

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JANUARY 30, 1956

FIVE CENTS

Ignazio Silone Replies to 'Labor Action':

"My Political Faith"

... page 6

Auto Economy:
THE CASE OF THE MISSING THEORY

... page 2

India, Spain, Argentina:
IN 3 LANDS, YOUTH TAKES THE LEAD

... page 5

In the Southeast Asian Cauldron:
THE SOCIALIST MOVEMENT OF MALAYA

... page 3

Crucial Strike at Westinghouse Needs Massive Support!

By BEN HALL

Fifteen weeks is a long time to be on strike. That is how long members of the International Union of Electrical Workers (IUE) have been out against Westinghouse.

There have been longer strikes in recent times: against General Motors in 1945-6; against Chrysler in 1950. But then the companies kept the plants closed; it was a contest of union endurance against company greed.

Westinghouse is more than a long strike; it is critical.

The company adamantly refuses to compromise; it rejects real negotiations; it wants to organize a back-to-work movement under protection of police clubs and court injunctions.

This is the first large scale, nation-wide strikebreaking campaign in a mass-production industry since the CIO became entrenched in industry.

By holding out as long and as solidly as it has, the IUE proves that it can emerge as one of the most powerful industrial unions in the country. This strike is its critical moment, the first big struggle in its career.

Westinghouse is apparently not satisfied with undercutting the unions demands; it wants nothing less than to break the strike and drive the union out wherever it can.

The Taft-Hartley Law gives it a terrible weapon. It need only put scabs and strikebreakers into a plant; declare the strikers "discharged"; petition for a decertification election in which the "discharged" strikers are barred from voting and only scabs are given the ballot.

The fight to keep the plants closed becomes a life-and-death union matter.

It's Not the Time For Routinism

The fight is not merely over working conditions; it is becoming a strike for unionism against open-shopism.

With these as the stakes, the attitude of the newly united labor movement is almost incredibly routine and complacent.

Except in local instances, strike news is frozen off the columns of the daily press. While a press controlled by employers can be expected to smother the union in silence,

(Continued on page 2)

ONE MILLION WILL HELP

In a noteworthy action, the combined AFL and CIO councils of New York City, in a joint meeting of their executive boards, voted to raise \$1,000,000 in thirty days for the Westinghouse strikers as well as to collect food for the 11,000 strikers in the metropolitan area.

Symbolically, this action was taken at what was the first joint meeting of the two labor centers since the merger, convened to make plans for local unification. The striking union, IUE, is a CIO affiliate.

But there was no report of plans for support of the crucial electrical workers' strike by mass demonstrations and actions around the city. That's still the need.

The Foreign-Policy Bust Is Bipartisan

By GORDON HASKELL

As the current debate on foreign policy continues to bubble and boil, the following should never be left out of sight:

The policies with which the United States has fought the cold war have been supported by the two major parties.

The major, critical decisions have been made by large bipartisan majorities.

What differences there were have been confined either to isolated actions of second-rate importance, or to disputes over the amount of money which should be allocated to this or that accepted program.

Isolated individuals in both parties have maintained a running criticism of the assumptions on which this country's foreign policy has been based. But in a showdown (such as the vote to give Eisenhower a free hand in deciding how to react to a Stalinist attack on Formosa) the overwhelming majorities of the leaders of both parties have gone down the line with the administration.

In an election year, the chances are that each party will seek to derive what benefit it can from foreign policy issues. As long as the incredible Mr. Dulles is around as secretary of State, the Democrats (like the Stalinists) will not lack for propaganda ammunition with which to score political bullseyes at his expense. But even if cheap partisan "victories" can be fashioned by the Democrats out of

Dulles' very special weakness for diplomatic blunders, the fundamental problems posed by the cold war to the whole world will remain just as real and menacing as they were before.

And the fact is, now that some of the headier fumes of the Geneva Spirit have evaporated, it appears not only that the cold war as such is far from disappearing, but that in the present phase American foreign policy is even less capable of countering Stalinist advances than it was when military struggles played a more prominent role in the over-all conflict.

"NOT VERY HAPPY"

British Minister of State Anthony Nutting spoke recently of the "gray world" which now envelope diplomacy, and, according to one newspaper correspondent "lamented Soviet policies on Germany and Moscow's dangerous meddling in the Near East."

Adding his lament to that of the British gentleman comes Senator George, chairman of the powerful Senate Foreign Relations Committee. George has said that this country's foreign policy "is not in a very happy state at this time." He was joined by another influential senator, Richard B. Russell of Georgia, who charged that the State Department is "sterile of ideas," and by Senator Byrd who says billions of dollars have been squandered without effect by the American government's programs abroad.

Since these gentlemen are all Democrats, it can be expected that they might color the picture with dim tints for partisan political purposes. But they are joined by as non-partisan a supporter of the bipartisan policy of military containment and/or retaliation as one might want to find—the *New Leader*, whose special supplement "Communism's Postwar Decade" (December 19) is prefaced by none other than the redoubtable Sidney Hook, who climaxes his introduction as follows:

"Some superior souls tell us that

(Turn to last page)

SPOTLIGHT

Who's Getting It?

Elsewhere in this issue, our Detroit correspondent notes that, in this era of superabundant prosperity for all, only a handful of auto workers make enough money to take advantage of the Ford stock plan, according to the statement of Reuther's union. The great and dazzling war prosperity has not exactly filled as many pockets as one might think after reading hosannas in the press.

It appears the same is true for businessmen, reported the Senate's Small Business Committee on January 11.

Small manufacturers did not get a proportionate share of the 1955 prosperity, it said. That's putting it mildly, for what worried the committee was the large number going broke.

"Why, in a period characterized by three-shift industrial activity, tremendous sales volume, and record-making profits, do we find such a high rate of small-business bankruptcies?" it asked.

And listen to this statement by the

committee, headed by Senator Sparkman of Alabama:

There "is an ominous significance in an atmosphere which makes it possible for the nation's mammoth corporations to reap record profits while the general run of small enterprises are worse off than they were three years ago." (Emphasis added.)

In 1954 the rate of failures (42 per 10,000 concerns) was the highest in 12 years. The 1955 average will duplicate this, it added.

These failures, it explained, were among small businesses, for the average liability of the firms going bankrupt in the first seven months of 1955 was about only \$40,000.

Hence the committee attacked the "growing domination of the market place by large corporations." But it had no new ideas on what to do about this process which has been lamented for close to a half century now.

Why didn't "more of the bloom of

(Turn to last page)

The Case of the Missing Economic Theory

By JACK WILSON

Detroit, Jan. 21

Surely one of the great mystery stories of 1956 is the case of the missing economic theory. Have you forgotten it? That simply proves how completely it vanished.

It was the well-publicized theory that the auto industry is the bellwether of American economy: "As the auto industry goes, so goes the nation." Its leading spokesman, backed by hundreds of economic professors at universities, was Harlow Curtice, president of General Motors. Backed by a \$250,000,000 advertising campaign for 1955, this outlook inundated all other viewpoints.

Now it happens to be a not unimportant theory. As a matter of fact, it was close to a sacred theory, doubted only by positively subversive elements: people read, see, live and think.

Strangely, in the year 1956 even Curtice forgot to mention that theory in his annual economic forecast just delivered in New York City. Quite the contrary. He predicts a good year, in spite of a projected 15 per cent cutback in auto production for the year!

Last year, at this time, the auto industry was roaring with activity. It is still pouring out cars, but at a much more subdued pace.

If auto is the pace setter for 1956—as so many economists believe—what

does it mean that at the present time 50,000 auto workers just got laid off? And that another batch of at least 150,000 have been working short work-weeks for the past month at General Motors, Ford and Chrysler plants?

NO PICKUP EXPECTED

What is the significance of the automotive trade-journal writers and so-called auto-industry reporters suddenly going silent on a very important issue—namely the state of the new-car inventory? Could it be that in the last three weeks it reached the absolutely phenomenal figure of 1,000,000 new cars in inventory?

Nor does the auto industry expect a major spring pick-up. Rather, it plans to rush 1957 cars to the market as early as possible next fall to save the industry's yearly record from disastrous downturns.

At the present time, new-car sales

in the Michigan area have fallen 15 per cent from last year's comparable figure, while used-car sales have dropped 50 per cent. This is likely to be the national picture too, although it must be said that accurate information is hard to come by these days, as the apostles of peace and prosperity dominate the political and economic world.

Although the UAW has been somewhat quiet about these developments, the pressure in the shops for a 40-hour week is terrific, and soon the international union will have to move in that direction. A 40-hour week is possible for the rest of the auto-workers only if Ford, General Motors and Chrysler lay off another 50,000 and keep car production down to around 150,000 units weekly.

IT'S NOT RUBBING OFF

Even then the auto industry should have major shutdowns of at least one month a piece for each major plant to prepare the 1957 models. Fortunately, the auto workers will be cushioned for three of those four weeks by the modified Guaranteed Annual Wage. The first week, of course, nobody gets anything, under the waiting-week provisions of the unemployment compensation laws.

In the face of these realities (and nobody in the auto industry would make a more favorable forecast), this writer is puzzled to see how 1956 is going to top 1955, unless John Foster Dulles puts on an-

other brink-of-war act to whip up the economy.

Another remarkable commentary on the social scene was the reply of the UAW this week to a challenge by a congressman on why the UAW didn't accept the Ford stock offer for its hourly rated employees. The reply, based on a study of economic conditions of the auto workers in 1955, was just this: Only a small handful of workers made enough money to be able to take any advantage of the plan. Mind you, in the year 1955, the greatest, most prosperous, most sacred year in the history of a sacred society, successful beyond all dreams of man, etc., etc., only a small minority of Ford workers could possibly save \$300 to buy stock at half price! It's almost enough to make a man doubt the permanence and validity of the theory that every man can become a capitalist in this country.

Besides the lay-offs this past week, Detroiters suffered from another shock, especially in financial circles. Ford stock failed to zoom up, as many of them expected; and more important, it failed to give the stock market the kind of boost it was supposed to. In marked contrast to the same time last year, the market has been losing ground since the first of the year. Again, why this should happen in a year marked as bigger than 1955 by everybody-who-counts, supplies the basis for another mystery story; worth looking into in the near future.

Strike at Westinghouse - -

(Continued from page 1)

the labor movement should be expected to ring out on behalf of its most embattled section. Yet no mass rallies, no outpouring of steel, auto, rubber workers on picket lines and protest parades.

Above all, the progressive wing of the labor movement must be alerted. The IUE, coming out of the CIO and part of its most socially advanced section, is making a fight to move forward. If it wins, it becomes the uncontested leader in its industry and its influence and bargaining power rises in the mergers and moves of tomorrow. If it loses, it sinks, at least for the moment, to second place, and the stock of the whole progressive section of the labor movement drops.

The Westinghouse strike is literally and directly the affair of the whole labor movement and of its left-wing in particular. The IUE has the duty, not only the right, to demand active support on the lines from every local, from every Industrial Union Council, from every Central Federation of Labor in its areas.

George Meany has just charged that the NAM wants to destroy unionism. This generality can be pinpointed at Westinghouse.

The AFL-CIO announces a broad campaign to organize the unorganized, to take in white-collar workers and government employees. Meanwhile it first has to campaign for a victory at Westinghouse.

The Issues Are Plain

All the big plans, all the grandiose speeches, all the promises of tomorrow become empty without a united fight on behalf of the IUE.

The issues are not complicated. The union wants:

- (1) A fifteen-cent wage increase.
- (2) No five-year contract. Its present contract has a year to go. But the union is willing to concede a three-year renewal now.
- (3) No time-studies or work standards for workers not on piecework without union consent.
- (4) Arbitration of all questions, including work standards, to be provided in the grievance machinery.

The company wants a smaller wage increase, a longer contract. It rejects all union rights over work standards and resists any modification of its own unilateral authority in this field. The union is ready to submit the dispute for arbitration; the company refuses and insists upon total union capitulation.

First Major Challenge To Speedup Drive

The fight of the IUE to curb and control company rights over work standards is probably the most crucial question of all. It goes to the heart of a dispute that has raged in all mass-production industries under the name of "speed-up."

Every conference and convention of the United Automobile Workers, for example, is plagued by this question and sturdy resolutions are invariably passed. But it

has been left for the relatively weak IUE to make this question a strike issue on a national scale for the first time.

This is the first major challenge to management rights on control of production standards in mass manufacturing. Even the powerful UAW has been unwilling or unable to face up to it.

As the months go by, this central question becomes increasingly important. Assembly lines and production methods are revolutionized as automation comes in. Operations and jobs become obsolete. New duties, new standards, new rules, new rates—all come up for settlement. Thus far, each new plant reorganization is handled by unions locally in piecemeal fashion. But as the unions move to face the challenge of automation, they need new and wider rights over production.

And the IUE is leading the way by its demands at Westinghouse. The present strike began on October 16 but it has its origins in the fight with Westinghouse over production standards that led to a short company-wide strike on September 13.

Locals Under Attack

If the labor movement has remained bogged down in the rut of routine, events have not.

- Local 601 in Pittsburgh found

its picket lines curbed and cut by a court injunction.

- Local 130 in Baltimore has seen scabs driven through picket lines under armed police escort.

- Local 617 in Sharon, Pa. is hit by an injunction against picketing.

- Local 449 in Trenton, N. J. finds its pickets cut to six at each plant gate under terms of an injunction. Members have been arrested by local police.

- Locals at Bloomfield and Edison, N. J. saw heavily armed police escort carloads of scabs into their plants.

- Local 746 in Columbus had 89 of its members arrested as one died on the picket lines. (The CIO Council reported: "The officers charged them swinging clubs, pulling revolvers in two instances, cursing and beating the workers, knocking them to the ground and beating them while they were down.")

- Local 759 at Mansfield, Ohio saw scabs enter their plant in groups while Governor Frank J. Lausche, Democrat, denounced union pickets.

The united labor movement has money; it has millions of devoted members; it has influence and resources. It can open up a nationwide campaign of publicity and organize giant workers' demonstrations in support of the IUE strikers.

How long will it wait? and why?

At last available!

The **SECOND** volume
of
Leon Trotsky's
THE FIRST
FIVE YEARS
OF THE
COMMUNIST
INTERNATIONAL

384 pages.....Paper covers
\$3.00

All orders must be accompanied
by payment.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

READ ABOUT INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM

in the series of special pamphlet-issues of Labor Action

10 cents each

No. 1—The Principles and Program of Independent Socialism

No. 2—Independent Socialism and War

No. 3—The Fair Deal: A Socialist Analysis

No. 4—Socialism and Democracy

No. 5—What Is Stalinism?

No. 6—Socialism and the Working Class

BRAZIL

The Multiple Faces of Juscelino Kubitschek

By JUAN REY

Santiago, Jan. 16

Brazil's highest court has not yet declared Juscelino Kubitschek the president-elect, but he is now abroad visiting the United States and Europe in that official capacity, receiving from his hosts the corresponding honors with due protocol.

The man who has stepped into the vacancy created by the suicide of Getulio Vargas, as Vargas' heir, is a politician who knows how to be all things to all men, to promise all things to all men, as he goes visiting all the countries of the world.

He was elected with the support of the Communist Party and with the blessing of the Kremlin; but he has visited President Eisenhower and asked for favors from Well-Street.

He is the representative of the nationalist tendency in the Brazilian economy, that is, of the tendency toward a demagogic autarky; but he has probably gone into deals with U. S. capitalists on exploitation of Brazil's oil and uranium, putting these national resources on sale in spite of the fact that he promised his voters to "defend the country's oil and mineral wealth against imperialist expansion."

The victorious contender for the presidency, put up by the "Getulists" (Vargas) camp with the support of the Stalinists, presents himself as a good Christian and promises to "pacify" Brazil. But the reality is another matter.

He was the candidate supported by the so-called Social-Democratic Party (PSD) of Dutra's; but this party has nothing to do with social-democracy or socialism and is actually the party of the industrial and bureaucratic oligarchy.

He was also the candidate of the "Brazilian Labor Party," i.e., the Vargas party (PTB); but this party is not a workers' party; it is supported by the backward workers, whose interests are in truth quite antagonistic to those of the PSD oligarchy.

OPPOSITION GROWING

If he takes possession of the presidency, it will be due to the coup engineered by Gen. Teixeira Lott, and this means that he must install the general as his minister of Defense; it also means that his presidency will be the legalization and continuation of the present regime of Teixeira Lott and Nereu Ramos, who was the provisional president installed by the coup.

Kubitschek's political power and freedom of action will also be very relative, to put the matter cautiously. The present regime is a military dictatorship which governs the country under a state of siege and censorship. If political persecution of the opposition is not greater, it is only because the opposition is not fighting openly, but waiting for further developments. But it is growing from day to day.

It is not only a matter of the National Democratic Union (UDN) and the electoral bloc that backed Gen. Juarez Tavora, the runner-up. The crux of the Brazilian political situation lies in the strong opposition that exists within the navy, the air force, and the army against

Teixeira Lott and Nereu Ramos. The civil and military opposition is postponing its own coup only because it is expecting the Lott-Kubitschek regime to run into new troubles.

Hence the amount of attention that was paid to Kubitschek in the U. S., on his visit there, was badly received in Brazilian opposition circles. It is not my business to teach Mr. Dulles and Mr. Holland of the State Department how to do their job in Latin America, but still it is a fact that the Dulles-Holland policy in Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia and Chile has continued to be marked by disasters.

BURNING TWO CANDLES

From Spruille Braden's "democratic imposition" of the Roosevelt-Truman policy, the U. S. diplomats went to the opportunist and cynical policy of supporting Peronism in Argentina, Getulism in Brazil, the Nationalist regime in Bolivia and Ibannez in Chile—a policy set back with Peron's overthrow. It is quite possible that the excessive kindness that the State Department has been showing to the representative of "Brazilian Peronism" will also wind up with a similar disastrous end.

It is worth noting that both Wall Street and the Kremlin are paying attention to Kubitschek. But this opportunism of the imperialist diplomats in both camps will not serve to overcome the contradictions in Brazil's internal policy, which is based on class antagonisms.

If Kubitschek sells out the country's oil and uranium to the U. S. and gets the "big money" for industrial investment that he wants, then he will lose the support of the Getulist party (PTB) and its real head, who is Vice-President-elect Jango Goulart, and also of course the support of the CP, and hence his popular base. Then he will have to depend on the military force wielded by Teixeira Lott, which is a risky proposition, and thereupon he declines in his usefulness to the industrial bourgeoisie insofar as he reveals his social and political weakness.

At that point, the door will be opened to an attack on this second edition of Getulism by the military and political opposition.

It is difficult, if not impossible, to dance with several partners at once, and Kubitschek wants to dance simultaneously with the PSD, the Getulist party and the Communists Party, with the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, with the Stalinists and the Catholic Church, with the army and the democratic opposition, with both the Kremlin and Wall Street. He wants to defend economic autarky and still get "big money" for investments. He wants to burn his candles both to God and the devil.

IN THE SOUTHEAST ASIAN CAULDRON

The Socialist Movement of Malaya and Singapore

This sketch of the socialist and nationalist movement in Malaya and Singapore was published by the Newsletter of the Anti-Colonial Bureau of the Asian Socialist Conference. We present it for the factual information of our readers.—Ed.

In Singapore there is the People's Action Party and also the Labor Front. Both organizations were formed at the end of 1954. Both contested the Legislative Assembly elections in April 1955, although the People's Action Party condemned the new constitution, and decided in advance that it would do no more than assume the role of opposition.

This was the role which the Labor Front thought they might occupy; but the voters, tired of the Progressive Party, which had collaborated so long with the colonial administration, and unsympathetic to the so-called millionaire's party, the Democratic Party, voted the Labor Front into office. Three of the four candidates of the People's Action Party easily won their seats.

Formed on November 21, 1954, the People's Action Party, by the middle of 1955, had a membership of more than six thousand and five branches. The party stands for an independent democratic non-Communist Malaya. This means a fully elected sovereign legislature and the unity of Singapore with the Federation of Malaya. Malaya should be the national language. Independence should be given immediately.

Prominently in the party's election manifesto was a promise to introduce legislation for a Worker's Charter which would include (a) minimum wage; (b) equal pay for women for equal work; (c) 40-hour week; (d) two weeks paid annual holidays; (e) child endowment and maternity allowances; (f) unemployment benefit; (g) enlargement of Workmen's Compensation Ordinance into a comprehensive scheme of compensation for industrial injured; (h) minimum 48 days paid sick leave per annum.

The People's Action Party also stands for free compulsory education up to the age of 16, slum clearance and subsidized housing, complete Malayanization of the public services within four years; support of local industries by protective tariffs and subsidies, and full control of Malayan trade and gold dollar earnings, and abolition of British destination control of rubber.

Secretary-general of the People's Action Party is Lee Kuan Yew, a 33-year-old lawyer. A socialist from student days, Lee is now the adviser of a large number of trade unions. He first came into prominence in 1952 when he handled negotiations for the postmen when they came out on strike. He is one of the party's three Assemblymen.

Chairman of the party is Dr. Toh Chin Chye, formerly on the British Medical Research Council scientific staff. The treasurer is Ong Eng Guan. The party is managed, between conferences, by an Executive Committee of twelve, which is responsible for the selection of officials.

TEST WILL COME

Meanwhile the Executive of the Labor Front is "reviewing party structure, and possibly a new constitution may be adopted in the light of experience." Possibly this might mean the rebirth or reawakening of either the Labor Party, or the Socialist Party, or a socialistic party with a new name.

This will need careful organization, and most of the people who might be able to do this in the Labor Front are at present very busy in the business of governing. But if any of them are successfully to contest the next election it would seem essential for them to be supported by a mass-membership political party.

The Labor Front is pledged to establish a democratic Welfare State in Singapore, in which the wealth of the island is so utilized that the masses enjoy the full fruits of their labor and industries.

Housing should be subsidized by the government, slums cleared, free medical services provided for everyone, all children should get free compulsory education, passenger transport nationalized, a basic wage fixed for certain categories of workers, unemployed insurance introduced, Emergency Regulations removed, land needed for the welfare of the people compulsorily acquired, a Singapore citi-

zenship created for election purposes, national income and national wealth equitably distributed.

The leader of the Labor Front is Mr. David Marshall, 39 years old, a criminal lawyer by profession, and is the only person of European descent elected to the Assembly.

After the general election in April 1955, Mr. Marshall was called upon to form the government. He formed a cabinet of seven members, belonging to different communities.

Both the Peoples Action Party and the Labor Front claim to be socialist. In a small island which lives as an entrepot, it is very difficult for any organization to prove its socialism. Even the colonial government planned to nationalize the transport system for passengers; it had already taken over the telephones.

The testing time will come later, after the July Federation elections, when the People's Action Party are expected to open branches in all the Malay States. A rather weak Labor Party is already in existence in the Federation, but it has no contact with the People's Action Party or the Labor Front. Possibly the Labor Front may organize a mass-membership party and also invade the Federation. No one seems to know at the moment what will happen.

At the moment there is certainly nothing but disunity among Malayan socialists. Further left the secret Malayan Communist Party remains probably the closest organized of all Malay's political parties. There are no shades of Communism as there appears to be shades of Malayan Socialism. Clashes of personalities are not permitted.

Fenner Brockway's View

Following is another view of the socialist movement in Malaya, by the well-known socialist anti-colonialist expert Fenner Brockway, writing in the London Tribune of Jan. 6.

Brockway wishes to stress that the Stalinists' guerrilla warfare in Malaya has "been defeated not so much by arms as by the emergence of democratic institutions" that have brought to the fore a socialist leadership in the native government, and this process can be completed only if the Malaysians are given complete independence and sovereignty.

"The answer to Communism," he writes, "must be to prove that democratic political institutions can be used for social and economic freedom. The need in Malaya and Singapore, as everywhere else, is for a democratic socialist movement which is as determined to bring about a social revolution as are the Communists."

He continues as follows on the subject of the Malayan socialists.—Ed.

In SINGAPORE there is hope. A Labor Front Government under David Marshall holds office. Marshall is an extraordinary man with a magnetic personality. He is a humanitarian, a liberal of socialist instincts, a born leader of men.

But his conversion to socialism is recent and unfinished and he won the election by his personal glamor rather than by the support of a movement. He has little organized working class behind him and no living association with the trade unions.

There is another socialist-led Party in Singapore, the People's Action Party. It began from the bottom-up, organizing the workers in trade unions. But the fact that the Communist Party is illegal has meant some infiltration by the Communists.

News has just come that it is to establish itself in Malaya as well. Here is a Labor Party, but this organization is weak and has suffered from splits.

The urgent need both in Singapore and Malaya is that the democratic socialists shall join forces. An agreement between David Marshall and the P. A. P. leaders who genuinely believe in democratic socialism would prove invincible.

A remarkable political experiment has evolved in Malaya. Side by side with the war in the jungle a beginning has been made in self-government. Its legislature must now be made fully elective. The right of Malaya and Singapore to independence must be recognized as the rights of India, Pakistan, Ceylon and Burma have been recognized.

How to Vote Against Franco

In Southern France, near the Spanish border, several hundred refugees of the Spanish Civil War are living in exile. For the last 17 years they have known nothing but poverty, disappointment and continuous insecurity.

The Franco regime, which took power with the aid of Hitler and Mussolini, has just been admitted to the United Nations.

The U. S. is giving this regime diplomatic support in exchange for air bases; Russia has re-established profitable trade relations and is preparing to re-establish diplomatic relations; tourists from the world over are vacationing in "inexpensive" Spain, while the victims of the regime meet a wall of oblivion and indifference.

To oppose the cynicism of the big powers and the forgetfulness of public opinion, we must prove our solidarity with these people. We must show that we have not forgotten them who have fought our battles and who have suffered a defeat that is also ours.

One of the most tangible ways to show this solidarity is to send clothing, needed more than ever during these winter months. Any articles of clothing you can spare should be packaged without delay and sent to:

SPANISH REFUGEE AID
80 East 11 Street, New York City

Concluding "DOWN ON THE FARM"—IV

Why Labor Must Organize the Farms

A farm labor employer put it succinctly when he said that the efforts of organized labor in agriculture were "like going after an elephant with a popgun."

The corporate farm interests have sized up the situation realistically. They control it, and they know it. The trend is toward their kind of farming, and they know it. Their economic and political power is growing, and they extend it at every opportunity.

The possibility of a serious trade-union drive in agriculture is, they feel, remote. Nevertheless, it is what they fear most. They have therefore grasped every opportunity to strike at the labor movement and weaken it if they cannot destroy it. If they can wound the trade union movement on the industrial front, so much better are their chances of keeping it out of agriculture. In their book, the best defense is an offense.

To further their cause, the big farming interests spend a great deal of money, time and energy. They cooperate closely with organizations in the industrial field which share their point of view.

One looks in vain for a similar sense of reality or a comparable effort on the part of the labor movement. Yet entirely apart from the fact that agricultural workers obviously need unions, there are pressing reasons why organized industrial labor urgently needs organized agricultural labor.

STANDING THREAT

It is axiomatic that a large mass of unorganized workers is a standing threat to the labor movement. And though the farm labor market is effectively insulated from the forces in the rest of the economy, the insulation only works one way. It keeps the rest of the economy out, but it doesn't keep the farm workers in. Whenever they can, they migrate to cities and towns to seek other employment.

And industry is migrating right out to meet them. It is a case of organized industry meets unorganized worker; organized industry hires unorganized worker; result: no union.

The textile industry in the South is a graphic illustration of this trend. It is located mainly in the small towns and cities of the rural South. Union organization has been most successful in the big cities, least successful in the small towns. The well-established textile unions will always be insecure so long as the hundreds of thousands of workers on the farms and in the smaller Southern cities are unorganized.

Decentralization is bringing industry close to rural areas. The sight of an industrial plant cheek by jowl with a field of tomatoes no longer makes us gape. Many of the people who find work in these newly migrated plants are part-time farmers, whose interests as small farmers as well as industrial workers need trade-union protection, and whose support the labor movement must have.

THEY DID IT IN EUROPE

Over fifty years ago the trade unions in the most democratic nations of western Europe saw the dangers arising from an unorganized mass of rural people, and the trade unions adopted a policy and program for the organization of agricultural workers. As a result, in Great Britain, Norway, Sweden, Denmark and Holland, from half to four-fifths of the farm workers are now members of trade unions. In western Germany and Austria, organizations of land workers have been revived.

Such organization in democratic unions constitutes a bulwark against Communists; on the other hand, if democratic trade unions neglect to organize these workers, Communists may well organize them to their own end as they have in France and Italy where the majority of agricultural workers are organized into Communist-led unions.

However, trade unions in the United States have been much slower in recognizing the threat to the security of their own organizations from the corporation farming interests. The labor movement has not been fully aware of the need for supporting the organization of their natural allies—the small farmers, agricultural workers, and employees in industries located in rural areas.

The fact that trade-union experience

From "Down on the Farm: The Plight of Agricultural Labor," published by LID and National Sharecroppers Fund, 112 E. 19 Street, N. Y. C.

in this country has been largely confined to urban areas means that a certain amount of retooling will be needed for the organization of agricultural workers. However, trade unions in the fields have found by trial and error that there are certain essentials for the successful organization of field hands.

LESSONS IN AMERICA

Here is what the professionals in agricultural unionism have found:

(1) The enterprises in the area to be organized should be large-scale corporation-type farms and closely related agricultural processing industries. Organization should be on an area-wide basis, and not confined to a single farm.

(2) The majority of workers must be regularly employed and be established local residents with ties directly in the community in which they live and work. Migrant workers are too migratory to form the basis of a self-sustaining union.

(3) If the majority of workers have common economic, racial cultural and religious associations and speak the same language, organization is easier. Some of the organizers should be Negroes if a significant number of workers in the area are Negroes. For Spanish-speaking Americans of Mexican descent, organizers fluent in Spanish are required.

(4) Substantial local support outside the group of workers to be organized must be obtained. This may be found in other trade unions in the area, in church groups, among local businessmen and sometimes among smaller farmers who, with good reason, fear the corporate farm interests.

(5) When workers in agricultural production are effectively organized, they have much more economic power than workers in an industry. In industry, a plant closed by a strike means the temporary postponement of the manufacture and sale of a product. In agriculture, an effective work stoppage can mean that the employer loses a year's investment in a crop. Therefore, such economic power must be used only as a last resort.

The area-wide associations of employers, including those set up to handle contract labor, are so organized that they could conduct collective-bargaining negotiations with their employees, provided the employees were organized on a similar basis.

Organizers with wide experience in the special problems of agriculture have been trained by the National Agricultural Workers Union and could constitute the core of an organizing staff.

CHANGES COMING

A new agricultural program is now in the making in Washington.

In his message to Congress in February 1953, President Eisenhower stated that "the chief beneficiaries of our price support program have been the 2 million larger highly-mechanized farm units which produce about 85 per cent of our agricultural products. The individual production of the remaining farms numbering about 3.5 million is so small that the farmer derives little benefit from price supports."

This statement was followed by a report published by the Department of Agriculture in April 1955, entitled "The Development of Agriculture's Human Resources."

Basically, the report recommends the displacement of the majority of these 3½ million farmers from the land through relocation of industry in areas where the farmers may be gainfully employed. It suggests that food-processing and forest-products industries may be among those which will be interested in shifting their plants to rural areas where there is an abundant labor supply. State and local authorities, business and labor are called on to cooperate in a program for retaining farmers for industrial employment. The report also recommends the consolidation of the lands of small-farm operators into larger and more productive units. In other words,

(Turn to last page)

A Bit More Than You Expect from Hollywood

By MEL BECKER and BERNARD CRAMER

Contrary to the type of appeal made by its ads, "The Trial" is the first Hollywood film to deal in a more or less sophisticated and knowledgeable manner with the Stalinist movement, particularly with Stalinism's manipulations of racial issues.

The praise must be understood as strictly relative; but after a surfeit of films of the "I Was a Communist for the FBI" type, seeing this one is something of an experience.

It has a minimum of crude red-baiting. The CP is counterposed not to the FBI, or to patriotic stoolpigeons, but at least to a character who is supposed to represent an honest, pro-democratic liberal. While the liberal turns out (with no evidence that this is the deliberate intention of the script) to be something of a hopeless idiot in politics, that too is not lacking in verisimilitude.

The plot takes its start from the arrest of a Mexican boy, in a California town, for the murder of a girl. The girl had died of a heart attack, but the state is out to prove that this was due to the boy's alleged "felonious assault," which would make the charge technically murder.

A Stalinist attorney, Arthur Kennedy, convinces the boy's mother to give him the case. Glen Ford, a young law teacher, still wet behind the ears, is spending the summer working with this lawyer to gain practical experience. The CP apparatus makes the case a national *cause célèbre*, complete with a Madison Square Garden rally in New York to raise funds.

But Ford, acting as the trial lawyer, riddles the state's witnesses and the boy is likely to be acquitted. At this point the CP operator, Kennedy, makes it clear that the Stalinists are out to have themselves a martyr, and insist on putting the boy himself on the stand. This, in Ford's opinion, would lead to his conviction. It does.

But Ford, the hapless liberal, has finally waked to the realization that (a) the CPer is a CPer, and (b) he himself has simply been used as a tool. Thereupon, after conviction but before sentence, he goes before the judge to denounce himself as an imbecile and Kennedy as a Communist. His appeal to the judge is, "The Communists are out to make this boy their martyr; therefore don't you impose the death sentence."

This works: the boy gets a prison-farm sentence, instead of what appeared to be the mandatory death sentence, on a technical loophole frankly presented by Ford as an evasion of the law; the CP lawyer gets a contempt-of-court sentence for race-baiting the judge (a Negro) in an attempt to provoke him to stick to the death penalty; and Ford makes a little speech about how he too thought there was race prejudice in the town at the beginning but now everybody is for justice.

THE HAPPY ENDING

This last aspect of the Hollywood ending is, however, belied by the whole of the film, which is a good deal more honest in its presentation than the pat speeches with which it closes. The script has shown that *nobody* except the Stalinists were ready to do a thing to get justice for the Mexican boy.

The town's respectables were a lynch mob, inflamed with racism and led by KKK elements, barely turned back by the reluctant sheriff—and only under the prodding of the CPer. The district attorney (not a racist) was simply out to convict. The sheriff (not a racist himself) had promised the mob that the boy would be "legally" executed, and so his own career hung on the legal lynching of the boy.

Presumably the political moral of the film is that the alternative to the Stalinists' demagogic defense of minority rights is the liberals' honest defense of them; but this moral, expressed in last-scene talk, is refuted by the plot itself. Without the CP the boy would have been convicted in a jiffy, and quite possibly lynched before he had a chance to be convicted. On the other hand, the CP was out to hang him with a trial and with a spectacular "defense." The happy ending engineered by Hollywood is not an impressive piece of script-craft.

As mentioned, it is doubtful whether the liberal is intended to emerge as quite as much of a political cretin as he does.

For one thing, the West Coast CP lawyer to whom he attaches himself unawares is obviously a public and nationally known character; for at the New York "Garden" rally he is cheered by 20,000 Stalinists as an old friend. Yet dazed liberal Ford knows nothing about him (and not even his best friend has told him) till he personally sees him operating in New York as a party-line fundraiser. And the time is not the '30s when something like this might have happened but in the day of McCarthy.

In fact, the McCarthy Committee (called the "Battle Committee") is in the script too; and here "The Trial" scores high. This is surprising given the sensitivity of Hollywood on this score. Yet the film takes the investigating committees on, and, what is more important, utterly destroys any possible rosy picture of those committees.

Obviously the rabid fear of McCarthy which was present in this land not so long ago has died down; but even so the investigating committees are handled exceedingly roughly for a Hollywood film, even for today.

PLUS AND MINUS

The lynch-mob scene is excellently done too. The tone is truthful cynicism. The sheriff calms them down but his motive is neither justice nor mercy but his own hide. The frenzied racists simmer down too, but the decisive appeal to them is that business and real estate in the town would be hurt if it became the center of a lynching scandal; and, as mentioned, they are guaranteed a legal lynching instead, in virtually so many words.

The Madison Square Garden rally, held by the "All-People's Party" (a thin disguise for the ALP) as a CP front, is spottily well done, from the "progressive" children's camp chorus with their dove-embled T-shirts, to the money-collecting models, to the "Philadelphia '8."

But while much of the nature of the CP is justly represented, the talk in the film leaves the impression that the CP is merely a monstrous conspiracy whose ranks are filled only with careerists, neurotic young female students, etc. At the only point where the script inserts a wordy explanation of why people are attracted to the party, the film degenerates into the same old Hollywood nonsense.

Dorothy McGuire in a tender scene with Glen Ford, explains why she became a Stalinist fellow-traveler. She was at a small college; she wanted to feel "different."... As for other joiners, they were the ugly students or the neurotic ones. The only other prominent CPer in the film is the lawyer, played skillfully by Arthur Kennedy—the crass opportunist, the manipulator *par excellence*, the bureaucrat, the shrewd demagogue.

And the two cases leave only one impression: that the CP does not recruit anyone for idealistic reasons, that it is merely the conspiracy that it is painted by the know-nothings.

But what do you expect for your money from Hollywood? The consolation is that "The Trial" shows more than it says.



LABOR ACTION

January 30, 1956 Vol. 20, No. 5

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

Editor: HAL DRAPER

Associate Editors:

GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL

Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

Upsurge in India, Argentine, Spain—

Youth Takes the Lead in Three Lands

INDIA

Young Socialists Go with the Left SP

By MICHAEL HARRINGTON

Socialist youth are able to play a particularly important role in the newly independent nations of the colonial revolution. This fact has been emphasized in the news coming from India in the last few months.

There, the Young Socialists of the SYS (Samajwadi Yuwak Sabha) have been in the forefront of the struggle which recently culminated in the split in the Praja Socialist Party and the creation of a new, and militant, Socialist Party.

Readers of LABOR ACTION are familiar with the general developments within the PSP which led to the new party. One crucial element in this process was the adherence of the youth to the left wing.

Indeed, a central issue between the Praja right wing and its militants concerned a conference held last June by the SYS. The SYS extended an invitation to Madhu Limaye, a suspended PSP leader, to speak at the Puri meeting. The PSP retorted, by banning participation in the gathering for party members.

The youth replied that the party was without authority to take such a step. At this point, Acharya Narendra Deva claims to have written a letter which approved of the conference if the SYS guaranteed that there would be no discussion of intra-party matters. The SYS denies that it even received such an offer. At any rate, the youth conference was held as scheduled and was one factor in the development of the left-wing majority in the SYS.

In September the executive of the SYS met and declared its adherence to the left-wing insurgents. They resolved "that PSP has ceased to be an instrument of social change and hence the formation of a new party of Socialists is a historical necessity for the country."

One of the crucial issues which the

SYS declared on when it took this stand centered around the PSP tendency which was moving toward Nehru's Congress Party. The youth charged at the Puri Conference that

"... in the ideological sphere, a persistent attempt is being made to blur the separate identity and distinctive features of socialism evolved through years of struggle and sacrifice and make it subservient to a conservatism that mouths radical phrases in order to preserve the existing order. Incidentally, it is the same set of people who two decades back had become an instrument of Communist domination inside the socialist movement, and who are seeking today to make it a constituent of the emerging national front under the aegis of the party of the status quo.

"The constant talk of coalition and cooperation with the ruling party paralyzes the will of socialism to achieve power and create a new society, and the clever talk about class struggle and revolution tomorrow and inaction today disrupts the developing agitations and struggles against injustice and class oppression."

It comes as no surprise that this po-

litical criticism of the PSP right-wing leadership was joined to a denunciation of their bureaucratic politics. Indeed, the criticisms which the youth made against the right-wing ideology could serve as an almost classic description of bureaucratic tendencies in social-democracy.

In addition to taking this general stand on the PSP intra-party question, the SYS press gives a general impression of militant socialist activity.

In Benares, the SYS rank and file defeated their leadership who were going along with the party right wing.

In Kampur, the Stalinist-sponsored United Democratic Party was defeated in the student elections at Christ Church College by the SYS. In that election, the SYS campaigned on slogans of "Rule by the majority and complete freedom of speech and criticism to the minority," and "To strive to create a group of uncommitted and independent nations, which may exert its influence in favor of peace as against the two mutually warring blocs."

At Allahabad, the SYS won the key points in the Allahabad University Union, thus ending three years of the Stalinist domination in that school.

In addition to playing this kind of militant role among the Indian youth, the SYS has joined with the PSP left and its publications have been crucial organs of communication for the Lohia group during the split.

It is, of course, impossible to make any kind of a detailed analysis of the situation from this distance, but all the evidence in the SYS press—in terms of ideology and action—points to the fact that the socialist youth of India have taken a militant stand on the basic questions facing their country.

As more information comes in, Challenge will keep its readers informed of developments among the Indian youth.

STUDENTS Vs PERON

By EDWARD HILL

Further evidence of anti-fascist tendencies among the youth of Spain came to light this week.

The information was similar to reports which have come from that country in the recent past in that it emanates from a spokesman for the regime and not from any of the student groups themselves. This particular analysis, a pamphlet by Dr. Lian Entralgo, the rector of the University of Madrid, was considered important enough to be transmitted to Franco himself.

According to Entralgo, there is a ferment among the Spanish youth which constitutes a real threat to the regime. Unless steps are taken to counteract this development, Entralgo says, Spain is "each day drawing nearer a point where it will convert itself into real and true 'deviationism.'"

This is especially true, reported the university rector, since the youth are an index to opinions "latent in the society to which they belong" or "privately expressed" in that society.

In particular, Entralgo was disturbed by the failure of official Franco propaganda to make any dent in the thinking of Spain's youth. All of those thirty-five and under—deprived, according to Entralgo, of the experience of the civil war—are likely to be apathetic or even hostile to the regime. (The New York Times, source of this report, points out that the percentage of the Spanish population which is under 35 represents more than 60 per cent of the nation.)

The reason for this development, Entralgo said, was that the Spanish ruling class had a record of "unsatisfactory behavior," in particular in the way in which they imposed a "stifling" censorship upon all intellectual activities. Because of this, Spanish youth are becoming susceptible to other political ideologies, especially those which "offer social justice and real participation in public life and the widening of the professional horizon, which is today so limited for the majority of the youth." (There is a marvelous candor in the Rector's horror that his students are attracted to politics which call for "real participation in public life"—we all know what that means!)

Entralgo's analysis follows upon a series of similar statements, most of which have been reported in Challenge. Among those publicly disturbed by the emergence of anti-regime tendencies among the youth are Franco himself; Raimundo Fernandez Cuesta, secretary of the Falange party; Jose Giron, minister of Labor; and the Very Reverend Angel Herrera, bishop of Malaga. Last year a poll at Entralgo's university revealed that the majority of the students were opposed to Franco.

Entralgo summarized his concern by noting that "Political ferment is due above all to strong skepticism as to Spain's future and to the lack of determination shown by our government in solving the problems affecting Spanish life—especially in the social and administrative fields." "Social inequality," he added, "is appalling."

In 1951, this discontent exploded in a series of political strikes which involved a million people. In the last two years, it has continually expressed itself in terms of discontent among the youth. Indeed, some sources within the Spanish underground feel that Franco might have fallen in 1951 if he had not received American aid in the nick of time.

This recent information makes it clear that the youth will have a role to play when that fall finally comes.

SPAIN

Rector Warns of Student Disaffection

By ELI FISHMAN

In the two other articles on this page, there are reports on the role played by young socialists in India and in Spain. Still another story, similar in nature, was recently in the news. It was contained in an article entitled "The Revolution in Argentina's Universities" by Gladys Delmas, which appeared in the January 12 issue of The Reporter.

According to Delmas, Argentine students, in many cases led by socialists, appeared in the revolution as a "mature and responsible movement, remarkable in a generation that has grown up in a political and intellectual vacuum..."

The details of the article bear out the assertion. Under Peron, education had been totalitarianized. 1250 professors were fired or resigned in protest in a three-month period. The imprisonment and expulsion of students was the price of political activity. Peronists, many of them totally unqualified for the post, were given the university jobs.

On September 23 the dictatorship fell. On the 24th the University Federation of Buenos Aires (F.U.B.A.), an anti-Peronist student organization with a socialist and radical-democratic leadership, initiated the setting up of student committees. The dean's office was occupied, a notary was called in to seal files, an accountant went over the financial books.

Then student assemblies began to take place. They decided to fire flagrantly Peronist or incompetent teachers (their exact position on academic freedom is presented in a confused manner in the article, as will be seen.) Other teachers were told to continue their courses.

On September 24 Dr. Atilio Dell' Oro Maini, a conservative, was appointed by

Leonardi as minister of Education. The students immediately convened a meeting, and came up with three nominations for the post of rector of the university. These were submitted to the minister. Their first choice, socialist Jose Luis Romero, was later appointed. The quick use of the mass meeting as a technique of action, which probably won him his job, seems to have been a normal student weapon in this period.

When the minister of education announced shortly thereafter that totalitarians of the right and left would be barred from teaching, the students were quick to protest once more. They took the position that "scientific capacity and ethical probity" should be the only criteria for teaching posts. How this relates to Delmas' assertion that they also believed in firing all Peronist professors is not quite clear in the article.

In addition to the socialist-radical tendency represented by the F.U.B.A., a much less influential organization of Catholic students came into existence after the revolution. Their group, the F.E.U., is openly conservative, and, according to the Reporter, the left-wing Catholics (Christian-Democrats in this case) are still in the F.U.B.A. The Catholic group, however, is described by the Reporter writer as having little chance of becoming a decisive voice in student life.

Finally, The Reporter notes that the socialist-led F.U.B.A. has placed the principle of worker-student solidarity in its program. During the dictatorship itself students had engaged in clandestine activity with the workers, and now all student programs call for university extension courses in which students qualified to do so will teach working-class groups.

YSL CLASS • NEW YORK

TUESDAY EVENINGS
at 8:15 p.m.

Three Sessions on

THE PERMANENT REVOLUTION

by
HAL DRAPER

- (1) Feb. 7—
Development of the Theory in Russia.
- (2) Feb. 14—
The Permanent Revolution and World Revolution.
- (3) Feb. 21—
The Permanent Revolution and the World Today.

114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

Young Socialist CHALLENGE

organ of the Young Socialist League, is published as a weekly section of Labor Action but is under the sole editorship of the YSL. Opinions expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of the Challenge or the YSL.

By IGNAZIO SILONE:

MY

POLITICAL

FAITH

A Reply to Critics

By IGNAZIO SILONE

Rome, January 15

In these last two months I have received several letters from American friends as a result of articles of mine, or articles about me, appearing in the press of their country, in which were posed some questions of a philosophic and political nature to which I have no difficulty at all in replying with clarity and conciseness, since I believe that in this way I may also clarify the questions in regard to my conduct in practice in recent years.

1. My Faith

I do not adhere to any system of philosophy, to any ideology, or to any orthodoxy. I think that all the ideological systems inherited from the last centuries, like the society that produced them, are in crisis at present—which does not mean that they do not contain some partial truth. I think that this has been the lot also of Marxism, in all of its variants. All metaphysics has lost its self-evidency.

Despite that, I remain a socialist. My principal criticisms of the existing social order are of a moral and politico-economic character. Only socialism can create a true democracy. An essay of mine, with the title "The Choice of Comrades," which appeared some months ago in *Dissent*, reflects more or less faithfully my way of thinking. My way of understanding socialism is fairly close to the Proudhonists'; my way of considering men, and their "foolishness," comes from the Christian-Popular tradition.

At this point one could ask me how it was possible for me to carry on practical political activity and participate in the leadership of socialist parties and groups, while having so individual a mental set, with such strong extra-political and even anti-political bents, as my novels reveal. My reply will be frank and candid: indeed, it was not easy; in fact it has been ever more difficult, both for me and for my comrades; all the more so in a situation like that of post-war Italy, in which the rules of the political game have become more and more degenerate.

2. The Third Front

In 1931 I left the Italian Communist Party, having firmly decided to keep far away from political parties for the rest of my life, and to continue the struggle alone, as a writer and an independent socialist. I remained faithful to that aim until 1941, when I yielded to the vigorous insistence of some friends, so that at least for the duration of the war I might help the underground organization of Italian socialism that was about to be absorbed by the Stalinists, with Nenni as accomplice. I have related in a chapter of some twenty pages, which will appear in a volume in honor of U. G. Mondolfo, with what political conditions I finally accepted this; a good documentation of these events is to be found in Aldo Garosci's book, *History of the Exiles*.

The recollection of that period gives me the opportunity to set down the significance I attributed to the formula of the "Third Front," which I had already pointed to in an interview with Clement Greenberg that appeared in the *Partisan Review* (Autumn 1939) and in another with Jean-Germain Tricot that appeared in *Nouvelles Littéraires* (Paris, August 26, 1939). Having adhered to socialism in the midst of the First World War, at the age of 17, attracted to it by the Zimmerwald Manifesto, my problem was this: Could one assume the same attitude toward the Second World War? I tried to formulate the answer in 13 points, which I called "Theses on the Third Front." The first three points give a general idea of it, and they are simply—

"(1) The Italian socialists affirm that the present war, besides being like the war of 1914-18 an imperialist and capitalist war to corner raw materials and markets, bears very grave consequences for the internal regime of every country, and on its outcome will depend to a considerable degree the future situation of humanity and in particular of the working-classes.

"(2) The attitude of the Italian socialists toward the present war is therefore dominated by their anti-fascist position, and by their firm conviction that democratic liberties constitute very useful premises for all future progress by humanity.

"(3) The decisive front on which fascism can be halted and destroyed is the home front of each country. Only on this third front can the social and political problems from which fascism has sprung be resolved. The only adversary capable of defeating fascism on the third front is socialism. The military defeat of the fascist powers must be considered only as a prelude to the decisive struggles which will take place on the third front. The democratic character of the powers presently

at war against the fascist states is neither homogeneous nor unalterable. The state of war, especially if prolonged, can also modify in a totalitarian direction the internal structure of the democratic states. The Italian socialists are therefore determined to safeguard liberty of criticism and autonomy at all times even against the democratic governments. The politics of the Italian socialists takes its inspiration solely from the interests and ideals of the Italian and international working class...."

Of the points that followed, the most important were those on anti-colonialism and on the condemnation in advance of any division of the world into spheres of influence. These theses were accepted by the foreign center of Italian socialism, and served as a guide for our action during the war. The quotation above should clarify: first, in what sense we had departed from the position of Zimmerwald; second, in what way our support of the war was conditioned. This distinction recurs later under the new conditions created in European socialism by the formation of military blocs and by power politics.

3. The PSU and the Atlantic Pact

When the war was over, with the defeat of fascism, my withdrawal from practical politics was delayed by the necessity of preventing the Communist Party from capturing Italian socialism. The objective was partly realized by us, but under quite confused and contradictory conditions.

One of the outstanding episodes of that struggle was the founding at Florence, in December 1949, of the Partito Socialista Unitario [United Socialist Party], into which various democratic socialist groups merged, with the exception of the social-democratic Right (Saragat-Andreoni). The PSU lived for a little more than a year alongside the other two parties that called themselves socialist, one headed by Nenni and the other by Saragat, and led a very hard life.

Its difficulties were as much material as political. It was the only Italian political party that had decided it would exist solely by the support of its own members; these were about 12,000 in number, and they did not succeed in paying the party headquarters rent or the printing of a weekly. All of us of the leading committee worked without pay.

But the political difficulties were much greater: I have tried to analyze them in a piece that I called "Cinque Tesi Sui Movimenti d'Opinione nell'Epoca della Politica di Massa" [Five Theses on Changing Opinions in the Era of Mass Politics]. In this piece I condensed the precepts of my political experiences in this second post-war period.

As compared with the past, our political life is now radically transformed. The general insecurity pushes individuals toward mass organizations. Small groups can still have some importance inside mass organizations: isolated, their function can be of a cultural nature at most.

Since the differences between the PSU and the PSDI (Saragat) were not on questions of principle but of tactics, it was necessary to unify the two parties. Moreover, the Socialist International exerted pressure on us in this direction. The previous aversion of the PSU for the Atlantic Pact seemed the major obstacle to rapprochement and unification.

On October 13, 1950, the leadership of the PSU approved a long statement on the policy "For Peace and Democracy," which appeared in print in a pamphlet under the title "Peace and Liberty," and which contained a partial tactical revision of the policy followed up to then. I pass over the preliminary statements in which the document reiterated the correctness of the socialist criticism of Soviet foreign policy as well as American and particularly bitterly criticized the policy that had prevailed at Yalta and Potsdam; and I reproduce the part concerning the Atlantic Pact:

"They (the socialists of the PSU) have fought for a long time for the formation of a European federation which would permit socialism to defend peace on its own positions; but the continuing Soviet pressure has brought about the conclusion of an Atlantic Pact which has forced European socialism, without renouncing its federalist aims, to continue the struggle for peace on positions withdrawn further back, like those constituted by the Atlantic Pact; and on this pact they are obliged to exert a tenacious and organic action together with the comrades of the other European countries, in order to keep it purely defensive and to ensure that the resurgent military power does not encourage militaristic and reactionary tendencies. . . . At each difficult conjuncture, in the face of any threat of conflict, we socialists will therefore always be for recourse to negotiations, mediation, arbitration, and any other democratic procedure that may preserve peace and

The November 28 issue of *Labor Action* carried an article by our Rome correspondent, Lucio Libertini, entitled "The Case of Ignazio Silone," a vigorous criticism of the well-known Italian novelist's political role in the socialist movement. We sent it to Silone and invited him to reply to it. The accompanying article is his response. His own title for it is: "My Way of Thinking on Some Important Questions."

At the beginning of this article, as well as in a note to us, Silone mentions that he has also received "letters from American friends" to which he is likewise replying in this article. No doubt this accounts for the fact that there are many references in Silone's article which do not seem to refer to Comrade Libertini's criticism.

Of course we expect Comrade Libertini to comment, if he so desires. We have room on this page only for a very general remark of our own.

Concerned as we are only with the picture of Silone's present politics which emerges from his statement, surely it must be considered regrettable that a man who has in the past rendered such signal services to the fight for socialism and human rights against fascism should now justify his alignment with a war bloc which is the denial of everything he stood for. While we are glad to present Silone's side in this space, we must say on our own part that it reads to us as a vivid example of the intellectual-political decomposition of a whole generation which once stood up firmly against all enemies of human emancipation, but today, disheartened by "The God That Failed," has gone after other idols, no less alien to socialism and the best aspirations of mankind for freedom. This document is part of the tragedy of our times.—ED.

permit the solution of international problems in accordance with justice. But, in order to be able to fulfill our peace-making function without misunderstandings, we feel the duty to make very clear to all that we do not intend in any way to compromise on the defense of democratic institutions or on resistance to all armed aggressions. . . ."

The declaration ended by criticizing the plan for a European armed force that was not made subject to a European political authority. After this, to facilitate the unification of the PSU with the PSDI (Saragat), I resigned as secretary of the former, and at the same time I announced to my friends that I would retire from active political life, continuing my struggle as an independent writer. So closed for me the parentheses opened in 1941.

4. The Crisis in the CP And Its Perspectives

After my retirement from active politics and party life, the press at various times took note of my solidarity with some Communists who had broken with Stalinism. This happened with Ceslaw Milosz, whom I presented, on his request, to a press conference in Paris at which he stated the reasons behind his political and spiritual crisis; and this was repeated with Elinor Lipper, whom I had known as a girl, and whom I met again in Zurich after 11 years of deportation in Siberia.

The motives for this solidarity of mine seem to me so obvious and comprehensible that it would be idle to try to explain them; it is a matter of human solidarity toward those who pass through the same experiences as I did, knowing as I do how hard and painful they are; and it is also sympathy toward all those who escape from prison. These same sentiments, even before any political rationalization, inspired me to undertake the defense of Cucchi and Magnani, as well as of Seniga, at the time when they were made the targets of threats and slanders by the Stalinist apparatus. These are situations that can be understood only by those who have gone through them.

But the very fact that my solidarity is extended to friends who escape from the Stalinist apparatus in the most diverse directions (from Titoists to left extremists) should suffice to reduce its importance to true proportions. There are, however, little would-be politicians who cannot conceive of a disinterested act; and each time, they thought I would return to active politics on the fortuitous platform of the deviationists of Communist origin with whom I solidarized myself; and when they realized after a while that they were mistaken; they charged me with being confused. The truth is that on the day when even these little imbeciles may be persecuted for their opinions, I would undertake even their defense, because I am for liberty for all and even for imbeciles.

The Communist Party is at present going through a serious political and organizational crisis, especially among the workers and intellectuals; to a lesser degree among the peasants but even among them there are clear symptoms of disaffection. The little groups of ex-Communist deviationists of various tendencies (in Italy we have at least five) have lived until now in expectation of the Stalinist thaw that would bring the still-absent worker masses into their ranks. But the crisis of the Communist Party has already assumed grave forms and this mass influx to the groups of ex-Communists is not taking place.

Why? The explanation lies in the social and ideological composition of the Communist Party and in particular the dynamism of each stratum that forms a part of it. I do not intend to put forth here an analysis that I have already presented before. I want only to recall that the Communist Party is an amalgam in which, around the bolshevik nucleus, are grouped the most diverse and heterogeneous elements: revolutionary peasants, free-thinking intellectuals, nationalist ex-partisans, vaguely socialist workers, etc. The tearing-away of all these very diverse elements cannot, however, take place in a single direction.

(Continued bottom of next page)

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

Discussion on Israel, Arabs, Minority Rights

To the Editor:

LABOR ACTION has pulled few punches in its attacks on the Israeli leaders and their fantastic policy of jingoism and calculated atrocities. This is quite refreshing in an atmosphere so charged that New York's Mayor Wagner has found it expedient to proclaim "Zionist Organization of America Membership Month" in accents turgid enough to satisfy even a Ben-Gurion, if not indeed the shade of Jabotinsky himself. (Could anyone imagine a mayor of New York City proclaiming "Lincoln Brigade Membership Month," or even—despite "free world unity"—"Foreign Legion Week"?) LA has of course not spared the Arab warhawks either, as is right and proper. Thus much for sins of commission, where there is little to choose between contenders.

As for sins of omission, here again LA correctly chastises the Zionists for their chauvinistic—yes, racist—habit of viewing the Arab DP much as the American frontiersman viewed the red Indian; and correctly insists on the necessity of planning a multi-national state. The counter-stroke here, to maintain due symmetry, would be a sharp critique of Arab crimes against Jewish minorities. This has not been gone into.

Although in general the approach to Jewish minorities in the Arab states has not been particularly good, the pursuit of symmetry would in this case have yielded up its reward, for it is precisely in the area of treatment of ethnic-cultural minorities that at least one Arab state has put Israel to shame. I refer of course to Tunisia, where the avowed theory of the nationalist government is that of a multinational state, where Jewish Boy Scouts and Moslem groups jointly maintain order at Bourguiba's homecoming celebration, where the Jewish community is deliberately given representation in the government and the leading committee of the Neo-Destour. I would venture that the "Ingathering of Exiles" is sweeping up proportionately few Tunisian Jews, who have no reason to be eager to become "exiles" from a country in whose future they have a stake.

While Tunisian Jews, as valued co-workers, help build independence in the former French colony, for whose autonomy the blood of so many Arab patriots was shed, Ben-Gurion buys more Mystère jets from . . . France! Israel consistently votes with the American bloc in the UN, including the issues which are pure self-determination vs. colonialism. As Mayor Wagner puts it, Israel can be counted on.

The issue in North Africa, as everyone but gutter journalists admits, is not Stalinism vs. "our free world ally"—it is imperialist colonialism vs. freedom. Nasser's recent arms deal with Czechoslovakia is inept, but what are we to say of the long-standing Israeli arms deal with France? Thoughtlessness and bad taste are excessively mild characterizations—it is impossible not to assume deliberate intent.

It is futile to appeal to the professed "socialism" of the Israeli majority parties—they are put to shame by the nationalist "moderate" Bourguiba. An Israeli who is a socialist must instinctively demand that Israel solidarize itself with the anti-colonial struggle, and call on

colonial Jews to fight beside their Arab and Berber compatriots. If we know in advance that no Zionist can do this, it is merely that no one—repeat: no one—can be a Zionist and a socialist at the same time.

Not Kibya, not even the yellow franchise is the chief shame of Israel—but the Mystères and Dr. Eban.

ELMER SIMMS

COMMENT

I should like to comment that in taking Tunisia, Comrade Simms is taking the Arab country which has been best, by far, in the attitude of its Moslems toward its Jews. It is not typical of the Arab states outside "French" North Africa; that is, it is not typical of precisely those Arab states that are threatening the life and independence of Israel as a state.

Secondly, even inside Tunisia, it is the militantly pro-independence movement of the Neo-Destour and its labor allies which champions this enlightened policy, which is also bound up with its anti-clerical (or at least secular) orientation; whereas it has been charged that the Old Destour is tainted with anti-Semitic sentiments, which are not entirely absent even in Tunisia. The same good Jewish policy is generally true of the Istiqlal freedom movement in Morocco. There is, one sees, an important relation between the degree of modern social character borne by the movements in the Arab countries and their Jewish policy.

Thirdly, it is worthwhile mentioning that there is a disturbing problem with relation to the Jews of Tunisia, a problem due to the social and economic position of the Tunisian Jews and not to the policies of the Tunisians. As Tunisia advances toward full independence from France, it will inevitably and justly tend to abolish all the restrictions, explicit and implicit, which were imposed by imperialist rule on the "Tunisification" of every department of life, economic as well as social and political. But for historical reasons a good part of the Jewish community exists in areas (like the legal profession) where their predominant position may be progressively squeezed out, not by discrimination against them but by the removal of discrimination against the Tunisians, for instance by the "Tunisification" of the legal system.

As for other Arab states like Iraq, or for that matter Egypt, their policy of legal discrimination against religious, ethnic and cultural minorities has traditionally been as reactionary as their regimes in general. (But, incidentally, it has not been specifically anti-Jewish, just anti-minority, at least up to the rise of the specially exacerbated hostility against Israel's establishment.) The Zionists are perfectly correct in pointing the accusing finger to the reactionary Arab regimes on minority rights, in defense of their own sins, only they seem quite unaware how much they are confessing when they can "justify" their own guilt by saying "You too" in this direction. If all this "bastion of democracy" can say is "Some Arabs are just as bad," the Zionists can hardly hope to inspire support.

I think Comrade Simms' spotlight on the Israeli government's pro-colonialism in the UN is a good contribution; but I think his first paragraph is overstated. As far as "atrocities" go, the Arab forces have pulled their own; LA's political discussion of Ben-Gurion's policy of "mas-

sive retaliation" by raising the ante in the border fighting had, I think, a different and better emphasis. Also, ringing in the Lincoln Brigade and the Foreign Legion in connection with Mayor Wagner's gesture invites effective rebuttal from Zionists; I would rather put the stress on the fact that this governmental kudos is being given a partisan-political movement. No doubt Mayor Wagner, like so many others, cannot distinguish between the Jewish people and the Zionists, who represent a reactionary political movement within the Jewish people.

HAL DRAPER

Gandhianism

To the Editor:

I have been properly impressed by Philip Coben's recent articles on the split in the Indian SP, but most annoyed by his sectarian treatment of the Gandhian socialists. Swinging his Marxist meat-cleaver vigorously but indiscriminately, Coben has reduced a complex ideological question to a simple equation: Gandhian (equals) right-wing.

It is an easier charge to make than to make stick. With flawless logic Coben points out that one of the reformist leaders, Jayaprakas Narayan, is a Gandhian who recently deserted socialist politics for Vinoba Bhava's land-gift movement. He then concedes "the undoubted fact that Lohia [the leader of the new left-wing party] hangs on to Gandhian theory while striving at a radical socialism." How embarrassing for Coben: The Good Guys wreck his equation by being Gandhians, just like the Bad Guys!

The fact is that there is no single Gandhian tendency, as Coben implies, but several Gandhian tendencies, one of which is in the vanguard of the new party. Gandhi was a saint, true enough. But he was also a political leader of considerable stature. As a result, he has both saintly disciples and political disciples. Among the latter there are reformist Gandhians and revolutionary Gandhians, just as there are bourgeois pacifists and revolutionary pacifists in this country. With all the subtlety of a watchmaker wearing mittens, Coben chooses to ignore these distinctions.

The revolutionary Gandhians are primarily interested in the weapons of mass struggle which Gandhi forged in the furnace of the national independence movement. Lohia, as anyone familiar with his recent history knows, is trying to develop Gandhi's techniques for use in the class struggle. Most of them, incidentally (mass disobedience of unjust laws, certain kinds of economic boycott, non-cooperation with state authority, etc.) are inherently extra-legal, and by definition anti-reformist.

Far from denouncing these efforts as class-collaborationist, Western socialists should regard them with interest and sympathy. At the very least they should adopt an open (that is, an empirical, scientific) attitude, and not condemn these experiments out of blind, sectarian dogmatism. Is it inconceivable that Indian socialism, ideologically "impure" by our standards, should make an independent contribution to socialist theory and tactics?

BOB BONE

REPLY

Comrade Bone's letter badly misrepresents my articles.

PHILIP COBEN

Nowhere at all did I "reduce" the "complex ideological question" of Gandhianism in India to "Gandhian equals right-wing." In fact, I pointed out more than once that the left-wingers consider themselves Gandhian too. Indeed Bone quotes this, without somehow being embarrassed.

The relationship between Indian reformism and Gandhianism is a little more complex than the simple-minded equation which Bone invented. In my Dec. 26 article I put it briefly as follows:

"In India, socialist reformism tends to take on a specifically national form, as elsewhere, and in India a national-traditional basis for reformism is at hand in Gandhianism, with its pacifist rhetoric and social-pacifist antagonism to class struggle."

I doubt whether Bone intends to deny the strength of this anti-class-struggle, social-pacifist impact of Gandhianism (including Gandhi's Gandhianism) in India, and its role as a basis for the national form of reformism.

He seems merely to be replying that there are also pro-Gandhians who are for the class struggle and who want to be revolutionists even while retaining some degree of loyalty to Gandhian ideas.

But if he will get over his anger about Marxist meat-cleavers, he will recognize that it is in my articles on the Indian split that this characteristic of the Lohia party is described in some detail and with emphasis, and that it is only in LA that there has been a "dialogue" between Marxists and some American representatives of such revolutionary pacifism.

Yet, with talk about watchmakers and mittens that is as ill-applied as it is ill-natured, Bone writes that "Coben chooses to ignore these distinctions."

The real difference between Bone and us, however, is something quite different. With our Marxist views on pacifism, we are of the opinion that the Indian left-wingers' aspirations toward class-struggle activity and revolutionary perspective is in contradiction with their pro-Gandhian sympathies (just as that is true of Bone himself).

This may be true or not in Bone's eyes, but it is not refuted merely by pointing to the existence of a left-Gandhian wing.

It is also not clarified by a gross misrepresentation of my passage on Narayan, which played no such part in my article as Bone says, not even remotely. In fact, it even comes some distance after the passage on Lohia's Gandhianism which Bone quotes as coming before it and connects by the phrase "He then concedes . . ." Comrade Bone's reading was not marked by flawless objectivity.

This question is also not clarified by Bone's imputation that we consider methods of mass disobedience, etc., as "class-collaborationist." The IWW was doing it long before the Indian socialists. This is another misrepresentation.

Lastly: Anybody can make a contribution; but Gandhianism isn't it. Methods of revolutionary non-violent mass resistance and struggle were not invented in India or by Gandhianism. Mainly, what absolute-pacifists and Gandhians have done is tie up these particular methods of struggle with a certain absolutist doctrine of no-violence-on-principle. Marxists draw a line between those methods and this doctrine.

We now learn from Bone that the traditional Marxist opposition to this pacifist doctrine is "sectarian dogmatism." Crushed by this news, we yield in admiration to pacifists who are so very undogmatic that they can afford to denounce us as "dogmatic" simply for expressing a contrary opinion. . . .

"My Political Faith": A Reply to Critics - -

(Continued from page 6)

Why have the extremists of the Azione Comunista [Communist Action] group not taken the road toward Cucchi and Magnani's USI [Independent Socialist Union]? Is it my fault? What nonsense! The dissidents of Azione Comunista are quasi-Trotskyist internationalists who reproach the Communist Party for its petty-bourgeois nationalism and its parliamentary opportunism; while the accusations made by Cucchi and Magnani were the reverse. It appears to my mind that Azione Comunista still remains independent of the Trotskyist group only because it does not mean to prejudice the internal struggle in the Italian Communist Party by assuming a critical position also toward the Russian Communist Party.

But these are concerns that have nothing at all to do with me. In my opinion an intensification of the crisis in the CP will be of use to all parties except the small groups of ex-Communists, who will continue to tear themselves apart in their impotence and blame fantastic scapegoats for their own sterility. They are daily ridiculed, slandered, and threatened by the Stalinist bureaucracy, and they think to take revenge by using the

same methods themselves. Having read a collection of truculent and acid phrases directed against opponents in the pamphlets of Lenin and Trotsky, they have ended up believing that this is the essence of revolutionary thought. Thus one sees excellent men grow old corroded by anger, their precious energies wasted.

5. Anti-Communism

Since one of the letters which I promised to reply to mentioned also the orientation of the Italian Committee for Cultural Freedom, of which I am one of the supporters, I have to clarify this last point too.

Writers and artists of all liberal Italian tendencies make up the organization. Four-fifths of the activities of this organization is devoted to the defense of cultural freedom in Italy, which is endangered by the remnants of fascism, by the clerical Right, and by a part of the state apparatus. We are in fact convinced that the duty of democrats is, above all, to concern themselves with liberty in their own country. But within the limits of our possibilities we try, above all in our publications, to make Italian intellectuals aware of the dangers that menace us on the international plane.

On this point also, however, I want to make things clear: We reject the sophism of equidistance. [This idea refers to equidistance from the two world blocs—Ed.] In the first national assembly of our organization, on January 18, 1953, a declaration was adopted in which one could read as follows:

"It would be an error to judge our open and irreconcilable opposition to totalitarian regimes of any kind, and our critical vigilance over the imperfections and contingent tendencies that exist in the democratic regimes, as a position of equidistance. In reality, in totalitarian regimes we condemn that political structure which does not permit the least expression for the individuals and classes that suffer under it, while in democratic countries we consider ourselves responsible citizens."

Without taking back the approval I gave this formulation at that time, I would now be more cautious in affirming that in totalitarian countries the oppressed are not able to protest: the facts of June 17 in East Germany and the Vorkuta strikes have demonstrated the contrary. For the liberation of oppressed countries, I put my hopes in revolution and not in war.

Foreign-Policy Bust - -

(Continued from page 1)

since we are all anti-Communists, now, we can turn to other things. Let them also tell us then why, since 'we are all anti-Communists the Communists are winning the cold war everywhere along the line.'

As far as we know, however, Prof. Hook has not yet torn himself away from his vital task of dismantling civil liberties at home in order to turn his intellect in the direction of solving this strange ability of a totalitarian despotism to appeal to the minds of men more strongly than his cherished capitalist democracy.

But it is certainly true that at each point where American military power or other forces have succeeded in stalemating the Stalinists during the past few years, time tends to work for them rather than for the United States.

SOMETHING WRONG

For American policy there is yet no way out of the South Korean mess. Rhee and his dictatorial regime stand as a constant threat of a resumed hopeless war, and a roadblock to any progressive political solution—an obstacle which cannot be overcome by American policy precisely because support of his regime is the foundation of whatever political policy the United States has in that area.

At Formosa, similarly, no political solution is possible within the framework of U. S. policy, and hence the danger remains constant that the Stalinists may try to hurry things by launching a military attack, or Chiang Kai-shek may resort to some desperate gamble to get the United States into a real shooting war with China as his only hope of salvation.

The danger is pointed up by statements such as that made by Air Force Secretary Quarles recently at Manila that Chiang's air force must be given atom bombs if the Chinese Stalinists attack Formosa. A few days later, Rhee was also demanding that his troops be given atom bombs if they are to be in a position to defend themselves against a renewed attack from North Korea.

In Indochina the possibilities of a political solution have not been completely exhausted as in the other two cases. Here is an instance where the political soil has not been so poisoned by American support of the forces of reaction that only Stalinism can grow on it and the only way the bipartisan shapers of American policy can counter that growth is to blow up the whole countryside.

As one moves westward from Indochina, it is evident that American policy has nowhere been able to muster the support of democratic forces, let alone to stimulate and assist them in the struggle they are waging against Stalinism in Asia and the Middle East.

To the Indian socialists, as well as to the broad masses of the Indian people, the United States is primarily a country which has formed a military alliance with the reactionary government of Pakistan.

The weakness of Washington's system of military alliances is once again illustrated by the struggle among Greece, Turkey and Britain over Cyprus; the failure of the Balkan Pact to jell; the ease with which the Stalinists have been able to jump over the "northern tier" countries of the Baghdad pact and start intervening in the muddled international politics of the Middle East, etc.

It would be doing the State Department and the leaders of the bipartisan foreign policy an injustice to say that they do not realize that something is drastically wrong with American foreign policy, and that some brand new approach is needed on how to conduct political warfare against the Stalinists. So many voices have been raised demanding such a new approach, that unless one follows the news carefully one is likely to get the impression that something has been done along the lines of meeting the demand.

PAPER TIGERS

One striking example of the utter lack of substance to the vague talk of a "new approach" comes from Melbourne, Australia, where the military advisers of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) have been conferring. According to the New York Times (Jan. 20):

"One of the purposes of the defense organization, not stated in the pact signed in Manila eight months ago . . . is to try to convert the uncommitted millions of the Asian so-called neutralist group, including India, Burma, Indonesia and Ceylon.

"But even in the three Asian countries belonging to the treaty group there is little apparent effort to counter scornful assertions by Communist China that the democratic alliance is nothing but a 'paper tiger.'

"The need for bold action on the propaganda front, along with the necessarily secret military planning, has been taken up by the United States delegation at the conference, headed by Admiral Felix B. Stump, commander in chief of the Pacific fleet. But efforts to thrust ahead boldly are reportedly being opposed, chiefly by

the British representatives."

"Thrust ahead boldly" with what policy, with what line? Neither the Times' special correspondent nor the admiral are likely to be able to say. Perhaps a few carrier sweeps off Quemoy and Matsu, or an air sortie or two over Shanghai? Or isn't the good admiral as stumped as his commander in chief when it comes to such questions?

DEMOS SWITCH

Since the Democrats have been trying to take what advantage they can of the none too brilliant position in which the bipartisan foreign policy has placed the country and the world, one might expect that they would come forward with a new policy to offer the voters during the campaign. As a matter of fact, Senator Wiley of Wisconsin, a leading Republican in this field, has challenged them to do exactly that.

"America would like to see any concrete alternatives which the Democrats might care to advance," Wiley shot back at the Democrat leaders who have been grumbling at Dulles' policies.

Although one cannot say that the Democrats have answered Wiley's challenge, it appears that at least a very influential and powerful wing of the party is thinking of adding a weapon to the government's political-warfare armory which was supposed to be (more or less) strictly Republican property. That is a cut in foreign military and economic aid.

Now, any regular reader of LABOR ACTION knows that we have never joined in the liberal notion that the deficiencies of American foreign policy can be made up for by the expenditure of sufficient cash (especially Point Four cash) abroad. We have maintained that economic aid, like military force, is an element in foreign policy which can have serious progressive impact only when applied to back a policy which supports the democratic, revolutionary forces which are seething below and above the surface in so many parts of the world—i.e., as part of a political offensive against Stalinism based on a genuinely democratic foreign policy.

But at least those people in and around the labor and liberal movements who have been pressing for vastly expanded and intelligently administered foreign aid programs have been seeking for an alternative to the deadly policy of relying on military means and reactionary governments propped up by military means to stop Stalinism and maintain American hegemony over most of the world.

And now these liberals, who still cling to the Democratic Party, are faced with the fact that the Eisenhower administration is proposing, for its own reasons, at least to maintain the foreign-aid programs at their present levels, and make possible their application to a wider range of economic projects than in the past, while a number of the decisive and controlling Democratic leaders in Congress have suddenly come out for reduced foreign aid programs, and on a short-run basis.

GEORGIA DECIDES

Here again Senator George is in the forefront. It seems he is being pressed in his race for re-election by Talmadge who has been playing on the anti-foreignism of the more backward Georgia farmers. To meet the challenge, George appears to have decided to be for as little foreign aid as possible during this session of Congress.

And to make sure that the chairmanship of this important committee remains in the hands of a Southerner, it is vital that George, who has the seniority to claim it, must be retained. So it is expected his colleagues who control the Democrats in Congress will see to it that he not be pressed too closely on the question of foreign aid.

Thus, as a consequence of our two-party system and of the reactionary way in which it organizes Congress, the sentiments of a few thousand farmers in Georgia can vitally affect the whole foreign policy of the government.

But that is so only so long as the labor movement itself fails to develop any ideas of its own on what America's foreign policy should be, and slavishly trails behind the bipartisan bankruptcy of the government.

It is high time that in this field, as in so many others, it began to think for itself. And the chief responsibility for pioneering in this falls on the militants in the united labor movement who truly have everything to gain by "thrusting ahead boldly."

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!

Organize Farms - -

(Continued from page 1)

government policy would actively promote the trend already running strong in agriculture.

Implementation of the plan would, not unexpectedly, be left largely to private enterprise and local authorities. The government would undertake a few pilot projects in the most depressed local areas to involve fifty families a year and to provide a basis for research and technical assistance to others similarly situated.

Here is the minimum legislative program to this end:

(1) Extension of at least the minimum wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act to all workers employed on the larger farms where three or more workers are hired during any calendar quarter year.

(2) The removal of the exemption of agricultural workers from the Labor Management Relations Act and the extension of the right to organize and bargain with employers to all workers employed on the larger farms to all agricultural processing industries now exempt.

(3) An amendment to Public Law 78 authorizing the importation of foreign contract workers to require the secretary of Labor to conduct public hearings and (1) determine the need for importation of foreign workers and the prevailing wage to be paid based on the rate for comparable work in each area and (2) provide that all the benefits given foreign workers must have been offered to domestic workers prior to approval of the importation of foreign workers.

(4) A penalty for persons knowingly employing or transporting illegal aliens for employment on farms or in industry.

(5) The extension of unemployment-insurance benefits to agricultural workers and the elimination of present exemptions in old-age and survivors' insurance of some agricultural workers.

(6) A complete program for retraining and rehabilitation of smaller farmers displaced from agriculture. . . .

SPOTLIGHT

(Continued from page 1)

1955's industrial bonanza . . . rub off on small business?" they want to know.

Why didn't more of it rub off on the workers who produced the wealth behind the profits? we want to know, too.

Hennings Blasts The Witchhunt List

Largely unnoticed in spite of the remarkable things in it has been a speech made by Senator Hennings, who has been conducting the hearings of the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights and was greatly responsible for adding pressure to the army to revise its rules for the draftee witchhunt. The speech was one made before the Lawyers Association of St. Louis and appeared in print in—of all places—the current (January) Democratic Digest.

For one thing, Hennings threw a grenade at the Subversive List after demon-

strating that the legal presumption of innocence was destroyed by the loyalty-program amendment of 1950 (he doesn't mention that this step was taken by Truman, well before the day of McCarthy).

"This example of the easy mood in which the loyalty-security program is operated is not unique," Hennings continued. "Another, by no means less significant, illustration is the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations. The International Military Tribunal in Nuremberg took months of hearings to declare some of the Nazi organizations criminal. Vast evidence was submitted, witnesses were heard and cross-examined and the issue was argued by counsel. Even so, the prosecution was granted only a part of its recommendations.

"But here, in the United States of America, where the issue touches on the dignity of United States citizens, the Attorney General, without hearings, on the basis of undisclosed evidence, declares innumerable organizations subversive with the inevitable result of stigmatizing their members automatically. And such a list now determines not only the fate of our government employees, but has become a decisive factor in private employment. . . ."

In another place, Hennings argues:

"It is my submission that loyalty-security proceedings are substantially trials for treason which in the eyes of our law belong to the category of infamous crimes." And he shows in detail what a mockery is made of due process and legal rights by the whole setup.

The whole speech could stand reprinting verbatim, in extenso, cum laude, and ex animo.

THE COLLECTED STORIES OF ISAAC BABEL

New edition of a Russian master, including all passages censored in earlier versions (chiefly references to Trotsky).

\$5.00

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.