senate."

The shame-faced apologists for this cynical deal claim that it has purely military significance and does not involve any endorsement of the Franco regime by the American government. That is a transparent falsehood.

THE "STABILITY" LIE

In reporting the treaty, the *New York Times* for September 27 states that "U. S. military experts" and unnamed "strategists" are "uneasy about the French political situation in relation to depending mainly on France as a major supply base. They feel that some future French government might demand that the base be withdrawn. Spain, on the other hand, has a land bridge to the heart of Europe, is relatively remote from Soviet air bases, appears to have a stable government."

A stable government! That this government has been "stabilized" on the basis of repressing all opposition with the utmost cruelty does not concern our State Department. Mussolini's trains ran on time; Hitler brought "order" to Germany; and Franco has a "stable government." There is the argument for the ardent defenders of the American side in the cold war in the name of "freedom" and "democracy"!

But even this argument, cynical and brutal though it be, is a falsehood.

(Turn to last page)

Durkin's Heart-Rending Story Of the Lamb and the Wolves

By BEN HALL

Did Eisenhower violate a solemn pledge to Martin Durkin by pigeonholing a presidential message, recommending 19 amendments to the Taft-Hartley Law, on the eve of its presentation to Congress? After Vice-President Nixon's tedious explanation at the AFL convention, the official administration version seems to go as follows:

(1) In the first place, no message was ever prepared; consequently there could have been no reason for withdrawing it.

(2) In the second place, the message that was prepared was withdrawn for very excellent reasons of "timing."

(3) In the third place, the administration admires the labor movement in general and the AFL in particular and promises to amend the Taft-Hartley Law, just as it promised about one year ago.

No wonder that Nixon met an unusual reception at the convention. Usually the full-time union officials who make up an AFL session listen and applaud with at least formal politeness to all guest speakers. But this time the personal representative of the president spoke to an audience who at first listened in cold silence, then taunted him with raucous laughter, and applauded in mockery when he said "If it has served the greedy few, this administration will lose the next election, and it will deserve to lose." A day earlier, Martin Durkin gave the

convention his version of the events leading up to his resignation as secretary of labor. Although his account was presented with all the emotion of a local union treasurer reporting on the proceeds from the annual dance, the sad story breaks through of labor's lone captive representative lost and bewildered in a Washington dominated by big business.

RUN-AROUND

For months he toiled to get assistant secretaries appointed; he finally succeeded only seven days before he resigned. (He omits entirely any reference to the case of Edelman, recommended by the CIO for one of the two under-secretaryships. Edelman, who was once a socialist, was turned down by Eisenhower and no CIO man was ever appointed.) Meanwhile, the budget for his department was cut to the bone; 900 posts were abolished with more layoffs due.

Nevertheless he continued to plod along, trying to reorganize his department somehow for greater service to the workingman and hoping to help a sincere

Eisenhower carry out his honest pledge to amend the Taft-Hartley Law and make it fairer to labor. But disillusionment was in store for him.

He established a committee "of the public, of management, and of labor" to work out the amendments; but the employers sabotaged it and it was dissolved. Time passed and Eisenhower asked: Would Durkin please meet with the Department of Commerce on the subject? Durkin tried, but these meetings too had to be abandoned as fruitless. Discussions were then shifted to meetings by Durkin with high-ranking Republicans: Taft, representatives of the Department of Commerce, the White House staff, and others. "This effort too," reports Durkin, "became a failure."

After all this time and all these failures, Durkin thought he finally faced the dawn of success. Meetings were held between his representatives and those of the White House; 19 amendments were agreed upon; a presidential message to Congress was drawn up incorporating them. "I read the message and approved it," says Durkin. The message was to go to Congress on July 31.

TREADMILL

But Taft died and it was held up "out of deference." Three days later, on August 3, the *Wall Street Journal* reprinted the message in full, a copy having been leaked to it beforehand. A big

(Turn to last page)

Liberal Party Chiefs Jittery as They Find The Fair-Dealers Arrayed on Other Side

By PETER WHITNEY

NEW YORK, Sept. 29—Robert Wagner Jr.'s victory in the Democratic Party primary fight for New York's mayoralty nomination aroused mixed feelings within the ranks of the Liberal Party. It shattered the mood of high confidence and aroused doubts about the policy of "going it alone" with the Liberal slate headed by Rudolph Halley. But in polarizing the more conservative attitudes, it also aroused those favoring independent candidates to a more conscious and articulate statement of their position.

Wagner's candidacy highlights the dilemma of the Liberal Party. It clearly counterposes their policy of yesteryear (more accurately, of the last nine years of their existence) with their policy today of running their own independent candidates for the major offices in New York City. While taking this giant step forward, the Liberals fear to break their ties to the Democratic Party and find themselves in one difficult position after another.

What can they say about Wagner? He used to be "their" man; again and again they supported him as representative of the "liberal," New Deal-Fair Deal type of candidate that they wanted to "force" the Democratic Party to run. They enthusiastically supported him in his last election and duly hailed his victory as "their" victory when he was elected Manhattan borough president.

GHOST OF THE PAST

The Liberal Party, in the 1950 mayoralty election, supported the Democratic candidate, Judge Pecora, who differs from Wagner as one pea from another in the same pod. The Liberals at that time had been pressuring the Democrats for a "liberal" candidate along the lines of a Wagner Jr. but went along with Pecora's selection. This has been their basic line in the past, and now these ghosts of the past rise to haunt them.

Especially since Wagner won a primary fight against the three Democratic

bosses who supported the present Mayor Impellitteri, he has already claimed that he owes less to political bosses and thus is more "independent" than any other candidate. (Wagner was the candidate in the primaries of only two out of the five party machine bosses in the city's boroughs. He was supported by the Bronx Flynn apparatus and the Manhattan Tammany outfit. This makes him "independent"!)

The more conservative elements in the Liberal Party ask: How can we oppose a candidate like Wagner? Haven't we always supported him? Didn't we keep urging the Democrats to run men like him for office? Aren't we out on a limb now, risking our very existence?

WATCHDOG POLICY

Actually, the Liberal leadership cannot give straightforward answers to such questions since it would mean a re-evaluation of their past policy and some analysis of what their future policy will be. They justify their previous policy of compromises and deals with the Democrats and, on some occasions, with Republicans, and stand ready to retreat to it.

Even when they are forced to run their own candidates on the Liberal line, they do so with arguments borrowed from yesterday's arsenal. Halley and his running mates are not put forward vigorously as Liberal Party candidates but rather as "good government" candidates, "unbossed" even by the party that runs them. The Democratic Party doesn't do the right thing by the New York voters, and so the Liberals have to save New York for the Democratic column against themselves; so they say.

Only those who have been for independent candidates in the past can consist-

ently and effectively counter the doubts and hesitations of the more conservative segments in the Liberal Party. These segments orient toward a reform and rejuvenation of the New York Democratic Party and feel uncomfortable unless they behave like a "loyal left wing" toward the Democrats. They regard the Liberal Party as a pressure weapon to keep the Democrats on the right track and fear any independent orientation on the part of the Liberals.

In the eyes of such conservative elements, the Liberals have already fulfilled their mission in life by waving their big stick of "independence" and thus scaring the Democrats into running a more "acceptable" candidate. Thus, every time the Liberals grow in power and strength, as reflected in running their own candidates, the Democrats will react by running "more progressive" candidates and cutting the ground from under the Liberals. This then is the limited role assigned to the Liberal Party—to be the watchdog of the Democratic Party and to give an "independent" bark or two when the Democrats go astray.

DIVIDED MINDS

These conservative elements can scarcely be chided for wishing to chain the Liberal Party to the old vicious cycle, since this type of thinking has permeated the party for many years. And yet the ideology of the party lags behind its actions. A powerful new tendency was set into motion when the party ran Halley as its independent candidate for City Council president in 1951, followed by running George S. Counts for U. S. senator in 1952 against both the Democratic and Republican candidates.

Today, running a full slate for the city posts, the party has challenged its previous policy by this action and aroused much frank discussion within the clubs on the party's basic outlook. Those who try to defend the policy of supporting "liberal" Democrats are greatly embarrassed by Wagner's candidacy and find themselves stuttering on why they can't support him. The dichotomy in their minds is reflected in their argument that, after all, Halley is a "better Democrat" than Wagner. Then why didn't they want him to run in the Democratic primary?

This split-mind feeling, apparent but not too well articulated in the Liberal ranks, found concrete expression in the inability of the city convention of Americans for Democratic Action to declare themselves for either Halley or Wagner. Instead, they straddled the entire issue by declaring both men good liberals, and the convention gave its blessings to both. Not so with the recent state convention of the CIO—it gave its strong endorsement to Wagner and thus permits him to boast that the bulk of organized labor backs him.

HALLEY AND TRUMAN

The ambivalent attitude of the Liberal Party colors every aspect of its campaign—starting with the main candidate himself. Since Halley is not a Liberal Party leader, he is not the best type of candidate to lead an energetic fight based on the party's principles and programs. While the party boasts that it is a new kind of party based on a program of social reform, little of this is reflected in the campaign. They are bending over backwards to run a "good government" campaign, against crime, corruption and other forms of sin rampant in big cities.

Halley's keynote speech promised a fight to return to the 10-cent fare and a program for more housing and slum clearance. But his major efforts have been devoted to prove that he's the best Democrat of them all—with testimonials from Stevenson himself to attest to his invaluable aid in the presidential campaign (Form Letter 46B). But Wagner rightly sneers at this feeble effort and rallies behind him all the Democratic bigwigs, from Truman down, including Senator Lehman, Averell Harriman, and Stevenson (alas—all men supported by the Liberal Party).

Truman put it most sharply: "Bob Wagner thinks like a Democrat, talks like a Democrat and acts like a Democrat, and I mean a regular Democrat—underline that 'regular.' Bob Wagner is my kind of Democrat." Truman, product of the Pendegast machine, is the last one to underestimate the importance of the regular

Democratic machine, with its regular supporters. He doesn't want any truck with mavericks, here today and in somebody else's picture tomorrow.

His statement can be given only one interpretation, since it obviously was not made for its popular appeal to the New York electorate. The voters of the city have shown no eagerness to vote for "regular" Democrats—on the contrary. That most insignificant nonentity in the late history of the New York mayoralty, Impellitteri, was elected to office primarily because he ran as an opponent of the "regulars," as was Halley himself when he made the City Council presidency. In stressing Wagner's "regularity," Truman is not speaking to the people in the first place, but to the Democratic Party stalwarts, enjoining them to knife the man who is threatening the party. By the same token he is grinding his teeth at the Liberal Party leaders who are behind it all.

And the pity of it is that this is guaranteed to make the latter uneasy, torn between the step they have screwed up their courage to take, and their loyalty to the Fair Deal circles they have gotten into the habit of supporting.

WHO'S LYING?

The picture of Halley as the courageous racket-buster and fighter against the corruption and gangsterism of Tammany is somewhat dimmed by charges that he approached the Democratic leaders to get their nomination. Tammany leader DeSapio insists that "All during last spring there was nobody in town who was busier in his determination to win Democratic support for his candidacy than was Rudolph Halley. He and his friends did everything possible to assure the very people he now denounces as 'bosses' that he would serve them faithfully and well. He was ready, willing and anxious to make every compromise, commitment and pledge in order to obtain the Democratic nomination."

DeSapio further charges that Halley wanted to make a deal to run a Democratic-Liberal slate, with himself for mayor and Wagner for City Council president. Halley's defense is that he sought to approach "good-government Democrats" because he was considering running in the Democratic primary at that time, but he denies that he would have anything to do with the Democratic machine. Halley points to a speech made before the Hatters' Union convention on June 12, where he roundly attacked the machines and bosses of both parties and urged the Liberals to run their own candidate, as proof of where he stood. But that speech was made at a time when the Liberal leaders had already decided to run him as their own candidate, so that Halley was risking nothing by his plea.

TO WIDEN THE GULF

Certainly, there would be nothing inconsistent if Halley had made such overtures. The point is that such muck-raking is possible only because Halley is a registered Democrat rather than a Liberal Party member, and his basic orientation is toward the Democrats. It is they, rather than he himself, who will widen the gulf and push him further away. The development of this campaign, which promises to be bitterly fought, may serve to push him more and more into an independent position, but more important it will push the entire Liberal Party into such a position.

For example, when the Yonkers Raceway scandal broke, Halley attacked both the Republican and Democratic politicians who were lining their pocketbooks by the tremendous profits made at the race track. He sharply attacked the political bosses of both parties who covered up the racket-ridden racetrack and had intimate dealings with Frank Costello and other gangsters. This will certainly not endear him to the Democrats.

Halley can scarcely compete with Wagner on the basis of who's the better Democrat and who will do more for The Party. That is the sure way to defeat and disaster. He gained his first victory by appealing to the voters as an independent Liberal Party candidate, dedicated to the welfare of the people. Only by continuing along this line, by advocating a program to meet the peoples' needs, and by fighting boldly and aggressively against the bosses and machines of both parties, can he hope to win the support of the people again.

G. L. K. Smith Says the Times Are Good for His Brand of Poison

LOS ANGELES, Sept. 18.—The fascist hate-monger, the "Reverend" Gerald L. K. Smith, held a rally of his Christian-Nationalist followers at the Embassy Auditorium in this city on Wednesday, where he harangued for two hours on his current line. About 200 heard the would-be fuhrer.

With a show of optimism, Smith told his audience that the American climate for "our Christian-Nationalist ideas and activity has not been so favorable for many years as at the present." He described the anti-Communist fear and hysteria in the land, the witchhunt and the government's foreign policy—all being apparently contributors to the favorable atmosphere.

Above all, he heaped lavish praises on Joe McCarthy and the other congressional investigators, as well as on MacArthur and State Senator Jack Tenney, who were Smith's presidential candidates last year.

"At last," said Smith, "we have men in high places who are saying quite a bit that we have been preaching for years, for which we were slandered and reviled." His speech was as usual full of anti-Semitic references, jibes, sneers, attacks on "Jew-Communists" and "Red-Zionists," "Jewish-international finance and its Red agents to destroy our Christian civilization," to rule America by "Moscow dictates, kosher-style," etc., and other such foul innuendoes.

Targets for today for Smith include Eleanor Roosevelt, the New York Post, Lucille Ball and Robert Wagner Jr. ("There is good evidence to believe that Wagner himself is really a German Jew . . ."). It seems that the "plot" to fluorinate water to prevent tooth decay is also a Jewish conspiracy. . . . The audience went along with laughter and jeers when he attacked the "stupid, soft-headed, mushy-mouthed preachers who

are afraid to even use the word Jew." He denounced a bill introduced in Sacramento to fight against anti-Semitism, claiming that "a prominent Jewish spokesman said over the radio the other day that three-fourths of all Christian Americans are actually anti-Semitic," and demanding to know whether all these people are going to be "locked up."

Anti-Negro filth also filled his talk: "Let's give the good old Southern white folks a pat on the back for their courage in defending their way of life against the Zionists and Reds who aim to mongrelize America. . . . Why, down there in some counties the blacks outnumber the whites ten to one. Don't tell me our little girls are safe if they have to sit among a bunch of sweating darkies shoulder to shoulder, knee to knee!"—following this up with even cruder and dirtier insinuations about the propensity of Negroes for rape and sex crimes.

In another section, Smith insisted that Walter Winchell is not on his side, despite the latter's anti-Communism. According to his story, Winchell "changed his tune" about the Communists simply for fear that McCarthy would "get" him. Smith made it clear that he has not forgiven Winchell for attacking him. Throughout Smith also kept implying that he was close to McCarthy, FBI agents, the police forces, and government figures. Also as usual, the bee was put on the audience to shell out money for his "crusades."

SH-H-H!

See clandestine communiqué on last page!

U.S. Puts Out a Feeler on Plan For Deal to 'Neutralize' Korea

By GORDON HASKELL

The Eisenhower administration has "leaked" its first hint on what it may offer as its program on the Korean question at the proposed political conference to end the war in Korea officially.

The New York Times of September 25 states that at least two of the United Nations members with armed forces in Korea have been approached by representatives of the State Department with a proposal which, according to the Times, goes as follows:

"(1) The Communists can continue to block the unification of Korea, as they have done one way or another ever since the end of the war with Japan. In that case the United States will maintain large forces in South Korea as long as there is a possibility of another aggression by North Korea.

"(2) But if the Communists will agree to the creation of a free and independent Korea and the withdrawal of all foreign forces, the United States will be prepared to join in an international guarantee of Korea's neutrality. Such a unified government would continue to have its own armed forces, but the international guarantee would be accompanied by reciprocal safeguards that the all-Korean government would not offer a military threat to the Soviet Union or Communist China, or vice versa."

This proposal was hinted at in vague terms by Secretary of State Dulles in a speech in the General Assembly of the UN last week, and also by the British representative to that body. Indeed, it is about the only kind of proposal this government could make which might get the support of most of the other countries which have been actively allied with the U. S. in Korea, as well as of the other powers which have maintained a relatively neutral stand throughout that conflict.

The withdrawal of all foreign troops and the unification and "neutralization" of the country is the best that this un-

happy land could hope for after the war which has been fought over its territory for the last three years. Yet it appears highly unlikely that any such plan can be put into effect. It is even unlikely that the United States seriously wants to have such a plan adopted.

If the unification of Korea is to take place as a result of a really free election throughout the territory of the country, would the United States be willing to bind itself in advance to an acceptance of whatever the results of such an election might be? That is, would the American government be willing to withdraw its troops in return for a "mutual guarantee of neutrality" with China and Russia if the Stalinists should win a free election in Korea?

RHEE SAYS NO

The question is not at all academic. That this is true is demonstrated by Syngman Rhee's immediate and frenzied statements of opposition to any such plan. Long ago he made it clear that by a "free election" he means an election only in North Korea for the 50 seats in the Korean parliament "set aside" by him for the northern part of the country. He certainly has no intention of permitting the Stalinists to campaign freely for votes in South Korea.

But if Rhee's position on this is accepted by the Americans, why should the Stalinists be expected to accept any set-up in which Rhee's government would be assured of control of the whole country in advance in exchange for the same "mutual guarantees?" It should be quite clear that in this hard world, neither side is likely to be willing to take a chance of losing through an election, free or part-free, what they fought for three years to conquer or maintain at enormous cost in lives and treasure.

Yet, the United States, like the Stalinists, must come forward with some kind of a proposal to offer the political conference. Even if that body should never meet, as is entirely possible, both sides cannot simply continue to squabble over the "two-sided" or "round-table" composition

of the conference, or over whether this or that country should be invited to participate. At some point each must come up with a plan for the final ending of the war, and seek to throw the blame for continuing the armed division of the country or the resumption of the war on the other.

But the tragedy of Korea is that poor and weak as that little country may be, the prestige of the great powers has become so deeply involved, that neither side can afford to take the risk of permitting it to settle its own destiny in its own way. At the most, they may make a deal. If China could buy admission into the United Nations, and possibly get Formosa, she might be willing to sell out North Korea to Rhee. But the United States could not risk a loss of South Korea to the Stalinists, for the question of Chinese representation in the UN and Formosa would remain as such a source of division in her alliance after such an event as it had been before.

GESTURE?

Thus, even if the American proposal, in its present vague form, were to be accepted by the Stalinists as a basis for negotiations, such acceptance, like the proposal itself, would be merely a propaganda gesture. At this stage of the game, neither side is going to let the Koreans solve their own problems through free elections. That is not the way of imperialism, be it Stalinist or capitalist. They will demand something far more concrete and tangible from each other than guarantees of the neutrality of Korea.

The main trouble with the American trial-balloon is that it does not even present an effective propaganda program unless such problems are forthrightly answered. At the best, the State Department may hope that the Stalinists will reject the idea out of hand so that it never has to concretize it or stand by it. But this would be the same as saying that it is a demagogic proposal, made only because it is likely to be rejected. However, a propaganda proposal should not be confused with a demagogic one—they are not the same thing.

LONDON LETTER

Britain and the European Army

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, Sept. 23—Among the many fine points of British diplomacy is the attitude to the European Defense Community.

One does not have to be a strategist to realize that were the Russians to attack in Europe at present, they would soon be most of the way to the Rhine, if not to the Bay of Biscay. In Europe today, Britain has the largest navy and air force of any Western European power. Thus, in the construction of a European army designed to hold the Russians at the Rhine, British forces would be essential.

The British government is fully aware of this. Any war in Europe involves Britain. Yet, if Britain allowed itself to join the so-called European Defense Community, the other countries of the West, including the U. S., would have a say in the disposition of British land forces, without consultation with the British government.

British imperialist commitments in Malaya, Kenya and Egypt would thus be indirectly related to the demands of European war preparations. Furthermore, British generals would be under unified European command. This is a possibility which the War Office finds rather unpalatable.

WHAT FRANCE WANTS

Since the inception of the North Atlantic organization, most of the British naval and air forces have been put under North Atlantic command. This is, in effect, lending them to the American Department of Defense in case of war.

Organizationally, of course, the orders must still go through the British command at a fairly high level. However, Britain has always been reticent to put its land forces under European command. It is fully prepared to maintain the British army of the Rhine and its newly built supply base at Brussels, but it is not prepared to place any large contingent in a European army.

Why is it that France is so keen for Britain to join this force? Britain's army is the most efficient army in Western Europe. France realizes that sooner or later Germany will join the European army as a full member. Adenauer's victory renders this more likely. If Britain joins in the land forces with the large army of France, the fears of the latter would be allayed. Western Germany—with a greater population and economic potential than France—would be easily balanced by France and Britain together.

The alternative to Britain's cooperation in the European army is a negligible German contribution. This possibility finds no favor for two reasons. Germany, having no colonies and no army, is forging ahead economically. It is the biggest creditor in the European Payments Union and in Europe as a whole (Britain is the biggest debtor). Britain, France, Italy and the Benelux countries are defending Germany in the cold war and they do not like the prospect of having to do so in a hot war.

LIMITED PARTNER

A second reason for arming Western Germany was put before the European Assembly yesterday by Nutting, the Conservative British representative. The East German "police force" has 100,000 fully armed men, 600 tanks, 250 self-propelled guns, 150 armored vehicles, and Russian aircraft. These token forces are, of course, mainly police forces designed to suppress the kind of trouble that broke out last June. In fact, no one knows the real strength of the army the Russians are training in Germany or Russia; most youth organizations are of a paramilitary nature anyhow.

The British government is fully aware of French fears and suspicions. It reacts by stating at the European Consultative Assembly that Britain is ready for partnership with the European Defense Community; but this is to be a partnership "with" and not a partnership "in."

On this question of European defense, the Tories and Labor hold much the same view, based on similar considerations. Roberts, representing British Labor, suggested to the Assembly that they should hold German rearmament in abeyance, while holding a world peace conference. This rather naive proposal met with no response from anyone.

Reuther's Annual-Wage Demand Has Some Tough Sledding Ahead

By M. J. HARDWICK

DETROIT, Sept. 27—Perhaps the most important decision by CIO President Walter P. Reuther since his rise to national fame through his General Motors strike demands in 1946 has been the pledge to fight for a guaranteed annual wage in the 1955 negotiations with major auto corporations.

The implications of this struggle, both in terms of its social weight and in redefining labor relations in this turbulent industry, are of the profoundest significance to the American labor movement.

Just last week Reuther told the convention of the Michigan Bar Association that "We don't intend to sign any new contracts until the workers are paid by the year"—a typical Reuther statement calculated to point up an issue.

Inadvertently, what the UAW has in mind in its program for a guaranteed annual wage was disclosed in comments made at this same convention by one of Detroit's ablest labor lawyers, A. L. Zwerdling, who happens also to be a one-time associate counsel for the UAW and a close friend of Reuther. Zwerdling's remarks, and a reply by a Ford corporation counsel, provide a good basis for beginning the inevitable discussion in the union movement on the merits and implications of a guaranteed annual wage plan such as the UAW will propose.

Zwerdling told the lawyers gathering that "the UAW would offer the employers the same sort of inducement on the annual wage proposal that it did on pension negotiations."

In reply, Malcolm Denise, Ford counsel, said that "employers were burned once on the pension setup and I don't

think they're going to be burned again on the guaranteed annual wage.

Zwerdling gave an illustration of how the UAW plan might work:

"Let's say that a guaranteed wage amounting to \$65 a week were negotiated at Ford. The inducement for management comes in the form of unemployment insurance the worker receives on the weeks when he is laid off.

"If he has \$30 a week coming in unemployment benefits, then Ford would only have to pay \$35 a week to provide the guaranteed wage."

Zwerdling also said the plan would depend on how various states would regard an employee's eligibility for jobless benefits. Before we discuss the UAW plan—and Zwerdling's ideas do contain the basic proposal inherent in the UAW program—let us see what the reply of the Ford counsel was; it is of some interest.

"When Ford negotiated the pensions," Denise declared, "the UAW used the argument that our contribution to the plan would decrease as social-security benefits were increased by the government.

"But as it worked out, the UAW insisted on raising the total pension level when social security went up. Now we have changed the system so the amount paid by the company on pensions is en-

tirely independent of social-security benefits."

Reuther's speech for a guaranteed pay came at a very appropriate moment, for over 100,000 auto workers in Michigan are unemployed and many thousands more are working short work-weeks. (The Ford company is a major exception, and if its status in the auto industry continues to be as favorable, it is bound to be the No. 1 target in the guaranteed annual wage fight.)

It also came at a time when the slogan, "30-hour week and 40-hour pay," is catching fire sufficiently to disturb UAW leaders, who feel that the guaranteed annual wage fight must be the main goal of the 1955 struggle.

TIMELY

In his blast at an economic double standard, in his plea for steady pay, Reuther raised the hopes and social consciousness of an increasingly restive rank and file. The concept of a regular pay check every week comes at a timely moment when many auto workers are cursing the short weeks, inadequate unemployment compensation and the waiting-week provision which deprives them of any income for seven days.

Soon the committee of outstanding economists who are advising the UAW on the guaranteed-wage plan will make a public report, and the entire nation will begin discussing the issue, if the broad publicity campaign set up by the UAW has its effect.

Among other considerations, what gives this kind of discussion an acute character is that stormy weather lies ahead for at least the auto industry and the problem of jobs and pay assumes a very pressing significance.

If last week's Business Week analysis

(Turn to last page)

Adenauer's Grab for Trade-Union Control

By JACK WALKER

Adenauer's Christian Democratic Union, emboldened by its success in the September 6 West German elections, has pointed a pistol at the head of the German Federation of Trade Unions (DGB), demanding greater CDU control in the federation or a split-off of the Catholic unions into a rival federation. The Kaiser-Arnold plan reported in the New York Times for September 11, was an ultimatum submitted by the CDU executive committee to the federation, insisting upon a special union convention to grant exceptional representation to the "Social Committee of the Christian Democratic Union" on the federation's executive committee, in such a manner as to shift more control to Christian Democratic members of the Federation (DGB).

The barefaced arrogance of this bid for power can be compared only to the Stalinist demand in East Germany for special representation of the "mass organizations" in the National Front elections of October 1950, when the Free German Youth, German Women's Federation and other Stalinist-dominated organizations were arbitrarily assigned so many seats in the "Peoples Chamber" to assure a majority for the "Socialist Unity Party" (Stalinist) core of the Ulbricht puppet government.

What democratic justification can be advanced when CDU members have always been justly represented on the DGB executive committee in the past, with an automatic co-vice-presidency going to Matthias Foecher in 1952's convention, plus great restraint in political statements by the almost solidly Social-Democratic federation executive committee?

PRETEXT

The excuse advanced by Adenauer's government party was that the federation had given up its neutrality during the election campaign by calling upon its membership "to elect a better Bundestag," plus an attack upon the social and economic policies of the Adenauer regime. It is interesting to compare this with the 1949 Bundestag elections when the federation had proposed a 7-point program and called upon its members to vote only for those accepting this program. The Social-Democratic Party was the only party fully supporting it, the Stalinists saying it didn't go far enough, and the CDU and Free Democrats accepting it only in part.

During the 1953 campaign Adenauer

had threatened a split, angry at the DGB's stand, and talk along this line had mounted near the end of the campaign. Walter Freitag, federation president and SPD leader, attempted to head off this new threat by issuing a declaration accepting the September 6 elections as a popular expression of the people and stating that the DGB's election manifesto had been aimed at the Free Democrats and the German Party, Adenauer's coalition partners, rather than at the CDU itself.

It is obvious, however, that the issue of "neutrality" was only a pretext, with the CDU considering an alternative plan to establish a rival Catholic federation of housemaids and employees of shopkeepers, prior to this bid for extended DGB control: drafted by Jacob Kaiser and Karl Arnold, minister and Land minister-president respectively. In Italy, France, Belgium and the Netherlands this is the Catholic parties' traditional method of functioning, setting up national sections of the International Federation of Christian Trade Unions as a means of dividing a social-democratic or Stalinist-led working class to bolster a conservative clerical party.

UNRESTRAINED NOW

Adenauer is merely losing no time in acting where he was previously restrained by the fear of being rebuffed or suffering politically adverse consequences. As early as the beginning of 1950, a few months after the founding of the tri-zonal DGB in 1949, Catholic community-level "social committees of Catholic unionists" were being set up, as a dual power within the federation. By February 1950 the SPD was forming "working committees" of its own to counteract the directives transmitted to Catholic trade-unionists, complaining of their "destructive effect" on trade unions. It was only the intense feelings of the membership for a united trade-union movement, as a reaction to the Hitler debacle, and the similar policy of the occupation powers for a single federation that restrained Adenauer until now. It is not unlikely that the split will be forced, especially by the use of such blackmailing tactics as have been already seen, despite the preferences of the rank-and-file Catholic unionists.

To perceive the injury that this split will cause does not mean that the bogey of government control of the trade unions, à la Ley's "Labor Front," which is evoked by the Stalinists, is present or near at hand.

Reading from Left to Right

Why the French Strikes Scared the Labor Leaders

FRANCE: THE MATCH AND THE POWDER KEG, by Theodore H. White.—The Reporter, Sept. 29.

Surveying the French strike wave of August, the Reporter's French correspondent paints an almost classic picture of a trade-union leadership scared to death of the unexpected militancy of their own workers, completely out of touch with the mood of the people, and anxious only to compromise with the government in order to avoid the responsibility of power.

The basic causes are well known and White goes through it again. In one word it is the misery of the workers—"simple, homespun misery, so persistent, so normal, so long enduring" that it has been taken for granted by all except the working masses. The summary fact is that—

"While in almost every modern country over the past 20 years workers have won a higher percentage of the gross national product in salaries benefits, their portion in wages and salaries has dropped." The workers are not only getting less, but they are getting progressively a smaller share all the time. (White does not mention Marshall aid at all, or what has happened to it.)

The government and trade-union leaders had no more idea of the powder keg they were sitting on than if they were in another country. "Labor chieftains—Socialist, Catholic, Communist—had all discussed the strike action since early July but decided it was impossible until autumn. Socialist Force Ouvrière chieftains had met as late as July 20 to discuss the forthcoming government decrees and had decided that the August lassitude made a strike impossible. And then all of France erupted. . . ."

The match to the powder keg was the announcement that the government was going to whittle down social security. "At the first touch of the draftsman's pen to the decree revising the pension system and paring away social-security status, suddenly, convulsively, with the itching irritation of a baited beast, the workers walked out. Not against their mythical enemy, the patron or capitalist boss, but against the state. For in socialized France the state, employing over two million persons, white-collar and industrial labor alike, is the biggest boss.

"And once out, with their grievances given tongue, no simple bureaucratic revision of phrase would win them back. Having challenged the state, they wanted to talk about wages, prices, salaries and misery as well as pensions. . . ."

Thus the workers discovered that without them the state could not function, writes White. And the trade-union

leaders were frightened out of their skins.

"The spontaneous walkouts in August thus caught everyone by surprise. I visited 'Red' Marseilles to call at the Force Ouvrière headquarters for southern France. The bemused regional chief said: 'Nothing like this ever happened before. We have comrades going out on the streets without even asking what the issues are. They're just walking out. After the demonstration strikes of the first three days we urged workers back to the job and I thought we had it settled. I went off for a weekend in the Alps—and when I got back to Nice Monday I found we had a strike all over France.'

"Caught thus at the tail of the parade that was forming without them, the union chiefs—Socialist, Communist and Catholic—raced madly toward the head of the procession to capture its leadership."

"As the strikes developed, a singular mood settled over France. No violence or bloodshed occurred. Both government and the workers, realizing that France was the threshold of disaster, stood transfixed with fear, hesitating before the strike blow."

Here was the real basis of the transfixing fear:

"The Socialist Catholic leadership was pushed from beneath by massive grassroots pressures. The strikers would not go back without a minimum net gain and guarantees against reprisals. Yet the non-Communist labor leaders knew that if the strikes went on it lay in their power not only to overturn the Cabinet but the very machinery of the state itself. . . ."

"At the peak of the strike, one of these leaders said to me . . . 'If the Assembly reconvenes while the strike is still on, no one can predict what may happen. If they submit to us, then parliamentary government is at the mercy of strikers and they are no longer sovereign. But if they don't submit to us, they'll have to try to crush us by force. The Assembly can't function with a gun at its head. We can't go on like this because the nation is at our mercy. We have to feed cities, clean the streets, take care of the sick, and let people work. . . . But if this continues we'll replace the government. And it's difficult to keep the Communists from fusing with us at the base. The government has got to sit down and negotiate with us. . . ."

Here in this quotation is the whole essence of reformist politics quailing before the power demonstrated by the working class.

Who Will Answer Milo Radulovich's Father?

By M. J. H.

DETROIT—Another shocking example of the extent to which fear and hysteria have spread in this country in this period of witchhunts came this week in the case of Lieut. Milo J. Radulovich, an air force reservist.

Lieut. Radulovich was informed that he must resign his commission since he was a "poor security risk," although he had an excellent army record and there is absolutely not a single charge against him. The reason: His father read a pro-Communist Serbian paper, and his sister was known to have participated in organizations under suspicion of being radically influenced!

A case something like this occurred two years ago when a Negro officer, Lieut. Charles Hill, was almost sandbagged because he is the son of his father, the Rev. Charles Hill, who has been active in Stalinist front organizations though he is not considered a Stalinist.

The current crucifixion came to light when the somewhat dazed Lieut. Radulovich protested the ruling and asked for a hearing, which the air force is going to give him in a star-chamber procedure. Two major Detroit newspapers have strongly criticized the witchhunt in the case.

The Detroit Free Press quoted Radulovich's father, "a frightened old man": "I read a Serbian paper, Free Word. It was a good democratic paper during the war. Afterwards it was called subversive and I stopped reading it. But I also read the other paper in Serbian. Is it wrong to get both sides of the argument?"

And he asked: "What has that to do with my son?"

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

Adenauer's Election Victory and German Reaction

To the Editor:

I read with appreciation Hal Draper's intelligent article on the German elections in LABOR ACTION of September 14. Unlike so many State Department Socialists and liberals, Mr. Draper realizes that the Adenauer victory was not a resounding success for democracy in Germany and Europe.

To anyone who reads the German press, it was clear from the first day of the election that Adenauer—supported by America and the vast funds of German big business—was predestined to win. It is true, as Mr. Draper points out, that there was no Christian-Democratic landslide. Adenauer's share of the vote has risen from 31 per cent to 45 per cent and given him an absolute majority in the Bundestag over all the other parties. But this success has been achieved not at the expense of the Socialists, as was hoped, but of all the right-wing parties, whose losses almost match the Christian-Democrats' gains. The Social-Democratic vote remained very stable. With the vacuum left by Schumacher's death and the vacillations and blunders of his successors, the high Socialist vote is a remarkable tribute to the devotion and sincerity of the rank and file.

Adenauer gained his new support from three sources. First, from the lower middle classes who have been ruthlessly exploited by Germany's free economy; second, from the refugees who want to reconquer Germany's lost provinces in Eastern Europe; and third, of course, from the ex-Nazis. It is absurd to argue, as so many do, that the small neo-Nazi vote was due to Germany's new democratic convictions. The voting pattern in this election was similar to that in the early years of the Weimar Republic. From 1926 to 1929, when Germany could claim an economic revival just as miraculous and unstable as the present one, Nazism won the following of only a

lunatic fringe. The middle classes, who a few years later were to acclaim the Nazis as their saviors, were perfectly willing during the "prosperity" to vote for respectable parties and accept the "economic blessings" of the capitalist boom.

I fear that the same is true today. The only people that can be counted on to defend German democracy through thick and thin are the 28 per cent who voted Socialist, despite American pressure and despite the defects of their leadership. Adenauer's majority is composed of millions of Germans who vote for whatever party is powerful at the moment, and who would desert him, if times change, as they deserted Bruening 20 years ago.

The outlook for democracy and social justice in Germany is indeed grim. With Adenauer still in control of the government, capitalism will continue its exploitation of the workers, and nationalism will grow to dangerous dimensions. By re-electing Adenauer, the German people are promoting a return to the social and economic conditions which gave rise to nationalist extremism in the past. Adenauer's election victory will be celebrated in Washington, in Wall Street and in some Socialist and liberal circles in America, but it will hardly cause rejoicing among those who want German democracy to survive and prosper.

Gabriel GERSH

Subscribe to LABOR ACTION —
\$2 a year does it!



LABOR ACTION

October 5, 1953

Vol. 17, No. 40

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

FRANCE'S NEW CANDIDATE FOR DICTATOR

Is Marshall Juin Being Groomed for Franco-Type Coup?

By ANDRE GIACOMETTI

PARIS, Sept. 18—The consequences of the Moroccan putsch for France were underlined last week by a resolution of the "Comité France-Maghreb." This committee is composed of several leading public personalities and is headed by François Mauriac, Catholic writer and editorialist for *Le Figaro*.

Its purpose is to mobilize liberal public opinion on the Moroccan issue. Not to be confused with "Comité France-Afrique du Nord," which is reactionary and unequivocally represents the colonists' lobby, the "Comité France-Maghreb" defends to the best of its ability the interests of the Moroccan people and of all sane people in France.

This is the resolution:

"(1) Moroccan feudalists, inspired and supported by the colonists and by high-placed French officials, have been able to organize a rebellion which, even though it is in direct opposition to its officially proclaimed policy, has not met with any resistance on the part of the government.

"(2) The French government which, under the treaty of Fez, is committed to maintain the existing powers, has not been able to or has been unwilling to impose its policy, thereby condemning France to suffer the consequences of a breach of confidence.

"(3) The recent palace revolution insures the triumph of feudal and religious elements whose devotion to France has been bought with the permission to oppress and exploit the Moroccan people. Consequently the nationalist resistance may well assume the characteristics of a social revolt movement.

"(4) Today's North Africa, completely controlled by backward and reactionary

forces, benefiting from complicity in high places, represents even now a temptation and a basis for the establishment of an authoritarian regime in metropolitan France."

The last paragraph is perhaps the most significant one, and refers to a situation that has been building up for some time, that is, the reorganization of the reactionary elements in France. The extreme right, composed of Vichyites, militarists, colonial elements, large landowners and some business interests, is looking for a way to get back into power.

BASE IN NORTH AFRICA

The Gaullist RPF proved to be an inadequate vehicle for its purposes, since the social conditions for a large-scale fascist movement do not exist in France at the present time. So another formula had to be found, and a number of recent happen-

ings suggest that it is to be a Bonapartist dictatorship with Marshal Juin as potential dictator.

Whereas it is true that the objective conditions for a fascist dictatorship do not exist in France for the time being, the same is not true in North Africa. Due to the war, due also to the rise of national-liberation movements in all colonial countries, the problems confronting France in North Africa have become pressing and their solution can no longer be postponed. This solution the French bourgeoisie is incapable of providing, as it is incapable of solving any one of the other problems before it.

The colonial bourgeoisie, on the other hand, has a solution. It is the same solution that the British colonists advocate in Kenya. Imperitently reactionary, it intends to fight for its solution with an energy that contrasts strikingly with the cowardise and indecision of the government in Paris.

In its efforts, the colonial bourgeoisie is supported by the extreme right in France, which sees in North Africa an unspoiled paradise for its operations and a base for attack on the democratic institutions in metropolitan France.

"STRONG MAN"

Unfortunately for these projects, North Africa is populated not only by colonists but also by 20 million North Africans, who have to be "neutralized" before any attempt on democracy in France itself can be made. The recent deposition of the sultan in Morocco is part of this "neutralization"; so is the current campaign of terrorism and repression in Algeria and Tunisia.

Why has Juin become the leader of this campaign? Because, more effectively than De Gaulle, he is the "strong man" needed by the reactionary elements. Unlike De Gaulle, Juin has been able to build up a considerable machine in government circles, in the army and, naturally, in the administrative apparatus in North Africa.

To begin with, Juin benefits from the more or less overt complicity of Martinaud-Deplat, minister of the interior, who is also controlling Algeria as it is administratively a part of metropolitan France. Juin also has the support of Bidault who, on the eve of the putsch in Morocco, came forth with the now famous words: "I shall never let the Crescent overcome the Cross."

Moreover, Juin also has close ties with Pinay and, during the recent crisis, not a few deputies voted against another Pinay government in order to avoid the possibility of Juin becoming minister of war. Unfortunately, as we shall see, their precaution was in vain.

NEW BONAPARTIST?

On August 18 Laniel and Pleven, the minister of war, signed a decree naming Juin to the post of "military vice-president of the Superior Council of the Armed Forces" and "permanent counselor to the government on all military matters." This means that Juin now no longer depends on the minister of war but finds himself on equal footing with him.

Moreover, being permanent counselor, he can exercise a far greater power over the officers' corps than a minister who falls when the government changes, which is often. On top of this Juin received sweeping powers on the promotion of officers in the three branches of the armed forces and on inspection of army units. In brief, the army has been handed to Juin on a silver platter.

But the real strength of Juin's machine is in North Africa. In Tunisia it is based on the colonialist mafia best represented by people like Colonna, Paux and the rest of the lobby, which is at the present time intensifying its campaign of military repression against the Tunisian nationalist movement.

Voizard's nomination as French high commissioner for Tunisia will only aggravate the situation. Voizard, who has a Vichyite past, is now one of Juin's most devoted stooges. In Morocco, the whole administration is for practical purposes in Juin's hands: the French resident-general, Guillaume, who deposed the sultan on Juin's instructions and against the instructions of the government in Paris; Boniface, ex-police prefect of Casablanca, responsible for the riots and now directing *La Vigie Marocaine*, one of the biggest dailies; De Blesson, Valat and most of the lesser officials. To this must be added the Moroccan quislings, headed by the pasha of Marrakesh, "El Glaoui," biggest bordello owner in Morocco who, in his own words, is engaged in "saving Morocco from anarchy and ruin."

HOPE IN MOROCCO

When the question of the candidature to the French Republic was posed recently, Juin declined, saying that "it involved more boring representative functions than real exercise of power." Is it, then, "real exercise of power" that Juin is interested in? To judge by the elaborate machinery that is being set up, little doubt can remain.

But powerful as Juin may seem, his power rests on an insecure basis. Before he becomes another Franco and turns North Africa into another Spanish Morocco, he will have to break the nationalist movements which, to paraphrase one of Juin's friends, may have lost a battle but are far from having lost the war. The North African nationalists have been taken by surprise, and they are learning the hard way. What there was of petty-bourgeois illusions and rhetorical flourishes is rapidly disappearing, and within months the French reactionaries will find themselves opposed by a harder, more mature and more experienced movement.

Today North Africa can be the grave of French democracy or the beginning of a revolutionary development in France. Which one it will be depends on whether the French working class can unite, whether it can eliminate the Stalinists in time and whether unity of action can be achieved between the French and the North African working classes.

SUMMING UP THE TUC CONFERENCE

British Labor's 'Industrial' Right Wing Still Rules the Trade-Union Apparatus

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, Sept. 16 — The main struggle at the Trade Union Conference has been between the "political" wing and the "industrial" wing. Practically all the members of the General Council of the Trade Union Congress (TUC) are in the latter group and have a decidedly rightish orientation.

It is with the greatest regret that we have to admit the defeat of progressive resolutions of any kind. The only true exception to this was on Thursday last. A resolution from the Post Office Engineering Workers rejecting "wage restraint which might interfere with the freedom of collective bargaining and independent arbitration" was carried unanimously.

On the other hand, a similarly inspired resolution by Stevens of the Stalinist-controlled Electrical Trades Union went a bit further: it was for complete opposition to wage-restraint and for "vigorous campaigning for higher wages." This was defeated by 5 million to 2,614,000 (weighted) votes. This only goes to show that it is not always the resolution but those who propose it which sometimes makes a difference. In voting against the second resolution, Deakin, the head of the Transport Workers, said that the object of Stevens' union was "to project the policies of certain political factions" on the TUC.

EVANS ISSUE

In supporting his resolution (similar to one carried two years ago) Stevens proposed that increased wages should come out of increased profits. Between 1948 and 1952 production increased by 35 per cent, gross profits by 50 per cent and wages by only 32 per cent. Increased wages could come out of these increased profits. This would not affect the prices and would not make the articles more difficult to sell in the export markets.

Another issue which caused some heat was the question of whether Sir Lincoln Evans—who was appointed by the Tory government to a board organizing the

denationalization of steel—had a right to be on the General Council of the TUC. This steel workers' leader will receive \$8400 per annum for a full-time job on the board, two of whose part-time members, Sir Andrew Nasmith and Jack Owen, are also on the TUC General Council.

Whitney of the Boilermakers Union moved a resolution that membership on these executives were incompatible. "It has not been unusual in this movement," he said, "for men to go over to the other side." And when they did, "they were divorced from the trade-union movement and could not even attend branch meetings." He thought it inconsistent with trade-union dignity to accept such appointments and sit on the General Council.

Among those who supported Whitney was J. Brown, representing the Amalgamated Engineering Union. He thought that there was a gulf growing between the TUC rank and file and the leadership. To sit on the boards representing the other side only helped to deepen this gulf. The immediate consequence of having three trade-union leaders on the steel board (denationalization board) was to help the Tories in power.

The resolution was defeated by 4,933,000 to 2,877,000 card votes.

SETBACK

The reader will already have heard of the defeat of the left wing over nationalization. The resolution of the General Council reaffirmed its belief in nationali-

zation but opposed rushing into further projects without time to consider them. While 1½ million bloc votes were having their tea, the resolution was passed by 3,702,000 to 2,640,000.

Roberts of the Public Employees Union described the report as "an abject confession of lack of faith in the principles on which this movement was founded." It would result in the Labor movement's going to the country at the next election with two programs, a political Labor one and a Tory industrial handbook.

Roberts said that the General Council was trying to fill the vacuum between capitalism and communism with "water" (the General Council had agreed to the nationalization of the water supply). Geddes, for the General Council, replied that water was better than hot air.

Railwaymen's secretary Jim Campbell lost by a large majority a resolution calling for a greater workers' share in the running of nationalized industries.

In summing up, we can see the setback of the left wing on the Evans issue, wages, nationalization, workers' control, and a host of minor resolutions. This will strengthen the right wing for the coming conference of the Labor Party at Margate. The affiliated trade-unions have a very large vote, and they elect most of the members of the Executive Committee of the Labor Party. Even if the left wing has the same phenomenal success as last year among the constituency party delegates, it has little hope of framing the next policy of the Labor Party.

Sh-h-h!

We regret to inform our readers that, for reasons which cannot be revealed publicly, the announcement originally planned for this space has been shifted to the bottom of the last page, printed in the Aesopian language.

New York Acquires a Witchhunt 'List' As Regents Implement the Feinberg Law

By PHILIP COBEN

The New York Board of Regents has finally implemented the 1949 Feinberg Law by officially declaring that the Communist Party is "subversive." This means that school authorities are called on to oust all teachers who are members of that party.

The Feinberg Law had provided for the drawing up of a list of subversive organizations by the board. The CP is its first and, so far, its only entry. For several months from December 1952 on, the board held hearings at which the CP was given apparently wide leeway in presenting its case. Last week the Regents published the text of their decision.

There are, obviously, several appreciable differences between this Feinberg Law "subversive list" and the notorious list created and used by the federal government through the Department of Justice. One, the hearings, has already been indicated; another is the fact that an individual CP teacher, before being fired, has the right to a trial and representation by counsel, etc. Even such differences, nowadays, must be noted.

BIGGER PURGE PLANNED

But essentially the Feinberg Law concept is still that of the inclusive black-list proscribing political organizations for their views and destroying the principle that a member of the teaching profession should be judged by his work and competence. It is a legalization of the witch-hunt-principle that Stalinist teachers have no right to a job simply because of their political association. As such it was, on its adoption, part of the current of anti-Communist hysteria, and today it remains so.

As a matter of fact, the more "democratic" accoutrements of the law, which have slowed up its implementation, have caused school boards like New York

City's Board of Education to find their own ways of achieving the same kind of purge, without any specific law whatsoever. However, now that the routine has been gone through for the CP, the city board has announced plans for an even more sweeping purge and investigation of the schools, guaranteed to cast a new pall of fear over the whole system.

CULLING QUOTES

The Regents' decision on the CP has four features worth noting particularly. First is the kind of "proof" which it adduces that the party is subversive, i.e., advocates overthrow of the government by force and violence, quite apart from anyone's opinion on whether the CP does so or not.

The Regents satisfy themselves with what they call "typical examples [quotations] culled from the three greatest of the Communist prophets: Marx, Lenin and Stalin." The "typical" quotation from Marx is a sentence from the *Communist Manifesto*, expressing his view in 1848 on "forcible overthrow." They do not "cull" other, and often more rounded, statements, by Marx as well as Engels on the same problem, which would not serve their purpose. In somewhat the same way they cite some extremely formulated statements from Lenin during the period of the world revolutionary upsurge of 1917-1923, without "culling" others or inquiring further into the tradition of Marxism on the question.

But, in addition, having "culled" these quotations, they proceed to quote Stalin—without this time adducing any reference to force or violence, that is, as far as their "culled" quotations are concerned. It is enough for them to quote Stalin (or Foster, or the CP constitution) in any way approving "Marxism-Leninism."

Their case depends completely on this

type of quotation. In what is apparently brought forward as supporting evidence, in addition, they also cite the CP witnesses' "bitterness and hatred of our American system of 'government by the people'"; their "harsh epithets" against hostile witnesses, etc.

PERIOD OF "GRACE"

Secondly; the Regents proclaim a 10-day period of "grace" during which CP teachers are invited to quit the organization now that its "true character" has at last been revealed to them in the Regents' dissertation; yet the rules announced permit the authorities to oust them even if they prove only membership before this date. It is up to the accused to prove that his membership has since been "terminated in good faith." Until he does so, he is guilty—guilty until he proves himself "innocent." This reversal of the time-honored precept is written specifically into the rules.

Thirdly: The provision for the 10-days' grace period deserves some attention in itself. Formally, as mentioned, it is provided in order to allow for the cases of those who may have joined the CP "without a realization of its true character." It is, however, terribly hard to believe that the Regents really think that their sophomoric little paper on the subversive nature of "Marxism-Leninism" is the bombshell which will at last open any Stalinist's eyes to the sins of the party...

On the contrary, the 10-days' grace will be meaningful, if at all, only for those Stalinist teachers who are ready to quit a movement they believe in out of sheer cowardice and capitulation to the police-club being swung by the state. This is the truth, even though we ourselves would prefer that they abandoned the Stalinist movement out of disgust with its ideology and politics.

According to the Regents' rules, a Stalinist teacher who is spineless, cowardly and plain yellow enough to run like a rat before the cop's billy of the Feinberg Law—and who can prove that he did so in accordance with the period of grace—is fit to teach our children, unlike his misled colleagues who will not scuttle from the party in which they mistakenly believe just because the government labels it subversive.

TWO EVILS

Fourthly: it is to be noted that the Regents are somewhat at odds with the attorney general's federal witchhunting department in another respect besides the ones already mentioned. At the very beginning of its document the Board of Regents states:

"Freedom to advocate changing our form of government into a communistic state, repugnant as it is to the overwhelming majority of the American people, is part of the American heritage of free speech." What is unlawful, it goes on to make clear, is not advocacy of such change in "our form of government" but advocacy of force and violence to effect the change.

Yet, as LABOR ACTION readers saw in last week's issue where we printed the Justice Department's case against the ISL, the attorney general's document time and again limits itself to the charge that the "subversive" Independent Socialists are against the "American form of government," without charging advocacy of force and violence.

There are, it would seem, lesser and greater evils in the witchhunt too, although (as in other cases) we are not required to tolerate either the lesser or the greater.

Oatis Tells Why He Confessed—Without Any 'Russian Soul' or 'Bolshevik Values'

By L. G. SMITH

On April 22, 1951, William N. Oatis, Associated Press correspondent in Prague, was arrested by the Stalinist secret police. A little over two months later, on July 2, he appeared in court and "confessed" to having been a spy for the American government. He was pardoned and released by the Czech government this year, and has now related his experiences in a nationally syndicated series of articles.

Oatis' articles appear to be frank and as objective as possible. After exactly six days of almost continuous questioning, he signed his first confession of espionage. Within a month he was signing any document put before him. All the "confessions," he says, were false.

And throughout his story, his explanation for why he signed and later related a rehearsed confession in court was his feeling that unless he "cooperated" with the police and judges he would never get out of their clutches.

THE MYSTERY

Oatis was neither drugged nor subjected to direct physical torture. His family was not in the hands of the Stalinists, so that no pressure could be exerted on him by threats to the lives of those dear to him. He was questioned beyond the point of his physical and moral power to resist.

Of course no one sitting in safety and freedom can merely point the finger of scorn or derision at a man who buckled even under the pressure to which Oatis was subjected, for no one can tell what his own power of resistance would be under similar circumstances. Yet Oatis' relatively rapid capitulation does throw something of a light on what was once one of the "mysteries" of Stalinist rule: the capitulation of those old Bolsheviks who confessed to equally absurd charges during the Moscow Trials of the '30s, and those capitulations which have followed since then.

At the time of the Moscow Trials there were three schools of thought, each of which had its own explanation for the confessions. First were the Stalinists, Stalinoids and mush-headed liberals, who said that the defendants were guilty and that no further explanation was needed.

Second were the anti-Stalinist Marxists who said that the confessions were extorted by some kind of torture, threats to loved ones, the wearing down of the moral fiber of the victims through a long series of previous capitulations, and the like. This school also pointed to the fact that hundreds and thousands of revolutionists who opposed the Stalin regime stood up to the tortures and were never brought to trial because nothing could break their will to resist. They were simply exiled to the slave camps or shot.

The third school was made up mostly of renegade socialists and other amateur and professional anti-Marxists. Some saw the old Bolsheviks' capitulations and false confessions, the praise for Stalin from the prisoners' docks, as a manifestation of the mysterious "Russian soul." But even more frequently others attributed the behavior of these men specifically to their Marxist training and ideology.

There is something, so the argument ran, about the Marxist dialectic, some-

thing in the alleged Bolshevik adherence to the idea that "the ends justify the means," that made it relatively easy for the GPU interrogators to entrap the old Bolsheviks in their own philosophy, in their own system of values, and thus bring them to their debased and debasing performances in the courtroom.

THE "AMERICAN SOUL"

William Oatis is an individual, as were those of the old Bolsheviks who preceded him on the road to capitulation and self-accusation. His own weakness is not necessarily any more a "proof" of anything about his ideology than was the weakness of a Bukharin or a Zinoviev. But if we were to follow the method of reasoning of those who attempted to draw conclusions about the relationship of Marxist ideology to the confessions, what would we have to say about the ideology represented by Oatis?

As a matter of fact, we do not have to say it, as Oatis makes it perfectly clear himself.

In his articles he does not once claim that he felt any responsibility to the ideas for which he presumably stands in resisting the Stalinist inquisitors. Frankly, and even naively, he claims to have been concerned only with himself, with his own fate. Quite early in the interrogation he implicated those Czechs who had been giving him information. With hardly a qualm he put the finger on the American military attaché in Prague as the man who induced him to spy for America. All he wanted was to take care of No. 1.

One could write pages on how American society instills this ideology in the American people. Getting rich, making a fast buck, every man for himself and the devil take the hindmost... that is one aspect of the vaunted American "individualism," of the ethics of the capitalist market, of the dog-eat-dog ideology of success in the business world and in the

professions, including the profession of journalism.

NO BOLSHEVIK, HE!

If we were to follow the anti-Marxist traducers of the old Bolsheviks, we could go even further. Not one of them capitulated in the short time it took Oatis to come to heel. They had greater powers of resistance than he did. And although most of them were men of stature, men who could be expected to stand up better than the average, Oatis too is not a nobody. At least, when he was arrested, his indignant colleagues of the American press claimed that he was one of the best among them, a very paragon of the independence and integrity which are supposed to be the chief characteristics of the great reporter.

We do not claim that there was no connection between the politics of the men who "confessed" in the Moscow trials and the fact of their confessions. They had been trapped, not by their "Marxist" logic and ideology, but by their inability to rid themselves of the political idea that Stalinism, despite its distortions and oppressions, was some kind of continuation of the social and economic heritage of the Russian Revolution. This predisposed them to their first capitulations to Stalin, and opened the road to their final degradation.

But William Oatis' background, his ideology, the social and economic system which he accepts and represents, were altogether different. Yet he capitulated too; his powers of resistance were, if anything, less rather than greater. This should be a warning, if not a lesson, to those who seek to make a point against their version of the Marxist method out of the Stalinist torture and debasement of the old Bolsheviks.

Get All Your Books from
LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 West 14 Street, New York City

SH-H-H!

DON'T TELL ANYONE

about the Witches' Sabbath brewing for October 31. Secret bulletin on subject is hidden away on page 8.

Treaty with Franco — —

(Continued from page 1)

Franco's government is far from stable.

Two years ago Spain was rocked by general strikes which had freedom as their chief demand. Under the fascist heel, under the utter corruption of the gang which has usurped rule in that unhappy land, the standard of living of the people has been brought to a new low and the economy itself to the verge of collapse. That is why Franco needs \$226 million to bolster his economy.

It is not the "stability" of his regime which makes an alliance attractive, but rather the alliance which is to stabilize the regime.

And that is why this is a black day for the American people as well as for the people of Spain. Despite the determined resistance of a tiny minority in this country, and the more lackadaisical and formal opposition of much wider sections of the population, primarily in the labor movement, the Truman administration was permitted to start the negotiations which have now come to fruition under the government of Eisenhower.

Thus, through apathy and indifference,

the American people will have to share the guilt for propping up and maintaining in Spain a government which denies elementary liberties to its people, and delivers every fighter for democracy on whom it can lay its hands to the jailer or the hangman.

WE WILL PAY

And this guilt is not just a moral stigma. It will have practical consequences of a far-reaching nature. The least of it is the financial burden which will have to be borne by the American people (and the \$226 million are only a start).

In view of the feeble resistance it has encountered in this country, this treaty with Franco will help to discourage and demoralize the fighters for freedom in Spain and all over the world. It will hearten and encourage the most backward, reactionary rulers in the capitalist world, for they now have added assurance that whatever they may do to democracy, however they may oppress and ravish their own peoples, American money and American arms can be counted on to support them.

The American people will have to pay for all that. If this country is to become the policeman of the world, or the power which stands behind the policemen, the contempt and hatred in which it will be held by the masses everywhere will pass all bounds. And today it is so obvious that it hardly needs repeating: among the chief beneficiaries of this hatred are the Stalinist totalitarians.

The action of the American government in joining hands with Franco comes as no surprise to those who have recognized long ago that this government has a deep, organic affinity for supporting capitalist reaction everywhere. That is its favorite, patented, and hallmarked method for "maintaining stability" and "fighting Communism."

That this is so reinforces our conviction that every American who is really interested in freedom and democracy everywhere cannot give political support to this government, even "critically," but must raise his voice in determined opposition to the whole foreign policy of which this aid to Franco is only one of the most cynical and brazen examples.

The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Durkin Amidst the Wolves — —

(Continued from page 1)

public campaign began against the amendments, and Durkin got worried and sought reassurance from Eisenhower. On August 19, he met the president in New York, and Eisenhower promised that he would release "the agreed-to nineteen points even though the Congress was no longer in session."

More time passes and nothing happens. Durkin learns that the White House staff is backtracking; he submits his resignation on August 31. On September 10, Eisenhower tells Durkin that he has changed his mind since their meeting in New York and "could no longer go along with the nineteen amendments."

What depressed Durkin even further was the knowledge that "Republican-sponsored legislation is the basis for most of the nineteen agreed-upon amendments" and that 12 of them had already been proposed by Senator Taft himself.

OPEN HOSTILITY

The AFL convention delegates had before them Durkin's direct charge that Eisenhower had gone back on his word and Nixon's direct denial. They voted unequivocally to endorse Durkin and adopted a resolution accusing the president of a "breach of agreement." The fight over the amendments and Durkin's resignation are the latest in a series of irritants which have been forcing labor away from a position of tacit neutrality into open hostility to the Eisenhower regime.

At last, one should expect, the unions must adopt a position of consistent political criticism and opposition to the administration. Such would seem to be the dictate of elementary political logic.

But that would be reckoning without the muddleheadedness of labor's political line. The same convention that endorsed Durkin's resignation asked the president to appoint another labor man to head the Department of Labor. (But Eisenhower has no desire to go all through this again.)

After explaining in detail how the Department of Labor was slashed to pieces, to labor delegates who know that Washington is in the hands of big business, Durkin says of the underlings he leaves behind in the department: "they will render the wage earners of this nation an outstanding service." One wonders: why didn't Durkin stay on and help them, if that is so?

The labor movement has obviously entered the road of oppositionism but the habit of cooperation with the administration is so ingrained that its AFL leaders are not quite aware of the full meaning of their own actions.

NIXON WARNS

In a speech to the Missouri CIO, John Livingstone, UAW vice-president, said: "Early in the year it was clear to many of us that Martin Durkin's role, as planned by the administration, was a window-dressing role. Behind this kind of smoke-screen, they could roll up the really heavy anti-union artillery. . . . The entire plan

had the earmarks of great political strategy. . . . We can be thankful that the entire political strategy of today's big-business Washington has now been laid in its most naked form before the eyes of the American voter and particularly the eyes of the American worker."

If the action of the AFL convention was ambiguous, this statement is not.

As President Eisenhower's personal representative, Nixon expressed dismay at labor's rising discontent with the administration. The Republicans could hardly have hoped to win active support from the organized working class but they sought at least neutrality. Now even that hope is gone. A foreboding of what the future might bring causes new uneasiness. Will labor form its own party? Nixon felt impelled to mention this question.

"There are those who will say what

labor needs today is a party which is theirs. Let me put out one word of warning. I believe the greatest tragedy that could happen to the American labor movement would be for the labor movement to be a captive of a government or of a political party. . . ."

This warning is somewhat belated. The labor movement is already a "captive" of a political party—a protesting, bargaining, demanding captive of the Democratic Party. And the Republicans just failed in their effort to get a little piece of captive for themselves.

Labor must truly cease to be the captive of any political party; and it can free itself only when it forms its own party which it controls, dominates, owns, and runs under the rules of democracy with at least the same firmness that big business runs the party of Nixon by the dominance of money.

Reuther's Annual-Wage Demand — —

(Continued from page 3)

is accepted (and its cold facts speak for themselves as against the whistling-in-the-dark statements by industry leaders) the auto industry will sell only 4 million cars in 1954, one third less than this year. The impact of this on employment hardly needs emphasis.

In the context of economic uncertainty and recessive tendencies, the risk that Reuther is taking is quite obvious. The whole fight in 1955 may well end up as a purely defensive struggle. The action of the AFL convention this week calling for a basic 35-hour week can become an embarrassing counter-program by 1955.

As a matter of fact, the insistence of the UAW for increased and prolonged unemployment insurance will become louder, at least in Michigan. Of course, such a struggle can be easily tied into the campaign for a guaranteed annual wage; in fact, it is an integral part of it.

But to see the guaranteed wage in the narrow light of only a glorified unemployment insurance scheme would be a serious error.

The projection of the idea that industry should guarantee an annual wage does put the finger of social responsibility on capitalism, a responsibility that it has evaded rather handily in the past when such a challenge came almost exclusively from

the minor radical movements. It is this major social implication which employers are likely to resist bitterly, and which may cause them to raise again the specter of Reuther's "socialism."

However, the hard-boiled industrial-relations departments of the major auto concerns are not going to confine themselves to mere verbal antagonism. They are bound to come up with counter-proposals which take as much as they give in terms of negotiations and new contracts. The pension plan, for example, did not turn out to be as painful to the employers as they had first assumed. Even today, the question is debatable as to who benefited most by the five-year contract. C. E. Wilson is quite proud of it; he claims full credit for the escalator clause and the annual-improvement factor. The resultant "stability" in labor relations—i.e., no major strikes—has indeed been a new development in the auto industry, especially since the big corporations accept the "living document" claim of Reuther.

So many new problems are raised in the complications of a guaranteed annual wage plan that a vast new field of exploration and explanation is required. To list some of them is sufficient for the moment.

• Can yearly production be planned in

an industry whose competitive character and seasonal variations in sales are increasingly noticeable?

• Could a guaranteed annual wage plan cover all auto workers or only those with some seniority? And if the industry's production goes from the current 6,000,000 mark to less than 4,500,000, what happens to the laid-off workers, before the guaranteed plan goes into effect? Are they included in the guarantee?

• Will such a plan signify the end of all strikes, including those over speedup and discharge of union officials, since the prospect of a regular pay check is bound to have a conservative influence on those working?

• Does this proposal tend to freeze a given proportion of the labor market irrespective of the relative weight of that industry in over-all national production? And how does it apply to any shifts from civilian to war production?

In the next two months, many of these questions are supposed to be answered when the UAW unfolds its plan officially. Certainly, one result is already evident. Collective bargaining is going from the hands of the unionists into the hands of experts. For the complicating factors are going to be something difficult for the secondary leaders to understand and discuss authoritatively.

Don't Tell a Damned Soul About Our

WITCHES' SABBATH and WITCHHUNTING ORGY

SH-H!

The following is top-secret, working-classified information, to be used for conspiratorial purposes only. Operation Witches' Sabbath will take place on Hallowe'en when it is least expected. Full details on time and place cannot be given publicly, but you will be informed by secret courier that the zero hour is 9 p.m. on Saturday evening, October 31, sometime this year. Walk East on Fourteenth Street to 114 WEST 14 Street, making sure that you are not followed by less than a dozen; knock on door of cover headquarters, Labor Action Hall. Agenda consists of Hallowe'en Hi-jinx (bring your own jinx). All agents caught revealing said information to unauthorized personnel will be authorized. Gather ye broomsticks while ye may.

A Labor Action sub is \$2 a year
Get it EVERY week!