

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

OCTOBER 15, 1951

FIVE CENTS

Egypt Moves to Oust British Troops

... page 3

Truman and The Press

... page 2

The Argentine Revolt

... page 7

Russian Idyll: Sad Tale of a Stoolie

... page 4

'Anti-Americanism' in Europe: Why Is It On the Increase?

By MAX SHACHTMAN

"Anti-Americanism" has grown and continues to grow throughout Europe. Every observer with eyes in his head and an ounce of honesty in his heart is compelled to admit this fact.

"My chief impression in visiting Europe this summer was the breadth and extent of the anti-American sentiment on the continent," writes Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr in the latest issue of the Liberal Party Newsletter. Niebuhr is a prominent liberal, dean of Union Theological Seminary, and vice-chairman of the Liberal Party.

"I know that this is not the whole story about Europe. The economic recovery of the continent continues and the MacArthur hearings had a most salutary effect upon European opinion. They were a demonstration of the solidarity of American democracy to the European mind; and they also refuted our detractors who insisted that America was irresponsible and wanted war.

"Nevertheless anti-Americanism has gained ground. Among the working classes the primary reason for this sentiment is that the rapid rearmament of Europe is having a deleterious effect upon the standards of living of the working classes. On the issue of 'guns versus butter' we are held responsible for forcing guns on Europe. The responsible leaders of Europe know that defense is necessary. But most of the continental governments are remarkably stubborn in holding down wages while rearmament raises prices. We are not exactly responsible for the social policies of continental governments. . . . But a great part of the continental anti-Americanism is caused by the belief that we must be even worse than our counterparts in Europe. . . ."

THEY'RE PUZZLED

Also attesting the fact recently—even if in less fulsome, that is, less accurate manner—is David J. Dallin, writing, as its Russian expert, in the latest issue of the eminently patriotic *New Leader*:

"Europeans by no means tend to identify themselves completely with the United States; 'the West' as a perfect alliance, as a community of homogeneous and united nations, does not exist. The sooner we rid ourselves of this dangerous delusion, the better. . . ."

"A trend which may be called Bevanism, or Nehruism, i.e., a tendency toward appeasement of Moscow [!], still constitutes a political force in a number of European countries. This tendency inevitably assumes the form of anti-Americanism."

nanced to such a large extent by United States contributions, leaves them puzzled and more than a little bewildered.

Robert Borel, a leading editor of *Le Monde* of Paris, the most authoritative organ of the French ruling class, likewise supports the preparations for the Third World War, favors the alliance with Washington, and is above all suspicious of being friendly to Stalinism. Because it may help Niebuhr and Dallin and not a few others to understand some of the reasons for the "growth of anti-Americanism" in Europe, a recent article by Borel is printed elsewhere in this issue. It is worth reading in its entirety.

Borel is a spokesman of French capitalism. He is not expected, therefore, to attribute any serious part of the calamitous position of French economy to the billions of francs being poured down the

drain in the vain effort to keep Indo-China under the old imperialist yoke of France or to maintain the old French chain around its North African colonies. His words about "reforms" needed in France are probably his delicate way of referring to the scandalous superprofits piling up in the coffers of the French bourgeoisie as a result of the "economic recovery" with which the Marshall Plan has kept France on the side of Washington; more than that he will not say about the "social policies of the continental governments" mentioned

by Niebuhr.

But his basic facts and arguments remain. For all the responsibility borne by the European capitalist classes, it is primarily the cold-war policies of the United States that are driving Europe to bankruptcy and ruin.

That is what Niebuhr, Dallin and their like—to say nothing of Truman, Acheson and Co., on the one side, and their Republican opposition, on the other—do not see and do not understand. The growth of "anti-Americanism" is due, in their eyes, to every conceivable cause, except the main one. All these doughty warriors against Stalinism do not understand Stalinism, and that in turn makes it impossible for them to understand the "anti-Americanism" of the European and Asiatic and African and Latin American peoples.

To one degree or another, they are all blinded by the disease of American chauvinism. Some can be cured of this disease; others are incurable. But so long as they remain blinded, they will continue to be responsible for the "anti-Americanism" and for driving not only Europe but the United States, too, to disaster.

GAS ON THE FLAMES

We do not hesitate to agree with Niebuhr or with Borel or even with Truman that Stalinism, in the form of the Kremlin regime and in the form of the Stalinist parties everywhere, is a menace. But because it menaces different people and groups in different ways and for different reasons, everything depends on who is resisting it, why he is resisting it, and how he is resisting it.

Stalinism threatens the capitalist classes. Where it triumphs, it wipes them out root and branch. No wonder they are taking such desperate and panicky and enormous measures to defend themselves against it.

It is no less true that Stalinism threatens the working classes. For, wherever it triumphs, it appropriates capitalism only to subjugate the working people under the most hideous regime of totalitarianism, exploitation and oppression.

The liberals and labor leadership, especially in this country, therefore argue: "In that case, why not unite with the capitalist government, especially so democratic a government as Truman's, to fight Stalinism jointly? When the house you live in is threatened by fire, isn't it right to join the landlord in putting it out,

(Turn to last page)

AND YET THEY DON'T LOVE US . . .



Truman Gets Both Feet in Mouth Defending His Order on Secrecy

By GORDON HASKELL

President Truman and the Great American Press have been involved in something of a rhabarb during the past week.

The occasion: the issuance by the president of an executive order on September 24 which directed all government agencies to adopt the State and Defense Department method of classifying all documents "in the interest of national security," to wit as Restricted, Confidential, Secret and Top Secret.

The beef: the newspapermen claim that this procedure is so open to abuse by government bureaucrats that they are bound to use it to cover up their own blunders.

The real issue: the right of the American people to know what the government is doing.

No one demands that the press be given access to all government documents. As long as governments are preparing for war, only a senseless person could demand that the nature, numbers and disposition of their weapons and armed forces be made a matter of public record. And in this time of complex and devastating weapons which require vast industries for their manufacture, it is clear that the area of secrecy required from a military point of view is much wider than it was in the days when a few government arsenals made most of the heavy weapons needed by the armed forces.

GOVT MYSTIFICATION

Yet it has always been the tendency of ruling classes and their governments to veil their normal operations from the eyes of the people. Although no one can deny that in order to be in a position to make intelligent decisions in a democracy the people must have access to all information which affects their welfare, it has been the practice of all ruling classes and their governments to make a great mystery of government.

Not the least important function of this practice has been its tendency to make government seem something mysterious and terribly complicated; something which can only be safely entrusted to men who come from the equally mysterious and complicated realms of the great corporations, the law offices, or more recently, the graduate schools of public administration.

In the United States, this tendency to governmental mystification and secrecy has been strongly tempered in the past by a number of factors. As government office has been considered the rightful reward for loyal service in the two great political job-getting machines known as the Democratic and Republican Parties, the people have come to suspect, with justice, that some of the greatest government secrets relate to how the graft is divided.

This suspicion has hardly been dampened by the most recent revelations on the perfectly legal

Heavens!

An article by Russian astronomer V. A. Ambartsumyan, republished by a British group, informs us:

"Abroad, the scientific lackeys of imperialism carry on a violent ideological struggle against everything progressive. In this struggle, an active part is played by bourgeois astronomy. Bourgeois astronomy has a role which is not at all negligible in the ideological arsenal of the imperialists."

WEEK by WEEK...

LABOR ACTION screens and analyzes the week's news, discusses the current problems of labor and socialism.

A sub is only \$2 a year!

"take" garnered by the chairmen of both political machines.

Added to this is our love of sensationalism, and the efforts made by the press to feed it. Government officers are regarded as legitimate prey. And in view of the fact that throughout the whole period of the New Deal and Fair Deal administrations (with the partial exception of the war years) the vast majority of newspapers were against the administration, they never tired of unearthing this or that boner pulled by some government agency. Their zeal for such exposures was only tempered by the fact that in most cases where real scandals were involved large and respectable corporations turned out to be the chief beneficiaries of the various "deals."

FOOT IN THE MOUTH

On the face of it, it would seem that the president's executive order merely seeks to systematize the handling of information by the different departments of the government. Yet the newsmen are quite right when they point out that it contains no firm criteria by which the departments are to guide their policies.

And their suspicions were turned into honest bewilderment when Truman attempted to "explain" his order to a press conference on October 4.

The president stated that 95 per cent of all secret information had already been published by the newspapers and slick magazines of the country, and that this was what he was trying to stop. When the newsmen pointed out that all information thus published had been released by appropriate government departments, usually the military ones, Truman stated that he didn't care about that, and that the editors should have the patriotism and good sense not to publish such information even when it was released to them. When a newsmen asked: "When the Department of Defense hands us photographs and a story, are we supposed to censor that ourselves?" Truman asked him whether he believed in saving the United States from attack!

This whole business became so ridiculous that the president's press secretary finally took him aside to give him some advice, and after the conference was over, issued a statement in his name to the effect that he had not meant what he had said. The final paragraph of this "clarification" reads: "The recent executive order on classified information does not in any way alter the right of citizens to publish anything."

We might add: it does not alter their right to publish anything, provided there is anything worth publishing about the government's activities after the government agencies get through classifying their material.

THE RIGHT TO KNOW

It is interesting to note that even while denouncing the executive order for tending to dam up the streams of information on domestic affairs, few of the editorials in the daily papers have questioned the idea that the State Department should keep most of its doings behind the screen of official secrecy.

Yet in this world of the cold war and the atom bomb, there is probably no area of government activity in which full knowledge of what is going on is more important to the American people. Our very lives depend on whether there will be peace or war. And certainly we have a right to know what commitments the government has given or will give, what policies it is enforcing on other governments, what political and economic groups it is pledging us to support abroad.

One example should be enough: The eminent historian, the late Charles A. Beard, wrote a well documented book which contended that President Roosevelt steered American policy in the Pacific in 1941 in such a way as to invite the Japanese attack. His contention has never been successfully refuted. Did the American people not have the right to know that their government was inviting war in the Pacific?

ANOTHER EXEC ORDER

In domestic affairs, the recent scandals involving public officials certainly call out for more information, not less. In Stalinist lands, to be sure, every bit of information, including ship arrivals and train timetables, are considered "secret," and men have been railroaded to jail on the ground that they "divulged" such information to foreigners. Their "justification" is that in an era of total wars, every bit of economic information can be useful to the enemy.

That is the horrible example before us, and we have a long distance to go before we get there. Yet Truman's thoughtless reply to the questioning reporter was exactly the kind of reply that a Stalinist judge might give to a defendant in one of the notorious "spy" trials.

Time alone will tell whether the president's executive order will have a really serious effect on the information available to the electorate in America. But it is the course of wisdom to expect that in this respect things will tend to get worse rather than better. This is not to be expected primarily because of Truman's motives. In the prepared statement with which he opened his ludicrous press conference he said: "I think my record in defending civil liberties in this country demonstrates that I have no desire to suppress freedom of speech or freedom of the press."

Perhaps he actually believes that. Yet everyone who has not been soundly asleep during the past few years knows that another executive order issued in the name of "security" has contributed mightily to the atmosphere of repression and fear in the expression of critical opinions in this country. We refer to the one which set up the attorney general's "subversive" list and ordered the investigation of the "loyalty" of every filing clerk and typist throughout the government service.

An informed citizenry is essential to democracy. And no citizenry can be really informed if their knowledge is confined to what government bureaucrats find it convenient for them to know. Real security for the American people, and particularly for the workers, lies in the extension of democracy, not in its curtailment. That is why it is to their own interest to insist that the government's actions are their business, and that they have the right to know everything which pertains to their business.

Westinghouse Company, calling its members on strike to correct important shop grievances. The UAW is conducting two important strikes in the aircraft industry: one at the Douglas Aircraft plant in California and the other at Wright Aeronautical in New Jersey, which began on September 26.

At a time when wages are hemmed in by wage-freeze policies, the union faces the task of raising aircraft pay levels up to those now prevailing in the auto industry, and of winning escalator clauses and annual wage-improvement clauses in that industry. Conflicts with the wage board are inevitable.

UAW Vice-President Livingstone is a member of the board and also director of the UAW's aircraft department. It will be interesting to see how skillfully he can dance on that tight-rope.

As aircraft production rises, new strata of workers are drawn into mass production industries. Many of the plants are not yet organized and must be unionized. The UAW drive to organize these

plant, non-union plants in other industries, emphasizes another knotty problem.

UNEASY BALANCE
All unions find it difficult to organize new plants. Workers who have had a limited experience with unions often expect and demand an immediate and substantial rise in pay when their factory is organized. But wage-freeze policies put strict limits on what the union can get under the formulas of the wage board. And so, the drive to organize the unorganized lags.

Union leaders understand these facts full well. But they are caught in a trap of their own making. They reluctantly and complainingly support wage "stabilization" and continue to sit on the wage board. At the same time they feel the pressures and sense the difficulties to come. For the moment they find an awkward formula for escaping from their dilemma.

In public, they continue to proclaim their acceptance of a "fair" wage stabilization. But in the privacy of their union offices, they advise militants and local officers to go out and fight for as much as they can get. Meanwhile they wrack their brains for devices and schemes that would justify improvements in working conditions without disrupting the wage stabilization setup.

Such an uneasy balance cannot last indefinitely. The labor movement may soon be forced, despite itself, to make another demonstration against the policies of the Truman administration.

If Peace Broke Out...

Senator Aiken, Vermont Republican, deploras the deplorable in a speech to the Missouri Farmers Association, printed in the Congressional Record for August 10:

"Only 14 months ago the economy of our country seemed headed for a slump or at least a descent to lower levels.

"Over three million men were unemployed. Except for a few heavy industries, the lag in production and construction created by World War II had been largely overcome.

"Farm prosperity was on the skids to such an extent that limitations on growing certain crops had been invoked.

"Then came the Korean outbreak and the situation changed virtually overnight. The trend toward depression was definitely off. Unemployment began to ease off. Demand and prices stiffened.

"What a tragedy it is that as a nation we must rely upon war or the threat of war to maintain full employment and economic prosperity. . . . Should the time come when war clouds no longer threaten . . . we will be confronted with a problem of major degree."

Nuts

The U. S. Chamber of Commerce last month published a story entitled "Something Rotten in Denmark." According to its rule, one of the "socialist" officials of that country ordered a shipment of nuts, but—being a "socialist bureaucrat," presumably he ordered the kind of nuts that grow on trees rather than the kind of nuts that go on bolts.

All of which makes sense if we assume that Danish bureaucrats speak English. It is well known, however, that they speak Danish. And in Danish, a nut for a bolt is a *matrisk* whereas a nut from a tree is a *nod*.

The inventor of that little story obviously thought that the world had already been completely Americanized.

LABOR SCOPE

Leaders Squeezed Between Wage Formula and Workers' Pressures

By BEN HALL

Since the copper strike, there have been no labor struggles of nationwide proportions, but we begin to notice a growing restiveness on the part of the union movement marked by local strikes, strike threats, and by expressions of dissatisfaction and irritation by union leaders.

These local incidents may be the expression of an accumulating discontent pervading the whole labor movement. We have already reported Emil Rieve's threat to resign from the Wage Stabilization Board and Joe Curran's denunciation of its decision on maritime wages.

Now the American Radio Association, representing seafaring radio operators, threatens to strike unless the wage board permits a wage increase already agreed to by the employers. Shipping companies offer a \$39-\$50 monthly increase to bring the wages of radio men up to par with other officers' classifications. But the board stalls and the increase is held up.

The union demands action, not only from the board but from the shipping companies. It seems that the employers signed the agreement with tongue in cheek and fail to display noticeable zeal, in appealing to the board for its sanction. In demanding that the employers put pressure on the board, this union learns that the whole wage stabilization setup allows the companies to unload responsibility for denying wage increases on to government bodies.

In Buffalo, the local IUE-CIO has shut down the plant of the

plants, non-union plants in other industries, emphasizes another knotty problem.

UNEASY BALANCE

All unions find it difficult to organize new plants. Workers who have had a limited experience with unions often expect and demand an immediate and substantial rise in pay when their factory is organized. But wage-freeze policies put strict limits on what the union can get under the formulas of the wage board. And so, the drive to organize the unorganized lags.

Union leaders understand these facts full well. But they are caught in a trap of their own making.

They reluctantly and complainingly support wage "stabilization" and continue to sit on the wage board. At the same time they feel the pressures and sense the difficulties to come. For the moment they find an awkward formula for escaping from their dilemma.

In public, they continue to proclaim their acceptance of a "fair" wage stabilization. But in the privacy of their union offices, they advise militants and local officers to go out and fight for as much as they can get. Meanwhile they wrack their brains for devices and schemes that would justify improvements in working conditions without disrupting the wage stabilization setup.

Such an uneasy balance cannot last indefinitely. The labor movement may soon be forced, despite itself, to make another demonstration against the policies of the Truman administration.

Egypt Moves to Regain National Sovereignty Over Suez Canal Zone, Ousting British Troops

By LARRY O'CONNOR

The dissolution of the British Empire is taking place with lightning-like speed. On October 5 the last British oil experts found it expedient to leave Iran and the \$1,200,000,000 investment in the oil fields there. And encouraged by the Iranian government's success, Egyptian Premier Nahas Pasha has now acted to abrogate the Anglo-Egyptian treaty of 1936.

Nahas Pasha's action calls on the Egyptian parliament to pass a bill involving three main steps:

- (1) Abrogation of the treaty.
- (2) Withdrawal of British troops from the Suez Canal Zone.
- (3) An end to the British-Egyptian condominium (joint rule) in the Sudan, and union of the Sudan with Egypt while at the same time giving the former country its own parliament.

The effect of this bill, if carried through, would be to oust British troops both from the Suez Canal Zone and from the Sudan. There are tens of thousands of British troops there at the present time, as well as millions of dollars worth of military stores. The right of these troops to be there is recognized in the Anglo-Egyptian Treaty of 1936, which has five more years to run before it expires. There is no provision in the treaty for its unilateral denunciation by either side.

The first reaction of the British government has been to state that they will not accept the Egyptian action. The Labor government has been under a concerted and irresponsible attack by the Tories during the election campaign for the loss of the Iranian oil industry. Thus there is strong pressure on them to take a "firm stand" toward Egypt, and their troops on the spot permit such a stand to be taken and enforced.

FOR INDEPENDENCE
Further, in the case of Iran the position of the American government was ambiguous throughout the crisis. It is now clear that the State Department refused to back any British proposals which may have been made to use force or even threats of force against Iran. It may well be that the American stand will be different with regard to the Suez Canal and the Sudan, since the United States government has been anxious to involve Egypt in some kind of Middle East military system as a supplement to that of

AS TORY VICTORY THREATENS IN BRITISH ELECTION—

Bevan-Attlee Hatchet Burial Is Only a Truce

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, Oct. 3.—Political prognostication is a very dangerous hobby, as recent events have proved; yet before either party had announced its manifesto, the London Stock Exchange was betting 7-4 on the Conservatives being returned at the next election on October 24.

The Tory manifesto contains few points of interest. The only industries they will dare denationalize are the steel industry and long-distance road haulage, which, it will be remembered, were the only industries nationalized to date which were running at a substantial profit. In addition, they hint about "decentralizing" the coal industry.

The Tories make the profound observation that only through greater incentive can greater productivity be achieved. They do not suggest how this can be done, but one assumes that a "freeing of the economy" by engendering greater inequalities will bring "greater incentives" in their opinion.

Both parties had avoided the Iranian issue until recently. The day evacuation from Iran took place, Churchill talked about "leaving the battlefield even before the parleys had finished." To which Bevan replied, "Mr. Churchill's only answer to a delicate diplomatic situation is to send a gunboat."

The Conservative manifesto, glibly talks about building 300,000 houses a year as well as maintaining the present rate of rearmament. Labor has pointed out that this is unrealistic, and has undertaken to maintain the present figure of 200,000 a year and to increase it when raw materials and manpower allow.

The real surprise of the speculation and on capital holdings. The reduction of taxes which is to occur as soon as feasible will take place from the lower paid groups upward. These two indications of greater social equality are considered to be of much weight here, especially by the City (London's "Wall Street").

BEVAN'S STRENGTH
No further specific nationalization steps are envisaged, but a single lonely ambiguous sentence muses about taking over "concerns which fail the nation" and "starting new public enterprises wherever this will serve the national interest."

The serious rise in the cost of living recently is to be dealt with by three specific measures: (1) strengthening price control (already over most basic foods and clothing); (2) setting up new provincial markets for fruit and vegetables, to sell direct to consumers; and (3) an overhaul of market conditions in other trades.

This manifesto was unanimously supported and presented to the Labor Party at Scarborough. There was dramatic evidence of a difference between the more progressive constituent branches of the Labor Party and the backward trade-union bureaucracy. Whereas, at the latter's conference last month, Bevan's view was substantially defeated, it

gave their desire to remain in the Sudan a "humanitarian," even a "democratic," ideological cover.

Anthony Eden, a Tory leader and former foreign secretary, stated last week that "We have special responsibilities to the Sudanese people. It is for them and not for Egypt to make their decision in due course as to what their future shall be."

The joker in that sentence is "in due course." It is true that the Sudanese are not Egyptians. It is true, also, that the Sudan Independence party, dominant group in the present legislative assembly in the Sudan, has attacked the Egyptian proposal to absorb their country, calling it "imperialism in its worst form." Yet the British proposal is not that the Sudanese be given an immediate opportunity to decide what their political future shall be. It is rather that the British stay in their country, with a promise of self-determination in some vague future.

At the present writing it is not clear just what the British government will actually do in this situation. Ernest Davies, under-secretary of foreign affairs in the Labor government, stated at Croydon last week that there is "no justification for resorting to force to insist on the maintenance of rights in the territories of foreign powers which wish to terminate those rights."

WHAT WILL U. S. DO?
He went on to state that Britain's Labor government does not

clear just what the British government will actually do in this situation. Ernest Davies, under-secretary of foreign affairs in the Labor government, stated at Croydon last week that there is "no justification for resorting to force to insist on the maintenance of rights in the territories of foreign powers which wish to terminate those rights."

WHAT WILL U. S. DO?
He went on to state that Britain's Labor government does not

clear just what the British government will actually do in this situation. Ernest Davies, under-secretary of foreign affairs in the Labor government, stated at Croydon last week that there is "no justification for resorting to force to insist on the maintenance of rights in the territories of foreign powers which wish to terminate those rights."

WHAT WILL U. S. DO?
He went on to state that Britain's Labor government does not

clear just what the British government will actually do in this situation. Ernest Davies, under-secretary of foreign affairs in the Labor government, stated at Croydon last week that there is "no justification for resorting to force to insist on the maintenance of rights in the territories of foreign powers which wish to terminate those rights."

WHAT WILL U. S. DO?
He went on to state that Britain's Labor government does not

clear just what the British government will actually do in this situation. Ernest Davies, under-secretary of foreign affairs in the Labor government, stated at Croydon last week that there is "no justification for resorting to force to insist on the maintenance of rights in the territories of foreign powers which wish to terminate those rights."

WHAT WILL U. S. DO?
He went on to state that Britain's Labor government does not

clear just what the British government will actually do in this situation. Ernest Davies, under-secretary of foreign affairs in the Labor government, stated at Croydon last week that there is "no justification for resorting to force to insist on the maintenance of rights in the territories of foreign powers which wish to terminate those rights."

WHAT WILL U. S. DO?
He went on to state that Britain's Labor government does not

clear just what the British government will actually do in this situation. Ernest Davies, under-secretary of foreign affairs in the Labor government, stated at Croydon last week that there is "no justification for resorting to force to insist on the maintenance of rights in the territories of foreign powers which wish to terminate those rights."

WHAT WILL U. S. DO?
He went on to state that Britain's Labor government does not

clear just what the British government will actually do in this situation. Ernest Davies, under-secretary of foreign affairs in the Labor government, stated at Croydon last week that there is "no justification for resorting to force to insist on the maintenance of rights in the territories of foreign powers which wish to terminate those rights."

WHAT WILL U. S. DO?
He went on to state that Britain's Labor government does not

clear just what the British government will actually do in this situation. Ernest Davies, under-secretary of foreign affairs in the Labor government, stated at Croydon last week that there is "no justification for resorting to force to insist on the maintenance of rights in the territories of foreign powers which wish to terminate those rights."

WHAT WILL U. S. DO?
He went on to state that Britain's Labor government does not

clear just what the British government will actually do in this situation. Ernest Davies, under-secretary of foreign affairs in the Labor government, stated at Croydon last week that there is "no justification for resorting to force to insist on the maintenance of rights in the territories of foreign powers which wish to terminate those rights."

WHAT WILL U. S. DO?
He went on to state that Britain's Labor government does not

clear just what the British government will actually do in this situation. Ernest Davies, under-secretary of foreign affairs in the Labor government, stated at Croydon last week that there is "no justification for resorting to force to insist on the maintenance of rights in the territories of foreign powers which wish to terminate those rights."

WHAT WILL U. S. DO?
He went on to state that Britain's Labor government does not

clear just what the British government will actually do in this situation. Ernest Davies, under-secretary of foreign affairs in the Labor government, stated at Croydon last week that there is "no justification for resorting to force to insist on the maintenance of rights in the territories of foreign powers which wish to terminate those rights."

WHAT WILL U. S. DO?
He went on to state that Britain's Labor government does not

clear just what the British government will actually do in this situation. Ernest Davies, under-secretary of foreign affairs in the Labor government, stated at Croydon last week that there is "no justification for resorting to force to insist on the maintenance of rights in the territories of foreign powers which wish to terminate those rights."

The action of the Egyptian government is being presented to the American people mainly in the light of its possible strategic consequences. American newspapermen and politicians give the impression that the retention of British troops, or perhaps their replacement with American or other Allied troops, is essential to the military strategy of containing Stalinism, and that their removal would somehow open Egypt and other Moslem countries in the area to Stalinist attack.

This approach, if backed by some action to forcibly maintain Western troops in Egypt would be fatal to the interests not only of the people in the area, but to those of the American and British peoples themselves. The only real barrier to Stalinist expansion in the area would be a transformation of the economic and social relationships. Imperialism hinders that transformation and under the circumstances of widespread popular revolt against it, to attempt to hang on to it by force could only help the spread of Stalinist influence and power.

Left will be on. This was the view of a secret meeting of trade-union leaders called to decide the success of Bevan's left tendency. They decided that once the election was over, they must isolate him.

If Labor is returned with a substantial majority, that is Bevan's cue. If it is thrown out, even by a small Conservative majority—as is the widely believed probability—exit Bevan, in this correspondent's opinion.

But the political winds about now are very changeable.

was given the most unambiguous vote of confidence by the party's general meeting.

Of the 7 people elected to the National Executive, the top three of the poll—Bevan, Mrs. Barbara Castle and Tom Driberg—were all "Bevanites," and in addition Ian Mikardo ran sixth. Herbert Morrison was fifth. Furthermore Mrs. Castle displaced Emmanuel Shinwell, the war minister.

PLAN TO GET BEVAN

In a fiery speech to the conference, Bevan said that the fact that Russia threatens the world today was attributable to Churchill and others who intervened when she was trying to throw off a tyranny, at the time of the Russian Revolution. He continued: We did not want to see Indonesia, China and India going the same way. Underdeveloped countries could expect no help from capitalism, as investment in them did not pay. Rather it was to our resources that they must look. This was a much better way to assure peace than rearmament itself.

Although Bevan said "we want to avoid schism at all costs" unless we're going to go the way of European socialists, his enormous success started just that. While a political truce was necessary during the election, after it the battle between Right and

Left will be on. This was the view of a secret meeting of trade-union leaders called to decide the success of Bevan's left tendency. They decided that once the election was over, they must isolate him.

If Labor is returned with a substantial majority, that is Bevan's cue. If it is thrown out, even by a small Conservative majority—as is the widely believed probability—exit Bevan, in this correspondent's opinion.

But the political winds about now are very changeable.

was given the most unambiguous vote of confidence by the party's general meeting.

Of the 7 people elected to the National Executive, the top three of the poll—Bevan, Mrs. Barbara Castle and Tom Driberg—were all "Bevanites," and in addition Ian Mikardo ran sixth. Herbert Morrison was fifth. Furthermore Mrs. Castle displaced Emmanuel Shinwell, the war minister.

PLAN TO GET BEVAN

In a fiery speech to the conference, Bevan said that the fact that Russia threatens the world today was attributable to Churchill and others who intervened when she was trying to throw off a tyranny, at the time of the Russian Revolution. He continued: We did not want to see Indonesia, China and India going the same way. Underdeveloped countries could expect no help from capitalism, as investment in them did not pay. Rather it was to our resources that they must look. This was a much better way to assure peace than rearmament itself.

Although Bevan said "we want to avoid schism at all costs" unless we're going to go the way of European socialists, his enormous success started just that. While a political truce was necessary during the election, after it the battle between Right and

Left will be on. This was the view of a secret meeting of trade-union leaders called to decide the success of Bevan's left tendency. They decided that once the election was over, they must isolate him.

If Labor is returned with a substantial majority, that is Bevan's cue. If it is thrown out, even by a small Conservative majority—as is the widely believed probability—exit Bevan, in this correspondent's opinion.

But the political winds about now are very changeable.

The Handy Way To Subscribe!

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, N. Y.

Please enter my subscription:
 NEW RENEWAL
 6 months at \$1.00
 1 year at \$2.00

NAME
(please print)

ADDRESS

ZONE APT.

CITY

STATE

Bill me.

Payment enclosed.

The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

INTERESTED?

Get acquainted with the Independent Socialist League—

114 W. 14th Street
New York 11, N. Y.

I want more information about the ideas of Independent Socialism and the ISL.

I want to join the ISL.

Name
Address
City Zone
State Tel.

Editorials

"Joseph-Come-Lately"

Considering that all things are relative, it cannot be denied that, for a Democratic senator, Senator Benton took on stature in unleashing his attack on McCarthy and calling for his expulsion from the august halls of the lawmakers. If one goes by the standard set by the average congressman, Democratic or Republican, who has been cringing before the torrent of slime exuded by the man from Wisconsin, Benton deserves to be congratulated. That standard of political integrity is so low, however, that how much this says for Benton positively is an open question.

More important and enlightening is the basis on which much of the counterattack against McCarthy is made. Benton's basis too, for example.

In a radio address on October 8, the Connecticut senator denounced McCarthy on the ground that he is a "Joseph-come-lately" in the field of anti-subversive operations. He was right too. But the liberal who feels the coxles of his heart warmed by any attack on the menace with the built-up shoes should contemplate the meaning of his label.

Benton explained the "Joseph-come-lately" appellation along the following lines:

"All his so-called 81 cases were old cases, including cases of job applicants who had been rejected, cases which had been or were already in process of being thoroughly investigated.

"McCarthy had nothing whatever to do with any of the federal prosecutions which resulted in the convictions of the 11 top Communist Party leaders, government employee Judith Coplon or former State Department official Alger Hiss."

It may be added: He also had nothing whatever to do with the passage and enforcement of the infamous Smith Act, with the setting up of the attorney general's "subversive" list, or with the Kafka-like trials and investigations carried on by the president's loyalty boards.

McCarthy's personal contributions to the witchhunt have been two: unbridled public defamation, slander and lies; and use of these methods to go after the hides of the Fair Dealers themselves, while the Fair Deal administration goes after the civil liberties of less prominent citizens with dangerous thoughts. Which is "McCarthyism"?

For Benton, as for Truman and the others of his stalwarts who have been blasting McCarthy with more and more self-confidence recently, it is only the former. In fact, they counterpose their own record of witchhunting to McCarthy's feeble efforts as their self-justification.

This is the meaning of Benton's charge of "Joseph-come-lately." We Democrats, he is saying, we started this thing; McCarthy has just tried to ride along on our coattails—with his own reprehensible methods; we want the credit for the witchhunt trials; we want the credit for the loyalty witchhunts.

In Terms of McCarthyism

As we have discussed before, the N. Y. Post is one of the few liberal voices which has, if only occasionally, recognized that Truman must be at least slapped on the wrist for the crimes against civil liberties which most liberals insist on attributing to the original sin of McCarthy. On the same day as Benton's radio speech, this newspaper editorialized as follows, and we wish only to add a comment:

"In the long run the real question is whether 'McCarthyism' won't prove more durable than McCarthy. In the running battle, too little notice has been paid to the continuing injustices in the government's own loyalty program. Almost every devout anti-Communist in this capital can cite one or two loyalty horror-stories with which he is personally familiar—stories of innocent lives being quietly ruined by prolonged and unending harassment."

That, incidentally, would add up to an impressive number of "horror-stories" particularly if we add those that are personally known to people in that larger portion of the United States which lies outside Washington, D. C. The figure could not even begin to be matched by the number of lies McCarthy has told, not to speak of the number of reputations he has smeared in comparison with Truman's pre-McCarthyites.

The Post continues, with its inevitable "saving" reference to President Truman's very private dubieties: "In private meetings with numerous people President Truman has voiced deep concern over these events. But McCarthy's attacks make a lot of men reluctant to discuss any modification of the loyalty procedures."

It is no doubt true that McCarthyism put an added and erratic spin on the ball which Truman set rolling. But Benton's remarks (as an example) show how the very fight of the Trumanites against McCarthy—to save their Fair Deal skins—is in terms of "McCarthyism" itself.

McCarthyism, we are told, will figure largely in the coming presidential campaign. But neither side will stand for the defense of civil liberties.

For living Marxism—read THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 15, No. 42

October 15, 1951

Published weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York City 11, N. Y. Send all communications to general editorial and business offices of LABOR ACTION at that address. Telephone: WATKINS 4-4222.

Subscription rate: \$2.00 a year; \$1.00 for six months. (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canada and Foreign.) Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.

Editor: HAL DRAPER

Assistant Editors: MARY BELL, GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL
Business Manager: L. G. SMITH Asst. Business Mgr.: SAM FELIKS

Opinions and policies expressed in the course of signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

Announcing National Tours by Max Shachtman & Gordon Haskell

The Independent Socialist League announces a new national lecturing tour by Max Shachtman, national chairman of the League and editor of the *New Internationalist*. He will be covering the larger cities from the East Coast to the West Coast.

Complete details of his schedule will be announced next week. Tentatively, he will be speaking on two subjects in the course of his tour: "The Elections in Britain and the Labor Party," and "The Struggle for World Power."

Dates for his itinerary are as follows—the last four not fixed as yet:

- Buffalo Nov. 5-6
- Pittsburgh Nov. 5-6
- Cleveland Nov. 7-8
- Detroit Nov. 9-11

- Chicago Nov. 12-14
- Seattle Nov. 15-17
- Oakland Nov. 18-20
- Los Angeles Nov. 21-23
- Newark Dec. 13 or 14
- Philadelphia Dec. 14 or 15
- Reading, Pa. Dec. 15 or 16
- New York City To be set

This year's first mid-west tour of Socialist Youth League units is to be made by Gordon Haskell, assistant editor of LABOR ACTION. Units are now in the process of arranging meetings and speaking engagements for him on the various campuses where socialist clubs exist. In most places Comrade Haskell will speak either on "The British Labor Party in the Elections" or "American Liberals and Civil Liberties."

Haskell was formerly national secretary of the Railroad Workers Joint Action Committee and has, in addition to considerable experience in the labor movement, a broad background of socialist activity. As San Francisco organizer for the Independent Socialist League, he was once a regular news commentator over a local broadcasting station.

The schedule of tour stops is as follows:

- Buffalo Oct. 13-15
- Oberlin Oct. 15-16
- Detroit Oct. 17-21
- Madison Oct. 23
- Chicago Oct. 23-27
- St. Louis Oct. 28
- Pittsburgh Oct. 31
- New York Nov. 2

Russian Idyll: This Stoolie Lost the Job

The system of secret denunciation which is widespread in Stalinist Russia will not be news to our readers, but we have rarely if ever seen as perfect a giveaway of the whole system (from the Russian press itself) as we publish in this space. It is a gem of its own kind.

The article is from the June 13 issue of *Pravda*, and is not at all unusual in its type. The Russian press constantly prints articles purporting to expose "enemies of the people," utilizing this practice not infrequently to put the skids under functionaries or bureaucrats who have fallen from favor.

If one of the bureaucratic "magnates" is on his way out, a letter of criticism from a "worker-correspondent" in his bailiwick is one of the ways in which the turn of the wheel is announced.

The *Pravda* article here is not one of those in which some "worker-correspondent" has struck it rich. It is rather the story of an informer who failed to pull it off, who didn't click. For the would-be

informer who is trying to break into the racket, the system is a two-edged sword.

SIDE-GLANCES

But it's the same system. On its very face, the article shows how the gossipy denunciation of a shifty character with a police record and no visible means of support was enough to turn a big factory upside down before the man was even looked up and questioned. The article makes no point of this: it is assumed as the natural course of events. The reporter is angry only because the denunciation proved to be worthless.

But there are also side-glances permitted—just as naively—into Russian life under Stalinism.

Pravda mentions in passing that the good-for-nothing Stroilov arbitrarily made himself a "workers' correspondent." It is to be suspected that this aspiring stool-pigeon was not quite so arbitrary.

Faced merely with a fantastic accusation in a secret letter, the august factory director and the big-shot party secretary are worried and nervous. The whole party organization and factory are on edge. The reporter, of course, sees nothing amazing in this reaction, for he assumes as a fact

Youth and Student Corner

The Radical Pacifists and the Socialist Party's Pro-War Position

By BOB BONE

The unequivocal, pro-war position of the Socialist Party has been a matter of record since the *Socialist Call* of July 7, 1950. The headline for that issue reads: "Socialists Support UN, Truman, on Korea."

We are just beginning to witness the political repercussions of this new line. We may first consider its effect on a broad segment of pacifist opinion; and next week we will discuss the necessarily new approach of the SP to its traditional pacifist periphery.

The bulk of American pacifists are, of course, bourgeois in ideology. Nevertheless, there has always existed an articulate minority of radical, and even revolutionary, pacifist sentiment. This minority has traditionally been anti-capitalist; that is, it has recognized that the elimination of war involves fundamental changes in the social structure. Conse-

quently, in the 1920s and '30s many radical pacifists found their political aspirations adequately voiced by the two main spokesmen for American "socialism"—the CP and the SP.

The two organizations did not divide the field equally, however. The pacifist movement is one area where social-democracy beat Stalinism to the punch. While the CP was winning over one-third of the CIO, the SP was making proportionate inroads among the pacifists. The reasons for the CP's failure and the SP's success in this field are fairly evident.

Both parties got off to a good start with the pacifists. The Russian Revolution, with its slogan of "Bread, land, and peace" and its revelations of czarist secret diplomacy, seemed to augur a new millenium in international relations. Some few pacifists, like Scott Nearing, have never outgrown their honeymoon stage with the "Workers' Fatherland."

On the whole, however, the pacifists eventually recognized in Stalinist totalitarianism a force completely alien to their anti-authoritarian values. As Russia became increasingly nationalistic and militaristic, united fronts between the pacifists and the American CP became more awkward. Nevertheless, the party's prestige among pacifists reached its zenith in the days of the American Peace Mobilization. The switch in line when Hitler attacked Russia dealt a death-blow to this alliance, and the behavior of the CP during the Browder period buried the corpse.

It is a tribute to the capacity of the pacifists to learn from the mistakes of the past that today, with all its emphasis on "peace" fronts, the CP has conspicuously failed to inveigle more than the merest handful of American pacifists into the Stockholm "peace" campaign and similar disingenuous "peace" movements.

WHERE CAN THEY GO?

The SP, on the other hand, started out with the anti-war heritage of Gene Debs for political capital. The SP's gentle reformism was more congenial to most proponents of non-violence than the "class-struggle" histrionics of the CP. Christian-socialists, in the Rauschenbush tradition, formed an obvious link between Christian pacifism and social-democracy. Fraternal ties between the two movements were symbolized by the Thomas brothers: Norman, the leading spokesman of social-democracy, and Evan, of radical pacifism.

Unlike the CP, whose shifting line on the war question made protracted contact with the pacifists impossible, the SP avoided any clear pro-war line up to recent times. To be sure the SP's position during *LABOR ACTION* II was one of "critical support." As readers of *LABOR ACTION* are aware, the wording of its resolution was sufficiently ambiguous to permit the pacifists in the SP to emphasize "critical," while the rest of the party was free to concentrate on "support." As of July 7, 1950, this little game of self-deception could no longer be played. On that date the SP took its stand—squarely in the American war camp.

The SP's unequivocal pro-war position has created a dilemma for the political pacifist. He feels progressively betrayed, first by Stalinism and now by social-democracy. Yet his basic political motivation remains the same: his desire to eliminate war still leads him to oppose capitalism as a social system which breeds war. But at present he feels there is no place to go, no political organization he can join.

The result is that a few radical pacifists are drifting toward anarchism, a few toward "small community," a few toward Sweezy and Huberman (because they represent "independent" socialism), but most are simply drifting out of politics altogether.

The radical pacifist today is at once anti-capitalist, anti-Stalinist and anti-war. He belongs in a third-camp movement, broadly conceived. He belongs in an organization which is conducting the anti-war struggle on a socialist basis. He belongs in the ISL!

New York SYL Forum

FRIDAY at 9 p.m.—OCTOBER 19

Hal Draper

on

THE CRISIS OF ZIONISM TODAY

LABOR ACTION HALL, 114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

"The Sower of Hatred"—An Article from Pravda

Citizen Stroilov is not employed anywhere and does not work anywhere but when asked how he manages to lead a rather easy life in spite of that, he replies:

"Oh, you see, my needs are not very great. A bowl of cabbage soup, a dishful of groats, a little tea, sugar, . . . And, just between you and me, it is not very hard to get cabbage soup and groats."

Stroilov was convicted for certain unsavory little episodes; and it seems that from exactly that time on Stroilov vowed fierce hatred against the people, especially the people of the public prosecutor's department; and after he set himself up as a workers' correspondent—quite arbitrarily, besides—he began his struggle against the "evil" in all its forms.

Every morning, after drinking his beloved cup of tea, he betook himself toward the factories and the marketplace, or strolled around the corridors of the political organs: he listens, sniffs about, and thoughtfully creates. What does he create? Starting with some old wives' tale or some silly conversation, he elaborates a story designed to sow hatred.

Then after returning to his comfortable little house, he begins to write. He writes so much that his accumulated "complaints" and "information" would make up a fat volume testifying that the town of Kuibishev is entirely peopled with scoundrels, rascals, liars and adulterers. On the other hand, only one man is irreproachable, only one man is truly animated by the Soviet spirit, and that man is Stroilov.

Ah, how this man has been able to bother the party and Soviet functionaries with his tricky schemes: How many of their precious hours he has wasted with his slanderous letters. It does not matter to him that, after disentangling his hate-filled "complaints" and "information," the comrades took the trouble to reply to their author: "Your protest was not justified." "The

facts which you give never happened."

Stroilov continues to write and write. But Kuibishev is no longer enough for him. He addresses his epistles to Moscow.

There he is, going about gleaming some bit of old wives' gossip here, some shabby scrap of absurd tittle-tattle there. Workers, employees, housewives, indeed everyone fails to reply to his greetings. They scorn him. But that doesn't offend him. It seems even to satisfy him.

"Ha, ha, they've got the wind up!"

Among the passers-by he spies Comrade A— who works in a big factory. A's head is covered closely with a bandage. At sight of the bandage, a thrill of joy passes through Stroilov's soul. What the devil is this citizen doing with his head thus swaddled? Maybe he had too much to drink and got into a brawl or got involved in some scandal? He probably tried to break the windows. This very day I'm going to write about this. . . .

But just then along comes that old gossipy busybody Makarikha. This Makarikha is a stupid old woman with few equals; there is surely not another one like her in all Kuibishev.

"Now why is his head bandaged like that, I wonder," asks Stroilov.

Makarikha gives him a knowing look; then she starts whispering in his ear in confidential tones. As she relates her tale, Stroilov's face lights up:

"Ah, so that's what happened!" "Yeah, it's the straight goods." "Well, I'll be—"

Returning hurriedly to his little house, he begins to write, line after line:

"I have the honor to call to your attention some facts about the leaders and prosecutors of the town of Kuibishev. At the factory (whose name follows) works a

director (whose name follows) whose violence reached such a pitch that he took a cut at a foreman by the name of A—; he struck him with a knife, and now this comrade is laid up. The party secretary of the factory (whose name follows) threw an inkwell at this excellent comrade A— and cracked his skull. This affair has been hushed up, and the comrade who is the victim has been threatened to say nothing about it. The town prosecutor knows all about it but has done nothing. The town regional committee also is in the know but keeps quiet.

"Signed: STROILOV

"P. S.—I urgently request that my name, undersigned, be kept secret."

The "information," gotten up in duplicate, was sent to the editors of one of the Moscow newspapers. The latter got in touch with Kuibishev. In short order, four or five comrades were charged with throwing light on this strange affair. They went to the factory, looking for this famous Comrade A— who had been stabbed by the factory director and whose skull had been dented by the party secretary with an inkwell.

But the factory is immense and there are several workers named A—. It becomes necessary to get hold of and interrogate Stroilov, to find out from him what his "information" refers to. But go look for Stroilov—he cannot be found even with a lantern; he is ferreting around somewhere looking for "documents."

The factory director and the secretary of the party organization are up to their necks in urgent matters; but they find themselves faced with an infamous and slanderous accusation. They are worried, nervous. They demand, quite justly, that the denunciation be probed in a complete inquiry as soon as possible.

Some hours later, they succeed in assembling all the workers named A—, including the man

with the bandaged head.

All of them are bewildered. "But what knife is he talking about?"

"But our director and our secretary are real bolsheviks!" "The whole factory respects them."

"Where on earth does this slander come from, about the knife and the inkwell?"

"It's all delicious—it's a shame—this is a shameless slander."

In short, it was a day of anguish. The party, organization was all on edge, as well as all the active militants of the factory.

And all this time, what was Stroilov doing?

He was lounging around the marketplace, pricking up his ears, sniffing in the air, getting up the raw material for some new bit of deception.

Isn't it time to make him understand, like all other liars and sowers of hatred, that a slander against our wonderful citizens is an act punished by the penal code?

A. KOLOSSOV
(Pravda, June 13, 1951)

SEQUEL

The general prosecutor of the USSR, Comrade G. N. Safonov, has informed the editors that an inquiry took place as a result of the story by A. Kolossof, "The Sower of Hatred," in *Pravda* for June 13. The facts published in this story have been entirely confirmed by the inquiry.

It has been established furthermore that S. D. Stroilov had also slandered a whole series of Soviet functionaries in the town of Kuibishev. It was likewise established that Stroilov was convicted three times for theft.

The investigation is now ended. Stroilov has been convicted for slander.

(Pravda, June 26, 1951).

THE AMERICAN SQUEEZE ON EUROPE

The Leading French Journal Answers U.S. Rearmament Demands with: 'Not at That Price!'

See the front page of this issue for the background of this important lead article which we translate from a recent issue of *Le Monde*, leading newspaper of Paris.—Ed.

By ROBERT BOREL

We are told: "In face of the danger of a Russian invasion, the West must rearm."

Europe has understood this and has set to work.

We are told: "That will mean sacrifices for everyone, but we must take care that we do not endanger the economic and political situation of Europe."

In the spring of this year economic statistics were given out according to which the cost of living in France had increased by 12 per cent in one year. Later statistics indicated that the figure was 15 per cent. On August 5 the French Institute of Statistics published a precise balance sheet on the development of the French situation during the past year: furniture had gone up 28 per cent; clothing and manufactured articles 20 per cent; rent and housing expenses 18 per cent; medical care 30 per cent; meat 40 to 57 per cent. On the average the cost of living has gone up about 24 per cent; and since wages have not gone up in proportion, the people are complaining, not without reason.

The government proposes to revise the minimum wage. This measure is certainly necessary, but, even besides the fact that it will not alleviate the situation of a good section of the population, it is clear that in France, which is largely dependent on its imports, it is our currency which will bear the burden of the operation, and that the cost of living will continue to rise.

We are told also: all this is not due to rearmament alone. The weather has been catastrophic. Rain has spoiled the wheat and hay harvest, cattle feeding has been difficult, and the price of meat reacted to all this. Besides France suffers from bad economic leadership. The nationalized enterprises work under a deficit and, while the social-security budget is more than 700 billion a year, we heard it announced last August that the treasury is empty.

This is true and calls for reforms; but it should not prevent us from seeing the facts as they are.

The Price Is Europe's Decline

Rearmament has led England to an even more serious situation than ours. England's trade balance in 1950 showed a deficit of 450 million pounds, whereas in the year before she had chalked up a surplus of close to 200 million. In the course of the first seven months of this year alone, this deficit came to 659 million pounds. In addition the dollar shortage is growing.

The [London] *Observer* wrote on August 5: "The next three or four months will be gravely critical for British exports in dollars. Well-informed circles think that unless the situation improves the growing trade deficit with America and Canada will perhaps necessitate a complete revision of the economic policy of Great Britain, which will henceforth have to concentrate its efforts toward exports at the expense of rearmament."

Indeed, the worsening of the British economic situation is not so much the result of her dollar shortage as of her accrued deficit to the nations of the sterling bloc, from whom she must buy the greater part of the raw materials needed for rearmament.

The British MP, R. A. Butler, stated on August 4: "The products which we must buy from this area now have increased by 500 million pounds a year, and the increase in our revenue is not enough to balance this rise. That is why the cost of living is going up."

We must remember that the traditional economic policy of England is to import its raw materials from the nations of the sterling area and to send them in exchange machines and industrial products, and that they can no longer send these because of rearmament; these nations therefore have to buy them elsewhere, probably from America.

We can therefore understand that what menaces the English economy is a general decline.

The Washington government is fully conscious of this grave state of affairs. In his last

quarterly report to Congress, President Truman declared: "Because of the necessary increase in its imports of raw materials, Europe's deficit has gone up from \$800 million for the corresponding quarter of 1950 to \$1600 million for the present quarter. Once the military expenses have been taken care of, every American still has \$1840 left for civilian needs, whereas every European is left with no more than \$530 for the same civilian needs."

Some people are now trying to explain to us that this state of affairs is due to the fact that Europe with its 250 million people (which has increased its production by 43 per cent as compared with 1938) produces only half the goods that America does with its 150 million people. It is therefore suggested that commissions of American experts should come to teach Europe better production methods. These commissions would certainly be welcome, but let us take a look at the figures.

If Europe's production fails to attain the desired level, this is due to the fact that a large part of its industrial equipment was worn out in the war effort and could not be renewed; and that an important part of this same equipment was destroyed by the war itself.

The first necessity before more can be produced is, then, to renew and increase the industrial equipment of Europe. That is the aim of the Monnet Plan in France. However, even if it develops favorably, by the end of 1951 France will have been able to make only three-quarters of the necessary investments in the basic sectors, and in the second phase of the plan she will have to modernize her commerce and agriculture.

America's "Sacrifice"

During the last four years, close to 60 per cent of the amount devoted to this plan has been furnished by taxes and treasury resources, especially by Marshall Plan counterpart funds. We are told that in the current phase France will get \$290 million, that is, about 100 billion francs, under the head of Marshall Plan aid. The total of investments will have to be close to 1000 billion. It is therefore clear that if we want to increase our production, the amounts necessary for the modernization of our equipment could be gotten only by imposing still further on the masses of French people—whose standard of living, which is already too low, has been heavily burdened by the increase of 24 per cent in the standard of living in the course of one year.

The American senators, who are 3000 miles removed from Europe, complain that European rearmament does not go forward quickly enough for their taste. Perhaps it would be well if their representatives in Europe let them know some of the following facts.

- National income per person is \$1800 in the United States, \$660 in France, and \$260 in Italy.
- In France the national treasure represented by the Palace of Versailles is going to ruin because the French government does not have 3 billion francs to get it repaired.
- For lack of credits, our hospitals do not have enough beds to take care of TB sufferers. In 1949-50 France had 79,610 new cases of tuberculosis. The hospitals and sanatoriums have been able to take in only 50,300. Therefore, 30,000 TB sufferers out of 79,000 could not be hospitalized. With a population four times less than that of the United States, France is forced to spend three hundred times less than the U. S. to take care of its cancer victims.

Does the United States think that the Atlantic Pact union could undertake to worsen this state of affairs still more without facing the consequences?

In England the people must be satisfied with a weekly meat ration equivalent in weight to two chops, one or two eggs and 100 grams of butter a week. They can buy almost nothing any more in the shops, the production being above all set aside for export, in order that the monthly deficit of 120 million pounds in the trade balance be avoided, lest British economy be brought to a catastrophe.

Comparing this situation with the minimum effects of the rearmament effort on the American standard of living, Mr. Harold Wilson, former president of the Board of Trade, declared in London on June 28:

"Not only is it true that the reduction in civilian consumption that rearmament imposes on America is only a drop in the bucket, but the U. S. government even looks ahead in the next three years to an increase in the national income of nearly \$45 billion."

This difference in sacrifice to the common cause already appears to be reconcilable with the Atlantic spirit only with difficulty, but there is something even more serious: on July 24 Mr. Snyder, the American secretary of the treasury, announced that Great Britain should begin (on December 31) to pay back to America its debts from the last war, which add up "with interest" to \$3750 million.

If England, at the cost of a heroic effort, had not resisted Germany alone from 1940 to 1942, Europe would today be Hitlerist, and America would be isolated before a Nazi Europe.

Whereas Germany has paid nothing for its aggression, it would be perhaps one of the most dramatic ironies of history if Great Britain—as the price of its sacrifices—whose people can no longer satisfy their hunger and whose rearmament effort threatens to ruin her economy, must pay back with interest a war debt of \$3750 million to an America which is preparing to increase its national income by \$45 billion.

If This Is Solidarity . . .

If this is Western solidarity, one has reason to fear that the Atlantic community will perish before being born.

To what conclusions are we led by this examination of the situation? Must Europe renounce participation in Western rearmament? We do not think so. On the contrary we think that because of the danger which confronts us Europe must continue to participate in the rearmament effort.

That established, Europe cannot envisage buying Atlantic security at the price of its own decline. Indeed, the facts show that it is down to its own economic and political decline that Europe will sink if its effort continues under the present conditions.

In fact, the figures speak with absolute clarity.

On August 17 the American Congress finally approved the foreign military and economic aid program. While President Truman had asked Congress to give Europe economic aid amounting to \$1675 for 1951-52—and this was already a very inadequate sum—Congress has now reduced this aid to \$985 million.

According to the figures given by President Truman in his last report to Congress, the rearmament effort has raised the financial deficit of Europe from \$800 million quarterly to \$1600 million quarterly in the course of the last period, which means that Europe's deficit has gone to \$6400 million a year.

In the course of the next period, the European deficit will even go over this amount, since England alone now has a trade-balance deficit of 120 million pounds a month, that is, a deficit of more than \$4 billion a year.

To top it all, America demands payment from England for its war debt of \$3750 million. It is therefore out of the question that the European aid of \$985 million, allocated by America for all of Europe, can prevent the European standard of living from sinking; and that it can in any way stop Europe's present march toward its decline.

If the Atlantic community must become a reality and assure the victory of the West over communism, it seems necessary for the Americans to revise their political and moral conceptions on the proportions of the sacrifice which it must assume in our common struggle.

The Atlantic community cannot be built on the prosperity of one and the misery of the others.

General Gruenther, chief of staff for General Eisenhower, recently told the American Congress that our common defense could be assured if the U. S. finds support and an adequate spirit of sacrifice in Europe.

As far as Europe is concerned, the same goes for America.

National Chairmen of Both Major Parties Caught in Bipartisan 'Influence' Racket

By RICHARD TROY

Thanks to the researches of an enterprising St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* reporter Washington and the entire nation was treated last week to one of the most instructive corruption-in-government scandals in recent history. The much-vaunted two party system was never so rudely embarrassed as it was last week.

Over the past several years the nation has become more than accustomed to hear of numerous congressional committees turning up with hair-raising stories of corruption in many top-level governmental agencies, particularly the executive branch of the government. In most cases it was, of course, the Democratic machine which got the public airing; the Pendergast machine became household conversation material and the deep-freeze and mink coats won stand in contemporary American history as symbols of corruption.

But this time the congressional committee—raking through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (which apparently is a veritable gold mine for enterprising government officials)—hit a political jackpot. In one fell swoop both of our two major parties were caught, almost simultaneously, in the same ranging net. A dark shadow was cast upon the uprightness of the Republican Party, hitherto the self-created symbol of indignant virtue on Capitol Hill. Not small-Fry Republicans either, but its most respectable top, its national chairman, Guy Gabrielson.

What gave the Gabrielson catch such poignancy was the fact that the particular Democrat under fire at this moment was Gabrielson's precise counterpart, Bill Boyle, chairman of the Democratic National Committee. This was too much for the nation's capital. For several days consternation reigned in Washington, until the unfortunate disclosures were properly straightened out and the impertinent committee silenced.

CANCELED OUT

What gave the Gabrielson catch such poignancy was the fact that the particular Democrat under fire at this moment was Gabrielson's precise counterpart, Bill Boyle, chairman of the Democratic National Committee. This was too much for the nation's capital. For several days consternation reigned in Washington, until the unfortunate disclosures were properly straightened out and the impertinent committee silenced.

THE "AMERICAN WAY"

Meanwhile, of course, Harry Truman, representing the conscience of the Democracy, expressed complete and utter confidence in Bill Boyle before, during, and after all the fuss. This was to be expected of Truman, the same loyal man who told a somewhat shocked world last spring that the Kefauver hear-

ings depreciated the stock of Bill O'Dwyer in his eyes not one whit.

The St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* reporter and the committee had discovered that:

(a) The American Lithofold Corporation of St. Louis had received three loans from the RFC totaling \$645,000 after it had been turned down three times by RFC financial experts.

(b) After approving an RFC loan of \$1.6 million to Lithofold in 1944 the RFC official involved got a \$25,000-a-year job with the firm.

(c) This official informed Congress that the RFC reversed itself on the 1949 decision only after Lithofold had asked Bill Boyle to bring a little pressure (but enough) on RFC boss Harry Hise, for which Boyle, then legal counsel for Lithofold, received \$8,000.

(d) Lithofold had given gifts (hams, cameras, fishing trips—the usual stuff, but no deep freezes) to RFC officials in recent years.

(e) The daughter of the Lithofold representative in Washington was a White House secretary until recent years.

(f) Lithofold admits having given \$65,000 to government officials all over the country.

(g) There was some connection between the Lithofold imbroglio and the grand jury investigation of Truman's 1948 Missouri boss Finnegan.

(h) Boyle's law business, which he sold for \$150,000 in 1949 without making any written contract, dealt almost exclusively with firms doing a large government-order business, at the same time that he, Boyle, was chairman of the Democratic Party and therefore patronage boss.

Boyle replied to all this muck-raking with the following statement: "I never asked a favor of a government agency in my life." That was all. In response, the *Post-Dispatch* writer challenged Boyle to sue his newspaper for libel, hoping this to be able to break the case open.

Boyle thus far has done nothing to press this matter except to say

that subsequent hearings "vindicated" him "completely." Truman reiterated his unbounded confidence. The Republicans gloated and Life magazine ran an editorial asserting that no man could retain his moral stature and not denounce Bill Boyle.

These things are part and parcel of the two-party system of American capitalism. The two great parties are not merely belts through which the moneyed classes determine government policy; they are also businesses in and out of themselves, and like most businesses, they charge what the traffic will bear.

Until the people are able to break this system—by forming, with the working class as its base, a new and independent party concerned not with patronage but with policy, based upon real needs of the masses of the people—we can expect little permanent improvement in the Washington atmosphere. Business is making huge profits and so its politicians see no reason why they should not take a slice for themselves.

Both parties suddenly faced each other with their pants down, and the sight was unattractive. The embarrassment was so great that, after a short glance at each other, they both ran for cover and pulled down the curtain. This show can't go on.

To take all this seriously one has to remember that at this fateful juncture in history these two highly moral parties, between them, have a monopoly on the political life of the most powerful nation in the world. Dean Acheson and John Foster Dulles, the eminent statesmen of the American Century, make splendid speeches in air-conditioned diplomatic parlors amid pomp; but, beneath them, in the great political ladders that stretch below, they are attached to two enormous political machines. Their political careers rest upon two rotten, patronage-ridden, corrupt machines.

So this is no laughing matter. The great scandals of the past few years have great meaning; they are not isolated instances of corruption revealing only the weakness of "human nature." Nor are they something Truman brought with him directly from Pendergastland (although it is

unsuccessful.

The fact that the two scandals converged on Washington at the exact same time is, of course, something of an accident. But the coincidence has been, by its very dramatic force, a very instructive lesson in American politics. It is little wonder that all but a few politicians have been in a hurry to call the whole show off and get on to a few good healthy witch-hunts.

THE RECENT MILITARY REVOLT IN ARGENTINA SHOWS THAT—

All Classes Oppose the Peron Dictatorship

By JUAN REY

SANTIAGO, Oct. 1—It is a most astonishing event, this uprising against the bonapartist-totalitarian dictatorship of Peron in Argentina.

In previous articles, we had written that the railroad strike proved that the situation is very serious. The strike was broken, but not the Argentine opposition, which is stronger every day.

The military uprising was led by ex-President Rawson and General Mendendez and by Guavecocha and Zinni of the air force, and a great many officers participated in it. The mutiny controlled the Palomar airport, the Campo de Mayo and "Punta de Indio," all very important military centers. But the uprising was put down and at the moment Peron and his Evita control the situation.

The situation in Argentina is very tense not only because of the economic crisis but also because of the pre-election strain. The growth of the opposition can be appraised by the fact that Eva Peron was obliged to withdraw her candidacy for the vice-presidency. All classes are opposed to the dictatorship—not only the conservative landowners but also the bourgeoisie, the middle class

and the greater part of the working class, which is represented by the Socialist Party, and the old trade-union cadres.

The situation can be compared with that of Bolivia in 1946, when all the different classes and groups of the nation agreed to act together against the dictatorship of the ruling party. Up to now, the army provided the support of the Argentine dictatorship, but the recent uprising shows that the military are now divided and that a good part of the armed forces are with the opposition.

Politically the opposition is made up of the conservative, radical and socialist parties, the traditional parties of Argentine bourgeois democracy. But the most important of these is the Radical Party, which represents the traditional Argentine bourgeoisie and the landowners, who are interested in raising agricultural prices and in a "free economy" and the restoration of "democracy."

SOURCES OF REVOLT

As our readers certainly know, Peron was elected president of Argentina in 1946 and proceeded to the nationalization of transport (the railroads), and then to the institution of a state monopoly in the sale of agricultural products (olive oil, meat and

wheat); these were to be bought up by the government at fixed prices and then sold at prices dictated by the administration. This monopoly is the principal basis of the economic power of Peronism and the basis for the discontent of the great landowners.

In practice this monopoly also means control of foreign commerce by the government. Through the income obtained through this monopoly Peron's government tries to support the development of the feeble Argentine industry. The low prices for wheat and meat which the government pays incenses the international opposition; the high prices for these products abroad provokes reprisal against the Argentine economy by the U. S. and partially by Great Britain—

the Stalinist party. They argue that Peron has raised the standard of living of the working class in Argentina.

But they forget that the rise in wages and in the standard of living was the result of the world war situation, which objectively furthered the development of industry in the country. It is quite possible that Peron's policy of industrialization may be better for the economic interests of the workers, but the historical and political interests of the working class require the destruction of Peronism and the fight for the restoration of democratic liberties as the condition for the struggle for socialism.

The Stalinist party declared, of course, that it did not participate in the uprising, but it demands from Peron the complete destruction of the "plutocratic oligarchy," which, it says, has arisen in revolt because it was not destroyed by Peron. The Stalinist party also demands the intensification of totalitarianism in Argentina, according to the Russian pattern.

The "official Trotskyists" support Peron as the bearer of the "democratic revolution" in Latin America, that is, they are supporting Peron and Stalinism; they are living in the shadow of

Los Angeles Readers:

The new address of the Independent Socialist League and the Socialist Youth League in Los Angeles is:
P. O. Box 2571
Terminal Annex
Los Angeles 54, Calif.

CORRECTION

An error appeared in the article "Convention of the IUE-CIO" in LABOR ACTION for October 1, 1951. On the question of increasing dues to \$2, the article stated that "two thirds of the locals must ratify the majority decision of the convention." Actually, only a majority of the locals is needed to ratify the dues increase.

'Anti-Americanism in Europe—

(Continued from page 1)

even if he owns it and you only rent it, even if he failed to repair the plumbing or the windows, or to clean out all the rats and vermin? After all, you can't appease a fire, you must put it out."

That sounds reasonable and wise. It persuades many people, even intelligent ones. They are too panicky to ask themselves what caused this particular fire, what kind of fire it is, and can it really be extinguished if the landlord is allowed to pour streams of gasoline on it!

All that American capitalism and its government can do is to pour gasoline on the fire of Stalinism.

TO FIGHT STALINISM

To fight Stalinism without bringing ruin to the entire world, you need the mobilized support of powerful social forces, in fact, the very same forces which Stalinism tries to mobilize—not without success—in the name of a struggle against capitalism and imperialism. Even Truman knows enough to have explained to MacArthur that, in the war against Stalinism, the United States alone is helpless and must therefore have allies everywhere. That is absolutely right.

Where will the United States get allies and who will they be? We repeat: that is decided by who is resisting Stalinism, and

by that token, *why* and *how* he is resisting it.

Because of the specific basic reason why Stalinism threatens the ruling classes in the United States, they fight it in the interests of preserving capitalist private property. That assures them of the support, more or less, of many American workers who are still duped by the watchwords of "free enterprise." It certainly guarantees them the support, enthusiastic or reluctant, of the capitalist classes in all other countries, who know that without the aid and direction of still powerful U. S. capitalism they would not last out the year.

But who else? The working classes of Europe? In their overwhelming majority they are through with capitalism. The hundreds of millions of today's and yesterday's colonial peoples? Almost to a man, they are through with that imperialist rule and outlook which capitalism represents.

These masses will never become the allies of American capitalism—never! And the clearer it becomes that Washington can count most surely only upon the capitalist classes, the imperialists and the reactionaries throughout the world, the more surely does it lose even the remotest possibility of winning the masses to its side.

FAST OR FASTER?

And the same is true, the clearer it becomes that under the relentless American drive to oblige all non-Stalinist countries to arm and arm and arm, the ruling classes, here and abroad, remain wealthy or grow wealthier, while the masses get poorer and lose more of their rights.

Under these conditions, the growth of "anti-Americanism" is bound to continue, with only this difference: With a Truman administration it will grow fast, and with (let us say) a Taft administration it will grow faster.

And the world-wide sentiment that is growing will remain anti-American so long as the Niebuhrs and above all the labor leadership, which officially represents the "other America"—the non-capi-

talist United States, the working class and the progressive-minded people—stay associated with the present American government and the policies which it cannot but follow, and thereby assume responsibility for them in the eyes of the world.

It is precisely they who, by trailing behind the policies of American capitalism with an occasional mild criticism, make it possible for the peoples everywhere to shrug their shoulders and say: "All the Americans are alike, all of them are chauvinists, aristocrats, imperialists, demagogues-of-the-phrase."

The "anti-Americanism" would be wiped out almost overnight if, in a clear and clarion way, the American labor movement were to put forward a genuinely independent and aggressively democratic foreign policy of its own, and were to declare that it aims at the national governmental power that would enable the country to pursue that policy. To expect Truman—or Vinson, or Eisenhower, or Stassen, or Taft—to adopt such a policy by "persuasion" or "criticism" is like expecting them to walk down the streets without their skin.

There is only one force that can do it, and that is the independently acting working class, politically free from all responsibility for present American foreign policy or association with it. The failure of the labor officialdom to lead it to that position is a disgrace, a criminal stupidity, an outstanding contribution to calamities of increasing dimensions.

What does such a policy mean? It means, first, an uncompromising insistence on the democratic principle of the right of self-determination for all countries, not only those ruled by the Kremlin, but those whose national independence or aspirations are undermined or thwarted by the governments of the "Western allies."

WHY THEY ARE BITTER

If the peoples of the world saw and heard an American labor movement promptly and vigorously speaking up, not only for Polish independence against Russian domination, but (as examples) for Iran's unqualified rights, for the

same sovereignty for Egypt and Indo-China that the United States enjoys, for an end to the abominable alliance with the Chiang Kai-sheks and Francos—how long would that "anti-Americanism" last which so disturbs Niebuhr, Dallin and others?

It means, second, a *real* sharing of benefits as well as sacrifices with those you ask to be your ally and to fight and shed blood side by side with you.

American foreign policy today is that of an aristocratic imperialism, and it is nothing at all to be wondered at that the peoples of other lands are deeply embittered and infuriated against it. The American imperialist, who has concentrated such disproportionate wealth and luxury in his hands, demands that the European peoples, bled white in the last two wars to an extent undreamed of in this country, work and fight in the "Atlantic Pact armies" which he directs as second or fourth-class citizens.

FOR PRACTICAL PEOPLE

If there are benefits from democracy, they must be shared equally; and if sacrifices are needed to defend it, they must be made equally. If the American

labor movement proclaimed this simple democratic principle, and broke indignantly with its ruling class and the feudal-lord class and contempt it shows toward its European serfs—how long would the "anti-Americanism" last? It would vanish into thin air, and give way to a solidarity between the American workers and the peoples of the other countries that no force of Stalinism could break through.

The "practical" people—not we "impractical socialists" but the "practical politicians" who represent the labor and progressive movements in this country—publicly deplore and privately bemoan (or curse) the "failure" of the Europeans to "understand" America's role in the struggle against the Stalinist menace. They go to Europe in a steady procession to "explain" to the Europeans, to win them over. The role of the American government they always find it hard to explain; their own role, impossible.

The practical result is the continued "growth of anti-Americanism." We fix the responsibility for it right where it belongs: on the shoulders of Niebuhr, of Dallin, of Reuther, of Dubinsky, of Green, of Murray.

IN BRITAIN

Press dispatches from Britain emphasize increasing anti-American sentiment from that country too. What is especially interesting is that, after reporting that "Dislike of American policy and Americans has been growing lately," the N. Y. Times' London correspondent adds:

"It is not confined to the left wing of the Labor Party but is beginning to afflict people in both political organizations who stand to the left of Winston Churchill and Anthony Eden." (Oct. 8.)

That takes in quite a section of even the Tory supporters. Instanced is the recent attack on American policy by the conservative London *Economist*, considered a portent because this eminent journal has been one which has had some of the kindest things to say about the U. S. in the past. The *Economist's* strictures were directed against Washington's lack of support to Britain's "rights" in the Iranian dispute; it feels let down.

This complaint, to be sure, is made strictly from the British imperialist point of view, while much of the anti-American sentiment of the masses is based on the relation between U. S. pressure for rearmament and their standard of living. But it is another facet of the effect of Washington's dominance in world power on the Europeans who are squeezed by it in all directions.

There Are Geniuses In Canada Too

A Liberal MP, J. F. Pouliot, in Canada's parliament:

"I do not see the use of maintaining, at high cost, a group of men to prepare statistics on the cost of living which . . . create disturbances in the country, arouse the feelings of the people, and cause them to worry about conditions in Canada."

This was topped by a Tory MP, G. R. Pearkes, with the counter-argument: "I do not believe that the majority of people in this country are concerned with the high cost of living."

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, AND CIRCULATION REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF CONGRESS OF AUGUST 24, 1912, AS AMENDED BY THE ACTS OF MARCH 3, 1933, AND JULY 2, 1946 (Title 39, U. S. Code, Section 233) of LABOR ACTION, published weekly at New York, N. Y., for October 1, 1951.

1. The names and addresses of editor, and business managers are: Publisher, Max Shachtman, Editor, Hal Draper; Managing Editor, none; Business Manager, L. G. Smith, all of 114 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.

2. The owner is: Labor Action Publishing Co., Emanuel Garrett Geltman, Max Shachtman, Albert Gates, all of 114 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.

3. The known bondholders, mortgages, and other security holders owning or holding 1 per cent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: None.

4. Paragraphs 2 and 3 include,

in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting; also the statements in the two paragraphs show the affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner.

5. The average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed, through the mails or otherwise, to paid subscribers during the 12 months preceding the date shown above was 3059.

L. G. SMITH

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 27th day of September, 1951.

MURRAY M. TITTLER, Notary Public, State of New York No. 24-9344600. (My commission expires March 30, 1952.)

Next Week—

A Four-Page Student-Youth Section Of LABOR ACTION

Beginning with next week's issue, and once every two months following, four pages of LABOR ACTION will be given over to the Socialist Youth League as its own section discussing student and youth problems. The SYL plans wide distributions of these issues.

While specifically directed toward student youth, it goes without saying that the material planned by the SYL will also be of great interest to regular readers. Gertrude Blackwell will be the section editor of these pages.

The editors of LABOR ACTION welcome this venture by the socialist youth and are giving their complete cooperation for the project.

The Crisis in Bolivia: 'Made in USA'

By JUAN REY

SANTIAGO, Oct. 2—Bolivia has plunged into a deep economic crisis which is marked "Made in U.S.A."

The price of tin, which had risen to \$1.80 a pound, was reduced to \$1.12 by the autocratic dictate of the American government's Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The *whole* Bolivian economy depends upon the export of tin: Bolivia is virtually a one-product country which must import all articles for national consumption by means of the dollars which it obtains from its tin export. Through the RFC's decree, the national income of Bolivia was reduced by more than 30 per cent—already it is 40 per cent—by the simple say-so of Truman's man Symington.

It is not to be wondered at that the bourgeois press of Bolivia has started to use phrases of ours like "bad neighbor policy" and "economic aggression," for all of the national economy is endangered by the exploitive policy of the American monopolies. On the one side, Washington proclaims a policy of fraternal friendship and its desire to be a "good neighbor," but these protestations become pure hypocrisy in the light of its economic aggression, which is put across by the RFC.

As a result of Washington's dictation of the prices of Bolivian products and its reduction in the national income of Bolivia, the country's currency has been cut in value by more than 100 per cent, and prices have risen more

than 300 per cent in the last two years. Thus the workers of Bolivia pay for United States war policy with their blood and sweat, for the benefit of the U. S. bourgeoisie and the detriment of the American workers.

EXPLOITATION IN TIN

The flagrant case of Bolivia is outstanding evidence of Washington's policy of imperialism, which obliges the peoples of the Americas and Europe to pay for its war policy. It is also a warning that U. S. imperialism could be one of the world's greatest oppressors and exploiters of the peoples of other countries if it conquers an international economic monopoly and world political power.

A provisional contract was signed between Bolivia and the U. S. which fixed the price of tin at \$1.12. But this price does not cover the costs of tin production, which are very high; for the tin is situated at very high altitudes and is quite distant from the nearest means of transportation. Therefore it is that the Bolivian producers and also the government demand \$1.50 as the minimum price. But the RFC rejects this figure, and so the entire national economy is endangered. The U. S. government bears the direct responsibility for this situation.

Politically this country is seeing its worst reaction of the last 15 years. The military government has an absolutely free hand, because the working class was defeated. The major responsibility for this must be borne by the petty-bourgeois parties, by the PIR (Stalinist party) and by the

Nationalist MNR, as well as the "Trotskyist" POR. These led the workers into adventurism and political strikes in the interests of a restoration to power of the MNR Nationalists, and thus exhausted the working class's energies. The workers are presently demoralized and incapable of resistance after all the massacres and defeats under the leadership of the Stalinists and Nationalists.

"ADVISERS" SWARM

Now when it is necessary to organize workers' strikes and resistance against wage cuts caused by inflation and against the American monopolists' economic aggression, it is quite impossible to do so. With this immobilization is given to the tender mercies of the working class, the country Washington and internal rightist reaction, whose deprivations could be stopped only through a new revolution.

The country is invaded by all kinds of advisers from the U. S. and from the UN, whose advice to the Bolivian government boils down to various reactionary and pro-imperialist measures. The principal goal of the Bolivian Right and of the foreign advisers is a liberal "free" capitalist economy—an aim which is entirely inadequate in a colonial and backward country.

The aim of this policy is very clear: to intensify the exploitation of the Bolivian people to the point where it approaches slave conditions. But Bolivia is a country of surprises. We may yet see 1946 all over again, and some people will be found hanging from the lamp posts as in that year.