

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

AUGUST 30, 1954

FIVE CENTS

SPOT-LIGHT

That 'Agonizing Reappraisal' Is Here: EDC Is Dead—Where To Now?

By GORDON HASKELL

Peurifoycation

After Greece and Guatemala, maybe a third country is to be "Peurifoyed" now. Washington columnist Robert S. Allen reports that U. S. Ambassador John E. Peurifoy is being assigned to Thailand next.

Peurifoy's reputation, such as it is, has come from his labors in riding herd on two reactionary governments—first in Greece, and more lately in engineering the Guatemalan counter-revolution of Castillo Armas. On the latter, see the article in this issue; and on the former there is some late news too.

Like Peurifoyed Guatemala, Peurifoyed Greece is also engaged in an anti-labor drive. The AFL News-Reporter recounts that the Greek minister of labor, Gonis, has decreed the outright abolition of the checkoff dues system, a system re-established on Greece's liberation in 1944 and in effect since that time.

"Gonis implied that the government was penalizing the unions for entering into party politics; critics of the action countered with the charge that the government was seeking to do away with opposition within the unions and thus to subjugate them," said the AFL paper.

Then the minister revealed that he planned to replace the old system with his own checkoff system, which provides funds for a so-called labor welfare fund which looks very like the Nazi "Strength Through Joy" movement of the Hitlerite Labor Front.

(Turn to last page)

It now appears that the death of the European Defense Community awaits only the action of the French Assembly to make it completely and formally official. This development will force an "agonizing reappraisal" not only in Washington but also in Bonn and throughout the West German Republic.

Chancellor Adenauer, who won a decisive victory at the polls just about a year ago, has been the chief advocate of EDC in West Germany. He has stood as a staunch American ally against the claims of both the extreme right and the Social-Democrats that integration of Western Germany into EDC and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization would sound the death knell for German unification. It appears that the basis of his position has been the view that German unification is not possible short of World War III, or at least of a shift in the relation of forces drastically in favor of the American bloc.

ADENAUER'S LINE

In the meantime, his reasoning seems to be, the quickest and surest way for the economic recovery of Western Germany is to accept integration into some form of Western community both economically and militarily. This would bring the speediest end to the occupation of his country, would provide it with access to the maximum markets in Western Europe and the rest of the non-Stalinist world, and would permit it rapidly to achieve a position of power and influence in the councils of the American bloc at least equal to, and probably more weighty

than, that of any other country on the continent of Europe.

Adenauer's position has not been universally accepted in Germany, even in capitalist and other conservative circles, although the heavy weight of German capital was thrown behind his party at the last elections as a way of making sure that the Social-Democrats would be beaten.

BALANCE OF POWER?

These circles are attracted by the idea that if the unification of Germany can be bought on any terms, in due course the country can come to play a balance-of-power role between the capitalist and Stalinist worlds, or at least that of mediator between them. A section of German capital is thirsty for the markets of Russia and Eastern Europe, and sees a larger prospect of trade there than in industrialized Western Europe. To this political grouping the actual integration of Germany into EDC appeared to signify the final slamming of the door on any hope of major trade with the East.

The right-wing objections to EDC were given voice recently by former Reich Chancellor Bruening in a speech before an assemblage of Ruhr industrial-

CROWDED OUT OF THIS ISSUE is further comment on the police-state law banning the Communist Party, now signed by Eisenhower, to the accompaniment of raucous silence from Adlai Stevenson.

ists. The speech found a considerable echo in the most conservative and even reactionary sections of German society. And now, with EDC foundering, it is quite likely that these will be the political groups in Germany which will derive the greatest benefit from the collapse of the Adenauer policy.

SPD STERILE

But the Social-Democrats have also opposed EDC. Why should not they be the ones to benefit from its defeat by the French? Or, to put it otherwise, is there some way in which they could benefit from this defeat.

In the past, the policy of the German Social-Democratic Party (SPD) has been fairly consistent on the question of EDC. That is, it must be said, it has been consistently muddled and indecisive.

The SPD has been for the unification of Germany. It has been against the rearmament of the country until and unless Germany is granted equality as a sovereign nation with the other countries with which it was to be joined in the EDC venture.

All that was perfectly proper, correct, and even commendable. But at the same time, the SPD leadership found it necessary to proclaim that they view Germany as being definitely in the "Western" (that is, American) camp, and that their sole hope for unification lies in negotiations among the four occupying powers.

This demand for negotiations, instead of an active policy of their own, has sterilized the SPD's opposition to the European Defense Community. The right wing at least proposes some kind of active role for the Germany of the future which can give hope that that country will one day be able to strike a decisive blow on its own behalf.

THE BEGGAR POLICY

The SPD's position, on the other hand, reduces the role of the party, as of the West German state, to that of a beggar who is to live permanently on the hope of favors from more successful patrons. Whether EDC lives or dies, such a future can hardly inspire any but the most inane trustfulness of Germans to follow the leadership of the party. They must be people who really believe that if the Germans are good but quiet boys, the Americans, British and French and the Russians will agree to let them reunite their country for no other reason than that such a demand is backed by the dictates of justice.

Writing about the political effects on Western Germany of a collapse of EDC, M. S. Handler, New York Times correspondent, had this to say "The overt and hidden Nazis, nationalists and political adventurers of all sorts would emerge into the open, triumphant over the final collapse of Dr. Adenauer's foreign policy. They would be confident that only a return to the traditional diplomacy based

(Turn to last page)

In Industry After Industry, Labor's Back Is to the Wall: 'Take It or Leave It,' Say the Bosses

By BEN HALL

Wage cuts at Studebaker last week pointed up the difficulties of union struggles today.

Economically: production is being cut back. Political: union rights are sliced away by a steady succession of unfavorable NLRB decisions.

The Studebaker affair gained nation-wide publicity because of the importance of the union involved—the UAW—and because a wage-cut, the first in an important sector of the auto industry, was at stake. But the dispute was only one incident among many.

In the textile industry, organized shops have been compelled to take wage-cuts for some time. In the hosiery industry, the union has just been forced to abandon its pension plan upon demand of the employers. In all these cases, labor has retreated.

GOODYEAR ARROGANT

In the rubber industry, the United Rubber Workers (CIO) is striking for a wage increase; but the course of the strike and the negotiations that preceded it is the best current example of the new "hard" employers' attitude that unions hit up against.

Unions have permitted wage-cuts in industries where employers have made tearful pleas of declining profits or

losses. But no such excuse for company resistance can be found in rubber.

On July 7, 23,000 rubber workers struck against the Goodyear Company. This strike continues 40 days later. The union demands an increase of 7½ cents per hour plus 4½ to level out area wage inequities.

Negotiations had begun as early as April but the company deliberately stalled and made its first offer only on July 2; it then offered 5 cents per hour increase, rejected by the union.

Its profits are the greatest in history. In 1953, its net profits had soared to an all-time high of \$49,300,000. And in the first three months of 1954, its profits were 11 per cent higher than in the same period last year.

L. S. Buckmaster, URW president, sums up the company attitude:

"The company's attitude was very arbitrary from the beginning of the negoti-

ations and it continued in the manner up until the negotiations broke off, about two hours before the strike deadline. When the deadline was reached, the union suggested a meeting the next day, but the company refused to meet, saying that they had other things to do the following day. Something new has been injected into our relationship with Goodyear. It looks like the pattern which General Electric, Timken Roller Bearing and certain other companies have been practicing. It seems to be a take-it-or-leave-it proposition without any room for real collective bargaining. Our answer to that attitude is the use of the only weapon which we have—our refusal to work until the company changes its attitude and its position."

BOSSSES HARDEN

In negotiations with the other big rubber companies, the union meets a firm united front of resistance. Issues came to a head next at the Firestone Rubber Company.

"Evidently," said Buckmaster, "Firestone has joined that ever-increasing fraternity of industrialists who seek to weaken our union by refusing to bargain in good faith with the elected union representatives."

(Continued on page 2)

Class Forces Behind the Anti-Vargas Struggle—

Brazil: The Generals Openly Take Power

By MADEIRA

RIO DE JANEIRO, Aug. 15—On the evening of August 5, the well-known Rio newspaperman Carlos Lacerda, editor of *Tribuna da Imprensa* and the foremost standard-bearer in the press of the liberal-rightist opposition to President Vargas, was shot by three members of Vargas' personal guard. The gangsters missed Lacerda, who was only slightly wounded, but killed an air force major, a friend of his, who was in his company.

This attempt stirred the country, especially the officers of the army, navy and air force, and brought a serious danger of a military coup d'état by sharpening the contradictions between Vargas and the heads of the armed forces.

Readers of LABOR ACTION are already aware of the political development that pushed the generals to compel Vargas to dismiss his demagogic minister of labor, Joao Goulart, last February. The organ which looks after the long-run interests of the whole of the heterogeneous Brazilian ruling class—the army, which in Brazil is something like a state-party—vetoed the Peronist trend in the Vargas government and took an oppositionist stand against Vargas by staying on the watch against him. Since it suits the interests of the ruling class to keep the constitutional framework as long as there is no immediate social danger in the country, the February crisis was closed by the fall of the labor minister and the decline of Vargas' demagogic drive in the working class.

AFTERMATH OF MURDER

Nevertheless Vargas—who is a very smart politician—was still able to appoint a new war minister, General Zenobio da Costa, who is a friend of his and somewhat counter-balances the oppositionist drive of his army comrades. At the same time, Vargas decreed the new minimum wage of 2400 cruzeiros per month (less than \$60 at the current free rate), which did not improve the workers' standards of living at all but did increase the uneasiness of the ruling class about Vargas and, as a matter of fact, accelerated still further the rise in the cost of living.

The majority of the Congress defeated the proposal to impeach Vargas put forward by the "liberals" of the UDN (Democratic National Union) party, and further denied the ministry of justice the

As we go to press, the news is that Vargas was ousted by the army and committed suicide. This climaxes the developments described by our Rio correspondent.—Ed.

right to try Deputy Lutero Vargas (Vargas' son) for his part in the scandal in which the Bank of Brazil (semi-nationalized) supplied the pro-government Rio newspaper *Ultima Hora* with funds. It was this scandal whose denunciation by Carlos Lacerda had prepared the atmosphere for the February events.

As a result of Lacerda's charges, Lutero Vargas sued him for slander on the assumption that Lacerda would be unable to prove his accusations. However, Carlos Lacerda was actually able to prove in court the same charges he printed in his newspaper. Carlos Lacerda is the most typical of those right-wing "democrats" [see Madeira's article in LA for May 31 who oppose Vargas from the standpoint of the ruling class and he has many times incited the generals to get rid of Vargas.

Then the attempt on Lacerda's life took place. After killing Air Force Major Rubens Vaz the assassins escaped.

If Lacerda himself had been killed, the political situation would not have become so serious as it has. Many generals and admirals immediately stated that the armed forces demanded a full investigation of the crime and the punishment of those who ordered and committed it, whoever they might be.

LOST AUTHORITY

A meeting took place in the Air Force Club in which many officers openly accused the government in a revolutionary tone. The government, relying on the incapacity of the police, stated that it was more interested than anybody else in solving the case. Vargas himself said that those responsible for the murder were "his worst enemies."

He did not expect that the air force would set up a committee of inquiry and that they would discover that two of the men who shot at Lacerda were members of Vargas' personal civil police guard.

Vargas' position is very weak. He has lost his support in the working class. His demagogic campaigns and the corruption and inefficiency of his administration also have incurred the hostility of the working class. The only thing that prevented his regime from being overthrown in February is that the interests of the Brazilian ruling class require them to maintain the constitutional framework intact if possible, and he has been kept under watch since then.

Now members of his personal guard are found guilty of murder. Nobody believes that Vargas himself ordered the murder or even knew anything about its planning. He is smart enough to foresee the consequences of such an act. But it is evident that the murder was ordered by somebody in Vargas' intimate circle, and his son Lutero, who is as corrupt as he is irresponsible, was strongly suspected from the start; he had the most to benefit from Lacerda's death.

In spite of all, Vargas refuses to resign his office in favor of the vice-president, and as long as he keeps a bit of power he will maneuver to improve his position.

Vargas has lost even the moral and political authority that becomes a president of the republic. The officers of the committee of inquiry searched the palace for the three members of the personal guard involved. This guard was dissolved and its members arrested and brought one by one before Lacerda so that he could try to recognize the men involved.

ARMY STEPS IN

Yesterday events began to move at a faster pace. First, the air force apprehended Alcino Joao do Nascimento, who admitted under questioning at the air force headquarters near Rio that he not only was involved in the shooting but that it was ordered by Lutero Vargas.

Yesterday afternoon the Military Club (army officers' club) met and first considered a motion to force Vargas to resign. This motion, while approved, was later withdrawn in favor of a milder one in which the officers declared their solidarity with the other branches of the armed forces and demanded that the responsible criminals be brought to justice and receive severe punishment for their

crimes. In particular they want any immunity, constitutional or presidential, abolished so that all can be brought to justice.

At the moment the situation is quite fluid.

The threat to democratic institutions and civil liberties in Brazil is now greater than any time since 1945. The air force inquiry has led, if not directly to Vargas, at least to his immediate family and government. His position would seem untenable especially in light of the motion withdrawn by the officers' club yesterday.

On the other hand, only with a gun at his back will he resign (he said as much last week at a public meeting at Belo Horizonte in which he was loudly cheered), and the majority in Congress is very unlikely to vote his legal impeachment. Only the army can depose him.

If they do, and if the generals still prefer—as it would seem they do—to keep the constitutional framework, the vice-president will take power. If, on the contrary the generals think that the time has come for a "Government of Public Safety" that could face the critical economic and socio-political situation of the country at the cost of its democratic institutions and the working class, then a military junta will be set up.

COUP D'ETAT?

There is no organized force to safeguard the democratic institutions as against both Vargas' corruption and the threat of military dictatorship. The "liberals" openly ask the army to compel Vargas to resign. While this is on the surface consistent with constitutional government, nevertheless it is a call for military coup d'état.

The unions are still controlled by the ministry of labor bureaucracy and have kept out of this entire matter.

Not a word has come from the Brazilian Socialist Party; some of its leaders condemned in an abstract way the attempt on Lacerda but did not denounce the threat to democratic institutions. The SP revealed once more its complete lack of political line and the fact that it is not even a social-democratic party on the pattern of (say) the Uruguayan SP, but only an electoral machine in a backward country.

The only immediate possibility for preserving the democratic institutions lies in the fact that for the whole of the Brazilian ruling class, (since an independent labor movement does not exist and the CP is outlawed) rule within the constitutional framework is still better than a military dictatorship. The generals themselves—even more than any other sector because they embody the whole of the ruling class—still probably prefer the forms of democracy.

The leaders and political organs for a military dictatorship are at this moment not in existence; the ruling class is very heterogeneous; and a military coup which would reverse the democratic trends since 1945 (little as they seem) would also reveal the political nature of the army and at the same time force it to face the growing unrest of the working class.

'Take It or Leave It' — —

(Continued from page 1)

On August 13, 25,000 left their jobs at Firestone plants in 8 cities on call of the union. Right now, 48,000 rubber workers are on strike with issues at the other two of rubber's Big Four unsettled: U. S. Rubber and Goodrich.

IN OTHER INDUSTRIES

"Blame for the prolongation of the present labor dispute at Goodyear," writes the *Summit County Labor News* of Akron, "can be placed on the shoulders of those members of organized labor who refused to . . . vote two years ago or . . . voted for the Eisenhower crusade. As a result, the entire labor movement . . . is reaping the fruits of their folly." This is

just its own eccentric way of attributing labor's hard times to the Republican administration.

The "take it or leave it" attitude is reported, in just those words, in the shipbuilding industry on the East Coast. The CIO Shipbuilders' union has been negotiating with the Bethlehem Steel Company since before June 23 when its contract expired. It is asking for a 21-cent hourly increase but the company offers only 3 cents.

"A spokesman for the union," reports the *New York Times*, "charged that Bethlehem's negotiators had walked out of a meeting Thursday evening after a 'take-it-or-leave-it' offer by the company had been rejected."

Across the country in Washington state and Oregon, the lumber strike of AFL and CIO workers continues after 9 weeks for union demands for a 12½-cent wage increase. And in Wisconsin, a UAW strike against the Kohler Company, involving 3,500 workers, remains unsettled after 20 weeks. Memories of old days rise before the union as the company rushes scabs through mass picket lines and union representatives are indicted on assault charges.

Rubber union leader Buckmaster compared the actions of Goodyear to those of General Electric. GE finally settled with the CIO International Union of Electrical Workers after 4 months of bitter negotiations. The company granted wage increases of 2.68 per cent, averaging about 5 cents an hour. But the union demand for a guaranteed annual wage, highlighted by the CIO, was rejected by the company and abandoned by the union.

During the negotiations, the union revealed a company ten-year plan of decentralization which would mean the loss of jobs in high paying union centers by

their transfer to new plants in unorganized low-wage areas, a threat to union working conditions and perhaps to the very existence of the union.

"GE's goal is to avoid the responsibility of collective bargaining, a goal that has caused a strike in 1950 and constant friction in every year's negotiations since. GE desires a situation where it can issue a proclamation on the contract—take it or leave it—and then pressure the . . . unions into accepting it quickly." These were the union's words as it suggested a non-partisan study of GE labor policies which lead, it charged, to "persistent union-management friction." Such a study, the union said, might succeed in "lifting our collective-bargaining relations to a level of mature, reasonable and collaborative understanding."

Apparently the company is not interested in such high ideals: it rejected the union proposal out of hand.

ROUGH ROAD

None of this made the front-page headlines in a daily press which does not attribute special significance to such incidents taken one by one. But together, they make up a picture of the rough road ahead for labor.

As the weeks pass and other unions are thrust into negotiations in this period of "take it or leave it," the resentments and grievances of millions of organized workers begin to accumulate. Strikes are now hard to win. Even defense of old conditions becomes difficult.

Many unions will shrink from the struggle today. We know, however, from the experience of the war years that these pent-up irritations and these unsatisfied demands will burst out with explosive force when the first favorable winds begin to blow.

World History—Year by Year

The bound volumes of LABOR ACTION

are an invaluable record of the social and political issues of our day, and a socialist education in themselves. Completely indexed from 1949 on.

1950-52.....\$3 per vol.

Bound volumes of LA are also available back to, and including, 1942, at somewhat higher prices depending on the year. Prices on request. A complete set of bound volumes for the 11 years from 1942 to 1952 is available for \$40.

Independent Socialist Press
114 West 14 Street, New York City

THE BENDING CROSS

A BIOGRAPHY OF
EUGENE V. DEBS

by

Ray Ginger

Now, while they last
only \$1.00

Order from:

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

A DISCUSSION

The Attlee-Bevan Business Trip to China

By PHILIP COBEN

If there is anything that could make us sympathize with the Attlee-Bevan Labor Party junket to China, it is the nature of the attacks on it that have come from the American press and from the few British critics. The more we read the editorialists' abuse, the more we feel inclined to jump to poor Attlee's defense.

If we can't really do that, it's because we have a few ideas of our own on the subject, of which more later.

However, the nature of the attack sufficiently explains why the Laborites' trip is popular with the British. In the first place, a good part of the denunciation is due simply to the fact that the Labor delegation is acting contrary to U. S. wishes.

"It's very bad for Anglo-American relations," explain absolutely shameless commentators on both sides of the Atlantic, "especially at this delicate juncture." By this they simply mean that since Dulles is determined to quarantine Stalinist China, the British Labor Party ought to be bound by his discipline.

Insofar as the China junket means that the Laborites are thumbing their nose at the State Department's frenzied whip-cracking, it is guaranteed to rouse the enthusiasm of most of the people of the world.

Insofar as the junket is attacked as disrespectful to the cult of Chiang Kai-shek, it is likewise assured acclaim. The trip is certainly an affront to the occupation government on Formosa, and that in itself is a good thing.

It is the American support to Chiang Kai-shek which is behind the press and government campaign of vilification of the Attlee mission. Nothing can obscure that very successfully. If we socialists decided our own policy merely by putting a minus sign wherever the Washington imperialists put a plus, we could have little doubts about the episode.

VILIFICATION

One gets a further push over in this direction from such stupendous products of the intellect as the N. Y. *Herald Tribune's* editorial on the subject. The *Trib* inveighed against the Attlee trip; then it paused for breath and noted that the Russian Supreme Soviet had invited its counterpart, the British Parliament, to send a similar delegation to Moscow, and the Parliament had accepted. But that's all right, said the *Trib* editorial genius—not at all like those bad Attlees; because it wouldn't be a *partisan* trip. . . .

It seems it's bad when a Labor Party group drinks toasts with totalitarians; but when Tories and Laborites do it together, the curse is taken off.

Editorialists take a calculated risk when they knowingly engage in such idiocy; *vide* also the N. Y. *Post's* invocation against the "immoral servility" displayed by the Attlee party on its Chinese trip. Some journalistic hypocrites have

SMITH ACT TRIAL ENDS IN PHILLY

By KARL CRAIG

PHILADELPHIA, Aug. 16—The Philadelphia edition of the Smith Act trails of secondary Communist Party leaders ended on August 11 with the conviction of the nine defendants for "conspiring to teach and advocate the overthrow of the U. S. by force and violence."

The entire proceedings from selection of the jury to the conviction took 71 days, to make it the longest trial in the history of this federal district.

The trial is noteworthy among other things in that the defense staff consisted of distinguished attorneys who were in no way connected with the Stalinist movement and who were members of the American Civil Liberties Union. The chief of defense, Thomas D. McBride, is regarded widely as the outstanding criminal trial lawyer of the area. The defense fought hard and expertly under the limitations set by the reactionary Smith Act.

Readers of LABOR ACTION are already acquainted with the exposé of "Colonel" Paul Crouch as a "downright liar" by Joseph S. Lord 3rd of the defense staff. Crouch identified David Davis, one of the nine defendants, as a man he had dealt with over a period of 20 years. He reluctantly admitted under cross-examination that four years ago when he testified at one of Harry Bridges' deportation hearings he testified that he never knew David Davis.

even devoted editorials to asking whether the British Labor Party really approves of Mao's totalitarianism.

This is a mild campaign of journalistic terror designed to help beat the British cousins into line—into the American Party Line.

We ourselves, in the name of 1776 and all that, are entirely in favor of a British declaration of independence.

But while everything we read pushes us inexorably to defend Attlee, one difficulty keeps obtruding: We cannot think of a single good reason for being *positively* in favor of the junket, and we can think of good reasons for vigorously opposing it as an offense to socialist aims.

POLITICAL PRICE

We think that from a genuine socialist point of view, the China junket is indefensible. And we have to say so, however reluctant we may be to come to the same conclusion as the stomach-turning Pecksniffs and imperialist-minded time-servers who are attacking the Laborites for their own reasons.

There is little doubt in anybody's mind about the most concrete motivation for the Laborite junket: British trade with China. It is quite openly expressed in BLP articles favoring the trip, and in any case is an objective which the Labor Party shares with the Tories.

We have nothing against that or any projects for stimulating normal trade relations between politically antagonistic states. What is involved at the heart of the motivation for the China junket is something a little different:

The meaning of the Laborites' mission is that they are implicitly offering a political price for a trade deal.

Labor apologists for the junket admit that "of course" the Stalinists will make "propaganda advantage" of the visit. What does this mean in actuality? It means that it will be "proved" to the Chinese people that the regime is approved by just those Westerners to whom they might look for a third alternative: not the American imperialists, not the henchman of Chiang Kai-shek, but socialists, including the "good" British Laborites.

Its political impact in China will inevitably be to discourage and dishearten precisely that kind of opposition to Mao which yearns to see its cause taken up by someone else than the butcher of Formosa or the State Department.

A delegation even of British Tories would probably not be as welcome to the Stalinists. The uncritical toasts and backslapping of Laborites in Peiping is more valuable for the regime at the moment.

And this goes for more than merely the Chinese people, who are the victims not only of the past crimes of Chiang Kai-shek but also of the present crimes of the Mao-Stalinist police regime. Chinese Stalinism is a magnet for all Asians, drawing them into the Stalinist orbit, insofar as Peiping's prestige grows and insofar as America's credit declines, as it is doing.

ILLUSIONS

This is the sort of thing it means to admit that the Laborite junket means "propaganda" for the Chinese Stalinists.

To slough this consideration off, for the sake of putative gains in British-Chinese trade, is perfectly in order for the bourgeoisie, and it is quite understandable for types like Attlee who are primarily socialist bourgeois-reformists; but it is a sad and narrow oversight for British left-wingers.

There is undoubtedly a great deal that British Labor could do to further British-Chinese trade without sellings its politics. In any case no mess of export-import pottage is worth that sale.

Now the situation, however, is not at all fully explained by the trade consideration. That whole motivation operates on the basis of a prior political view. After all, even a gold mine in British-Spanish trade would not induce Attlee to go on a good-will-and-backslapping tour of Franco Spain. These Laborites, Attlee and Bevan in their own ways, have a certain attitude on Maoism.

Part of the common ground which they share, along with many others in Europe,

is the simplistic view that the Chinese Stalinists would turn out to be good fellows, and maybe even sterling democrats, if only they could be convinced that the West doesn't want to "encircle" and crush them.

We would agree that every political effort should be made to woo Peiping away from dependence on Moscow, or to fan every ember of latent "Titoism" (national-Stalinism) in Mao's China. We certainly agree that the U. S. policy is absolutely guaranteed to throw every Chinese element into Moscow's arms. LABOR ACTION has explained its reasons for favoring the admission of Peiping into the UN.

But none of this, and nothing along these lines, could possibly justify any step which tells Asia, or seems to tell the people of Asia, that socialists have anything but political antagonism for the political and social system of Stalinism.

NO BOUQUETS

It would be a victory to tear Mao-China away from Moscow, but such an independent Stalinist China would be no less a totalitarianism than before, if nothing else changes. Socialists can no more proclaim approval of such a Stalinist regime which is independent of Moscow than they can throw political bouquets to the Yugoslav national-Stalinist regime in Belgrade.

The new-found love and affection which blossomed between the Titoists and so many European social-democrats was founded on simple social-patriotic considerations. When Tito became an ally of the West, he became kosher and respectable in the eyes of so-called socialists who then found it possible to overlook, gloss over, or whitewash the continuing police-regime of the anti-Moscow-type totalitarians.

The Attleeites hope that Chinese Stalinism can also be detached from Moscow. They are saying in effect that the "bad" thing about Maoism is the fact that it is allied with the wrong war camp, and not so much its social and political regime. In fact, they whitewash the latter feature in practice, for the sake of possible concessions on the former feature. . . .

In addition, Bevan (unlike Attlee) has a set of Stalinoid-neutralist illusions about Stalinism in general, and Chinese Stalinism in particular, which intensifies all of these tendencies.

No doubt, the Chinese trip appeals to the British people because its aims are to help bring some kind of greater "understanding" between "East and West" and therefore take a step toward peace. The intentions are wonderful. It is equally laudable when the Laborites talk about going to China in order to "see for themselves" and "find out" the truth, etc.

But socialist grownups should not take this sort of talk too seriously. The Laborites will "see" and "find out" nothing important whatsoever on their tour; and if any of them expect to do so, the more's the pity. They will not find out whether Stalinism means a police-state by being escorted through a jail; nor will they find out whether the Chinese people support Mao as they whirl through banquets.

SOCIALISTS CAN'T APPROVE

For Third Camp socialists, there is no question of coming to an "understanding" with Stalinism any more than of coming to an "understanding" with capitalism and its imperialism.

That sort of talk is all right for the fuzzy "neutralists" who represent the immaturity of anti-imperialism in the world. These latter do not set the task of fighting Stalinism to the death, just as capitalism has to be fought to the death. They want to make a deal with this enemy, they want to placate Stalinism, some of them frankly want to appease its appetite; they think hopefully in terms of the Stalinists reforming from the top down.

There is a great deal of this in Bevanism, and a great deal of this lies behind the BLP China junket.

A government's relations with a reactionary state are one thing, whether political or economic. A party's relations with a totalitarian movement are another thing.

If Attlee, as prime minister of England, shakes hands with a Stalinist (or fascist) leader in the course of "correct" diplomatic relations, who would necessarily dream of caviling? But if Attlee or Bevan, representing their party, publicly embrace butchers of the working class—whether in Moscow or Madrid, or in Peiping—how can a socialist approve this political demonstration?

LONDON LETTER

No Off-Season on Debates within BLP

By ALLAN VAUGHAN

LONDON, Aug. 18—The three most important issues that have caught the attention of the Labor Party over the last two weeks are: (1) the Beaverbrook campaign against German rearmament—parallel in many respects to the *Tribune* campaign; (2) the rebuke by Hector McNeil, Labor's minister of state in the late government, to Attlee and the Labor Party delegation, for their "inopportune" visit to China; and (3) the NEC ban on the *Socialist Outlook*.

As has been pointed out previously in these letters, the *Tribune* opposition to German rearmament has all the hallmarks of an anti-German chauvinism. The *Daily Worker* has joined in this poisonous campaign along with the Beaverbrook-controlled *Daily Express*. The lord chancellor's attempted suppression of Lord Russell's factual history of Nazi war crimes, *The Scourge of the Swastika*, has only added fuel to the flames of anti-German hatred that is being whipped up by this strange alliance of Empire-Tories, Bevanites and Stalinists.

Understandably, the broad mass of the population are uneasy about German rearmament, uneasy about the return of prominent Nazi generals and SS officials to public life in West Germany. This is entirely a healthy sign; but this uneasiness about a trend to World War III, instead of being directed along internationalist channels, is directed against the German people.

Of course, the responsibility for World War II lay not with the German people collectively, but with the statesmen of all the major powers who appeased and built up the Hitlerite war machine. This fact has not been emphasized at all by any of the opponents of German rearmament.

In this situation, socialists cannot but resolutely oppose the whole anti-chauvinist undercurrent within the framework of the general opposition to German rearmament, while putting forward their own grounds for opposing the German rearmament plan around EDC. Unfortunately, the task is by no means easy given the present realignment of political forces.

ATLEE'S TRIP

When Hector McNeil bluntly criticized the Labor Party NEC's decision to send a delegation to visit China at this delicate point in Anglo-American relations, his view received wide publicity, but no support (at least no public support) from any major figure in the Labor movement.

One takes it for granted that the Chinese Stalinists will utilize the visit for propaganda purposes. However, it is difficult to see what real "harm" can be done by the visit, in and of itself.

The Labor Party has no use for Chiang Kai-shek, and the quicker his pirate's nest is smoked out in Formosa, the better it will be for all concerned: that is the universal opinion not only within the Labor Party but among all classes of the population.

Surely the establishment of trade contacts, the affording of diplomatic recognition, etc., will make it easier for Mao's China to establish itself independently of Moscow? A policy of encirclement and endless provocation can only push Mao's China more and more into Moscow's embrace. This argument is very common throughout the Labor Party, and there is more than an element of truth in it.

America's policy of "non-recognition" of Mao's China is determined not by the existence of totalitarianism but by the fact that China has eliminated the basis of a capitalist order. It is the revolutionary and anti-capitalist aspect of the events in China, and not its ruthless police regime, that America refuses to recognize. This policy is costing her the friendship of even the *realpolitiker* statesmen of Europe. And this loss could be fatal to her, in the long run.

FACTION GAG

The third issue that has caught the attentions of the Labor Party is the ban on the *Socialist Outlook*.

In a circular sent out to all trade union, constituency and local Labor Party branches, women's sections, and leagues of youth, party secretary Morgan Phillips has written the following letter: "I am directed to inform you that the National Executive Committee at its last meeting decided that persons associated with or supporting *Socialist Outlook* are

(Turn to last page)

The 'Peurifoyed' Regime Smashes at Labor and the Peasants

Guatemalan Reaction Turns the Clock Back

By BERNARD CRAMER

Since Guatemala is now out of the screaming headlines, it is the inside pages that inform newspaper readers that the U. S.-sponsored counter-revolution is acting itself out as predicted. John Peurifoy's protégés are behaving true to form.

The non-existent "Communism" of the Arbenz regime has been victoriously banished, and the country is being turned back to the very real embraces of the feudals.

A wide-open admission of counter-revolutionary policies came on August 22 when the Castillo government issued a decree taking back national lands that had been parceled out to peasants. The final lie was thus given to the protestations of the present rulers.

During their rebellion, they claimed that the land-reform law made the peasants into tenants, did not really give them the land at all; as carried out by the Arbenz regime it really enserfed them to the state; they, the gunmen for United Fruit and the State Department, would really give the land to the Indian peasants.

These transparent lies were given credence not only by paid liars for the State Department, who at least were doing their job, but by most of the U. S. press, including N. Y. Post liberals like Max Lerner and a New Leader Guatemalan expert named Daniel James. All of these also piously quoted the sermons about "preserving social gains" that were handed out by U. S. Ambassador Peurifoy.

Right after their victory the new government suspended the land law, but still gave the excuse that it had to be rewritten to make it more "just" to the peasants.

The new decree takes back from the peasants 120 plantations that had been government land before the land law. This land had been taken from German owners during the Second World War, by the regime then headed by the dictator Ubico. This land, moreover, is among the richest coffee-growing lands in the country.

BACK TO PEONAGE

The peasants who are now expropriated will be turned into hired laborers. The government decree's arguments are transparent.

The text of the decree pretends that a "large majority" of the peasants have declared that they prefer to be hired laborers rather than own their own land. At the same time, in a rather incredible contradiction, it also states that the land expropriation benefited only "Communist militants"!

The decree also argues that production on the land has been disrupted and that conditions are chaotic. There may well be a kernel of truth here; the new peasant landholders may well have been "disrupted" by the counter-revolutionary threat and victory; farm work may well have been held up. Also, the division of the land could have been made efficient only insofar as the government proceeded to aid the peasants to get equipment, etc. This was part of the program of the Arbenz government. A temporary fall in production was possible. But none of

these considerations has anything to do with the Castillo Armas decree.

The new decree abolishes all the agrarian cooperatives that have been formed on the land and cancels their legal status. Magnanimously the decree provides that co-op members may continue working on the farms as hired laborers, which traditionally means as peons.

On August 23 a new government decree hit the urban workers. It abolished the law regulating land sales on the installment plan and housing projects, in accordance with demands of the real-estate owners.

Here is the great victory that the U. S. won over "Communism" in Latin America, under the "brilliant" engineering of two-gun Peurifoy.

CIO Accuses Regime Of Union-Smashing

The first authoritative report on the union-smashing activities of the Castillo Armas government reveals also the hypocrisy of the claims that this U. S.-sponsored government could "clean out" the labor movement. As LABOR ACTION has reported, it was pretty well established that the Guatemalan labor movement under Arbenz was indeed dominated by the Stalinists. A "clean-up" by the counter-revolution and United Fruit, however, meant that the unions would be "decontaminated" by beheading not only the Stalinists but also all militants.

A CIO representative now discloses what has been happening, behind the vague news items about a labor reorganization that have been appearing in the press. In July an American trade-union delegation had gone down to Guatemala, accompanying a group of Guatemalan unionists. Serafino Romualdi represented the AFL, Daniel Benedict the CIO, and Paul Valdivia the Cuban CTC.

In the CIO News Service for August 16, Benedict reported as follows:

"We heard the president's repeated assurances that there would be no attempt to hinder the development of free trade unionism and no attempt to destroy the land-reform gains of the peasants.

"U. S. Ambassador John Peurifoy, who makes no secret of his important role in the events which led Castillo Armas from exile in Honduras to the armed taking over of power in Guatemala, has also been quite vocal about no 'turning back the clock' of social progress.

"Yet non-Communist workers known for, or suspected of, strong trade union feelings have been, and are being, fired by the score.

"About half the Communist Party members in Guatemala (reported to number about 2,000) have either taken refuge in foreign embassies—hundreds of them are sleeping on and under the desks of the bulging little Mexican Embassy—or fled the country. Yet, it is estimated that between 5,000 and 8,000 people have been thrown in jail.

"The long lines of obviously poor Indian peasant women seen by this writer waiting outside the jails with little baskets of food to send in to their arrested menfolk were certainly no indication that the thousands in jail are foreign Communist agitators or local party big shots.

"In shops with five or six Communists, bosses have decided that the fall of the Communist-dominated Arbenz regime was a good opportunity to fire dozens of workers whose 'crime' was merely union activity or protesting against wage cuts. Many of these workers have been thrown in jail.

"The United Fruit-controlled IRCA (International Railways of Central America), which runs the railways of Guatemala, has taken the lead in the reactionary wave of drawing up blacklists of union men to be fired.

"Even members of the National Committee set up provisionally to start a free trade union movement (the CNRS), have been menaced by the employers, although Castillo Armas has now given assurances that at least National Committee members would not be fired."

SINISTER TACTICS

Also this month, the CIO officially voiced its concern over the dismissal and jailings of trade-unionists in Peurifoy's Guatemala.

In a message to the State Department,

the chairman of the CIO's Latin American Affairs Committee, O. A. Knight, said the United Fruit Company, through its railroad subsidiary, is "among the leading employers in this drive to prevent a growth of a stable democratic labor movement." The CIO message ended merely by urging the government "to impress upon all its officials and upon U. S.-owned business firms the danger of this course," a weak and meaningless conclusion.

At about the same time, Serafino Romualdi was reporting on Guatemala to the AFL Executive Council. The account of this report in the AFL News-Reporter (August 13) headlined the fact that the dictator "lauded" the "anti-red stand of the AFL," and quoted Castillo Armas' repeated assurances that he is for "the establishment of legitimate trade unions." It is indeed to be wondered whether this accurately reflects what Romualdi actually told the council about what he had found out in Guatemala. . . .

The AFL report does, however, put some light emphasis on another disturbing development which undoubtedly is part of the Guatemala's regime's plan for straightjacketing labor.

A split-up trade-union movement is being sponsored. There are to be two federations, one being organized by Reuben Vilatoro, to whom the government has turned over buildings used by the former organization, and one organized under Catholic auspices, by the Federation of Independent Unions.

It looks as if Catholic influence is being used to keep labor divided.

Canada CCF Hits U.S.

In Canada, the strong labor party, the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation, strongly attacked the U. S. on the "aggressive armed attack against the legitimate government of Guatemala by reactionary military elements backed by the United Fruit Company and the U. S. State Department."

The resolution, adopted at the party's national convention, proposed that the UN Security Council investigate whether the UN charter was violated. The premier of the CCP government in Saskatchewan, Douglas, said that in the Guatemalan affair "a government that represented the people's interests had been ousted by a putsch of military adventurers who fought a war to make the world safe for the United Fruit Company."

ORIT Condemns The Intervention

The free-labor federation of the Western Hemisphere has not gone along with the U. S. line on Guatemala. Although ORIT is the labor federation which includes both the AFL and CIO, its statement all but specifically condemned the U. S.-sponsored overthrow of the Arbenz government.

ORIT (Inter-American Regional Organization of Workers) is the regional organization which is a part of world labor's ICFTU (International Confederation of Free Trade Unions). It is entirely anti-CP, of course.

ORIT's declaration, which was printed in the July 15 bulletin of the ICFTU, vigorously affirmed its continued support for the Arbenz government's economic and social-reform program, including its land law. It repeatedly attacked the "imperialism" of the United Fruit Company, accused the U. S. of "listening" to the company rather than to the American trade-unionists. It condemned "all interventionist policies, whether carried out by the U. S., Russia or any other country."

The statement by ORIT, signed by General Secretary Luis A. Monge, deserves to be recorded in full, as follows.

"ORIT has repeatedly and publicly declared its determined support for the economic and social reforms which have been carried out in Guatemala since the popular movement put an end to de-facto dictatorships. The Labor Code, the establishment of the Guatemalan Institute of Social Security and, more recently, land reform are all measures which have gained our sympathy. We consider land reform, notwithstanding the agitation carried out by the Communists in this

direction, to be a step forward for the Guatemalan people against the feudalism which has always been closely linked with the imperialist interests of the United Fruit Company.

"This has been and will be our position, dictated by the principles which guide our trade union movement and by our duty toward the Latin American peoples. We have maintained this position despite the unfortunate fact that the trade union movement in Guatemala is controlled by Communist elements hostile to our organization and we have ignored the hostility of the Guatemalan government itself. We refuse to abandon our defense of the social achievements of the Guatemalan people, and to approve the disastrous policy followed by the United Fruit Company there and in other Central American countries.

"We repudiate the aim of the United Fruit Company to control the destinies of the Guatemalan people, in the same way that we deny the moral right of the Communists to attribute to themselves the responsibility for the introduction of social and economic reforms in Guatemala. We condemn all interventionist policies, whether carried out by the United States, Russia or any other country, and deny the moral authority of the Latin American dictators to set themselves up as champions in the fight against Communist infiltration. We want to see these dictators eliminated.

"The United States government, instead of listening solely to the United Fruit Company, should accept the counsels of the North American trade union movement, which is in touch with the needs of the Latin American peoples. Instead of believing in the hollow anti-Communism of the dictators, they should realize that the only movements which can save democracy in the world are those with genuinely democratic ideas.

"Whatever the outcome of the events in Guatemala, ORIT reaffirms that it will continue to:

"(a) Defend the economic and social achievements of the Guatemalan people;

"(b) Oppose the groups which want to establish dictatorships, either of the Right or Left, in Guatemala;

"(c) Repudiate the imperialist policy of the United Fruit Company and all interventionist policies;

"(d) Strive to ensure that economic and social reform is carried out without Communist interference and that the trade union movement is established on a democratic basis;

"(e) Support the Guatemalan people's efforts to ensure that their freedom, sovereignty, and economic and social progress are not curtailed in any way."

WATCH HONDURAS!

In addition, both ORIT and its world organization, the ICFTU, see the situation building up in Honduras to the point where reaction exploded in Guatemala. They are taking steps to act in the case of Honduras before that point is reached.

The United Fruit Company has been besieged in Honduras by a strike of 25,000 workers. Says the ICFTU bulletin:

"Discussions have been held with representatives of American trade-union movements about the necessity for working rapidly in Honduras before a situation arises similar to that which already exists in Guatemala. The presidents of the U. S. organizations have sent telegrams to the headquarters of the United Fruit Company in Boston, but the company has shown itself completely unwilling to compromise.

"At present, Honduras presents very similar characteristics to those of Guatemala before the 1944 revolution, when the dictatorships were brought to an end. There are no workers' organizations. There is no labor legislation protecting the workers, and the Communists are trying to take advantage of the general situation to achieve their own ends.

"To ensure that no interventionism shall be able to deprive the Honduran workers of any benefits which they are striving for at the moment the ICFTU regards it as a matter of prime importance that a fully democratic trade-union movement be established in the country, and it will give every possible support to that end."



LABOR ACTION

August 30, 1954 Vol. 18, No. 35

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

Editor: HAL DRAPER

Asst. Ed.: GORDON HASKELL,
BEN HALL

Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

STALINISM'S ECONOMIC CRISIS

Czech CP Congress Mirrors the Bureaucratic Jungle of the Regime

By MICHAEL HARRINGTON

One of the most persistent fallacies with regard to Stalinism centers around its "economically" progressive nature. It is true, this point of view maintains, that the Stalinists are *political* totalitarians, but then one must admit that their economic accomplishment is great. This was Henry Wallace's attitude when he was the leader of the Progressive Party (although he managed to slide over a discussion of political democracy in Russia rapidly enough).

Only today, the publication of a left-wing section of the British Labor Party League of Youth arrived at the *Challenge* office condemning Stalinist totalitarianism, but citing the superiority of Stalinist planning over free-enterprise in the field of production.

What such an attitude misses is the relation between political democracy and economic progress. It sees a bureaucratic apparatus which is separated from the needs of the people and the problems of production as "efficient."

Just how fallacious this approach is can be seen by a reading of the documents of the 10th Congress of the Czechoslovakian Communist Party (published in *Masses-Information*). For here is the reality: economic catastrophe hidden by phrasemongering, an atmosphere of fear among the various factions, the intrigue of the international Stalinist movement—factors which are the antithesis of "efficiency."

At this congress, the stage-managing had changed. At previous meetings, there were always interruptions to allow the workers of such-and-such a plant to greet the delegates and announce a production victory. But at the 10th Congress, there was only the official optimism and the hardly concealed unofficial fear.

After all, since the 9th Congress, the leadership has suffered the following losses: Frank and Slansky executed, Gottwald and Kliment dead (under suspicious conditions), Smrkovsky and Svermova in prison, Bares and Bastovansky vanished, Erban and John eliminated from political life, and Kopriva and Nosek not re-elected to the Central Committee.

Within this purge-ridden atmosphere, the delegates were faced with the failure of Czechoslovakian Stalinism in both industry and agriculture. There was a forced, almost frantic, repetition of references to "success" but the word had a hollow ring, for it was a cover-up for catastrophe.

Signs of Crisis

In the field of industrial production, there was an unofficial admission that there is a widespread unemployment. In October 1953, proposals had been made to have industrial workers "return to the land," particularly all those who had come to industry since 1945. This plan was denounced as "an erroneous and illegal practice." Yet at the 10th Party Congress, it had become the policy of Czechoslovakian Stalinism. Siroky called for a movement of 320,000 workers to agricultural production between 1954 and 1957. Moreover, he obliquely admitted that this was a form of "relief" for the proletariat.

Coupled with this admission of unemployment, there was the fact that the goals set by the congress in many fields of industry were not equal to the basic needs of production and the population. Since this is a case of

the announced goals being inadequate, there is no telling what the reality will be. But over-all, the reports of the congress give the impression of an economic breakdown of considerable proportions.

In agriculture, signs of a crisis were even more marked. Siroky reported on an exodus of peasants from the co-operatives and of a breakdown in the whole policy of collectivization. Faced with a problem of such proportions, the congress came out for a "substantial augmentation of agricultural production." This, despite the fact that in one region (Presov) there had been a fall in the number of co-operatives of nearly five hundred in one six-month period.

An impression of just how deep this crisis is came from a Presov delegate, Nigolas Karmanik. Karmanik reported on the effect of terrorism and enforced collectivization in his district. As a result of this policy, the peasants began to leave the kolkhozes in great numbers. It became necessary to assemble the CP militants of the region in the presence of a special delegation of the Central Committee for a solemn condemnation of terrorism. After this meeting, party functionaries were instructed to assemble the people of the district so that they could publicly admit the mistakes they had made in attempting to "socialize" the villages.

The result of this incident? "Following this severe criticism, a certain group of militants lost all initiative and firmness in obtaining the execution of the tasks assigned to agriculture. . . . The left deviation became a right deviation which encouraged the kulaks to openly sabotage the execution of their obligatory deliveries."

Bureaucratic Planning

The answer which the congress gave to this problem was, as noted before, to call for a "substantial augmentation of agricultural production." But there is evidence that the proponents of the plan did not take it seriously themselves and that they recognized that there was no real solution to the agricultural crisis. Thus, they worked out the production to the tenths of a percent—and then declared that these goals should be met in two or three years. The contrast between the exactitude of the plan and the vagueness of the expectation is symptomatic of the "efficiency" of the Czech Stalinist bureaucrats.

Even more revealing was the fact that *this* agricultural plan was considered to be the most noteworthy accomplishment of the congress, and that it was a substitute for the new Five Year Plan. The official reason given for the absence of a Five Year Plan for 1956-60 was that all of the satellite five-year plans were to be integrated. More to the point, the Bulgarians have gone ahead with their plan. It is the Czechs and the Hungarians—the two chief areas of economic disaster—who use this excuse, and only they.

This economic breakdown in both industry and agriculture, and the inability of the Stalinists to meet it, is easy enough to document. More important is an analysis of why this happens. The most pertinent single reason is the fact that a Stalinist bureaucracy is out of touch with real problems, or that various factions within it must suppress the intrusion of reality for political reasons. A subdivision of this cause is the function of terror within the bureaucracy. It was visible, in interesting form, at the Czech party congress.

Purge Atmosphere

This was the first congress after the purge and the anti-Semitic trials. The memory of these events is hardly an inducement for candor. On the contrary, as *Masses-Information* points out, those men who had come into the top levels of the bureaucracy through the liquidation of the veterans tried to equivocate on all essential questions. It was not for them to make a deviation by committing themselves one way or the other. This was especially true since the Minister of the Interior, Barak, reminded them that deviation was still everywhere. Someone is going to have to be sacrificed as an expiation for the current breakdown of the economy and the delegates walked softly.

The main faction dispute was between the Zapotocky group and the followers of the late President Gottwald. The result of the congress was a defeat for Zapotocky, but not a victory for the Gottwald group. In his last address, for example, Zapotocky was forced to dwell on all the failures of the regime. But more importantly, the factional dispute which he lost had obvious relation to the recent organizational crisis within the French Communist Party.

To begin with, Zapotocky was not authorized to present a report to the congress, and his protégé like

Jindrich Uher, Minister of Agriculture, found themselves subject to violent criticism. The trade unions, which have always been closely associated with Zapotocky, were charged with all kinds of deviations, and, especially, anarcho-syndicalism. The new Central Committee only has three trade-union directors, whereas the 9th Congress elected eleven.

The criticism of "anarcho-syndicalism" echoes the events in the French Communist Party which led to the fall of Benoit Frachon. The same accusation had been made against him and his followers in the CGT. And there is other evidence that there had been some kind of alliance between Frachon and the Czechs, an alliance which had been solidified by the Kliment visit to Paris in 1953. There is also a possible tie-up with the Polish Stalinist union leader Victor Klosiewicz who had a line similar to that of Zapotocky and Frachon.

What this means in terms of "efficiency" is that in addition to the purge atmosphere *within* the Czech party, there is also the problem of the purge atmosphere of international Stalinism. Both cases involve a subordination of reality to the political needs of a murderous factionalism, a process which makes calm and reasoned decision quite difficult, to say the least.

Overtones of Factionalism

This international character of the purge was underlined by the appearance of Nikita S. Khrushchev, secretary of the Russian Communist Party, at the Czech congress. His words seemed to indicate a broad factional struggle within the world Stalinist movement in which he was trying to provide a base for himself among the Czechs. Two elements especially characterized the part he played in the congress. First, he came out against the current line of "coexistence." And secondly, he flattered the Czechs excessively, thus repeating his conduct with the Polish party at their congress.

What does all this mean in terms of "efficiency" and "economic progress"? First of all, it is apparent that "progress" in Czechoslovakia is consonant with unemployment in industry and a complete agricultural breakdown. Here, at least, the Stalinists have not solved the most basic of economic problems. But in addition to defining the reality of Stalinist progress, the Czech congress also suggests at least one of the reasons for its failure.

This 10th Congress met in an atmosphere of purge and intimidation. Speakers could only hint at what was really going on. There was a conscious effort to hide mistakes. Problems were defined, and decisions taken, not in relation to any concept of need, but according to the struggle within the bureaucracy itself, and with one eye on the factionalism of international Stalinism. In short, the bureaucracy demonstrated that it is incapable of "planning" in any rational sense precisely because the nature of its existence precludes the assignment of responsibility until after a catastrophe, i.e., when the purge begins.

In these proceedings lies the proof of one of the major fallacies of the Stalinist "progress" attitude. The 10th Party Congress of the Czechoslovakian CP reveals this progress to be illusory, even an impossibility, because of the very nature of the Stalinist bureaucracy itself.

The YSL's Aim

The Young Socialist League is a democratic socialist organization striving to aid in the basic transformation of this society into one where the means of production and distribution shall be collectively owned and democratically managed. The YSL attempts to make the young workers and students, who form its arena of activity, conscious of the need for organization directed against capitalism and Stalinism.

The YSL rejects the concept that state ownership without democratic controls represents socialism; or that socialism can be achieved without political democracy, or through undemocratic means, or in short in any way other than the conscious active participation of the people themselves in the building of the new social order. The YSL orients toward the working class, as the class which is capable of leading society to the establishment of socialism.

—From the Constitution of the YSL

JOIN THE YSL NOW!

YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, New York

- I want to join the Young Socialist League.
 I want more information about the YSL.

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY ZONE..... STATE.....

SCHOOL IF ANY

CAN MENDES-FRANCE DO IT?

By A. STEIN

"To govern is to choose": it is with this precept that Pierre Mendès-France took office as premier two months ago. And in the brief period that has elapsed, this sober and rational bourgeois politician has demonstrated what he means by this. At Geneva last month and in Brussels last week, Mendès-France took vital decisions which have brought a three-fold crisis to a head in France's domestic politics, in her relations with the United States and her relations with Western Germany.

At Geneva Mendès-France risked the displeasure and threats of Washington when he signed an Indochinese truce with the Russian-Chinese delegation, yielding the northern half of the country to the Vietminh. The French masses were grateful for the fact that the senseless blood-letting was ended, and that the possible threat of a third world war had been averted. Decisive sections of the bourgeoisie accepted the inevitable loss of part of an empire rather than run the risk of losing the whole of Indochina, with its grave implications of further convulsions in North Africa.

The realistic decisions taken by Mendès-France in Southeast Asia and North Africa, to preserve what could be saved of the empire, were the necessary prelude to a radical turn in France's European policy. Just as he refused to follow American policy in Asia which demanded a continuation of the Indochinese War, he repudiated America's political and military strategy for Western Europe in Brussels last week.

EDC IS KILLED

The American strategy pursued two aims: to arm Western Germany, and to integrate the six Western European countries into one solid economic, political and military bloc subordinate to America's command. At Brussels, Mendès-France demanded a drastic revision in the West European army projected in the EDC treaty.

In the first place, he demanded that the supra-national character of the army be abandoned, leaving France complete master of its armed forces. In the second place, he demanded greater powers of veto for France in the Council of Ministers as a means of checking and controlling the growth of the West German armed forces.

The refusal of the other five foreign ministers signatory to the EDC to accept the French revisions spelled the death sentence of the European army. For as everyone in Brussels knows, the French National Assembly will vote down the EDC treaty in its present form.

There is a beautiful piece of historic irony in the French repudiation of the European army, for it was France that first proposed the formation of such a supra-national military force. When in the summer of 1950 on the outbreak of war in Korea Washington demanded that its allies in NATO approve the arming of Western Germany, the French came up with a plan for a European army known as the Pleven Plan.

PLEVEN PLAN

As always, the French were obsessed with the specter of a reborn German militarism and the Pleven Plan was designed to prevent its rebirth. In a speech on October 24, 1950 before the French National Assembly, Foreign Minister Pleven outlined his proposals:

(a) Each country would retain its national army except for Germany. A European Ministry of Defense would be created to coordinate the national armies.

(b) National armies would become contingents in the unified and integrated European army. In the case of countries having overseas possessions (France), they would have the right to withdraw units of their national forces in the European armies for service abroad.

(c) Germany would be entitled to small regimental units, of three to four thousand men each, to be recruited and trained under international officers.

The Pleven Plan was coldly rejected by Britain and the United States, and the present EDC Plan was born. Nevertheless, the French, fearful of Russian invasion and the rebirth of an independent Western German army, went along with the plan. At the same time they sought to impose conditions that were

incompatible with American strategy for a unified army and a large German contingent.

In 1950 it was still possible for the French to dream that they could simultaneously maintain their vast empire and at the same time maintain their position in Europe. In 1954, the French bourgeoisie has wakened from this dream, to be confronted by the two-fold danger of losing both its empire and seeing Western Germany assume the position of first power in Western Europe.

The French bourgeoisie no longer believe they can contain Western Germany's military power within a purely Western European framework, and they have the Schuman Plan, now a reality under the name of the Coal and Steel Community, as a lesson and warning for the future. Within the framework of the Schuman Plan, the French hoped to continue their access to Germany's coke and coal and to exercise control over West Germany's heavy industry, thus maintaining their own industrial predominance. Subsidized by Marshall Plan funds, the French were engaged in an ambitious scheme to modernize French heavy industry and insure its superiority over the Ruhr.

HOPES SHATTERED

On their part, the West German industrialists were ready to enter the Schuman Plan. It would lift restrictions on West Germany's steel production, and, by placing the Ruhr under the supervision of the Plan's authority, avert the danger of nationalization of steel and coal should the Social-Democrats come to power.

French hopes have been completely shattered. Within the framework of the Coal and Steel Community, Germany's heavy industry has far outtraced France's stagnating industries. Today, West Germany is producing 15 million tons of steel to France's 13 million, and France counts as her own the Saar's output. Germany today produces 123 million tons of coal to France's 70 million tons, again including the Saar. And in general, the West German economy has expanded its output at a terrific pace while France stagnates and stumbles from one crisis to another. Again, the West German industrialists are growing restive under the restrictions imposed by the Coal and Steel Community now that they no longer have to fear a Social-Democratic victory at the polls. And they are demanding the return of the Saar industries to West Germany.

The French bourgeoisie reason that what has happened on the economic plane will happen with regard to the struggle for domination inside the European Defense Community. If Western Germany is rearmed, what is to prevent her from pulling out of EDC and the Coal and Steel Community, and demanding the return first of all of the Saar? In that case, West Germany's industrial and military power would destroy France's precarious position as the first power in Western Europe.

America's insistence first on the restoration of Western Germany's economic power, and now on the rebirth of her military power, guarantees this result from the French point of view. The result has been the present rebellion against American policies.

NEUTRALISM ON TOP

The French bourgeoisie is today groping for a new road, a new program both in domestic and foreign policy—and it is no accident that the first painful steps have been taken in the sphere of foreign policy, since a domestic turn is impossible until France stabilizes her empire and reconsiders her foreign commitments.

The road that the French bourgeoisie is taking in the person of the resolute Mendès-France has a name—it is known as "neutralism." And this is true, even though Mendès-France has on more than one occasion denied his adherence to such a political program, and insisted on his support of the Atlantic Alliance.

But while Mendès-France wishes to maintain France's membership in the Atlantic Alliance, he has also made clear that the time has come to revise France's approach to Malenkov's Russia. The present premier has explicitly stated that Washington is mistaken in believing that Moscow plans military aggression in the immediate and foreseeable future in Western Europe.

What a decisive section of the French bourgeoisie now aspire to is to play an

"intermediate role" in Europe, to combine NATO with a Franco-Soviet Alliance. Unspoken is the thought that such a role would permit France to come to an agreement on Germany with Stalinist Russia, at the expense, of course, of Germany.

At the best, the French bourgeoisie hopes to continue the division of Germany along the present lines; at the worst, a unified and "neutralized" Germany, deprived of the right to determine its own destinies.

'FRANCE FIRST'

What distinguishes Mendès-France from the ordinary French neutralist is the sober understanding that a mere agreement with Malenkov's Russia cannot insure French-domination in Western Europe just as the alliance with Britain and the United States did not enable France to hold down Western Germany within a common West European economic framework, the Coal and Steel Community. The unique element in Mendès-France's program can be summed up in his own words: "France First—Europe Afterwards!" meaning America's satellite Western Europe.

Mistaken or not, Mendès-France believes he will weather the crisis over EDC and continue in power with the reluctant support of both the supporters and opponents of the treaty. Mendès-France has insisted he "stands above" this question and wants to realize his program of "national renovation." To emphasize this position he has made it clear he will not stake the fate of his government on the success or failure of the treaty when the great and bitter debate on the EDC treaty opens in the French National Assembly on August 27.

He believes all the opponents of the EDC will support him because of the death sentence he read over the treaty at Brussels last week. These political forces range from the extreme right to the moderate left, from the Gaullists and Right-Wing Independent-Peasants through the divided Radical-Socialists and Socialists, and the Stalinist Party as well.

He believes that he will win the support of sufficient pro-EDC treaty elements, who will vote for him on the question of domestic reforms. This includes the left-wing of the MRP (Popular Republicans), a wing of his own Radical-Socialist Party, and the Mollet wing of the Socialist Party.

ABOVE THE PARTIES

In what sense does Mendès-France stand above and outside all of these political forces and their programs?

He has vigorously attacked the pro-American policies of the MRP, which strove to maintain the status quo in the empire, in Western Europe and inside France with the aid of American financial support. Bidault and Schuman used funds to consolidate the position of the big industrialists.

Mendès-France has time and time again pointed out that American aid has not saved France from a ruinous inflationary debacle and a crushing military burden. Between 1950 and 1952 the percentage of the French budget going for military expenditures rose from 19 to 36 per cent, with most of the increase being achieved by a decrease in state investments. With a stagnant economy and the terrible drain of the war in Indochina, the share of the French national income going for the military became the largest in Western Europe, reaching almost 15 per cent.

By reducing France's military commitments in NATO and Western Europe, Mendès-France has claimed he will be able to improve the lot of the workers and salaried employees, averting the social chaos that has threatened France continuously for the last few years. It is this aspect of his program which has won him the support of the Socialist Party and the discontented left wing of the MRP.

Mendès-France does not share the imperial delusions of grandeur which obsess De Gaulle and his dissident followers. He sacrificed one part of the empire to save the rest, and has proposed a policy of concessions in North Africa in order to prevent the inevitable explosion and revolt. But at the same time, he has won the support of the rabidly nationalist and imperialist elements by insisting on preserving the integrity of the French army as an instrument of imperial pacification.

Again, Mendès-France does not believe it is possible to contain West Germany by artificial political stratagems. If

France is to win a dominant industrial and economic position in Western Europe, she must throw off the shackles of restricted production and modernize her entire economy. Only in this way can she meet West Germany in an open competitive struggle and establish her predominance.

One of the decisive reasons for Mendès-France's rebellion against American hegemony is his complaint that Washington's drive to arm Western Europe had militarized the French economy. The American and French government war orders have guaranteed the French industrialists with a market for war goods and deprived them of the compulsion to modernize and produce efficiently. Here is one of the explanations for the disastrous decline in the over-all quantity of consumption goods produced by French industry.

The first stage envisaged by Mendès-France in the renovation of the economy must be its reconversion to civilian production. But this means a repudiation of American policies to maintain and increase the militarization of the West European economy. French dependence on American financial subsidies must come to an end.

FATAL LIMITATIONS

The rise to power of Mendès-France signifies the first definitive victory of neutralism in Western Europe. At Geneva the first fruits of French neutralism were harvested and revealed the tragic limitations of the program the French bourgeoisie is taking as its own.

Mendès-France broke with the intransigent, aggressive policy of Washington and negotiated with the Russian-Chinese bloc. He thereby proved the correctness of the idea that at the present time Moscow and Peking seek a period of "co-existence."

He also created the condition for future political and military victories for Stalinism in Asia by agreeing to a division of Indochina, and maintaining French domination in Southern Indochina. The ten French divisions remain in the French-held territories.

In Western Europe, Mendès-France read a death-sentence over the "Little Europe" planned and sponsored by the United States as a military and political shield for the present against Russian Stalinism, and a staging-ground for future military operations. Is this repudiation of American strategy a progressive act? Not when it is accompanied by a chauvinistic appeal to France for "national solidarity" in an effort to reclaim and assert national greatness. What the German answer to this will be is not hard to guess.

In a few months it is clear that France and Britain will force the United States to participate in another conference with the Russians on "European questions," and this means first and foremost the German question. What will France have gained by freeing itself to some extent from American domination, if it pins its hopes on arriving at some agreement on Germany with Russia?

Had Mendès-France counterposed to the American-dominated Western European federation, the notion of a genuine federation, independent of both Washington and Moscow, his break with the United States on this issue would have been cause enough for rejoicing. However, this most intelligent of French bourgeois politicians pursues narrow class and imperialist interests. The fatal result must be the flaring up of the vicious fires of national antagonism in Western Europe.

Only the two power blocs can benefit from the existence of a divided Western Europe. The most realistic and sober of French politicians has already revealed the fatal limitations of his class and the illusions which infect his "neutralist" realism.

THE FIGHT FOR SOCIALISM

by

Max Shachtman

A basic primer on the ideas of Independent Socialism!

\$1.00

Cloth \$2.00

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

Concluding A REPLY TO CLOVIS MAKSOUD

The MISTAKES of The ARAB SOCIALISTS

By HAL DRAPER

As we see it, then, Comrade Maksoud is reluctant to take a square look at one whole side of the post-war impasse in Palestine. He can see clearly the reactionary contribution which Zionism made to this impasse. But he does not give weight to the force which we emphasized in the first part of this reply: the flight of the Jewish people from Europe, and the channelization of this struggle for sheer survival to Palestine.

An exhausted victim of shipwreck is swimming in burning waters. He tries to climb into a lifeboat. The lifeboat already has its quota. To take on another will not swamp it but it will make the fate of all in it so much the more precarious. "Why pick on our little boat?" say the possessors of the lifeboat indignantly, as they crack the newcomer over the head with an oar and throw him back into the water. . . .

Maybe that picture is not entirely fair, but it will serve to underline a point. The point is that the post-war plight of a desperate mass of Jews brought about a situation around Palestine which could not be met simply with denunciation of Zionism and in which the rights of the Arab peoples were not the only considerations for internationalist socialists.

We have already sketched the revolutionary solution which we proposed, revolutionary in the literal sense that it depended on revolutionary action from below among the Arab and Jewish masses. It was only in the context of such an approach that we had a right to advocate the free immigration of Jews not only to the U. S. and any other "country of their choice" but also to Palestine.

Immigration and Rights

Here Comrade Maksoud does us a grave injustice. He quotes our statement that the Jews (like all other peoples, remember) have a "right" to immigrate ("to found a new life") in "the country of their choice." He then proceeds to transpose this to mean that according to us there is a "Jewish right to Palestine," and this naturally is exactly the Zionist claim. Therefore, the ISL holds "the concept of a 'Jewish right to Palestine'" and really accepts Zionism. . . .

The right of desperate Jews to find haven in Palestine or anywhere else is not their right to take that country away from its inhabitants. Contrariwise, if Maksoud rightly insists that there is no "Jewish right to Palestine," that does not mean that he must oppose Jewish immigration.

We know well enough why the Arabs link the two questions. It is no mystery. It is because Zionism linked them. The Zionists looked on unrestricted immigration as the means of gaining a formal Jewish majority in the country and thus getting into position to take it away from the Arabs.

The Arab opposition to immigration, and the Zionist calculations on immigration, were the two sides of the same coin. Both sides read: *Interne war and hatred between the peoples—No Exit.*

The internationalist socialist attitude on free immigration had to be linked with the revolutionary solution of a bi-national Palestine.

The Arab solution was much simpler: *Let the Jews get out and stay out, and go inflict their plight on some other people*, who no doubt would feel the same way about it. The Zionist solution was also simple: *Take their country away from the Arabs.* The Zionist position was not, and never has been, founded on the specific post-war problem of uprooted Jewish masses. They merely demagogically utilized this appeal in order to further their own objective of taking Palestine away from its people. Thus, neither from the Arab side nor from the side of the Zionist leaders of the Jews could a solution be found.

Partition was the UN's attempted compromise between conflicting aims which could lead only to bitter-end war. Sections of Palestine were already inhabited mainly by Jews. Let these Jews have their own territories under their own state, separate from Arab Palestine, and maybe there will be peace.

The calculation was mistaken, and partition could not bring any real peace or any real solution. As already discussed, we were against partition as a "solution." But being against partition still didn't answer a different question:

Did the Palestinian Jews have a right to self-determination in their territories? We believed that the Palestinian Jews did have a right to decide that they wanted partition, even though in our opinion this was a wrong and bad choice.

Self-Determination—for Whom?

Let us try to clear up the following questions about this "right to self-determination."

(1) Simple though it is, it is often important to drive home an easy distinction: there is a big difference between the RIGHT to self-determination and the wisdom of EXERCISING that right in any given case.

Sometimes people who have no difficulty in agreeing with this in the abstract have great difficulty in grasping it in a specific case where they are vigorously against the exercise of the right.

Take an American case in point: For a long time the Stalinists raised the demand in the U. S. for "self-determination for the American Negroes" in a certain "black belt" which they drew in maps through the

Southern states. The CP made clear that it advocated this breakaway from the union.

Our movement has always ridiculed this demand. Only a handful of Stalinist Negroes have ever been for it. It never struck any response among the Negro people. We could explain why. We opposed the idea.

But that did not stop us from taking up a different question. We said clearly that if the Negro people ever came to favor this move, even against our advice to them, then we recognized their right to self-determination, even though we viewed it as a mistake.

(Is it theoretically possible that the American Negroes might come to such a pass? If the Negroes ever faced in the U. S. the gas-chamber horrors and concentration camps which the Jews passed through in Europe, who can deny the possibility?)

But all we want to do at this point is illustrate the idea of how we recognized the right to a self-determination against which we advised.

(2) "Which Jews have this right? Is it every Jew?" asks Maksoud, and he writes that our resolution did not answer this. This is strange, since our resolution has a specific passage on this very question.

Our resolution said that with regard to this problem of the right to self-determination—

"(a) the problem concerns not Jews or people of Jewish descent in the world as a whole, but specifically the Jewish community in given territorial areas of Palestine, and (b) whatever the scientific-theoretical verdict might be for the Jews as a whole, it is obvious that the Palestinian Jewish community has acted and is acting exactly as if it were a national people, and this is enough for the purpose of determining a political program."

Isn't that perfectly clear? We (not the Zionists) are talking about a certain peculiar people in a certain territory, the Palestinian Jewish community.

Jewish Nationalism

(3) Maksoud asks further: Do the Jews constitute a "national self"? Are they a "national entity"? Also "what Jews belong to this national self?"

Now we are more or less acquainted with many decades of socialist and non-socialist argumentation over the question "Are the Jews a nation (or a race, etc.)?" What our resolution limits itself to pointing out is that this time-honored conundrum does not have to be settled in order to grapple with the question we raised.

For the question always referred to "the Jews" as a whole over the world. Maksoud still does so in his article. I am not at all sure what can be said about "the Jews" of the world collectively; I am not even sure that anything at all can be said that applies to this heterogeneous collectivity called "the Jews." The Zionist line of talk along these lines, in my opinion, boils down to a mystical tribalism, and is of no theoretical value whatsoever.

We were interested in the much more concrete question of the specific Jewish community situated on a certain territory in Palestine, and its right of self-determination not as "Jews" in general but as a certain community in the land.

This community, we pointed out, whatever its origins, had in fact developed to the point where it was demonstrably ACTING as a national people.

A question of Marxist method is in order here. One can dispute everlastingly whether a certain people constitute a "nation." One can usefully go over various criteria for nationhood, among the varying criteria which have been weighed by Marxists among others. Such theoretical discussion can be very good. But for Marxists above all others, the test of theory comes in life. If "theory" has told us that X is not a nation, but if this people acts historically and collectively in every way that a national people acts, then something is wrong with the theory, or else some important change has taken place which theory has not yet caught up with.

In the case of the Jews, I believe it was especially the latter that was true. On the other hand, a certain Jewish community (however transplanted) had in fact taken root in Palestine and developed a national physiognomy, one which was even different from that of the immigrant Jews. And on the other hand, tens and tens of thousands of European Jews were forcibly turned mentally into the channel of Jewish-national feeling by the simple fact that they were uprooted from every other national soil. Hitler had his victory.

Jewish-national feeling swarmed into the vacuum created in the minds of concentration-campful of Jews. Hitlerism created Jewish nationalism in a way that Zionism by itself could never do.

Invaders and Refugees

In any case, all that our resolution points out (and it limits itself wisely) is that we as Marxists do not impose our schema about "who constitutes a nation" upon facts. It is sheer doctrinairism to counterpose some theory about nationhood, against the fact that the Palestinian Jewish community has acted exactly as if it were a national people.

This is not to derogate theory. I could discuss with Maksoud the theoretical criteria for Israeli nationhood. But I should like to point out that the development of Israeli nationalism (today an indisputable fact, reac-

tionary as it often tends to be) is an historical event which a Marxist has reason to keep in mind in renovating his theory.

(4) Lastly, granted that this specific Jewish community in Palestine may be regarded like other ethnic communities situated in given territories and given the same rights, isn't their case different after all because of the way they got there? That is, since this Palestinian community was established and nourished by Zionism muscling in on Arab territory, aren't they still mere interlopers and invaders?

This is on pretty thin ice, when you start applying it to a whole people, settled in a land, and not merely a military garrison. What might we find out if we dug into the mode of arrival of various minority peoples in many countries?

The whites in South Africa, for example, are invaders and interlopers (in origin); but this undoubted fact hardly points to a solution of the racial problem there. We would not be in favor of throwing the racist whites back into the sea. We are in favor of ending the dictatorship of the white minority over the black and colored majority, and building a thoroughly democratic state where both races could live in harmony. (In South Africa too this objective can be won only through a revolutionary solution.) But if put up against it, we would have to recognize the right of the minority whites to "self-determination" in a sadly partitioned South Africa. . . .

In Palestine the invasion and affront is more recent. The wound is rawer. That is true. It is also one reason for the hellishly difficult dilemma of the region. But we can see no other socialist stand possible.

In summary for this section: this right to self-determination was a right (the exercise of which we disagreed with) of a Palestinian community territorially established and acting as a nation.

Israel has as much "right" to existence as Pakistan. The problem that we see is not whether Israel has a "right" to exist, but how all of the people of the region can live together.

Toward Socialist Federation

Israel may have a "right" to exist, but its existence will be a hell for the Jews and a thorn in the flesh of the Arabs as long as it insists on being a Jewish ghetto in an Arab world.

Before Israel can find a modus vivendi with its neighbors, it must overcome its Zionist illusions and policies. The Jewish people of Israel must come to the realization that the country must be built as a bi-national state, with cultural autonomy and full equal political and social rights for both peoples. Zionist expansionism must be repudiated. Its anti-Arab measures must be reversed.

All of this requires an internal revolutionary rejection of Zionism's specific politics, whether it consciously takes the form of a repudiation of Zionism or (perhaps more likely) takes the form of a gradual abandonment of all of Zionism's conclusions.

A movement toward this objective, we believe, can be built in Israel, even if only small elements of it are present now. But what will never be built in Israel is any movement or even grouplet which will advocate giving up the country's independence. The "emasculatation" of Israel's independence and sovereignty can be accomplished only by war, and then only perpetuated by armed force and terror.

A bi-national Israel is only a first step. We look to a larger aim: an independent federation of the Near East states which constitute an economic and geographical entity. We cannot venture to say whether such a federation can or will include all the Arab states, in line with the aims of Arab nationalism. We are very interested in what our Arab comrades write about this question. But we see the final solution to the Palestine question in federation.

We have written time and again that the genuine socialists in Israel—and we do not mean the hard-bitten Zionist chauvinists, some of whom call themselves socialists, who are betraying socialist principles—can make their great contribution to this end by fighting with such a program for an understanding with the Arab people and for Arab rights, in the first place for the rights of the Arabs in Israel itself. The relative monolithism of Israeli Zionist chauvinism hardens Arab chauvinism.

A Plea to Arab Socialists

But now we are addressing ourselves to Arab socialists. We tell them the same thing:

Only insofar as you show fight against the reactionary and chauvinist aims of the Arab governments, can you expect to awake and enflame courage and heart among Jewish socialists who want to break out of the Zionist trap! The responsibility is yours too. It belongs to the genuine socialists on both sides of the line.

You say that the destruction of Israel is necessary to bring peace. Can you really believe that? Do you believe that even if the Israeli armies are crushed in a war by the Arab power, the Jewish population will settle down as Arab citizens? No, as always, the worst will be brought out on both sides, in a permanent state of revolt and war and terrorism. What exactly will be solved, since you insist so strongly on having a "solution" and not only a "settlement"?

Comrade Maksoud wrote on June 7: "The presence of Israel as a state constitutes such a threat to the Arabs that all their attention is diverted away from foreign policy. The true interest of the Arabs in international affairs lies in pursuing a vigorous and positive neutralism, but the local area tensions prevent the effective expression of this interest and block the materialization of a unified Third Force movement in Asia. This movement is the only possible path toward peace. By obstructing it, Israel acts as an agent of war and imperialism."

We beg to submit that this is not socialist think-

(Turn to last page)

'Agonizing Reappraisal' — —

SPOTLIGHT

Continued from page 1

(Continued from page 1)

on using Germany's strength as a bargaining counter would serve the interests of the German people."

Actually, there is absolutely nothing wrong about a country using its strength "as a bargaining counter" in the interest of its people. If the Social-Democrats permit the German reaction to exploit that idea for their own purposes, while the SPD continues its posture of kneeling supplication before the occupying powers, they will have only themselves to blame for the political disasters which will inevitably follow.

For this must be borne in mind: there is little likelihood that the Russians will be willing to accept any deal which would involve their leaving Eastern Germany. But even if they should be willing to give up that part of the country in exchange for an agreement on the neutralization of Germany, they would much rather deal with a conservative German government than with the Social-Democrats. Thus, just as Adenauer was in a better position than were the Social Democrats to get concessions for Western Germany from the United States, so the Russian-oriented conservatives would be in a better position than the SPD in the event of neutralization and unification of the country as a result of a cold-war deal. The SPD might as well learn that no one loves a beggar, no matter how well-behaved he may be.

GOLDEN OPPORTUNITY

EDC was the grand capitalist design for the unification of Western Europe in a reactionary bloc dominated by the United States. It has collapsed from the weight of the debris of history which engulfs European capitalism.

For the German Social-Democracy, this in reality could represent a golden opportunity. Adenauer and the conservative, capitalist and Catholic forces of Europe he represents have demonstrated their inability to unify either Germany or Europe in their way, as an American satellite continent. Now the SPD could step forward to

take the initiative for the unification of Western Europe as a major political step in the creation of a labor and socialist Western Union, independent of both war blocs.

What would the chances be for the success of such a policy? Only the effort could demonstrate that, but in advance it is possible to point to a number of factors which would give good reason to expect success as the alternative to certain failure for the present "policy" of the SPD.

If the SPD were to become the most active proponent of Western Union, the workers and the population in general of the other Western European countries could be expected to rally to the idea far more warmly and massively than they have to the idea of EDC. For everyone in Europe knows that German militarism and imperialism have never been spearheaded by the German working class, even if its organizations have at times permitted themselves to be dragged behind the war-chariots of the Junkers and industrialists.

Secondly, such a Western Union would not be an American creature, but would be defending and advancing the interests of the peoples of Europe free of dictation from the United States. This does not mean that a Western Union would be hostile to the people of America, nor even that it would be cut off from economic aid from this country. After all, unless sheer insanity were to prevail in the American government, it would be clear that the best interests of the U. S. could only be served by preserving as close ties as possible with such a Western Union. These would have to be the ties which bind equals who have certain interests in common, rather than the bonds of vassaldom.

TO FIGHT STALINISM

Thirdly, the formation of a Western Union would be the greatest blow for peace which could be struck by the peoples of Europe.

The Russians have denounced EDC and NATO as tools of aggressive Ameri-

can imperialism in Europe. They have been at least half-way right. Hence, they have been able to convince not only large numbers of the people behind the Iron Curtain that their only defense lies in massive military preparations, but they have been able to gather millions in Europe either to outright support of Stalinist aims or to a posture of paralyzed neutrality.

True, a labor-socialist Western Union would represent a terrible political threat to Stalinism. It would exercise a pull on the satellite countries which is beyond the reach of a capitalist Europe. It might make continued division of Germany a political impossibility for the Russians.

One of the reasons it would represent such a political menace to Stalinism is precisely because it would no longer be in the American camp politically, economically or militarily. At the same time, it would not be in the Russian camp either. It would be the real, concrete, hopeful beginning of that Third Camp which alone can disintegrate the futile, dangerous and deadly power of the two war camps, and thereby offer hope of a solution to the world's crisis without the devastation of World War III.

The German Social-Democrats have a golden opportunity to launch a campaign for Western Union at the dramatic moment when the Adenauer-American policy has collapsed in ruins in Europe. This is the moment when the Russian Stalinists as well as the most reactionary social and political forces in Germany will seek to seize the initiative. Will the German Social-Democrats sit idly by and watch their opportunity turned into their doom?

Within BLP—

(Continued from page 3)

declared to be ineligible for membership of the Labor Party. The National Executive Committee reported to Annual Conferences in 1951 that it had proscribed an organization known as 'Socialist Fellowship' and that *Socialist Outlook*, though not the official organ of 'Socialist Fellowship,' published the propaganda of that body.

"The National Executive Committee felt that its duty was to protect the party from the disruptive influence of 'Socialist Fellowship,' since the fractional activities it organized had a disturbing effect on many parties and led to a diversion of effort and attention from the task of building up an efficient electoral machine in the constituencies. Earlier in the same year the National Executive Committee decided to ask constituency Labor Parties not to encourage the sale of *Socialist Outlook* . . ."

"While prominent members of the Labor Party have contributed to this journal, a number of its regular contributors are known for their previous association with the Trotskyist Revolutionary Communist Party. The Revolutionary Communist Party dissolved in 1949, and advised its members to join the Labor Party and to fight for their policy within its ranks. . . ."

BAN AND BOOST

From the extracts from this circular, it can be seen that a deliberate attempt has been made to smear the *Socialist Outlook*. The whole left-wing press has come out in defense of the *Outlook's* right to continue publication.

The most noteworthy leading article came from the pen of Michael Foot in *Tribune*. "I Call It an Outrage!" was the *Tribune* headline. In the front-page lead article he asks the NEC whether they are trying to "appease the NKVD and the Un-American Activities Committee by the same single act?"

Actually, of course, the *Socialist Outlook* has nothing like the influence the NEC seems to imagine. On the contrary, the *Outlook* would have remained a relatively inconspicuous left-wing publication but for the artificial boost that it has gotten from the ban.

The Stalinists have treated the whole matter with an air of lofty and eloquent silence. Usually so sensitive to the "rights" of left-wingers, the Stalinists appear to be looking the other way!

If the Scarborough Labor Party Conference were to overturn the NEC decision, it would represent a great victory in defense of the rights of publication within the framework of the Labor Party. It remains to be seen how far the rank and file have matured since the Margate Conference, in their appreciation of the issues bound up with the infamous ban.

Arab Socialists — —

(Continued from page 7)

ing, though we can readily believe that it has its appeal to the people. Does it mean, for example, that the existence of Israel leads the Arab regimes to truckle to the West in the hope of winning support against Israel? that this keeps the Arabs from joining some "Third Force movement"? that if Israel were only removed, the Arabs would become Third-Force and peace on earth would be attained?

That is self-delusion at best. In every other country, people have their own reasons for choosing between the war camps and lining up, hoping to gain some advantage, some "lesser evil," some profit. If Israel were to disappear, the Arab rulers would be no more for a real Third Camp than they are now. They would still have much to hope to gain from one side or the other; and in any case, the alternative is not some kind of illusory "neutrality" (even à la Nehru) but a positive dedication to international socialism. A strong Arab socialist movement can do this. But Comrade Maksoud continually keeps identifying the policy of the Arab socialists with that of the Arab regimes as a whole.

A BI-NATIONAL PROGRAM

We would like to ask Comrade Maksoud and his colleagues: Granted that other Arabs, who are not socialists, are seduced by imperialism because of their hatred of Israel; but you socialists, you the vanguard, is it possible for you to fight for a line which is against every outside imperialism and at the same time extend the hand of friendship to anti-Zionist Israelis on a common program (not war)?

Why do YOU not swim against the stream and propose an anti-imperialist program for the Arab people, which will stimulate tendencies away from Zionist expansionism within Israel, which will

promote revolutionization within Israel—and which will not tell the Israelis that their country has to be crushed in war?

Comrade Maksoud mentions that in the war against Israel it was the reactionary, anti-democratic, sometimes anti-Semitic, non-progressive elements who became vocal, while the "rational democratic forces . . . were maneuvered . . . to abstention." We did not quite grasp the explanation he gave for this. But it is a development that has been seen before. It often means that the socialists found themselves, in practice, traveling in the train of reaction, because of their lack of an independent revolutionary policy.

Comrade Maksoud's argument seems to say that the existence of Israel is counter-revolutionary in and of itself because the Arab's hatred of it diverts them from settling with their own rulers, diverts their revolutionary energies. But this is exactly the kind of situation in which socialists must act like a vanguard, not as echoes of mass prejudices and fears.

Here in the U. S. hatred and fears of Russia overlay and stifle class-consciousness and socialist aspirations. If the threat of Stalinism could be removed, an enormous weight would be lifted that now weighs down on the socialist movement. In this situation, there are not a few renegades who have concluded that it is wise for socialists to support the drive to World War III in order to settle with Russia. . . .

Arab war against Israel would no more solve the Palestine problem than World War III can solve the world crisis. It is the special task of the socialist vanguard not to go along with majority fears and prejudices but to boldly propose their revolutionary solutions and fight for them against the field. A movement which is seduced by imperialism because of Israel will be seduced in some other way if Israel is removed, for it has lost its socialist moorings.

We propose that the Arab socialists consider the program of a bi-national Palestine in a Near East federation, as the revolutionary alternative to endless war, and to this end organize genuine socialist forces on both sides of the Israeli-Arab border.

The labor leaders are charging that the minister wants to go back to the times of the pre-war dictatorship when the minister of labor also held the post of general-secretary of the labor federation.

Not only that but Greek trade-unionists say that the government is even now drawing up new legislation which will give the labor ministry a virtual dictatorship over all labor questions. The AFL's European pro-consul, Irving Brown, is quoted as expressing "grave concern" over the trend in Greece.

So as everybody can see, Peurifoy has saved democracy in Greece as well as in Guatemala. A new assignment to Thailand ought to suit him down to the ground. Thailand has the most reactionary government in Southeast Asia.

Of course, that means its own government doesn't have to be Peurifoyed, but it will be a convenient base for saving democracy in the rest of Asia. Being so close, kind of a neighbor, maybe he can even organize a strictly native revolution in India to return the country to the rule of the British, thus getting rid of that well-known Communist Nehru, while the U. S. patrols the Indian Ocean to stop all arms shipments to New Delhi. . . .

Portuguese, Go Home

Colonialism still flourishes only in Africa and here and there in plague spots through the world, and virtually everywhere that it exists the people are fighting. The big colonies (like Indochina, Tunisia, etc.) have hogged attention, but recently some small pestholes of imperialism have been heard from.

In the tiny Portuguese colonies that ulcerate India—Goa, Damao and Diu—the Lisbon police-state is on the defensive. Their very existence is an anachronism. In Cyprus the British are hanging on amid growing rumbles. In West New Guinea, Indonesia is determined to force the Dutch out.

The European imperialists are clawing desperately for a firmer stance. Right after the war, in the flush of Britain's abandonment of India, some liberals announced to us unregenerate Marxists that capitalist imperialism had disappeared forever; but one would never know it from their efforts to hang on wherever possible. But they cannot hang on.

In Cyprus the movement for fusion with Greece (*enosis*, according to the Greek scholars) is countered with the British argument that Greece has no ethnological claim to the island. And the British—what are they doing there? Greece, no doubt confident of the result, settled any possibility of a quibble by demanding a vote of the Cypriots, their right to self-determination.

Similarly, we are unfortunately ignorant of how good a claim that Indonesians have to West New Guinea, but we know one thing for sure: the Dutch have no claim at all, and ditto for Australia; and that leaves only Indonesia, or else a dubious autonomy.

If the UN meant anything but a talk-shop, these colonial plague-spots would be cleaned up in a jiffy. Nor have we heard the U. S. coming out against colonialism here. Those sentiments seem to be reserved for after the start of a Stalinist guerrilla war. . . .

The Handy Way to Subscribe!

LABOR ACTION

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

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

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

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