

LABOR ACTION

November 18, 1957

TEN CENTS

40 Years After the Russian Revolution
The Ideal of Socialism Remains:

FREEDOM IN EQUALITY

By MAX SHACHTMAN

... page 7

Mideast Arab Socialist Movement

... page 6

Norway Labor Party Wins Again

... page 2

SPOT-LIGHT

The Panic is On

The launching of Sputnik II has intensified the political panic in the United States which was touched off by Sputnik I. That panic is the proper word for it is demonstrated by all the symptoms. When people, or animals, are confronted with a sudden, unexpected, overwhelming or mysterious danger, they are likely to panic. One reaction is simply to run in a direction opposite to that from which the danger seems to threaten. Another is to take some accustomed, familiar measure which has warded off danger in other circumstances. Another is to "freeze" to whatever one is doing or holding on to in a state of temporary paralysis of will.

All of these symptoms, singly or in combination, are exhibited by almost every sector of the political spectrum in this country. What needs to be sorted out now, if any political benefit is to be derived from this experience, is why this is so, and what can be done about both the world situation in which the American people now recognize themselves to be, and about what has put us in this situation.

BARKING AT MOON

Manufacturers of public opinion in this country have been misled and have misled the nation on the capabilities of Russian science and technology. But this alone is a minor matter. If the British or even the West Germans had launched the Sputniks, it would have been sensational, but not traumatic. What has got the American people running around in circles and barking at the moon is not the realization that they have been outsmarted in the race for outer space. The panic is on because Americans have been taught to believe as a fundamental proposition of their existence that what has kept Russia from launching World War III up till now has been primarily and above all this country's unique capacity for massive, devastating airborne nuclear retaliation. They now feel stripped of what they had thought was their major means of protection against atomic annihilation, or world victory by Stalinism.

Since this is the source of the feeling of panic and crisis, the immediate reaction to it is understandable. If America and the world were safe before the Russians forged ahead in the arms race, the thing to do is to put our shoulders to the wheel, appropriate a few billion dollars, train a few hundred thousand scientists, and get ahead of the Russians again. In other words, let's keep on doing what we were doing, only more so.

Before the panic can really be allayed, the first thing which has to be done is to establish the real source and magnitude of the danger created or revealed by the fact that the Russians have the Intercontinental Ballistic Missile first.

The fact is that now, or within the next year or so, the Russians will have the capacity to deliver nuclear bombs over any target in the world faster and more certainly than does the United States. If

(Continued on page 2)

Cause of Algerian Freedom Endangered by Murder Campaign Silence Would Be Complicity!

By A. GIACOMETTI

On September 1 Messali Hadj, the founder of the Algerian nationalist movement and present leader of the Algerian Nationalist Movement (MNA), addressed an appeal to the Algerian people.

For several months, the fight between the two nationalist parties MNA and National Liberation Front (FLN) had grown worse. The slaughter by the troops of the FLN of whole villages near Melouza, in the Soumman valley, near Relizane, near Saida, near Massena, were bloody episodes in this struggle. In France, assassinations and attacks on the nationalist militants became increasingly frequent. As we have explained in detail in earlier issues of LABOR ACTION, there cannot be any doubt that the primary responsibility of this situation lies with the leadership of the FLN which, in the absence of a firm political basis and program, falls back on terror as a means to monopolize the coming negotiations with the French government.

This is not to say that the MNA has not used terror itself. However, in the assessment of responsibilities, two facts stand out: the military units of the MNA have never resorted to wholesale slaughter of whole population groups in regions that supported the FLN. Further, the MNA has never denied the right of the FLN to exist as an independent tendency and to participate in negotiations with the French government. The FLN, on the other hand, has always defined the MNA as a "counter-

revolutionary" tendency which must be wiped out, if necessary by terror.

In his appeal to the Algerian people, Messali Hadj pointed out the tremendous danger inherent in this situation. Not only does the French colonialist press spread these crimes all over its pages to justify the perpetuation of the colonialist war, but the spectacle of division within the Algerian nationalist movement alienates even those sectors of French and international public opinion which are ready to support the struggle of the Algerian people for self-determination.

POLITICAL CRIME

Every political crime thus represents a weapon of the French government before public opinion and at the United Nations. The public support which the Algerian revolution has acquired in all circles, Messali continued, is one of the conditions of its success. The Algerian people cannot afford to allow a handful of adventurers to jeopardize its common cause. The vast majority of the Algerian emigration in France is opposed to murder

as a means of settling political differences: it must isolate and remove from its midst the irresponsible elements that discredit its cause.

For over two weeks after the appeal, the political murders ceased completely. Then came the answer of the FLN:

Ahmed Semmache, treasurer of the USTA (Algerian Workers Union) in France, shot at Colombes (Paris) on September 20.

Mohammed Nadj, regional secretary of the USTA in Paris, had been killed at an earlier date.

Hocine Maroc, an auto-worker at Panhard, member of the USTA regional organization for Paris, shot on the Boulevard Saint-Germain on September 24. His brother, Mohammed Maroc, is one of the leaders of the MNA now serving a two-year sentence in Paris for his activity in the nationalist movement.

Mellouli Said, secretary of the USTA at the Renault works, heavily wounded by a gunman on the Boulevard Diderot, also on September 24.

Abdallah Filali, Assistant General Secretary of the USTA in France, shot on October 7 near the headquarters of the union on the rue d'Enghien. He survived in spite of having been hit by four bullets—in the back, as always—but he is not yet out of danger.

Mansour Bouali, who had replaced Semmache as treasurer of the USTA, shot on October 11.

(Turn to last page)

Not Thieves vs. Honest Men, But Two Conceptions of Unionism Contest for A New Balance of Power in Labor

By BEN HALL

George Meany was "shocked" to discover the extent of corruption in the labor movement. So he told the convention of the Industrial Union Department on November 1. The fund of information he gathered in a long and eminent career is about to be supplemented by many more hitherto neglected facts; even now, there has been no public recognition of the full depths of what are politely called "unethical practices." Some union officials have been caught with their hands in the till; others are suspect; some have refused to use the power of their office to act against arrant acts of racketeering in their own internationals. A full roll call of officials who should come under close scrutiny might startle Meany even more; for they are in control of unions whose total membership is probably about three and one-half million; perhaps, more. And this is some twenty per cent of the total membership of the united federation! The combined strength of their unions is greater today than that of the whole labor movement in 1935.

It is not just a matter of sweeping up a few overlooked corners of accumulated, neglected filth. UAW Secretary Treasurer Emil Mazey told a Milwaukee television audience this month that the AFL-

CIO should charter a new Teamster union when Hoffa's union is expelled. He did not want to "leave the rank and file of the Teamsters under the clutches of the Becks and the Hoffas." But the Teamsters Union is the largest of all and it has a lot of friends in the AFL-CIO, silent but strong. Whether a new union is set up or not, a protracted battle lies ahead to refurbish the labor movement, to free it from the dead weight that has held it down, a job begun twenty years ago with the rise of the CIO but never completed.

WHO FIGHTS WHOM?

Who is fighting whom and over what? Ethics and honesty are simple virtues and not much to ask of union officials. But far more is at stake; the united labor movement is impelled to act against crooks by

a far more potent force than the twitches and twinges of a newly sensitized conscience. Racketeering is not a suddenly erupted disease. At one time, men like Joe Ryan and Dave Beck were considered highly respectable figures inside the labor movement and consorted with statesmen and politicians at will.

Meany was head of the New York Federation of Labor at a time when notorious grafters like Joe Fay were a power within it. Did he realize it then? Perhaps he didn't think about the subject at all; at any rate, even if it seemed important, there was nothing he himself appeared able to do about it. In any case, he went about his business doing what he could for the workingman, lobbying for improved social legislation and speaking at public gatherings on behalf of unionism. With the CIO came the spirit of organizing the whole working class into clean, fighting, vigorous unions. But in the AFL the mood of business as usual remained. Rackets could persist because they were rendered immune by the indifference of strong powers.

If it all seems scandalous, as it is, we are reminded by A. H. Raskin of the New York Times that not long ago Dan Tobin,

(Continued on page 4)

NORWAY

Results of the October Elections

The Status Quo Remains

By TRYGVE CHRISTENSEN

The October 7 Norwegian parliamentary election results showed a remarkable stability in current Norwegian politics. (See Table 1 for a comparison of 1957 results with those of the previous parliamentary election in 1953.) The Norwegian Labor Party (NLP) was returned to power with a narrow but absolute majority of parliamentary seats (78 out of 150). The NLP obtained only 48.7 per cent of the total vote but the Norwegian system of proportional representation, which favors the larger parties, accounts for their absolute parliamentary majority.

Basic issues in the campaign were taxation, inflation, foreign policy and socialism.

TAXATION

Taxation. The Labor Party was attacked by all the other parties for its taxation policies. The four bourgeois parties (Agrarian, Christian Democratic, Conservative and Liberal) generally called taxes too high, the Conservatives clearly advocating lower taxes for upper income groups. However, the bourgeois parties generally supported the Labor Party's 10 per cent national sales tax. The Agrarians, Conservatives and Liberals all supported lower subsidies on basic foods.

In contrast, the Communists and Social Democrats advocated higher taxes for the wealthy. Regarding the sales tax, the Communists proposed reducing it from 10 per cent to 6½ per cent, while the Social Democrats recommended its abolition. In addition, the Communists favored higher food subsidies. The Labor Party campaigned for the status quo.

It is interesting that the after-tax distribution of personal income in Norway is remarkably similar to that in the United States. (See Table 2 for details.) An exception to this generalization is that the lowest two-tenths are relatively better off in Norway.

INFLATION

Inflation. The cost of living has increased steadily in Norway since 1949. The official index was 100 in 1949, 136 in the last parliamentary election year of 1953 and it now stands at 152. All opposition parties have attacked the NLP on their inability to halt inflation. The Labor Party has responded by emphasizing the steady growth in the country's social security and general welfare and the substantial industrial expansion in the post World War II era under Labor governments. Capital has been accumulated at a phenomenally high rate. Net fixed investment as a percentage of net national product for Norway in the five-year period from 1950 through 1954 was 20 per cent, second only to Finland in Western Europe and twice as high as its prosperous neighbor, Sweden.¹

Foreign policy. In general the four bourgeois parties supported the NLP foreign policy of commitment to the West, NATO membership and a good-sized defense budget (about 20 per cent of the national budget).²

The Social Democratic and Communist parties both attacked Norway's membership in NATO, advocating large cuts in the military budget as well. The Social

Democratic Party line was neutralist with heavy reliance on the United Nations as the organ for settling international disputes. The Communist Party foreign policy faithfully followed Moscow. (In 1940 the Norwegian Communist Party did not oppose the Nazi German conquest of Norway for it was during the Hitler-Stalin honeymoon era.³ In 1956 the Communists characterized the Hungarian Revolution as counter-revolutionary.)

**TABLE II
PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION
OF PERSONAL INCOME
AFTER TAXES IN 1950**

	United States*	Norway†
Top 10th	27%	25.3%
2nd	15	15.8
3rd	13	13.2
4th	11	10.9
5th	10	8.6
6th	8	7.3
7th	7	6.4
8th	5	5.5
9th	3	4.6
Bottom 10th	1	2.4

*Includes effects of federal personal income tax only.

†Includes effects of all taxes and food subsidies.

Sources: Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1956. (Washington, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1956), p. 305; Det norske skattesystems virkninger på den personlige inntektfordeling. (Oslo, Statistisk Sentralbyrå, 1954), p. 88.

SOCIALISM

Socialism. The Labor Party was attacked by the bourgeois parties for being socialistic and by the Communist Party and Social Democratic Party for not being socialistic.

The socialism of the NLP has, like the old soldier, faded away. Einar Gerhardsen, prime minister and chairman of the NLP, stated in the May 31, 1957 *Arbeiderbladet* (main organ of the NLP) that the once sharp differences between the NLP and the bourgeois parties have dissolved; the bourgeois parties have accepted most of the social changes instituted by the NLP. Gerhardsen is correct that the bourgeois parties now accept the basic social insurance laws that comprise the Norwegian welfare state. However, another and more basic reason for the narrowing of differences between the NLP and the bourgeois parties is that the NLP's socialism has become so attenuated.

At the NLP congress last Spring a convention delegate had to remind the national committee of the party that they had "forgotten" to even mention the word socialism in their election program. This program was a long, vaguely-written document which stood for mankind, human freedom and social security. All concrete resolutions for nationalization of specific

industries were rejected by the delegates who appeared content to follow the moderate leadership of the party. Also rejected was a resolution calling for company boards of directors to have a minority of labor members. Strangely enough, this mild co-determination was originally conceived of by NLP leaders who this Spring withdrew their support of the idea following its rejection by top Norwegian Federation of Labor leaders.

It is due to the fact that the NLP has watered down its former social democratic program that in 1956 a rival working class party was formed. This new party, the Social Democratic Party, is comprised of former NLP members who desire to implement the social democratic program of the NLP of former days. A glance at the election results,

however, does not indicate that any large segment of workers is willing to join this small sect, notwithstanding its program.

The major basis of the Communist vote is due to the NLP non-socialist program and their wage restraint policies in conjunction with the Norwegian Federation of Labor. In Norway today there are very few ideological followers of Moscow.

Both the Communist and Social Democratic Parties support nationalization of certain industries and also mild co-determination.

Today, after 17 years of Labor Party rule, over 80 per cent of gainfully-employed Norwegians are employed by private enterprises and there is no workers' control in industry. There are very few Norwegians who even know that the NLP in 1920 was a revolutionary Communist International-affiliated party whose program was "socialization" (nationalization) of basic industries and all power to the councils (soviets) of workers, farmers and fishermen.

1. Economic Survey of Europe in 1955 (Geneva, United Nations, 1956), p. 44.
2. *Arbeiderkalenderen*, 1957 (Oslo, Norwegian Labor Party, 1956), p. 78.
3. See the Communist daily *Arbeideren* during April and May, 1940, especially April 15 and 22.

SPOTLIGHT

(Continued from page 1)

they have also perfected and produced anti-aircraft missiles of sufficient deadliness to make the American strategic bombers obsolete, they have, or will have for a short while, the unquestionable global military superiority which the United States had between Hiroshima and the Russian development of atomic weapons.

Does this mean that the Russians are about to attack Western Europe, or to issue an ultimatum to the United States and the rest of the capitalist world: either surrender and be occupied by our troops, or we will wipe you off the map?

It does not mean that any more than the American atomic monopoly of the late '40s meant that America could have destroyed Stalinism by a similar ultimatum. A few political madmen advocated a "preventive war" then in this country; and there may be a few madmen who advocate it in Russia now. But there is no reason to believe they are in power, or can get there.

It should be evident that the development of the Russian ICBM (and that is the real power significance of Sputnik) does not alter the actual relation of power between Russia and the United States, or it does so only for a short while and in a way which is more of psychological than of material importance. No one doubts that the United States is capable of producing an ICBM in a short while, and the Sputniks to go with it. What has been altered, for one thing, is the understanding Americans have of material relations of power, and since our understanding is now closer to reality, that is all to the good. But the fact remains that technologically and economically the United States is still a very large distance ahead of Russia.

And another fact which remains is that once a country has reached a stage in its scientific and technological devel-

opment like that which prevails in the United States, what counts is not its ability to advance rapidly toward the conquest of space. What counts is its political ability to put this science and technology to maximum use for the benefit of its people and all mankind.

The cry rises in the country now: we must train more scientists and technicians, or the Russians will surpass us in this field. But that is absurd, a product of panic. To get into space is an exciting and fascinating adventure for mankind. But it will not solve a single social, political or economic problem on this earth during the next few decades. Nor will a single such problem be solved solely by the training of tens of thousands of scientists and engineers.

We are for subsidizing the training and education of young people because it benefits them and can be of general benefit to the world. We are for more money spent on basic research, for the same reason. But all of that can be really useful to America and to the world only if we find the political and social means of using the talents of these young people to raise the standards of living and the cultural level of mankind. It is not the low level of technology which keeps millions of Americans in material and spiritual misery. It is the irrationality of our social and economic institutions.

And to the extent that Sputnik dramatizes the advancement of Russian technology, its long run effect may be devastating to the social rule of the bureaucracy there. For the Russian worker, farmer and intellectual may have a new dimension added to his question: if my country can match the imperialist world in means of destruction, and can begin the exploration of space, why can't it give me a decent apartment, and the right to free speech, press and political organization?

**TABLE I
NORWEGIAN PARLIAMENTARY ELECTION RESULTS, 1957
(Comparative 1953 figures appear inside parentheses)**

Party	Votes (in thousands)	Percentage of total	Parliamentary seats
Agrarian	154 (149)	8.7 (8.3)	15 (14)
Christian Democratic	182 (187)	10.2 (10.5)	12 (14)
Communist	60 (90)	3.4 (5.1)	1 (3)
Conservative	300 (295)	16.8 (16.6)	29 (27)
Labor	863 (830)	48.4 (46.7)	78 (77)
Liberal	170 (177)	9.6 (9.9)	15 (15)
Social Democratic	3 *	0.1 *	0 *

*The Social Democratic Party was formed in 1956.

Source: *News of Norway*, Nos. 34 and 35, 1957, Norwegian Information Service, Washington, D.C.

The New Class

"An Analysis of the Communist System"

By Milovan Djilas

List \$3.95

our price \$3.50

The Roots of American Communism

By Theodore Draper

List \$6.75

our price \$5.75

History of the Russian Revolution

By Leon Trotsky

Trotsky's great classic, now available for the first time in years
New Edition—Three Volumes in One

List \$12.50

our price \$10.00

Labor Action Book Service
114 West 14th Street, N. Y. C. 11, N. Y.

LONDON LETTER

Labor Party Left Wing Is Asking

Where Do We Go From Here?

By OWEN ROBERTS

London, November 8

Where do we go from here? That is the question now being asked by the more advanced sections of the British Labor Party left wing. It is a question prompted by a series of circumstances. First, the consequences of the recent Party annual conference which resulted in an all-along-the-line win for the right wing in policy formulation. Second, the role played at the conference by Nye Bevan when he formed an active alliance with the right wing in order to defeat a left wing resolution on nuclear weapons. Third, and stemming from the second, the tailing away of Bevanism as the main motive force of the left wing. Fourth, the reaction of the labor movement to the general sharpening of the class conflict as the Tory government presses its disinflationary policies with their inevitable consequences.

The first three conditions are linked tightly together and it is impossible to split them for purposes of analysis. Briefly, the right wing was able to win its way at the recent Party conference because Bevanism has played out its initial historical role within the BLP. Having failed to develop beyond this point, it exposed the weakness of the left wing and also threw into sharp relief the fundamental instability of Bevan's political position as a positive force in its own right rather than as a negation of the right wing.

BEVANISM NO PROGRAM

Bevanism was never really a political program in the Labor Party. It was rather a tendency or a mood which encompassed a wide range of political attitudes from disgruntled Fabians on the one hand to ninety-nine per cent Stalinists on the other. Its merit, however, was that it was the medium through which dissenting voices could speak. Thus Bevanism can rightly claim to have prevented the drift rightwards in the British labor movement and to have averted the once very real and apparent danger that all views coming into conflict with the right wing and Party bureaucracy would be quickly silenced. Bevanism made it possible for a left wing to exist inside the Labor Party and, more important, made it possible for the best elements of the British Marxist Left to work within the Labor Party in contact with the mass organization of the working class rather than operate as introverted little sects outside of the main stream of the broad labor movement.

The gathering of what has frequently been described as an "amorphous Left" behind the banner of Bevanism never got beyond its first stage of development, for several reasons. The prime reason was that Bevan and his immediate associates (for real Bevanism has always essentially been confined to Bevan's immediate associates in Parliament or on its fringes) failed to develop a consistent and coherent policy in conjunction with the large section of the rank and file which was dissatisfied with the policy advanced by the right wing leadership. Instead, personalities—and largely the personality of Bevan—filled the space which should have been occupied by policies and emotional discontent was the adhesive which kept the amorphous Left in loose contact.

POLITICAL WEAKNESS

Because the leading Bevanites failed to develop a left wing policy to pose as an alternative before the Party they could not (and had little need to) organize the left wing in any positive fashion. The weekly Bevanite newspaper *Tribune* performed the role of a left wing passport but then, when it could have been the focal point around which the Left could have rallied, discussed and formulated positive policies, it was restrained because of the political weakness of leading Bevanites.

Such a situation could exist for some while in the early stages following the emergence of Bevanism in 1951 when Bevan and a number of his associates quit their posts in the Labor government. But as the

years passed and it became apparent that Bevanism was not going to develop beyond its infant stages it should have become equally apparent that the more advanced sections of the left wing must make ready to force the pace. Unfortunately this did not happen, and it is something for which all of us on the Left must bear responsibility. There is little doubt that we saw the situation arising as articles written over the past few years bear witness. But—for a variety of reasons—we failed to really do anything about it other than write occasional articles and make occasional reference to it in speeches. Because no section of the Marxist Left carried the broad amorphous left wing beyond the first stage of its development (Bevanism) it became weakened relative to the right wing.

GROWTH OF IDEAS

The worsening position of the left in relation to the right has been further accentuated over the past couple of years because the right wing has made real efforts to give its ideas positive form. It has posed before the Party the main issues of the day (often posing them, of course, in a way most suitable for solution by right wing remedies) and then has endeavored to show why these problems cannot be overcome by the application of "outworn slogans and dogmas" and why it is necessary to "rethink" the attitude of the Party on many matters now most important in contemporary society (most important, that is, in the eyes of the right wing).

The outcome of this situation has been the growth of right wing ideas, not in a quantitative sense but qualitatively, as the process of discussion and interchange has built up, or grafted onto earlier right wing ideology, a whole set of essentially reformist ideas aimed at the apparent solution of issues which loom large in the public eye at this moment.

With Bevanism having outlived its usefulness in its first form and failing to develop into a more advanced stage and the right wing making ideological progress, conditions were ripe for an over-all turn in the attitude of the Labor Party, and that is what happened at the recent Brighton conference. It was brightly illuminated because Bevan himself acted as the catalyst for the fusion of the centerite groupings of the Right and Left wings. And as the whole of the right wing has shifted slightly centerwise in face of the Tory government's policies the action of Bevan was the expression of the amalgam of the left center with the right wing leadership. With such an alliance of forces on the Right, coupled with the weaker political expression of the Left, the result of the Brighton conference could not have been anything other than a win for the leadership.

NO CLEAR ANSWER

All of this leads back to the starting point, where the left wing says: Where do we go from here? And so far there appears to be no clear answer beyond the generally agreed fact that big strides must now be made to take the left wing far beyond Bevanism in its political attitude. Just how this is going to be done is not yet clear, but some of the conditions which will govern it can be outlined.

First, although Bevan is at the moment in alliance with the right wing leadership there is no guarantee just how long this will last. Bevan himself appears to be taking the attitude that he must keep his mouth firmly closed on any differences which now exist between himself and the right wing and concentrate all his activities against the Tories. Just

when he will decide that such conditions no longer apply cannot be determined, and indeed is really of no consequence. All that needs to be noted is that at some future date Bevan is likely to again come into conflict with the leadership. This could prove a diversion to the left wing forces, for if they now begin to move forward in their political attitude they need to be on their guard against any outbursts which may stunt their development and turn them back to the position of 1951.

BEST OF BEVANISM

Second, although Bevan's limitations have now been clearly revealed it must not be assumed that all the Bevanite leadership which now remains can be considered in the same light. The fact remains that the Bevanite camp still formally exists, but it is alive with contradictory forces. The attitude taken by Bevan is but one which now exists within the Bevanite leadership and it contrasts with that of, say, *Tribune* editor Michael Foot who has always been further to the left than Bevan and much more developed as a political thinker of the left. Foot's advanced positions shows itself now in the fact that he supports the left wing against Bevan on the central issue of whether Britain should make nuclear weapons. Foot represents all that is best in Bevanism (or what remains of it) and therefore must be considered as an ally by those who wish to lead the left wing to higher stages of political development.

Third, the general climate in which the left wing will be required to operate in the immediate future will be largely dictated by the reaction of the labor move-

ment to the mounting Tory attack on working class standards as part of its disinflationary policies. The main force aligned against the Tories and employers will be the trade unions, and there are many signs of growing militancy within their ranks. However, there are also signs that the right wing leadership of the Party wants to dampen down the militant attitude of the unions. The reasoning being that on current showing the Labor Party has as good as won the next general election, but the one thing which the right wing feels might upset things is a large strike wave in circumstances where the unions could not fail to come into conflict with the government itself and the strikes thus take on a political character. This stretching between straightforward trade union economic interests and the electioneering possibilities of the Labor Party (tinged with the right wing dislike of political strikes) has only just begun, but the way in which it develops will have a definite bearing on what role the left wing will have to play both in relation to immediate tactics and as part of its longer term objective to consolidate a large section of the Labor left behind a positive and coherent policy.

CLEAR UP IDEAS

As may be imagined, the rather sharp development of events on the Labor left has produced many reactions. There are those of the left who seriously believe Bevan has sold out to the right wing in return for the promise of a post in the next Labor government. There are others who have consigned all those associated with Bevan to the rubbish heap. And yet others who say that the departure of Bevan is a good thing because he never was any good to the left and the sooner his friends follow him the better. These attitudes, and various combinations of them, are to be expected as a natural reaction to recent movements. The immediate task of the Marxist left wing is to clear these ideas up, explain to often embittered rank and filers just what has happened and why it has happened and then to provide them with a positive program around which to gather and campaign.

Gomulka Regime in Poland Seen At New Stage of Development

By A. RUDZIENSKI

After the youth riots in Warsaw, after the suspension of *Po Prostu*, the organ of the October Left, the Polish regime had entered a new stage of development. Although the basic conquests of the October upsurge remained intact (the dissolution of the Stalinist collective farms, religious freedom, and the workers councils), freedom of the press was limited as the suppression of *Po Prostu* and the introduction of government censorship showed. The youth answered with anti-Gomulka demonstrations in the heart of Warsaw, but the working class and the peasants remained passive, fearing armed intervention by Russia. In this way Gomulka took an important bastion of the October Left, the free press, which is now under government control.

After this "victory" over the youth, who together with the workers had elevated him to power, Gomulka opened fire against the opposition in the official party. He attacked not only conservative Stalinists, but primarily the "revisionists," that is, the October Left, the current which corresponds to the closed *Pa Prostu*.

Gomulka's exposé of the party is proof that under the impact of the October upsurge the omnipotent party organization was crushed and that it is incapable of exercising power without a great purge.

As we have written in former articles, there are three currents in the party: the Stalinist conservative right of "Nato-lin," the Gomulkaist center, and the "revisionist" October Left. After winning the first battle against the youth, Gomulka is now moving to the next stage of his policy: reconstruction of totalitarian monolithism in Poland which had been

destroyed by the popular impact. He can achieve this only by a great purge, that is by totalitarian, fundamentally Stalinist methods.

Of course, we hope that the big purge in Poland will not be as bloody as the old ones in Russia. We are now in the year 1957, the break-up of classic Stalinism is behind us, and Poland is situated a little further to the west than Russia. But Gomulka's intention is to rebuild a "monolithic," "Leninist" (or Stalinist) party, as in the good old days of Stalin, when millions and millions of revolutionary workers and intellectuals died as "mad dogs of the counter-revolution."

Thus Gomulka is discovering a "new face" of his personality, which is the old snout of the Stalinist bureaucrat. He is carrying out the points of his agreement with Khrushchev consistently. Gomulka has ceased to be the leader of the October upsurge. He is no longer a national leader, for he sold his birthright for a mess of pottage. As the price for Khrushchev's recognition of his regime he gave up the independence of Poland's foreign policy and agreed to the liquidation of the October Left. He has gone to Berlin and to Belgrade as a messenger for Khrushchev, and has thus rendered him great services.

But with this change in his policy, his regime has changed basically. It is no longer a transitional regime, raised by the revolution and opposed to Stalinism. It is now a regime of October's liquidation and of a return to a new type of Stalinism. To be sure, this turn implies an alternative of a growing revolutionary opposition and of overcoming "Gomulkaism." The strikes in the mines and factories and the youth demonstrations show a clear road for the development of a new Polish left. Gomulka is hardly master of the political moment, and no longer a leader of the Polish people against Stalinism. He is condemned to political death, like the other epigones of Stalin's totalitarianism.

FROM THE PERIODICALS

Two British Publications Reviewed.

By M. H.

THE FERMENT IN THE socialist movement during the past year is world wide. The explosive series of events within the Stalinist empire, the Twentieth Party Congress, Poznan, the Polish and Hungarian Octobers, the Russian intervention, these have resulted in a surge of discussion, so often among socialists who wouldn't talk to each other the day before yesterday. Publications have developed in this new context: in Belgium, *La Gauche*, organ of the left-wing Social Democracy; in France, *La Commune*, the publication of the Liaison and Action Committee for Workers Democracy, a left socialist grouping; and in England two very interesting magazines, *Universities and Left Review*, and the *New Reasoner*.

Universities and Left Review (Business Office: The Business Manager, Magdalen College, Oxford) unites a broad range of socialist opinion. Its second issue contains articles by those who have only recently broken with the Communist Party, by various types of left socialists and by some from the reformist tradition. The result is stimulating, varied, and to the outsider, somewhat confusing. There is a literal babel of voices, most of them young. The contributors are primarily the younger intellectuals, some of them still in graduate school, others teaching in different colleges and universities.

The *Review* is part of the remarkable break-up of rigid lines which has taken place in England. A forum movement mushroomed there during the last year, and some of the activities of the *Review* group have attracted hundreds. Evidently the operation will take some kind of organizational form since the *Review* is sponsoring lecture tours in Britain, in Paris and in the United States. The primary orientation seems to be toward the British Labor Party as the proper arena for socialist activity in England, though there are a host of attitudes on what policy should be followed within it.

REVITALIZATION

Clearly, the *Review* is an important sign of the revitalization of the left in England. At this stage, its very broadness has much to recommend it. Pure and simple discussion cannot, of course, predominate forever, but in the present context it is an important and hopeful step toward the recreation of a strong socialist left in England.

The *New Reasoner* is much narrower than *Universities and Left Review*. It is the successor to the *Reasoner*, the opposition organ published in the British Communist Party (and banned by it). Its editors are John

Saville and E. P. Thompson, and the note it strikes in its Summer 1957 issue is one intermediate between the former Stalinism of its contributors and democratic socialism. Hyman Levy, whose outspoken speech against the Party leadership was one of the high-points of the British Communist Party Convention this year, has an article on "Soviet Socialism" which is indicative of the magazine's general tendency:

FAR CRY

If this leading Soviet light, then, was guilty of Marxist fallacy, guilty of a space-time anachronism in talking of their having passed the stage of Bourgeois Capitalist Democracy, so also are those from Capitalist Democracies who persistently demand for Soviet citizens what they regard as justice, freedom of expression and free elections, in the special sense in which they operate here.

This is obviously a far cry from democratic socialism. It could be characterized as the Deutscher-Mollet amalgam, or the theory of Marxist imperialism, since it is predicated on the idea that whole peoples are somehow (by reason of tradition, past history, etc.) not "ready" for democracy and require a period of tutelage, i.e., "la Mission Civilatrice," i.e., exploitation by a ruling class. And yet, for Levy and his co-thinkers it is not simply Deutscherism, or some similar brand of Stalinist reformism. For them, it is a step away from an old position, it is the indication of movement toward a democratic conception of socialism. If it ossifies at its present point, then it will definitively become a form of totalitarian apologetics. But if it moves, if it continues to confront the developing situation under Stalinism, then we may hope that it will become something quite different.

But the *Reasoner* is not devoted to the Russian question alone. There are a series of interesting articles (including a translation of Tibor Drey's story, "Behind the Brick Wall"; Drey, it will be remembered, played a conspicuous role in the Hungarian Revolution). Still, the main significance of the magazine lies in the fact that it is one more element, and an important one, of the world wide tendency toward socialist realignment.

Out of developments like this, it is possible that the socialist movement may recapture the vision and humanism which were dealt such a tragic blow by the destruction of the October Revolution.

Kohler Strike

The strike at Kohler's is in its fourth year. It was impossible for the company to utilize the same Taft law provision because it was facing union unfair labor practice charges. After long delay, an NLRB trial examiner upheld the union on almost every count and ordered the reinstatement of all discharged strikers except 45 active unionists. This omission, the UAW will appeal to the full NLRB. The UAW immediately offered to settle the strike on the basis of the examiner's recommendations but the company turned down the proposal. The Kohler strike and boycott go on.

SCREEN the NEWS with Labor Action

A sub is \$2 a year—
subscribe now!

Balance of Power —

(Continued from page 1)

then president of the Teamsters Union, boasted of controlling six out of thirteen seats on the old AFL Council. It was under his regime in the Teamsters that Beck and Hoffa rose to prominence. It was this old AFL that held control over a majority of the organized workers. The CIO alone could not break the hold of the established conservative officialdom of the AFL and under its sheltering wing, corruption was nourished.

Even now, after the merger constitution adopted machinery against corrupt practices, after the exposures, the racket boys can count upon allies. Some, like Harry Bridges, have in common only a mutual fear of isolation but nothing more. Others, like Joe Curran, are engaged in small time factional maneuvers that give comfort to crooks. But the real point of support for persisting corruption comes from the most conservative elements in the old AFL.

Anthony Valente resigned under fire from his job as president of the United Textile Workers Union on November 2. He was bitter because no one had spoken up for him at the AFL-CIO Executive Council meetings although he claimed that 12 of the 29 Council members had promised to support him. But, he said, "They reneged on their commitments." He didn't say who they were, but it is easy to believe that there are Council members who privately would like to call off the crusade against grafters but are too prudent to say so in public.

"SUCKED IN . . ."

Hoffa has been working closely with building trades groups, ostensibly to protect their jurisdictional claims against the CIO unions. Early last month, building trades leaders from eight Midwest states met in Detroit. Richard Gray, president of the Building Trades Department, told them, "We were sucked into a convention (the merger) where we were hopelessly outvoted." After his speech, a resolution was adopted that if no satisfactory solution is found to the jurisdictional problem by March 1958, "all building and construction trades, international unions shall cease paying per capita tax to the AFL-CIO."

This was reported at the Teamster convention to give encouragement to the machine. West Coast Teamster delegates reported that a similar resolution was only narrowly averted by a technicality at a recent convention of the California building trades. On November 8, at a meeting of the Detroit Building Trades Council, the building trades unions were called upon to withdraw their 3,500,000 members from the AFL-CIO unless they get satisfaction.

We recall, too, that William Hutcheson, president of the 800,000-member Carpenters Union, telegraphed prompt congratulations to Hoffa upon his success at the Teamsters convention. Hutcheson was charged in Indiana with being mixed up in a land-selling swindle; he was not indicted; but he took refuge in the Fifth Amendment against giving testimony and has never been asked to explain himself before any union committee.

Now, the exposure of Nathan W. Shefferman at the Senate Committee reveals how conveniently degenerate union officials fit in with the plans of ruthless employers. Shefferman was able to parlay the sweetheart agreement into a thriving business with a national hook-up. More than 300 firms paid him hundreds of thousands of dollars to keep out unions; but where this was impossible he had the contacts to bring in corrupt or tractable unions instead. In one case, he helped destroy a local of the Packinghouse Workers Union and then brought in a local of the Bakery Workers Union whose president James Cross stands condemned for grafting. In Boston, he tried to oust the Retail Clerks Union from Sears Roebuck and install an amenable Teamster local in its place.

But it would probably be a mistake to conclude that crooks are aided in the labor movement only by other crooks. The fact is that many labor leaders see nothing terribly immoral or unethical in the practices revealed at the Senate hearings and condemned in the AFL. Or, if they do, they see no reason for all the fanfare. True, some labor leaders enriched themselves. But, many conservatives must think, if they were businessmen no one would bother them. What is so wrong, they ask, with profiting from business connection; with accepting loans from those for whom you

do a favor; why split up the labor movement over such trifles?

Right now, the overt line of division inside the union movement is between honest men and thieves. It is a grotesque peculiarity of the American labor movement that the grave issues before it could be defined in such a fashion. It must be discouraging to those who see only this: a mighty social movement preoccupied with picking out fleas. But that is only how it seems.

Actually, conservatives in labor are oppressed by the fear that "radical" trends will be strengthened by the expulsion and destruction of grafting union officials. Radical, that is, by the standards of American union leadership. And they are right.

Now, there is a totally new balance of power in the union movement and two different conceptions of the role of the labor movement are pitted against one another. One is the old, narrow conservative view which assigns labor only the most primitive tasks and hopes to perform them without coming to the attention of the nation. Those who hold it can afford to shrug off little things like private graft and sharp practices.

But the other is a conception of a broad political and social role for labor. From this standpoint, the unions cannot appeal for justice and equality for all if their own officials use them to get rich quick.

Those in the old leadership who reconciled themselves to merger under the illusion that it would bring only a paper unity while everything went on as before are bitterly disappointed. For it is clear that their day is at last coming to an end. They are being shoved aside by the slow evolution of a labor movement which now takes in a majority of the industrial working class.

RESPONSIBILITIES

When this labor movement arose and grew, it began by wresting more from the employers and went on to dispense great social power in national life. With its power, came the counter moves of business to curb it: government controls; Taft-Hartley; right-to-work laws; restrictions on labor political rights. Now, the small change of old-line business unionism is not enough. There is politics; there is economics; there is society. With its power, unionism takes on responsibilities, not only to its own membership but to the nation and it will begin to fulfill those responsibilities or be chiseled down.

When the AFL and CIO united less than two years ago, it was a sign that the labor movement as a whole was beginning to face up to its tasks. It was the first big sign in 20 years of a new surge forward. For nearly 20 years, despite its growing numbers and influence, since the early days of the New Deal in 1938, not a single piece of important social legislation had been won by the labor movement. Despite all the advances on the economic front, there was a stalemate.

And now it was time to break out. The united labor movement was to direct itself to organizing the unorganized not to jurisdictional warfare; it was to intensify political action; it was to wipe out Jim Crow and support the fight against racism in national life; it was to rally the Negro people to its side by supporting their fight for democracy in the South and everywhere; it would strike down crooks and recapture the old crusading spirit.

It was a moment long awaited. But nothing spectacular happened, not because the promises were illusory but, for one reason, because the labor movement is compelled to pause and settle accounts with the rackets which it brings along from its past. The fight against crooks, gangsters, and easy-money men must be looked upon as nothing less than the preparation for carrying out the promises and prospects of labor unity.

LABOR ACTION • 18th YEAR

November 18, 1957 Vol. 21, No. 37
Published every other week by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone WATKINS 4-4222—Re-entered as second-class matter July 26, 1957 under the act of March 3, 1874.—Subscription: \$2 a year; \$1 for 6 months.—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: GORDON HASKELL
Assoc. Editor: HERMAN BENSON
Business Manager: Mel Stack
Editorial Board:
GORDON HASKELL
HERMAN BENSON
MAX MARTIN
SAM BUTTONE

NEW YORK LABOR ACTION FORUM

Thursday, November 21

LIBERALISM AND THE PROGRESSIVE
MOVEMENT
AFTER WORLD WAR I

Speaker: Julius Falk

Thursday, December 5

INTEGRATION
AND THE N. Y. CITY SCHOOLS

8:30 p.m. at L. A. Hall, 114 West 14 Street, N.Y.C.

Young
Socialist

CHALLENGE

November 18, 1957

Edited and Published by the YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE

TEN CENTS

CHALLENGE LETTER BOX

Exchange On Socialist Youth Movement

Dear Comrade:

I am sure that, as socialists dedicated to the pursuit of truth, you will have the courtesy to publish an unabridged correction of three false statements contained in your article of November 4, "YSL Tour Makes New Friends In Pacific Northwest Area."

First and second, you refer to "a broad socialist youth movement unaffiliated to any adult group" . . . "which the Socialist Workers Party is currently trying to establish." (1) The group to which you refer as a mere idea is already, after only some two months of existence, substantially larger than the YSL. Given this and the fact that it publishes the only national socialist youth newspaper, it would be somewhat more accurate to refer to the YSL as "currently trying to establish" a youth movement. (2) In the New York Young Socialist Alliance, which is the only local group of which I can speak with authority, non- and anti-SWPer, such as myself, constitute the majority. Our group, however, apparently attaches somewhat less importance to such sectarian considerations than does yours.

(3) And most important: On no fewer than three occasions in the article do you suggest that the Young Socialist Al-

liance and its fraternal groups in other cities are unwilling or unable to "support democracy everywhere." I quote you the following paragraphs from the Constitution of the Young Socialist Alliance:

"The YSA supports the struggles of the working people of all races and nations against their oppressors. The YSA places itself in unalterable opposition to imperialist policies on the part of any nation on earth and upholds the right of all peoples to self-determination.

"The YSA rejects the notion that socialism can be imposed against the will of the people. We assert that there is a necessary and intimate relation between socialism and democracy. Real freedom can come only with socialism; but socialism can never come without real freedom. Socialism does not transcend or outmode the liberal freedoms; on the contrary, it realizes and completes them. It is therefore necessary to insist on the unqualified defense of these rights at all times and in all places."

Fraternally,
RICHARD DEHAAN,
Vice-Chairman
YOUNG SOCIALIST
ALLIANCE

New York, November 5

That there are non- and anti-SWPer, for example in the New York Young Socialist Alliance, is a fact beyond dispute. But how long can this "free-for-all" persist? We believe that a socialist youth organization must have a perspective, above all, that it must be able to act in the name of a political program. We are pledged to building a broad socialist youth movement, committed to democracy everywhere and affiliated to a Debsian Socialist Party. Eventually, the Young Socialist Alliance, and similar formations, will have to determine their relation to the socialist movement in America in general. To those comrades, like De Haan, who are not SWPer, we can only say that we hope that they are not then carried along by the sterile, unproductive, dead-ending "revolutionism" and sectarianism of the SWP.

(3) The article was not on the Young Socialist Alliance. It was on the point of view presented by an SWPer and SWP sympathizer at a particular meeting. *Challenge* vouches for the accuracy of its report that this point of view refused support to democracy everywhere.

As to comrade De Haan's defense of the Young Socialist Alliance and its attitude on democracy everywhere, we can only say that we are delighted with this development. When the YSL was originally approached to participate in this endeavor, this demand of ours (that any new group unambiguously support democracy everywhere) was rejected. We are glad to see that the reality of American politics, if not ideological considerations have resulted in this change of attitude.

(4) Finally, we must point out that the problem today is not that of simply assembling a forum of many views. We welcome such forums, will participate in them, but we are convinced that they are not enough. In the YSL's wide-ranging organizational campaign this Fall, we have seen that there is a crying need for a democratic socialist youth organization embracing all democratic socialists. We have a perspective toward accomplishing this. We hope that De Haan, and those like him, will join with us, if not now, then in the near future when we participate in the formation of a nationwide socialist youth organization affiliated to a Debsian SP.

Anvil Editor Sees Genuine Political Revival on Campus

"There is a genuine revival of interest in politics and socialism on the half-dozen campuses that I visited," George Rawick, editor of *Anvil*, commented at the conclusion of his recent tour of the Mid-West for the Young Socialist League. Rawick spoke at off-campus meetings in Pittsburgh, Columbus (Ohio State University), Ann Arbor (University of Michigan) and Cleveland. While the agents of the Asian flu cancelled larger meetings in Ann Arbor and Cleveland, Rawick reports that he was able to engage in good and lengthy discussions of socialist politics with many interested students at these places.

PITTSBURGH

At Pittsburgh Rawick found an eager group of students, most of whom did not think of themselves as socialists, who engaged in a very satisfying dialogue with him on socialism, starting from his general presentation of a socialist view of the Alienation of Modern Man. Each member of the audience found the topic to be of personal relevance, and were able to see the relation between what were seemingly private problems and social reality.

At Columbus an excellent group of graduate students and young instructors met with Rawick for a very lively and mutually challenging dialogue. In particular those present, many of whom considered themselves radicals and/or socialists, were pessimistic about the possibilities for socialism in the United States and were consequently wary of any organizational commitments at this time. The problem that this group presented lies at the heart of the attitudes of many who have either left the organized socialist movement or who are not eager to join it for the first time. Rawick, on the basis of this discussion and other stimulation, is at work on an article on this subject which will appear in the forthcoming issue of *Anvil*.

The meeting at Chicago held under the auspices of the Politics Club at the University of Chicago was the largest public meeting of Rawick's tour. He spoke on a symposium with representatives of the Independent Voters of Illinois, the local Americans for Democratic Action affiliate, and the Democratic Party of Cook County on the subject, "Liberals and Labor: What Road to Political Action."

Rawick presented the case for a basic realignment of American politics and the need for a party of labor. He pointed to

the "daisy-chain" effect in American politics in which Reuther is tied through many arms to Governor Faubus and Senator Eastland. Both of the other speakers nominally assented to the idea of a basic reconstruction of the Democratic Party by forcing the Southern reactionaries out of it. However, they were not particularly interested in making much of an issue of this, nor ready to commit themselves to fight for this.

The representative of the IVI envisaged the task of the liberal to work in an independent organization such as the IVI-ADA in order to place pressure upon the Democratic Party. The Democratic Party politician argued, of course, of the political realism of working for nominal things within his party. Rawick and several members of the audience attempted to bring out a basic confrontation of points of view. While this did not make for intellectual clarity, a number of socialists present were encouraged by the fact that a liberal and a Democratic politician were not horrified by the idea of a basic restructuring of American politics, were indeed in favor of it, although this idea was not the center of their political ideas.

TOUR PLANNED

Rawick hopes to go on tour for the Young Socialist League again in December hoping at that time to speak in New Haven, Buffalo, Antioch College, Madison, as well as in most of the places visited during the current tour. The current series of tours by Bogdan Denitch, Rawick, Michael Harrington and other socialist speakers has done much to help bring socialist political ideas to the campus and to help revive student political interest. Rawick felt that there is a genuine reason for socialists to be optimistic about the prospects for the socialist youth movement on the basis of his contacts on his tour. The Young Socialist League, he felt, has an excellent opportunity for growth and for aiding in the building of a unified and revived socialist movement.

Boston U. Meeting

On Saturday evening, Nov. 9, Mel Stack presented the views of the Young Socialist League on "Towards a Democratic Foreign Policy" to a group of students at Boston University. The meeting was sponsored by the Students for Democratic Action club of Boston University.

In his talk, Stack concentrated on the dangerous drift that is taking place in the world, a drift that could possibly lead to the outbreak of the nightmare of a nuclear Third World War. He emphasized that the theory of military containment, which presently guides both the government's foreign policy and the liberal approach, will neither contain Communism nor bring peace to the world. Instead we must strive towards the creation of a truly democratic foreign policy. And this would concretely mean the ending of all H-bomb tests, the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Europe, the call for self-determination in all countries, Spain and Algeria as well as Hungary and Russia.

A lively discussion followed Stack's talk. Many of the students thought Stack had expressed their own feelings; others had a more questioning attitude; none were hostile to this socialist analysis of foreign policy.

In all respects the meeting was a successful one.

REPLY

First, comrade De Haan speaks of "false statements" and the "pursuit of truth." As will become apparent, the differences between us are not those of representation and misrepresentation but of opinion. *Challenge* regards it as unfortunate that comrade DeHaan felt it necessary to phrase the differences in the terms which he uses.

(1) According to comrade De Haan this group is already "substantially larger" than the YSL. In the YSL's extensive Fall organization campaign which has reached a good twenty campuses, we have encountered a forum group along the line proposed by the SWP in a few cities, mainly New York, Philadelphia, Los Angeles. As far as we have been able to determine, these groups have not formed any kind of national organization, have no political program, have had no national organizational meetings. Our impression is, therefore, that the statement about these loosely related groups being "substantially larger" than the YSL does not coincide with our observations throughout the United States.

(2) These groups were started on the initiative of the SWP and the Left Wing Caucus which split from the YSL. We make our statements regarding this fact because of our immediate, personal contact with the initiators of this group. We know that it is literally impossible for a youth group, on a national scale, in the United States to support itself on the basis of youth resources alone. The cost of an office, of publications, of phones, etc., require some aid from an adult organization, either through affiliation or fraternal relation. If, as comrade De Haan asserts, there is a functioning national organization which binds together the few forums which we have observed, then it must face this problem. Further, all past experience leads us to the conclusion that the labors of the SWP in this regard are not altruistic. There is, of course, nothing wrong with such an approach, but we feel that those who are involved in it should know what is going on.

NEW YORK YSL

Fall Camp

Mountain Spring Camp, N. J.
November 29 to December 1

Bayard Rustin

Executive Secretary, War Resisters League.

Secretary to Martin Luther King
"New Stage in the Civil Rights Struggle"

Dan Wakefield

Staff writer, *The Nation*

"The New Minority:
Puerto Ricans in America"

George Rawick

Editor, *Anvil* and Student Partisan
"Sputnik—The Liberals Go To War"

For reservations call or write
Young Socialist League
114 W. 14th Street, New York 11, N.Y.

INTRODUCTION

The following article on Arab Socialism is translated from Die Neue Gesellschaft, a German Social Democratic magazine (September-October, 1957).

A few words of introduction are in order. For some time now, the most confusing reports have reached America on Arab socialism in general, and the Baath Party in particular. In articles and discussions LABOR ACTION has tried to assemble some solid factual information on the movement (See specially LABOR ACTION for February 11 and 18, 1957). This, however, has been extremely difficult. The role of the socialists in the current crisis in Syria is a case in point. Are they crypto-Communists? If not, what kind of a socialist tendency do they represent?

We have no information on the background of the author of this piece. Its authority must, at least temporarily, rest upon the fact that it was published by a major theoretical organ of the German social democracy. But it also seems valuable in that Feddersen's estimation provides a working hypothesis for dealing with the various actions

of the Arab socialists which have recently been reported in the American press. And a few points of analysis should be emphasized.

The more or less standard interpretation of the Baath Party in this country is that it is a secret agency of the Kremlin's foreign policy and of domestic Stalinism in the various Arab states. Thus, Dana Adams Schmidt, writing in the October 27 New York Times, remarks, "While Colonel Serraj himself stayed out of politics, his most effective political allies were Akram Horani and his pseudo-socialist 'positive neutralist' Baath, which has only fifteen seats in the Parliament of 142, but makes up in vehemence what it lacks in numbers."

In terms of Feddersen's analysis, this characterization is too simple. If this report is right, the weight of specifically socialist ideology in the Baath movement is not great. And there is the political alliance with Moscow which Feddersen describes. But the distinction which has been lost on most of the American press is one between a political alliance with Russian foreign policy and the actual ideology of the movement. If the separation between politics and ideology is as

Feddersen describes it, then the rest of his conclusions are extremely important. For they lead to the judgment that the situation is in flux, that the decisive form of the movement has not yet developed, and that it is possible for Western socialists to influence it in a democratic socialist direction.

It is here that the tragedy of socialist support for colonialism comes into play. As Feddersen remarks, one of the most crucial factors which inhibits real exchange between Western and Arab Socialism is the position of the French social democracy. And here, we come face to face with yet another consequence of socialist support of colonialism. It is not simply that this does great violence to basic socialist principles; nor is it even confined to the things which happen in the actual country where the attack is being carried out, in Algeria, for instance. More than that, it divides the world socialist movement, it increases the opportunity of the Stalinists to masquerade as socialists, it sets back democratic socialism, not only in the metropolitan power and in the colonial nation directly involved, but throughout the world.—M. H., translator.

THE MIDEAST ARAB SOCIALIST MOVEMENT

By JENS FEDDERSEN

What is it, in the midst of all the accidents of daily political decisions, that dominates the Arab world, that enormous space which stretches from the Persian Gulf to the Atlantic, with a population today of 80 million and an anticipated population in 2000 of 120 million? It is a struggle with roots in European education which has become rebellious against Europe, a fight which is waged against the absolutism of kings, sheiks and emirs who, those representatives of the past, often enough, are supported by England and France.

As it emerges, this struggle is sometimes led by those who speak in the name of socialism—by the Arab Socialist Party, the Baath-Party. It is a Party of 80,000 registered members, where membership is understood as meaning a militant activism. In practice, each member is a functionary, and only rarely is employed at a full time job. As the "core of a cell" these members work almost exclusively for the party and are paid by it.

The greatest concentration of the Socialist Party is in Syria. The center for the Arab world, as a matter of fact, is in Damascus. There is also a relatively strong concentration in Aleppo, the textile city of Syria, and it is a point of focus for the entire neighboring area. This is understandable given the fact that the monthly wage of textile workers in Aleppo today is about 40 marks, while the owners of the industry maintain luxury villas on the Mediterranean shore in nearby Lebanon. This discrepancy in living standards is both a case in point and a symptom—it shows a basic reason for the formation and spread of the revolutionary socialist tendency, and for a general politicalization in this region.

Outside of Syria, the Baath Party has groups and organizations—sometimes legal, sometimes illegal—in Lebanon, Jordan, in pro-Western Iraq, in Morocco, Tunisia and in Egypt. Egypt however is an exceptional case. Formally, there is a socialist political grouping. But in actuality, its support of Nasser's policy is so thoroughgoing that it engages in no real activity of its own. In Saudi Arabia, all attempts to develop a party have been abandoned, since the regime brought all pressure at the disposal of the authoritarian state against the organization. This, of course, is not simply because of opposition to socialist domestic and international policy, but because the Saudis will not tolerate, on principle, any kind of political groups in the country. In Iraq, the Socialists are illegal, while in Lebanon they are in open struggle with the pro-Western regime. The recent elections, and the bloody incidents which preceded them, show the bitterness of the opposition. And this situation has not been resolved in any stable fashion.

This is a brief survey of the spread of the Arab Socialists. To clarify their political and ideological standpoint requires an understanding of the meaning of socialism in the Arab world. Socialism here means, almost exclusively, nationalism, the struggle for national independence, with an emphasis upon social change. Only in the distant future does this social emphasis have anything to do with the goals of socialism. The Arab Socialists place nationalism in the foreground, and they must do so. They feel that the road to the solution of pressing social problems requires first political victory. Concretely, in those countries in which the socialists are not in the government, they carry on their struggle in national terms, and only with this message. This, they feel, is the only way to reach the masses of the people who, in this transitional period, which is characteristic of all the Arab states, are practically anesthetized by these slogans.

The situation is different in those countries where the Socialists participate in the government. For example, in Syria Socialists hold the post of foreign minister and labor minister, and an enormous section of the officer corps is under Socialist influence. Here, and in Egypt, the relative weight between pure nationalism and social themes changes. And social progress has been made in Syria, particularly in the industrial complex of Damascus where the reactionary influence of the Bedouins is not as strong as it is in the Aleppo region. But these victories of social policy are not so extensive that the socialists can dispense with the narcotic of nationalism. Rather, there is a changing proportion of the two elements, with the national emphasis more important where the struggle is against the conservative power supported by the Bedouin sheiks and the social more prominent in the agitation among the industrial and agricultural proletariat.

CONCEALED COMMUNISM?

It has often been said that Arab Socialism is a concealed form of Communism. Practical experience and investigation disproves this assertion, without removing the possibility that someday it might become true. A definition of the situation would go along the following lines:

Arab Socialism rejects Communist ideology. It fights against it, and seeks to remove its partisans from the ranks of the Socialist Party. At the same time, it joins with the Communists on the national question, tolerates them, and sees the Soviet Union as a power which supports the Arab movement. In this context, the Arab Socialists work with Moscow in terms of the immediate national and international issues.

What does this mean in practice? No more, and no less, than that the Moscow regime has a dependable ally in the Arab Socialist movement, even though that movement takes steps to keep Communist ideology out of its ranks. Today, this opposition to Communist ideology, as seen from the outside, has been effective. The question is, however, how long can a distinction be maintained between Moscow as a government and Moscow as an ideology? Can it last for long? The Kremlin, with great insight, has understood that it must appear in the Arab world as a regime which supports Arab governments. So far, Moscow has carefully avoided coming before the Arabs identified as an ideology which it exports, and thus pressing against the socialists. However, in the long run this development tends toward an "export of ideology through the backdoor"—and the backdoor is the Russian government.

But today, one cannot characterize the Arab Socialists as Communists. And all the evidence makes it seem unlikely that they will become Communists in the foreseeable future. In particular, the differences on the religious question are of great importance in blocking this development, for religion plays a very impor-

tant role in the Arab world. What is probable is a continuation of the cooperation between the Arab Socialists and international Communism, particularly in terms of the new co-existence line.

THE LEADERS

Who are the leaders of Arab Socialism? There are three major personalities. Here is a thumbnail sketch of them:

Akram Horani, 42 years old, general secretary of the Party. He is particularly skilled in organizational work. A devout Mohammedan. Expert mass speaker. He is called the "boss of the streets" in Damascus, Beirut and Amman where his influence upon the people is particularly strong. As a young man he was an agricultural worker. Studied in Paris, politically active since the age of 25.

Michael Aflak. A Christian. Previously a Communist. Like Horani, a general secretary of the Party. His specialty is theory. Forty-nine years old, of considerable intellectual power. Studied for a while in Paris.

Salah Bitar. Forty-three years old. Syrian foreign minister. Outspoken type of revolutionary and politician. Was persecuted, arrested and sentenced by the previous conservative regime in Syria and by the Lebanese and Jordanians. Friend of Nehru. One of the "originators" of the pan-Arab idea. Friend of Nasser. Studied in Paris.

Contact between the Arab and European socialists is, for most of the Arabs, unthinkable. On the one hand, there is the support of the French socialists for anti-Arab policies, on the other, the whole question of Israel, which is a decisive point. The only relationship is with the Italian social democracy, since this Party appears to the Arabs as "unfainted." The attitude toward the German social Democracy is not unfriendly, but is somewhat skeptical. For a long time, partly through personal circumstances, there has been contact with Nehru. Visits to New Delhi are on the order of the day, and many feel that Nehru's influence is responsible for keeping the Arab Socialists out of the Communist camp.

FUTURE OF MOVEMENT

The future of the Socialists is an open question throughout the Arab world. The West must not make the mistake of thinking these parties Communist. In the first place, this simply isn't so; in the second, such an attitude drives the Arab Socialists toward extreme positions. Moreover, it is unreal to think that the Arab Socialist movement can be suppressed, as so many other movements have been suppressed. Today, the movement is already strong and maintains entrenched positions throughout the Arab world. The decisive problem is that this movement must serve the masses which follow it. In this way, and it is crucial for the West, a socialist movement stretching from the Persian Gulf to the Atlantic will be created. But if we ignore it, then we will have the effect of finally driving it into the arms of the Kremlin.

The Ideal of the Russian Revolution Is the Ideal of Socialism Today:

FREEDOM IN EQUALITY

By MAX SHACHTMAN

The fortieth anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution of November 7, 1917, has been celebrated all over Russia and in many other countries.

The triumph of that revolution marked the most important dividing line in the history of mankind: between the end of the age of capitalism and the beginning of the age of socialism. That is how every thoughtful person judged it at the time and the judgment remains fundamentally sound. The forty following years have shown, it is true, that this line is not as straight and clear as we first believed. It has often been twisted and tangled up since the ten titanic days that shook the world. It has bent back upon itself and been broken off by unforeseen detours or overlaid with rubbish. But it has not been obliterated from the consciousness and aspirations of tens of millions of people, far more in number today than there were four decades ago. If the achievement of socialism will, as we believe, signify a great new epoch for man, there is nothing in the annals of his striving for freedom that more fully merits celebration than the first herald of the socialist age.

Counterrevolution

Yet, nowhere, least of all in Russia herself, did the official celebrations of the revolution raise the banners under which it was won or extol the program to which it was devoted. There is no mystery about that. If the workers and peasants who carried out the revolution of 1917 would fail to see the fulfillment of its promises and hopes in 1957, it is not because the revolution has matured and flowered beyond their dreams, but because it was cut down and crushed by a counter-revolution. It is in reality this counter-revolution that has just been celebrated under the command of its beneficiaries, just as it has been for a good quarter of a century. The importance of this counter-revolution is hard to overstate. Indeed, it can be said, even if it sounds paradoxical, that the failure to understand this counter-revolution lies at the base of almost every misunderstanding and misjudgment of the revolution which it displaced. And those are in turn the source of most of the immense confusion that prevails today about socialism and the socialist movement both among their supporters and their opponents.

The essence of the Bolshevik Revolution was the transfer of all power in the country to the Soviets (Councils) of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies. Russia was then being ravaged by a crisis inherited from the Czarist regime and unrelieved by its first successors. The whole people was sick and tired of the war; the peasants, who formed the bulk of the population, wanted the land for themselves; the workers wanted an end to the paralysis in industrial life which was accompanied by rampant profiteering; and almost everybody wanted a democratic regime that would wipe out all vestiges of Czarist autocracy.

Soviets and Democracy

The first heirs of collapsed Czarism could not even begin to solve the crisis. The genius of Lenin, and of the Bolsheviks whom he finally persuaded to follow him, lay in proposing a new and revolutionary solution to the problems of the crisis. Let the peasants simply take the land they till. Let the workers themselves set the economy into rational motion by establishing their own organized control of industry, starting right in the shops and factories. Let the people as a whole end the war on the instant by proposing a democratic peace without annexations or tribute. And who or what is to guarantee that these measures can not only be undertaken but carried out? The masses of the people themselves, not as brought together in institutions for which the Bolsheviks or anybody else had worked out a faultless blueprint in a political laboratory, but as they had already been brought together, spontaneously and naturally, of their own accord, into organizations embracing virtually all the toiling people of city and village and the military forces as well—the Soviets.

The Bolsheviks did not invent Soviets. They did not create them, not in the Revolution of 1905 or in the Revolution of 1917. These councils were the elementary form of the people's demand for self-determination and self-government. The Bolsheviks simply gave the clearest, simplest but most incisive expression to this de-

mand in terms of the already organized life of the Russian people. In a country where the official, although unelected, government (the "Provisional Government") showed not the slightest ability to govern, let alone to comply with the wishes of the people, the Bolshevik slogan: "All Power to the Soviets!" proved to be irresistible.

Tirelessly and in language understandable by all, the Bolsheviks repeated: If the peasant is to have the land, if the worker is to have control in the factory, if the people are to have peace—the Soviets which already embrace all the people must have the power to govern. They pointed out that even the most frantic opponents of this idea, the supporters of the Kerensky Provisional Government, nevertheless always referred to the Soviets as the "revolutionary democracy." The idea that the revolutionary democracy should establish itself as the state power prevailed. The Bolshevik Revolution thus confirmed the prediction and wacry of the Communist Manifesto seventy years earlier: "The first step in the revolution by the working class, is to raise the proletariat to the position of the ruling class, to win the battle of democracy."



Expand or Perish

If this central characteristic of the Bolshevik Revolution is not grasped in full as the heart and soul of the revolution, of the reason why the people rallied to the Bolsheviks, and of why they all carried it through with unexampled enthusiasm and sacrificing spirit, everything of importance will be missed or misunderstood. Lenin, who was so often plain to the point of bluntness, even harshness, was never so direct, harsh, unambiguous and unyielding as he was on this score in 1917. He would not even listen to any proposals for a peace program, for a land reform, for reorganizing the economy, for any change or promised change in the social life of the country, unless it was coupled with the proposal for all power to the people that would enable them in reality to carry out the proposals in their own interests, all power to the people already organized democratically in their Soviets. In these muddled days, when the mere word "planning," for example, sends so many people, including socialists, into paroxysms of approval, it is instructive as well as refreshing to recall Lenin's own words just a few days before the revolution:

"The proletariat, when victorious, will act thus. It will set the economists, engineers, agricultural experts and so on to work out a 'plan' under the control of the workers' organizations, to test it, to seek means of saving labor by means of centralism, and of securing the most simple, cheap, convenient, general control. We shall pay the economists, statisticians, technicians, good money, but—but we shall not give them anything to eat unless they carry out this work honestly and entirely in the interests of the workers.

"We are in favor of centralism and of a 'plan,' but it must be the centralism and the plan of the proletarian state—the proletarian regulation of production and distribution in the interests of the poor, the

laboring, the exploited, against the exploiters."

Everywhere the italicized words are Lenin's, and they give us a far truer idea of his own conception of the essential feature of the socialist revolution and the reconstruction of society on socialist foundations than is to be found in a thousand books by his successors or his adversaries. They give us also a true idea of what the Russian workers wanted at that time; and found in the program of the revolution.

This is not the place to set forth all the reasons why the ideal of the revolution could not be maintained for long in the isolation of an economically backward land, harassed for years of its infancy by hostile forces at home and abroad. It may suffice to say that there were few problems the revolutionary leaders were more keenly aware of than that of remaining in isolation, that is, of the revolution failing to extend its frontiers to the more advanced countries of Europe. In that event—and they did not hesitate to proclaim this view over and over again—the counter-revolution would triumph and the revolution would perish. In this, they proved to be only too tragically correct. They did not, to be sure, foresee the unique form and nature that the counter-revolution would have, but then neither did anyone else.

In their desperate efforts to hold out until the revolution spread to Western Europe, at least, the Bolshevik leaders placed one curb after another upon the ideal of socialist democracy which had assured the initial victory of the revolution. If the abused term, "degenerated workers' state" (or more accurately, deformed workers' state), could be applied to the Russian revolution, then it was precisely in its early years, when it was still under the leadership of the Bolsheviks, and the term was indeed first used and applied by Lenin himself.

At first, the curbs were imposed by the rigors of the civil war and the war against foreign intervention, and, on the whole, no working-class government could or would have acted otherwise. But when, after the civil war was ended, the curbs were not only maintained and extended but were even exalted as principles for a normal development of socialism, the revolutionary ideal, the essential characteristic of working-class self-administration, starting in the factories and running all the way up to the highest governmental institutions, was undermined more and more gravely. Without the increasingly conscious self-administration of society by the producers—for which the constant expansion, not restriction, of democracy is a synonym—socialism is a fraud, or in any case unrealizable.

Undermined Revolution

And to the extent that the architects of the revolution restricted democracy, in the Soviets, in the trade-unions, and even in the Bolshevik party itself in the first few years of the revolution, they contributed to the undermining of the socialist revolution itself, to enfeebling the resistive capacity of the socialist organism. In that sense, they themselves unwittingly facilitated the work of the counter-revolution in completely destroying the organism. Once this is said—and the wisdom which hindsight makes so much easier dictates that it be said—the distinction must nevertheless be maintained. The man who unthinkingly neglects to maintain the fire-proofing qualities of the home cannot, regardless of justified criticism, be equated with the arsonist whose work of destroying the home utterly has been made easier.

The essence of the Stalinist counter-revolution lies in the destruction, root and branch, of every form, institution and right of democracy. Perhaps worse even than this sinister achievement is the fact that it has destroyed, as it had to, the socialist thought of an entire generation of revolutionists who were drawn to the Russian Revolution: those it has not corrupted intellectually it has demoralized, those it has not demoralized it has disoriented, those it has not disoriented it has reduced to cynical courtesans. The whole conception of the socialist society and the road to it, the whole conception of a political movement having socialism as its goal—all this has been hideously distorted beyond recognition or resemblance to what it always was in the past. There is not a single element in the defense of the Stalinist regime by ardent advocate or mild apologist that is not an abominable, discrediting abuse of socialism.

The fact that the gulf between producer and director of production is greater in Russia than in any modern country of the world, is never even mentioned by defenders of Stalinist "socialism." The fact that the Russian worker (and peasant) has less to say about determining the conditions of production than has the worker in any other modern country, is of no importance to this "socialism"—even though Marx so rightly emphasizes that the rule of society lies in the hands of those who determine the conditions of production. The fact that there are not and for decades have not been any workers' or peasants' or soldiers' Soviets in Russia—or that where the people establish such councils, as in Hungary last year, it is Russian tanks and cannon that blast them out of existence—may or may not be of importance "in itself," but it is of no relevance to the reality of this "socialism." The fact that literally millions of people, guilty of the crime of having different political views or even innocent of the crime, were slaughtered by the Russian regime with a cold bloodedness and callousness excelled, if at all, only by Hitler's regime, is, belatedly, deplored, but does not change the "socialist" character of the regime. The fact that the people as a whole, even including the members of what is supposed to be the ruling party, do not have the right to speak, to meet, to publish, to vote, to worship (if they wish to), is of no fundamental consequence to this "socialism"—it might be better, conceded some apologists, if they had these

(Turn to Last Page)

FREEDOM IN EQUALITY — —

(Continued from page 7)

rights, but it is not fatal to socialism if they do not have them.

What, then, is important to socialism? Planning? But that is a commonplace to capitalism in every crisis, particularly the crisis of war, when production is organized according to plan, instead of being left to "free enterprise" and the regulation of the capitalist market. The overcoming of illiteracy? That is almost a commonplace, also, under capitalism; indeed, the highest development of capitalism is increasingly impossible without the elimination of illiteracy. The stratification of the means of production and exchange, a formula which has a hypnotically numbing effect on the thinking of some socialists? And the enormous development of the productive forces with which the Stalinist regime has so greatly awed the entire world?

New Tyranny

There is no private ownership of property under Stalinism, it is true, and the development of the productive forces is likewise a fact. But it is a terrible mark of the deformation of socialist thinking that these two facts are somehow equated with socialism or the organic development toward socialism. Without democracy, without complete political and administrative control by the producers, the centralization of all economic power, all the means of production and distribution, in the hands of the state combined with the expansion of the means of production, signify not the development of socialism, but the establishment of the most potent tyranny of modern times—exceeding, not exceeded by, the tyranny of capitalist exploitation. Here indeed has Stalinism wrought its destruction of the socialist mind as well as the socialist goal.

A concrete foundation is essential to a good home, just like the nationalization of the means of production and distribution is essential to the construction of a socialist society. But on the same foundation of concrete can be built a prison (in fact, the foundations of most prisons are supposed to be stronger than of most homes). Very few people, however, speak of prisons as "imperfect homes" the way the Stalinist states are

sometimes called, by affable apologists, "imperfect socialism." And even fewer people are ready to call upon the prisoners for "unconditional defense" of their prison because the concrete foundations on which it rests might some day be used to build a happy home on.

Of all the known societies based on class exploitation, our socialist teacher, Frederick Engels, once wrote: "It is not the producers who control the means of production, but the means of production which control the producers. In such a society each new lever of production is necessarily transformed into a new means for the subjection of the producers to the means of production." There is not a capitalist country where each "new lever of production," where every expansion of the productive forces, has more effectively subjected the producers than it has those who are under the rule of the class that owns and controls the means of production through its monopoly of state power in the Stalinist states. It is not socialism we see there, but its brutal denial in the name of socialism.

The Russian Revolution had as one of its achievements the reinvigoration of international socialism which was so deeply discredited by the blood and filth of the First World War which most of the European socialist parties supported with chauvinistic enthusiasm. The new movement drew its inspiration from the socialist ideal which was being transformed into reality by the Russian working class. The promise which it bore, despite all its primitive and infantile errors, was as completely smashed by the Stalinist counter-revolution as was the Russian revolution itself. When one of the leaders of the Bolsheviks said at a party congress in 1919 that it would not be a bad thing if all the Communist parties of the world were subordinated to the Central Committee of the Russian party, Lenin was horrified to the point of the rebuke: "If there were anything like this in the program, there would not even be any need to criticize it: the authors of such a proposal would have dug their own graves." When the Stalinist regime finally succeeded in reducing all the Communist parties to vassals of the Russian party Secretariat, it dug the grave of the Communist movement as a working class or socialist movement.

The international socialist movement today, too, re-

quires reinvigoration and reorientation. In our eyes, the aim of the socialist movement remains, or must again become, the establishment of a working-class government, the winning of the battle of democracy, as the road to the socialist reorganization of society. But all that has happened in the last quarter of a century—the rise of Fascism, on the one side, and the rise of Stalinist totalitarianism masked as socialism, on the other side—emphasizes the urgent and indispensable need of one more identifying, not just associating but identifying, the fight for socialism with the fight for democracy in every part of the world and in every sphere of social life—not in Russia alone, but in Algeria too, not in Hungary alone but in Guatemala and Okinawa as well, not in parliamentary reforms alone but in the foundations of society, the factories, as well, not in bureaucratic arbitrariness in the Kremlin alone but in the United States as a whole and in our trade unions in particular.

In the very first periodical published in England by the German Communists of the time of Marx and Engels with whom they were associated, the Communist Journal of London, in September, 1847, we find these remarkably timely words:

"We are not among those communists who are out to destroy personal liberty, who wish to turn the world into one huge barrack or into a gigantic workhouse. There are some communists who, with an easy conscience, refuse to countenance personal liberty and would like to shuffle it out of the world because they consider that it is a hindrance to complete harmony. But we have no desire to exchange freedom for equality. We are convinced, and we intend to return to the matter in subsequent issues, that in no social order will personal freedom be so assured as in a society based upon communal ownership."

The socialist movement which maintains the divorce between socialism and democracy, between socialism and freedom, will never succeed in establishing socialism, but only in discrediting it. The socialist movement which champions, in word and in deed, the identity of the two, which realizes in the social flesh the ideal of the Russian Revolution of freedom in equality, will be irresistible. The future belongs to it.

Silence Would Be Complicity —

(Continued from page 1)

Ahcone Lahouati, regional leader of the MNA in Clermont-Ferrand, killed by a gunman on October 17.

Ahmed Bekhat, general secretary of the USTA in France, killed on October 25. His body was found on a vacant lot in Colombes, a suburb of Paris. He had been kidnapped and shot. He had narrowly escaped an attempt on his life a few months before.

The striking circumstance about this series of murders, is that it is directed primarily against trade-unionists, militants of the USTA. What we are witnessing here, is a deliberate attempt to decapitate and to smash the Algerian trade-union movement. It is well known who the killers are. These assassinations are carried out by professional gunmen of the North African underworld in France, who are paid for each job done (the equivalent of \$200, it seems). The important question is: who is behind the killers? Traditionally, the responsibility for a crime is laid to those who benefit most by it. By these standards, circumstantial evidence points to three groups, which have been prominent in organizing political murder in the past:

WHO BENEFITS?

(1) The bourgeois leadership of the FLN, which is interested in destroying the USTA as the main base and strong point of the MNA. From its point of view, these crimes are simply a continuation of its policy, in France and in Algeria, of exterminating political opponents by wholesale murder.

(2) The Communist Party, who is interested in eliminating the only independent, democratic and militant working-class organization that can block its path in Algeria. The affair of the CGT arms cache in Lyon, among other incidents, has proved that it actively helps the FLN in the organization of its political murders. This is its calculation: if the USTA takes these blows lying down, it will eventually be smashed; if it retaliates against the Stalinists, the CP will be able to cry that the "Messalist provocateurs" are "turning against the French working-class."

(3) The French police, who would be delighted to smash the spearhead of the Algerian revolution while putting the

blame on the other nationalist organization. Since the thirties, the police have always tried to infiltrate the Algerian nationalist movement; it is naive to assume that they have not succeeded to some extent. The loose, heterogeneous structure of the FLN, its lack of internal control and discipline, are elements which favor such infiltration.

This is a "united front" of a new kind: a political cess-pool in which professional criminals, police provocateurs, political adventurers and Stalinist agents can operate at ease. The men of the FLN who have ordered these murders have taken a terrible responsibility before the Algerian people and before the international labor movement: they have turned a significant part of the Algerian nationalist movement into a tool of its worst enemies.

THE VICTIMS

Who are the victims? The personality of the two main leaders will serve to further clarify the significance of these murders.

Abdallah Filali, who narrowly escaped death, is an outstanding veteran of the Algerian working-class movement. In 1927 he was one of the co-founders with Messali Hadj of the "Etoile Nord-Africaine," the first proletarian party and the first nationalist organization in North Africa. Since then, he has participated in every struggle against colonialism. Under the Vichy regime he was first condemned to forced labor for life, then to death by contumacy. He is one of the founders of the USTA, and represented this organization, with Bekhat, at the recent congress at Bamako of the "Rassemblement Démocratique Africain," the leading nationalist organization of French West Africa.

Ahmed Bekhat was twenty-seven years old. He had been a metal-worker and a welder since the age of sixteen. At twenty years, he was one of the leaders in the trade-union work of the MTLD (forerunner of the MNA) and of the MTLD fraction in the CGT. He was one of the outstanding leaders of the North African labor movement. All who have known him will remember him for his clear intelligence, his warm humanity, his absolute honesty and integrity.

The men who are being killed now represent the hope and the best human potential of the labor movement in North Africa. Their death is an irreplaceable loss. The movement will continue and grow, as it has continued after the murder of Ferhat Hached, founder of the Tunisian UGTT (Tunisian Workers General Union). But its progress will be slower and less steady than it would have been had these men lived.

PUBLIC APPEAL

A statement, signed by leading French and African intellectuals, socialists, and trade-unionists of different tendencies (*) after the attempted assassination of Filali, read as follows:

"We do not know who has armed the assassins, and it is astonishing indeed that the recent attacks were directed particularly against the trade-unionists of the USTA. But, even if these crimes were

committed at the instigation of nationalist leaders, they nonetheless remain crimes. . . . We cannot but cry out in anger over crimes against men of the value of Abdallah Filali and his union brothers. What is involved here is our basic conception of human dignity and brotherhood.

"Moreover, these acts hurt the Algerian cause terribly and build up a wall of hostility between the French and the Algerian workers.

"Only the ultra-colonialists can welcome such acts which eliminate men who have survived the repression.

"As to those organizations and militants who have always advocated opposition to colonialism and support to the Algerian people, they must cry out in indignation.

"Silence would become complicity."
SILENCE WOULD BE COMPLICITY!

We await the statement by the leadership of the FLN and of the UGTA (Algerian Workers General Union) dissociating itself from these murders, condemning the practice of settling political differences by murder and expressing their willingness to make an agreement with the MNA to end all mutual aggressions.

We await a statement from the French CP, condemning the murders of the trade-unionists of the USTA.

We await the appointment by the ICFTU of a neutral investigation commission into the murders of Algerian trade-unionists, and speedy action with all means at its disposal to protect the USTA from further repression.

We await statements from the Moroccan UMT and from the Tunisian UGTT, whose founder Ferhat Hached was assassinated under not dissimilar circumstances, condemning the murder of Bekhat and of his comrades.

SILENCE WOULD BE COMPLICITY!

(*) Jean Cassou, Claude Gérard, André Breton, Yves Dechézelles, Marceau Pivert, Jean Rous, Edgar Morin, Colette Audry, Paul Ruff, Alexandre Hébert, Daniel Guérin, Pierre Lambert, Daniel Renard, and others.

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.