

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

TUNISIA — —
Revolt Enters New Phase

... page 6

Witchhunt Gathers Momentum

... page 3

Israel and the Arab Socialists

... page 4

AUGUST 2, 1954

FIVE CENTS

editorial

A PROVOCATION

The recent aerial incidents off the coast of the Chinese island of Hainan are a clear-cut case of American sabre-rattling provocation! And the fact that the liberal press and liberal leaders in Congress have not been one step behind the most chauvinist reactionaries in attempting to fan national passions into a state of inflamed bellicosity shows how meager is their claim to represent national sanity in these trying times.

What are the publicly-known facts which have been whipped up into this war-hysteria pattern?

- For some time Chiang Kai-shek's planes from Formosa have been conducting quickie observation and bombing attacks on Hainan.

- On July 23 a British air liner was shot down off Hainan by Chinese war-planes, with the result that several passengers were killed.

- Upon British protest, the Chinese Stalinist government immediately apologized for the incident, claiming it was a case of a pilot's confusing the British plane for a Formosan one, and offered to consider indemnity for the plane and passengers.

- The United States government immediately upon hearing of these events dispatched two aircraft carriers and a flotilla of destroyers to the area to "search for survivors."

- On July 26, three whole days after the original incident, American planes shot down two Chinese fighters within one minute flying time of Hainan territorial waters.

- Navy officers informed the American public that their men had orders to be "quick on the trigger" in any encounters with Chinese forces.

Those are the facts to date, as they are admitted by everyone. We are not including the Chinese Stalinist claim that in their search activities American planes repeatedly flew over Hainan territory.

Could the truth of the matter possibly be clearer? Why were two aircraft carriers needed to search for survivors? Why did they have to be accompanied by a flotilla of destroyers? Why were they ordered to shoot first and look afterwards ("be quick on the trigger") after the prompt Chinese apology? What would the attitude in this country be if Chinese aircraft carriers appeared five minutes flying time off our coast with orders to be "quick on the trigger" if approached by any American planes? We would think it was a PROVOCATION—and we would be right!

And how did Congress react, from liberal left to reactionary right? Like a bunch of bloodthirsty warmongers. Those are hard words, but none softer would be truthful.

Wayne Morse (Ind.) "We cannot stand by as a sovereign nation and permit anyone anywhere in the world to transgress on the sovereign rights of the United States."

Homer Ferguson (R.) "An hour of peril is at hand because of continued aggression of the Communist world against the free world."

M. W. Neely (D.) "pledged support to the administration and said the United States, if forced to fight, would win 'over godless, cutthroat forces of communism in Russia, China or wherever they might be.'"

Stuart Symington (D.) "said developments bore out his earlier criticism that Americans were 'not taking adequate and proper steps' to defend themselves against the 'great and growing strength of Soviet communism.'"

(Turn to last page)

Senate Gives Away Peoples' Atom Power

By SAM TAYLOR

The two week filibuster on revision of the Atomic Energy Act was the opening gun of the 1954 congressional elections. While the revisions in the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 were in the making for the past year, there was no indication that it would lead to this protracted debate and filibuster.

The debate on atomic energy has primarily been one centering around public vs. private electric power development, and specifically the Tennessee Valley Authority. Only secondarily has it dealt with the broader issues of the commercial utilization of atomic energy.

The opportunity for the Senate Democrats to revive the charges of "giveaway" against the Republican administration and thus revive the issues of the tidelands oil debate of a year ago was a wind-fall gain handed to the Democrats by the Eisenhower administration. It has given what an unnamed high official of the Democratic National Committee called a "head to the spear" in the Democratic attempt to recover control of Congress. But at the same time it has revealed a split between the pro-public power Democrats and the conservative Democrats, headed by Minority Leader Senator Johnson of Texas who supported Knowland's attempt to break the filibuster.

The debate arose as a result of an order by President Eisenhower directing the Atomic Energy Commission to negotiate a contract with the Middle South Utilities, Inc. and the Southern Corp. to build a \$107 million steam plant in West Memphis, Ark. to supply 600,000 kilowatts of energy to the T.V.A. system, which would replace power T.V.A. is supplying for the atomic

energy plant in Paducah, Ky.

It is this action that has rallied most of the senators from the states in the T.V.A. area and the West, where the issue is also water for irrigation and flood control. It was the opportunity to attack the policy of this self-avowed businessman's administration to weaken public power development in the interests of the private utilities.

ANNOUNCED POLICY

The announced policy of the Eisenhower administration has been that the federal government shall be a "partner" in power development with state and local interests. In practice it has meant the slow withdrawal from federal power projects and leaving the field open to private utilities. It has not been the Eisenhower policy to make an all-out assault on T.V.A. or other authorities; instead T.V.A. funds are withheld, plans for new dams are dropped, encouragement is given to private utilities to take court action against power co-ops and the funds for the Rural Electrification Administration are whittled down.

Against this background and the success of this campaign, the direct attempt to force the T.V.A. to acquire power from a private company takes added importance. It is not one of merely weakening T.V.A. but the strengthening of the conservative and pro-business atmosphere in the country. It is not that the Senate Democrats are filibustering in an attempt to combat this trend for they are moved on the whole by the coming 1954 elections and the benefits to their particular states of past policies which weakened private power groups.

Most of the opposition to this reactionary revision of the Atomic Energy Act was from Senators in the South, West and mid-West where the issue of cheap electric

(Continued on page 7)

(Turn to last page)

For or Against U.S. Armed Intervention?

INDOCHINA AND THE LIBERALS

By LARRY O'CONNOR

Among the reactions to the Indochina truce, that of the leaders of American liberalism is perhaps the most curious. As the labor movement tends, in these times, to generally reflect the political attitudes of the liberals on vital issues of the day, and as the labor movement is the only source from which the political power can be generated to change American policy, these reactions become most important.

During the Indochina crisis there was a certain tendency for liberals to take a long, hard look at French colonial policy, and to come up

with the conclusion that this was the chief source of Stalinist appeal in Indochina. In fact, the denunciations of French colonialism became so general and vociferous, that one was almost led to believe that leading spokesmen of American liberalism had come to consider Indochina as a lost cause, opposed the idea of "saving" the country from Stalinism by American military intervention, and, in fact, were convinced that such an attempt would be disastrous.

A real close look at liberal discussion of the Indochina crisis, however, shows that throughout it

remained just about as rudderless as the Dulles policies which the liberals were attacking. The liberals, from their adored leader Stevenson on down, were primarily concerned to clear the former Democratic administrations of Republican charges of selling out China to the Stalinists, and at the same time to throw a barb or two into the "new look," "massive retaliation," and other sloganized insanities of the Republican leadership.

But throughout the crisis, had the liberals given up the idea that the United States could rectify by

LABOR SCOPE

Trouble Ahead for Electrical Union

By BEN HALL

Top executives of the General Electric Co. met in Schenectady in April to mull over a ten-year plan for the corporation. The minutes and documents intended only for the highest company officials fell into the hands of the union, the International Union of Electrical Workers-CIO, which reports disturbing facts in the July 19 issue of its newspaper. There can be no doubt: trouble lies ahead for the union.

The aim of the ten-year plan may not be modest but it is ordinary; GE wants to double its income from the 1953 level of only a little more than 3 billion dollars to 6.3 billion in 1963. No one objects to a few billions in profits one way or the other; but the methods envisaged at the conference may well create a crisis for the union within the next ten years.

GE owns 132 plants in 101 cities, but a large part of its production is concentrated in giant plants. Fifty-five per cent of GE workers are now concentrated in 7 cities with 10,000 to 40,000 workers employed in each of them, in areas where labor commands a high pay scale and is strongly unionized. But the GE plan calls for a program of decentralization which would break up these big units and scatter production in smaller units. The following are the key points of the plan:

1. An increase of productivity of 100 per cent so that twice as much production could be obtained by the same working force.
2. Reduction of labor costs. This would mean, among other things, constant pressure to reduce wage rates and a shift of production from the unionized, high wage areas to the small town, unorganized, lower wage areas.
3. "A more rapid evolution of mechanization with more complete automation, push button machines that require few or no workers, in some product lines.

The impact of the plan is already felt. At the conference, A. F. Vinson, vice-president in charge of production, pointed out that the company had moved out hundreds of jobs from its plant in Schenectady into a small plant in Bloomington, Illinois because it could get the same work at far lower wage rates. The union knows that it must get ready to meet a big push against working conditions. If the political and social climate of the next decade is kind to labor, it may weather the shift without too great a crisis. But, suppose the trend in national politics continues toward greater conservatism, toward a bigger squeeze on labor? That is what makes even the most powerful labor leaders uneasy.

Unity for Strength

It is worrying calculations like these that led to the signing of the AFL-CIO no-raiding pact as a step toward greater collaboration. Labor officials inspired even by the most elementary understanding of the facts of the class struggle feel the need to prepare for unity and united action. Recent developments which high-

light the search for strength through unity are:

- In the CIO, the Transport Workers Union with 110,000 members has just merged with the CIO United Railroad Workers which claims 40,000.
- On the West Coast, the CIO Woodworkers Union and the AFL Lumber and Sawmill Workers Union collaborated in a strike of nearly 100,000 workers.
- In the AFL, the Machinists and the Plumbers have signed an agreement which provides not only for no-raiding but for mutual assistance in strikes.
- In the oil industry, action toward the projected merger of the CIO Oil Workers Union with a group of independents has slowed down. But meanwhile, in separate talks, the oil union is considering merger with another CIO union, the Gas, Coke, and Chemical Workers Union. These two unions together claim about 200,000 members. If a general merger of all groups into a new Oil and Chemical Union is successful, the new union would be one of the largest in the country.

Kohler Co. Strike

Everybody likes to talk about labor-management harmony, living together, eras of understanding. But every once in a while, labor is reminded of the grim facts of life. This time by a strike of 3,300 members of UAW local 833 at the Kohler Company in Wisconsin. In 1934, Kohler workers struck but their picket lines were cut down by guns, teargas, and clubs when 2 were killed and 47 wounded. The plant remained unorganized until 1952 when the UAW won a collective bargaining election. And on April 5 of this year, the men struck to try to bring their wage standards up to UAW levels.

At a hearing before the Wisconsin Employment Relations Board, owner Herbert V. Kohler shocked the community by a series of admissions which recreated a vision of 1934. He testified that the guns and clubs of 1934 were still stored in the plant together with teargas, ready for any emergency. He himself carried a ten-inch club, 1934 vintage, through the picket lines. Later, the county sheriff seized 375 rounds of teargas from the plant. But the company dominated local police chief admitted that teargas was stored at its headquarters.

PENNSYLVANIA

Miners' Wildcat Wins!

By GERALD McDERMOTT

PITTSBURGH, PA.—The wildcat strike of fifteen thousand southwestern Pennsylvania United Mine Worker members in defense of their seniority has ended with a victory for the strikers. The action of the strikers in closing twenty-three mines forced the personal intervention of John L. Lewis and the company's agreement to a new interpretation of the seniority system acceptable to the strikers.

The strike underlined the fact that the seniority clause in the present UMW contract is not adequate. Companies interpret it as they please. In the Nemacolin mine, where the recent wildcat started, the company observed only seniority within job classifications, and not mine-wide seniority. Thus, a timberman with twenty years seniority could be laid off while a trackman with five years

Stimple Life in Prague

Prace (Prague), August 17, poked fun at the new Prague telephone directory, advising subscribers to be prepared for a "hazardous journey" through its pages when they try to look up a number. They were particularly warned not to wait until the last minute to try and find the number of a hospital, doctor, undertaker, or "of anything or anyone you need in a hurry."

"Let us suppose that grandfather topples off a ladder and hurts himself. A trip to the clinic is necessary at once. You bless your luck that you have a telephone; you can arrange for an immediate appointment. And that is where the trouble starts. Clinics do not appear as such in the directory. Clinics, you are advised, must be looked up under the main heading 'Schools' among 'Faculties of Medicine.' Do not be too sure of finding your particular clinic on the page indicated. There it says: 'Clinic for Plastic Surgery—see State District Hospital in Prague N.E.2; other clinics—see State University Hospitals.' Quickly you turn to the letter S. Grandfather is failing fast. Under S you find, by luck and dint of effort, that 'State specialized health and nursing institutions—see Hospitals' probably includes the clinic you are seeking. In the meantime grandfather has passed away. So you need no longer look for the clinic. Now for the undertaker. It may be best to turn back to the 'Schools' page. There you will find among 'Faculties of Medicine' the institution which will provide the deceased with the last service. Should you wish to arrange for a grave then we had better help you, to save you further harassment. For 'Cemetery,' look under 'Communal institutions, Department of Gardens.'

"And what about you, comrade, whose basement apartment has been flooded with sewer water? Correctly you look through sixteen pages of 'Communal institutions' where you will discover that 'Sewage service' is 'see National Committees: Central National Committee.' Good advice is better than gold. But you won't find 'Sewage service' even under 'National Committee.' The language of the directory calls it the 'Prague Water Economy Service of the Central National Committee.'

Prace concluded: "Be careful and patient above all, Comrades. Why should

we lead a simple life when we can have a complicated one? The editor of the directory must have had this attitude."

Bosses Fear Socialism

The July 12 issue of the CIO News carried on its front page a full-page reproduction of a letter sent out to its members by the National Small Business Men's Association.

The CIO's comment on this letter was simply "A Good Reason for Giving a Buck to PAC!" For our part, we wish that the NSBMA were right when they claim that "the CIO, the AFL, the ADA and all sorts of radical groups are pushing their programs for more socialization. . . ." But one thing is certain. However much the labor movement and the liberal spokesmen in this country may seek to deny that politics in this country follows class lines, these birds of the NSBMA think and act differently.

Here is their letter, dated June 3, 1954:

"We are now running into something we haven't previously encountered in the seventeen years our Association has been in existence—a spirit of complacency. Quite a few business men seem to feel that everything is all right now that we have a new president in the White House.

"I'm sure you will agree with me that this is a short-sighted, unrealistic view, and that instead of sitting back doing nothing we should redouble our efforts because now there is an opportunity for greater accomplishment than 'our' side has had at any time since 1933.

"The socialism Roosevelt and Truman injected into the operation of our federal government is still there, and practically every member of Congress is today under greater pressure from the 'other' side than he has ever been. The CIO, the AFL, the ADA and all sorts of radical groups are pushing their programs for more socialization and less freedom of enterprise harder than ever. They confidently expect

"The most effective way in which to counteract this radical pressure is through the organized activities of an organization like ours which has the courage to fight the labor bosses, the communists, the bureaucrats and anyone else without giving any consideration to possible reprisals or the likelihood of being smeared in the papers and over the air.

"None of us want this country to go all the way down the road to national socialism, a socialistic-welfare-state. So it is imperative for each of us to put up the best fight he is capable of making and to do it now.

"You can help by sending us a check for \$15.00 in payment of your current dues."

The standard biography

KARL MARX

by

Franz Mehring

\$3.50

Labor Action Book Service
114 West 14 Street, New York City



LABOR ACTION

August 2, 1954 Vol. 18, No. 31

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

Editor: HAL DRAPER
Asst. Ed.: GORDON HASKELL,
BEN HALL
Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

Support Your

LABOR ACTION—

GIVE

to the Fund Drive!

'THE NEW INTERNATIONAL'

is the leading Marxist magazine in the United States, internationally recognized as among the foremost organs of Marxist thought and political analysis in the world.

SEND 35 CENTS FOR THE CURRENT ISSUE
OR SUBSCRIBE AT \$2.00 A YEAR

New International, 114 West 14 Street, New York City

This loads up the mines still working with what are in effect "yellow dogs." It also offers an object lesson to miners in mines which are approaching exhaustion—better be "good boys" if you want to be transferred and kept at work.

If this trend were permitted to continue, coal diggers would be back where they were in the black days of the early thirties. That is why the miners in the important southwestern Pennsylvania fields have called a halt to the operators' drive with militant united action.

Witchhunt Picks Up Momentum In Congress Rush to Adjourn

By GORDON HASKELL

Without any debate whatever, the House of Representatives passed a bill on July 21 which would strip of American citizenship rights any citizen who advocates overthrow of the government by force and violence. On the same day, with the lone dissenting voice of New York Congressman Celler, the House judiciary subcommittee approved a bill to outlaw the Communist Party of this country and all "frontal" organizations.

The reaction to these new and radical steps in the direction of a police state was mild if not negligible. The press of the extreme right hooted with delight, while the more "responsible" papers of "Republican liberalism" and even the extreme liberal press like the New York Post contented themselves with a few observations on the contradictory or redundant nature of the two measures.

SANCTIMONIOUS TIMES

The claim in that quarter seems to be that as the Smith Act already provides criminal penalties for "conspiring to advocate overthrow of the government by force and violence," the "de-nationalization" bill would add nothing to the worries of possible defendants. And the argument goes that both Attorney General Brownell and FBI-chief J. Edgar Hoover have opposed the illegalization of the Communist Party on the basis that it would drive it further underground than it is now, and hence would make it more difficult for the FBI to follow its activities. The New York Times typically contents itself with the editorial observation that "The question is, of course, not whether we dislike communism but how best, in the light of our traditions and present responsibilities, to deal with it. We can't put the whole party in jail. Probably we will have to continue to proceed against individuals for specified offenses, just as we do against murderers and burglars. And certainly persons charged with being members of a Communist conspiracy should continue to have the same rights—as they have had, to the last ounce of judicial patience—as burglars and murderers."

First of all, it is difficult, in the present atmosphere, to guess why the Times assumes that "we can't put the whole party in jail." That is precisely the purpose of the emergency provisions of the McCarran Internal Security Act. And what the bill passed by the House subcommittee proposes to do is to make just this possible even without an emergency.

DEMOCRATIC TRADITION

As the democratic tradition in this country is only shaken and not completely put to route, the bill does not simply provide, as a similar statute in a Nazi state might, that anyone charged by the state authorities with being a member of the CP can be put in "detention" for an indefinite period. It covers its intent with legal verbiage.

In past court trials, the most difficult thing for the government has been to prove Communist Party membership in those cases where it

was denied. In most of the Smith Act trials, where the defendants were prominent party leaders, this obstacle for the prosecution was never too great. But even with the legions of FBI informers inside the CP it may remain most difficult to prove actual party membership against a rank and file member.

So, the bill sets out to "liberalize" the rules of evidence by which juries shall determine whether or not a person had been a member of the proscribed organizations. It sets forth the following criteria, to be considered by a jury under instructions from a judge, in determining membership in any proscribed organization. The bill says that the jury, in determining membership shall consider whether the accused person:

"1. Has been listed to his knowledge as a member in any book, or any of the lists, records, correspondence or any other document of the organization;

"2. Has made financial contributions to the organization in dues, assessments, loans, or in any other form;

"3. Has made himself subject to the discipline of the organization in any form whatsoever;

"4. Has executed orders, plans or directives of any kind of the organization;

"5. Has acted as an agent, courier, messenger, correspondent, organizer or in any other capacity in behalf of the organization;

"6. Has conferred with an officer or other member of the organization in behalf of any plan or enterprise of the organization;

"7. Has been accepted to his knowledge as an officer or member of the organization or as one to be called upon for services by other officers or members of the organization;

"8. Has written, spoken or in any other way communicated by signal, semaphore, sign or in any other form of communication orders, directives or plans of the organization;

"9. Has prepared documents, pamphlets, leaflets, books or any other type of publication in behalf of the objectives and purposes of the organization.

"10. Has mailed, shipped, circulated, distributed, delivered or in any other way sent or delivered to other material or propaganda of any kind in behalf of the organization;

"11. Has advised, counseled or in any other way imparted information, suggestions, recommendations to officers or members of the organization or to anyone else in behalf of the objectives of the organization;

"12. Has indicated by word, action, conduct, writing or in any other way willingness to carry out in any manner and to any degree the plans, designs, objectives or purposes of the organization;

"13. Has in any other way participated in the activities, planning, action, objectives or purposes of the organization."

Thus, the definition of "membership" is proposed to be extended to include activities which might be engaged in even by distant sympathizers of a movement.

Further, the bill broadens the definition of the type of organization to be proscribed to "all frontal organizations and other organizations with the same revolutionary purposes" as the Communist Party.

As to the bill which provides for the stripping of citizenship rights from persons convicted of advocacy of the violent overthrow of the government, it is true that on the face of it this is a duplication of the vicious Smith Act. But that is scant reason for complacency. It only shows that Congress is swept by such a hysteria on the question that they are quite willing to pass duplicate, overlapping and even contradictory measures of this nature. The motivation is neither judicial logic nor the pressing necessity for legislation to fill gaps in the law. It is simply that almost no congressmen dare to oppose any "anti-Communist" bill these days, and most of them consider the passage of one of these bills, with their name on it as author, as a great help in the race for re-election.

It is not a foregone conclusion that all the bills described in this and last week's issue of Labor Action will become law. And it is quite probable that the Congress has become so reckless in its grape-shot type of legislation in this field that the courts will throw a good deal of it out the window as unconstitutional, even if it is passed.

But the closer America comes to a police state, the harder will it be for the labor movement to develop the degree of independence of thought and action which is required if this country is to become a factor for progress in the world rather than a bulwark of reaction.

No Surprises, PLEASE!

Last week Labor Action carried a page two headline "Police State Measures Deluge Congress." After the article had been written summarizing the spate of bills grinding through the legislative process which would restrict civil liberties or impose savage penalties for actions which in the past have been regarded lightly by the law, Washington dispatches to the daily press told the story of the unanimous passage by the House, without debate, of a bill which would deprive any American citizen, whether native born or naturalized, of his citizenship if convicted in court of having advocated or conspired to advocate overthrow of the government by force or violence. The House Judiciary Committee had also passed, with only Congressman Celler of New York dissenting, a bill outlawing the Communist Party.

As is customary these days, both these bills were written so loosely that they could be a threat to anyone who is not a firm and unthinking supporter of the status quo.

This week we feel that we could keep intact the same headline used last week. And as we plan the lay-out of the paper, we have kept a little room open for a flash announcement. Who knows what repressive measure Congress may pass before we actually go to press?—Ed.

A. J. Muste on Europe Tour

A. J. Muste, prominent American revolutionary pacifist and supporter of the Third Camp idea is now touring Europe where he is addressing a number of meetings and conferences. Rev. Muste's tour will be climaxed by his delivery of the keynote address at the triennial conference of the War Resisters International at Paris on July 29. The theme of this conference will be "The Third Camp."

The following is a speech delivered in London by Muste, as it was reported in the July 9 issue of Peace News, British pacifist weekly.

The Third Camp Movement was concerned with the possibility of preventing world catastrophe, said Rev. A. J. Muste, Secretary Emeritus of the American Fellowship of Reconciliation, in an address to leading members of British peace organizations in London recently.

Nothing less than a revolutionary program which could appeal to others as well as pacifists would be capable of doing this, he said. It was necessary to create in the world a group of nations and people which constituted a different kind of alliance, an alliance of fraternity, based on a different kind of power—moral power. It was possible that in India, Africa and Western Europe people could be found who would subscribe to such an idea. But it was necessary for the Third Camp to have a sound ideological base if it were to be a positive force in the world. There was every hope of arriving at new and creative political ideas through the cooperation of pacifists and social and political radicals. Each group had much to teach the other.

The main hope and objective of the Third Camp was the possibility of its being able constructively to influence the two great power blocs. At the moment

there was nothing to influence them except each other. If there were a third element, not based on military power, the deadlock could be broken and healthy elements could be encouraged in both Russia and America. A. J. Muste believed that there were such elements in existence but they would remain unmoved by anything which was a mere reflection of the policies of either power bloc. The Third Camp had thus to repudiate both American and Russian expansionist policies.

If war were joined, the United States would have no hesitation in bombing out Western Europe, he said. Similarly, if it could be done with impunity, the Russians would be strongly inclined to occupy Western Europe if American influence were withdrawn. Only an independent, dynamic, non-power policy in Europe could prevent either fate from befalling her. But if such a policy could be initiated, Western Europe, in common with other nations of the Third Camp in Asia and Africa, could gradually eliminate in both East and West those policies based on economic and psychological compulsions, which drove the powers to conflict.

YOU'RE INVITED

to speak your mind in the letter column of Labor Action. Our policy is to publish letters of general political interest, regardless of views. Keep them to 500 words.

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

Israel, Zionism, and the Position of the Arab Socialists — A Discussion

EDITOR'S NOTE

In the June 7 issue of *Labor Action* we carried an extensive article by Clovis Maksoud, a spokesman of the Socialist Progressive Party of Lebanon, on "Arab Socialism and its Parties."

In his article, Comrade Maksoud hinted at certain Arab Socialist opinions on Zionism and Israel, and at that time, in an editorial note, we called for further discussion and clarification on the question. We hope to publish in early issues of *Labor Action* an extensive discussion of the Lebanese socialist point of view on these matters by Comrade Maksoud.

In the meantime, we have received a letter from Comrade Gebran Magdalany, acting foreign commissioner of the Socialist Progressive Party of Lebanon, in which he takes issue with recent articles published in our paper by Al Findley. We are printing Comrade Magdalany's letter below, with a reply from Comrade Findley.

It is our feeling that this exchange still leaves the question of the policy of the Socialist Progressive Party toward Israel as unclear as before. Perhaps the forthcoming article from Comrade Maksoud will clarify the matter for American socialists.

We need only add that Comrade Findley's remarks on Zionism do not necessarily represent the views of *Labor Action*. Those views are briefly stated in our editorial note in the June 7 issue of the paper.—Ed.

A Few Corrections

To the Editor:

When I read Comrade Al Findley's article "Scorpion Pass V/S Kybya" in April 5 issue of your magazine, I was rather shocked by the number of inaccuracies.

But Comrade Findley's article on Israel in your May 17 issue proved that, the author—though not always well informed—was of good faith and that is why, I would like to point out to your readers a few details, Comrade Findley did not seem to know:

I—I don't know where Comrade Findley got the information assuring the one-sided attitude of the U. S. and other countries in favor of the Arabs.

(a) Without the U. S. Israel would have never become a reality.

(b) The U. S. has been pumping Israel with dollars since 1948 through government and private funds.

(c) The U. S. has procured for Israel the weapons it has used to kill the women and children in Deir Yassin, Kybya, Nahaleen, (to name only the most important mass slaughters).

(d) A practical embargo of weapons was applied by the Western powers against the Arabs.

II—Kibya is by no means a retaliatory attack:

(a) The investigation commission did not find the Jordanians guilty of the Scorpion Pass attack while it affirmed the responsibility of Israel in Kibya.

(b) Kibya is not the first terrorist "exploit", it has brilliant predecessors: assassination of Bernadotte, Deir Yassine; (the heroes of which were rewarded by the Israel courts which shocked even the reactionary *Time* magazine) and it has a dignified successor: Nahaleen.

(c) Even if we suppose that Jordanians are the authors of Scorpion Pass (which according to me is not true), this will have been the first serious attack by the Arabs, and you will agree that there is no comparison between Scorpion Pass (11 killed) and Kibya: 46 killed and an entire village destroyed (in Deir Yassine 150 women and children were killed).

(d) In 90 per cent or more of the border skirmishes Israel has been found guilty by the Armistice Commission.

(e) The Authors of most of the Israel attacks are in the army while from the Arab side most of the attacks come from Bedouins who have no connection with the army.

III—The enemies of Israel are not the Feudals: by the way these are its best allies but their fear of the mass is the factor which keeps their mouth shut (officially). They are the only ones who sold parts of their lands to the Zionists in Palestine and southern Lebanon and they protect the "contraband" between Israel and its neighbors.

IV—If in Nazareth the Communists got 38 per cent of the vote, they reached a percentage of 50 among the Arab refugees in Lebanon, Syria and elsewhere and I will not be surprised if they grow steadily because of Israel.

V—Zionism and socialism cannot go together; for Zionism is essentially racist and confessionalist while the latter is anti-racist and anticonfessionalist. We understand that the Jews have been the victims of discrimination but the solution for racism should be looked for at the root, and not created at the expense of a peaceful population which has been thrown out of its ancestral homeland. We know how powerful the Zionist propaganda is in the United States and especially in New York, and that could be one of the factors which misled Comrade Findley but we would like him to analyze the fact that "socialist" Israel is completely with the capitalist bloc while the feudals of the Arab world did not dare to take any step—thanks to socialist and progressive pressure—in that direction. It is needless to add that the Arab socialists are the only mass strength in this area fighting for the third force.

Yours sincerely,

GEBRAN MAGDALANY
Acting Commissioner
Foreign Commissary
Socialist Progressive Party

Beirut, Lebanon
July 12, 1954

A Reply

To the Editor:

In a continuous series of border incidents over a number of years there can be no doubt that both sides are guilty of unjustified killings etc. The Israeli-Arab fighting is no exception. My article made that clear. The letter from Comrade Magdalany does not seem to operate on that fact but appears to be one-sided.

In a specific case the guilt and degree of guilt of one or another side can be discussed. But such a discussion, while assessing the relative guilt, should also take into consideration the endlessness and therefore the uselessness of these acts.

Now, to the inaccuracies I am accused of:

(1) *Arms*. Has Comrade Magdalany forgotten that the Arab Legion of Jordan is financed, armed and officered by the British? That the U. S. has just signed a military pact with Iraq?

(2) *Role of the U. S.* The U. S. has sometimes favored Zionists. It has also sometimes favored the Arabs. In the last few months the scale has been tipping over in favor of the oil and strategic location of the Arab countries.

(3) *Number of casualties*. The matching of figures as to how many died in an Israeli atrocity as compared to how many died in an Arab atrocity is entirely beside the point. The point is that socialists should condemn all atrocities. The fact is that in total casualties Israel has suffered more. True, they have been the result of small attacks, but they add up. As to condemnation by the mixed armistice commission I do not understand where the ratio of 9:1 was obtained. In the first years the condemnation ran against the Arabs. Recent events have turned them more against Israel.

(4) *Volunteers, Bedouins, Army*. In the Kibya incident I pointed out that nobody could believe Israel's statement that the attack was carried out by volunteers. It is equally difficult to believe that Bedouins alone are responsible for attacks from the Arab side. The armies of both sides have been involved. The Arab Legion has been "active" in Jerusalem. However, most often the acts are carried out by reserves, or militia who are disciplined

but responsibility for whom can be denied by the governments.

(4) *Feudal Arabs and Israel*. The statement of the king of Saudi Arabia that the Arabs should be prepared to sacrifice millions of men to get rid of Israel shows that there is no love lost between the feudal Arabs and Israel. It incidentally is a good clue (given its governmental weight) in judging the relative guilt in border incidents. That the Arab masses are now also opposed to Israel is also unfortunately true but is a fact that can not be a final one for socialists.

(5) *Confessionalism and racialism*. Some Zionist policies do give some basis for the charge that Zionism is "racist and confessionalist." But to identify Zionism per se with racialism and confessionalism raises the theoretical question of whether Jews are a nation or not, a question which space forbids discussing here.

At any rate, it is necessary to differentiate between Zionism and Israel. Some extreme statements have been made that "Zionism is dead" and Israeli nationalism has replaced it.

What Comrade Magdalany's attitude is toward Lebanon and Pakistan I do not know. However here are states that are almost exclusively confessional in their

reason for separate existence. As a socialist I may deplore the state of feeling on one or both sides which creates the burning desire for separation. However, once this exists socialists can only support the right to self determination and work for closer cooperation and eventual confederation or other form of reunification.

On the Arab-Jewish question I think it would make for a clear and more fruitful discussion if Comrade Magdalany would express his opinion on a few questions.

(a) Do the Jews have any legitimate national aspirations in the Near East? What are they?

(b) How would Arab socialists propose to satisfy such just aspiration?

(c) Does Israel have a place in Arab socialist plans for the unification of the Near East?

(d) A *New York Times* dispatch of May 9 reports that socialists of Lebanon and Syria have come out for a struggle against peace with Israel. Is this report accurate, and does it refer to the Socialist Progressive Party of Lebanon? If so, what is the party's reason for such a stand?

AL FINDLEY

LONDON LETTER

The Chauvinist Danger In the BLP Left Wing

By ALLAN VAUGHAN

LONDON, July 21 — Cease-fire agreements have now been signed in Indochina. So ends the war which has lasted for seven years and seven months. The Left-Radical premier, Mendes-France, has saved French capitalism from another humiliating military defeat in the Far East.

From the point of view of the British labor movement, there is quite a case to be made in favor of the proposed "partition" of Vietnam. However, this case is by no means as impressive as *Tribune* [the Bevanite weekly], would appear to assume.

There is peace in Indochina, and the blood of Frenchmen will no longer be spilled on the altar of an outmoded and outdated French imperialism. But it must be realized that another Korea is in the making, for the division of Vietnam into two zones without prior consultation of the peoples of the country lays the basis for a united Vietnam on one premise alone: the military victory of the Vietminh (which can now only take place in the face of a United Nations intervention in Indochina) or of the Vietnamese authorities (which too can only be conceived in the context of a general war in the Far East with Chinese intervention). In other words, the temporary advantages of the Geneva Conference agreement are cancelled out by their long-term disadvantages.

These facts are not properly seen at the moment, however. There is jubilation in the columns of the national press. *Tribune* will no doubt hail Mendes-France as a French Bevanite, and Eden's diplomacy at the Geneva conference will receive fulsome praise in the editorials and lead articles. Unfortunately, to large sections of the labor movement in this country, to be "left," one has to advocate more conferences among the big powers than the right wing proposes. The apparent success of Mendes-France's deal with the Stalinists will engender still further illusions in the efficacy of such conferences among the rank and file of the movement. This is a fact we must not blind ourselves to. . . .

German Rearmament

The Indochina situation has momentarily eclipsed the concern and interest of the Labor Party in the controversy over German rearmament. Although it is

certain that Aneurin Bevan will be defeated for the post of treasurer of the Labor Party, it is by no means certain that the right wing will get away with its policy in support of rearming Germany. Meetings held in the London area on the rearmament issue have left no residue of doubt in the minds of Transport House [BLP headquarters], that on this point, the rank and file is firmly resolved to prevent this suicidal National Executive Committee policy from doing any further damage to the Labor Party's already tarnished prestige.

At a meeting on Saturday, July 17, Denis Healy, former international secretary of the Labor Party, and now Labor M.P. for a Leeds constituency, made a brave attempt to push over the right wing's policy to a conference of a few hundred delegates from labor parties and trade unions in the London and Middlesex areas. He skillfully played off the various groups of opinions, one against the other. Quite a considerable number of delegates, I am told, opposed the official policy on purely chauvinist lines ("The Germans can't be trusted," or "remember Belsen and Buchenwald"). Others opposed official policy on pacifist grounds. Two Quaker delegates spoke (including Jimmy Hudson, the pacifist M.P.)—and put forward some utterly chauvinist arguments against the platform.

SOCIALIST POSITION

Fortunately, a few delegates did put forward the true internationalist position. They pointed out that socialists are not opposed to German rearmament because it is German, but because it is part and parcel of the rearmament of the western capitalist bloc. The key question was the withdrawal of troops from Germany, both West and East—so that the German workers themselves could settle accounts with their own capitalists or bureaucrats.

This German rearmament question is the real meeting ground for principled revolutionary socialists. Nearly all the Bevanite M.P.s are tinged to some extent with this vicious chauvinism—a hang-over from Vansittartism of the war years—and it remains the duty of socialists to fight energetically against this poison in the bloodstream of the Labor Party.

WEEK by WEEK . . .

LABOR ACTION screens and analyzes the week's news, discusses the current problems of labor and socialism, gives you information you can't find anywhere else.

A sub is only \$2 a year!

Bar Association Proposes: Teach Communism in Schools

By MICHAEL HARRINGTON

Last week, the Standing Committee on American Citizenship of the American Bar Association proposed that the theory and practice of Communism should be taught in all United States schools.

Said the Committee, "The dangers of communism could be readily understood if properly taught, and it would be of great value to the youth of our country if they could be adequately shown the differences between the theory and practices of communism and the theory and practices of the United States under our Constitution."

In as much as this resolution is for the teaching of a controversial subject, one's tendency is to welcome it as a break in the monotony of the witch-hunt in our schools. However, such feelings of joy are tempered when one realizes that the Committee also says, "Should occasions arise, and it is entirely possible, where advantage is being taken by the teacher, it is believed that this could be speedily handled and without danger to the persons who are being taught."

SPEEDILY HANDLED

How can a teacher lecture on the nature of Stalinism with such a knowledge? Will the problem be "speedily handled" if a teacher declares that the October Revolution was made by the great mass of the Russian people? Could one risk saying that Czarism had been a brutal despotism and that revolt against it was moral and ethical? How would the intervention of western troops be handled?

This is one set of problems. They will arise if the teaching of the "theories and practice" of Communism is taught as we expect it to be taught; under the shadow of the witch-hunt where problems can be "speedily handled." In this case, the compulsory ignorance on the subject of the nature of Stalinism—and particularly, the nature of its appeal in colonial areas—will simply go on or increase and the Bar Association contribution to academic freedom is know-nothingism.

But what if, by some miracle, the Bar Association actually means: teach the theory and practice of Communism, without the shadow of the witch-hunt. What is the American theory of Communism? And how can it be taught?

Certainly, there are many American images of Stalinism. Elements of the reactionary groupings actually take the propaganda at its word and see Russia as a socialist nation—which they are against. But by far the most popular theory of what Stalinism is emerges as some kind of variant of the conspiracy thesis. A group of neurotic, hate-ridden, Godless

revolutionaries went and overthrew the Czar (who was not too good) and Alexander Kerensky (who was marvelous). Since then these men, and their successors and assigns, have been plotting world revolution which moves forward through the activities of traitors, fifth columnists and decadent intellectuals like Alger Hiss.

So the theory runs. Yet notice that such a theory cannot deal with any of the mass movements which the Stalinist control. It could not account for the strength of the

(Continued on page 7)

A Principled Defense of Civil Liberties

A letter published in the *New York Times* last week expresses some very important points on the nature of the witch-hunt and the defense against it. This letter was written by a Robert B. Daniels, assistant professor of Slavic studies, Indiana University. He wrote in reference to a defense of the Carnegie Corporation by Charles Dollard, its president.

Said Professor Daniels, "Despite commendable efforts by many people to stand up against the attacks on non-conforming thought which have become popular in some quarters, there is a disturbing tendency often to be noted in the tactics of the defense. The critic is not opposed in principle, but only on the ground that his attack is erroneous and unfair. . . ."

"DEEP AFFECTION"

"Must the Swede Gunnar Myrdal have a 'deep affection' for America, as Mr. Dollard adduces in his defense, before his epochal research on American social problems should be allowed? Must social science guarantee that it will not reach conclusions favorable to 'socialism' before it is allowed to exist?

"In fear of that verbal bogey, Mr. Dollard defends 'social planning' on the ground that it pertains to the New Deal and does not violate the presumed anti-socialist principle of Americanism. This example of the error of trying to prove conformity is only an unconvincing terminological retreat which concedes all the strength of principle to the opponent of planning. . . ."

The Appeal of Stalinism Among Students Abroad

In Asia and in Africa, the student plays a far more important political role than he can in the United States. The backwardness of his country and the importance of literate skills allow the student movement to take a position of leadership in the anti-imperialist struggle. A recent book, *Communism in Education in Asia, Africa and the Far Pacific*, (\$3, American Council on Education) makes it clear that the United States has failed to reach these students with any kind of success.

Why do the Stalinists capture such movements? The author, Eells, answers in one sentence: "Communist student leaders know what they want." In other words, Stalinism at least has a coherent program, actually addressed to the problems of the Asian and African nations, and specifically anti-capitalist in content. That this program is a cover-up for brutal totalitarian reality is not the point. What is crucial is that the Stalinists obviously do have a political appeal to make in Asia and in Africa.

GOOD EXAMPLE

A good example of the nature of this appeal lies in another fact which Eells reports: "It has sometimes been said, also, that communism thrives on ignorance and illiteracy, but this generalization is not entirely borne out in India. The percentage of literacy is only 10 per cent or less in India as a whole, but is fully 75 per cent in parts of southern India, particularly Travancore-Cochin where the Communist Party achieved its greatest gains in the 1951-52 general elections. Large quantities of Communist books, magazines, pamphlets and leaflets were poured in. . . ."

This second point is of the greatest importance. Those few Americans who do realize the very real fact that poverty and illiteracy are one of the chief problems of our world often do not understand the political acumen of the Stalinists and the appeal which they can make to colonial students and intellectuals.

Yet although Eells himself realizes this fact, he can offer no really positive approach to the entire problem. Thus the very first point in his program of "How to deal with Communism in the educational system abroad," is to call for domestic reform. The areas where we must concentrate, according to Eells, are "the race problem, labor strife, graft, crime . . ." and what we should do is "to set our own house in better order." On this score, Eells is particularly interested in the importance of race relations in the United States in the opinions of colonial students abroad.

Eells' second and third points are routine (though certainly with a value). He calls for greater exchange of information between governments and an increase in the exchange of students, professors and other leaders between the different countries.

SUICIDAL IGNORING

Yet when the conclusion of this book is stated, "The war of ideas must be won. Communism must not be permitted to possess the minds and souls of the youth of Asia, Africa and the South Pacific." One cannot help but feel that America will lose these minds as long as it continues in its suicidal ignoring of the political content of Stalinism in backward countries.

Moreover, when Eells calls for domestic reform as part of the program to reach the mind of foreign students, he is basically calling for the United States to abandon its position as a defender of capitalism and to appear before the world as a socially conscious nation. Yet the advocacy of such programs, stated in terms of the problem of education alone, immediately involves you in the whole question of American political life and how to organize precisely such a movement.

It is good that Dr. Eells makes his point on the success of Stalinism in dealing with the students of Asia and Africa. It is good that he sees that this success is intimately tied up with the political appeal of Stalinism in a backward country. But what is tragic about the situation is that Dr. Eells is among a tiny minority—most Americans being more or less convinced of the soundness of the basic premises of that mindlessness which is called foreign policy—and more than that, that he fails to see that his program does not merely call for reform, but for a democratic revolution.

The YSL's Aim

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

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

—From the Constitution of the YSL

Nationalist Movement Must Re-Think Policies

TUNISIAN REVOLT ENTERS NEW PHASE

By A. GIACOMETTI

PARIS, July 17—The ignominious collapse of High Commissioner Voizard's "reform" policy in Tunisia has brought the temporary truce to an end. Since May, the French government, in its dealings with Tunisian nationalism, has relapsed into de Hautecloque's policy of military repression, thereby forcing the Tunisian people into armed rebellion.

This new clash has thrown colonialism into a crisis, both under its "extreme" and "moderate" forms. Unable to fulfill any of its functions, or even to maintain its own law and order, so to speak, the collaborationist M'zali government started to fall apart and finally resigned on July 6. This resignation pulled the last pretense of Tunisian support from under Voizard's policy. The French administration has thus been forced to assume full responsibility for its own actions, and has been brought face to face with the only representative negotiation partner in Tunisia: the Neo-Destour party and its exiled leader Habib Bourguiba.

But, more important for us, the sharpening of the conflict has also placed before the nationalist movement new problems, which will force it to reconsider its political bases. The most important factor which is forcing the French administration to retreat and the Neo-Destour to revise its policies, is the rise of the "National Liberation Army," which has also been called the "fellaghas."

This movement first appeared a little less than a year ago in the form of small armed groups operating in Southern Tunisia. At the time, the French press dismissed them as "bandits." The groups were not numerous, and they were confined to the arid and sparsely populated South. They were composed mainly of Neo-Destour members who had been forced to go underground to escape deportation to concentration camps, exile or torture under High Commissioner de Hautecloque's administration. The support the population gave these groups was, in the main, passive, and they could not be described as a real popular mass movement. Although the French administration attempted repeatedly to wipe them out by military means, it only succeeded in providing them with new recruits as a result of the reign of terror it had established in the cities and in the villages.

Strength of the Fellaghas

Today, the strength of the "fellaghas" is estimated between 500 and 2000, depending on the sources, with 1500 usually quoted as a likely figure. Their range of operation extends over the whole country. They are well equipped in light but modern weapons, mainly from stocks left in North Africa after the last war. They wear a uniform. They are said to be trained in Tripolitania, with moral and material support from Egypt and the Arab League. Infiltrating over the border in small groups, they unite on Tunisian territory for concerted military operations. Aided by the virtually unanimous support of the population, they sometimes merge with it: "one meets them continuously on the street without knowing; nothing distinguishes at first sight a fellagha from any other Tunisian," wrote a frightened French businessman in a letter quoted by *France-Observateur*. They have succeeded in controlling temporarily whole areas, where they have administered justice and performed other administrative functions while in control. In short, these armed groups are assuming more and more the characteristics of a partisan army.

Politically this movement represents a backward form of nationalist revolt, usually with religious overtones, comparable to the Muslim Brotherhood in other Middle Eastern countries. There is no evidence at all of Stalinist influence in it, although the French administration, always quick to smear by amalgam, hints darkly at "Moscow gold." What there was of Neo-Destour influence, has decreased as the movement has grown. Since it is opposed to military resistance and terroristic action, the Neo-Destour Party could not attempt to take

the leadership of the movement. The people who are flocking to the underground now are politically untrained, backward elements, peasants and agricultural workers for the most part, who are driven to desperation by the French repression and see no solution except counter-terrorism—killing, crop burning, sabotage.

In the cities similar tendencies are making themselves felt by propagandizing for Arab dress, as opposed to European clothing. Young Tunisians have been attacked on the street for going about bare-headed instead of wearing the fez. A more ominous sign has been the indiscriminate slaying of Frenchmen, regardless of sex, age, political affiliation or degree of responsibility in the regime. In agricultural areas, the action of the "fellaghas" has been sometimes directed against agricultural machinery, in a luddite, machine-smashing spirit. A correspondent of *Le Monde* writes:

Luddite Machine-Smashing

"In the wheat growing regions of the Center, they destroy not only the crops but also the (agricultural) machine. They have let the farmers know repeatedly that they would not attack those who would harvest with sickles. This is a far cry from the modernistic tendencies of the (Neo-) Destour. . . . The inhabitants of the steppes have always migrated to the North in the beginning of summer to work in the fields during harvest time. This seasonal work is an indispensable source of income to them. Today the mechanical harvesters more and more deprive them of this work, and there have been incidents over it in the past. In 1952, in the Kef region, Bedouins attempted to stop the machines and harvest themselves by force. The European settlers and the (Neo-) Destourian farmers indignantly united then to make them understand, by means of pick-handle blows, that the era of the sickle was a thing of the past. In resurrecting this quarrel, the fellaghas actually propose a new economic doctrine, for which a case can be made, but which is not the doctrine of the nationalists."

The correspondent of *Le Monde* then continues:

"Thus the fellaghas are neither the shock troops of the (Neo-) Destour nor, it would seem, of any other Tunisian party. Their action has certain aspects—xenophobic and backward—of a mass-movement. But it is a disciplined movement. And it is the first time that popular reactions are being organized without the help of the middle-class politicians, who until now had succeeded in channelling and utilizing them."

How did this movement arise outside the Neo-Destour Party to the point where it is threatening to outflank it? The answer must be sought in the policies of the Neo-Destour itself. Like the other nationalist movements in North Africa, such as the Istiqlal and the PDI (Parti Démocratique de l'Indépendance) in Morocco or, in Algeria, the UDMA (Union Démocratique du Manifeste Algérien) and, to a lesser extent, the MTLD (Mouvement pour le Triomphe des Libertés Démocratiques), its action has been based on reformist assumptions: that a measure of democracy and national autonomy could be achieved by gradually wringing reforms from the French government; that the Parliament in Paris could be played off against the French settlers in North Africa; that the U. S. who has a military and economic stake in North Africa, could be played off against French colonialism.

Experience has disproved these assumptions on every count. Nevertheless, even now the nationalist parties of the Maghreb have refused to shed their illusions. A case in point is the reaction of the Neo-Destour to the recent events in Tunisia. Far from demanding total independence, it is actually willing to accept for Tunisia the status of a French satellite, hoping that within such a framework local autonomy can be achieved. In the face of the rising tide of rebellion, the Neo-Destour thus obstinately offers the French government a last chance which the latter neither can nor wants to take.

What Does Neo-Destour Offer?

What is the Neo-Destour offering? Writing in the July 3 issue of *L'Express*, a Paris weekly which supports Mendès-France, a member of the Neo-Destour's Directing Committee, Hedi Nouira, summed up the nationalist demands as follows:

- (1) Creation of a Tunisian executive, with control of police.
- (2) Election by universal and direct suffrage of a Tunisian legislative assembly, the first task of which would be to draft a Constitution. This assembly would not otherwise possess the power of legislative initiative, but would discuss only projects submitted to it by the executive.
- (3) Recruit from now on Tunisian functionaries instead of French ones in order to achieve a Tunisian administration.

Under these proposals, the following extensive safeguards are offered to the French government:

- (1) The French military bases and garrisons would be retained.
- (2) No changes would be made in the trade policies with France; the currency unity would be maintained; preferential rights would be granted to France for the exploitation of natural resources.

(3) Preferential rights would be granted to French educational and cultural institutions over similar foreign institutions.

On the political level, the French residents in Tunisia would enjoy every possible right compatible with Tunisian autonomy. They would, of course, enjoy full voting rights; an Economic Council, composed of both French and Tunisians, would have to be consulted on all economic and social matters, as well as on certain financial questions. In the administration, the rights of Tunisian functionaries who would be taken over from the present administration, would be fully respected. Moreover, on the judiciary level, the Neo-Destour's proposals include two higher courts, composed of both Frenchmen and Tunisians, who would "constitute a necessary counter-weight to administrative omnipotence" and would also settle disputes arising from possible measures taken by the Tunisian Assembly "which could appear to infringe on the collective interests of the French colony in Tunisia."

"We do not claim any of the external attributes of sovereignty, such as the army or the conduct of foreign affairs." The only thing the Neo-Destour really opposes, he said, is the usurpation of political power by the French settlers, since the intended outcome of this policy is to transfer Tunisia into a French province. Bourguiba went on to say:

"If we cannot obtain Tunisian autonomy peacefully, if war should break out, then all will depend on the power which will help the Tunisian people to liberate itself. For France it means a dead end, for Tunisia the unknown. No, I cannot believe in this. It is in the interests of France to go forward, especially since its future depends on the future of Africa. It is in the interests of France to accept as negotiation partners a modern party and modern men, with a lay orientation, which she herself forged, and who live on the spirit, the culture and the principles which she herself has taught them. We can, on a State to State basis, build a strong edifice. . . . We are ready to do it. But time is growing very short."

The Will to Cooperate

This will to co-operate, to reach an amiable understanding, is even more apparent in another interview, which Bourguiba gave to *France-Observateur* on July 1st. Answering the question of what concrete measures the French government would have to take to appease the revolt in Tunisia, he said:

"It would be sufficient to face up squarely to the political problems, to abandon the more or less clearly formulated projects of integration, and to be content with ensuring the presence of France by the friendship of a people that has been rallied to her. Besides, this friendship would be guaranteed concretely by the military presence of France, which we are not questioning. No mere reform will appease the tempers. . . . There is a very coherent (policy) which aims to transform Tunisia into a French country. The Tunisians will die rather than accept this. Friends, allies, satellites of France, yes. Frenchmen, no. . . . If you can get out of the rut, we shall be at your side, loyal and solidly with France, with the support of the Tunisian people behind us: thus we shall help you to counterbalance Germany, whereas today the Maghreb is a thorn in the French side. We could contribute to your influence, whereas today we are a flaw in your system."

Mr. Bourguiba is obviously very unwilling to break all ties with the French government. What he would like to find before him, is an intelligent, co-operative, reformist government, willing to organize a "modus vivendi" between the French and the Tunisian bourgeoisie, with enough daring and imagination to grant reforms in order to avoid revolutions—the "unknown"—which Bourguiba fears no less than the French do.

If the French bourgeoisie, including the "enlightened" supporters of Mendès-France, were not bankrupt, and if it did not unanimously consider its domination over North Africa as an essential source of what little strength it has left, this policy could bear some fruits. As things stand, however, it can only be a source of confusion. Any bourgeois government in France, even headed by the most intelligent men with the best intentions, is unable to meet the needs and the demands of the peoples of North Africa.

Mendès-France's Policy

If any doubt should linger about this, the colonial policy of the new Man of Destiny should have been sufficient to dispel it. When Mendès-France took office, one of his first actions was to set up a Ministry of North African Affairs, in order to show the interest of the new government in such matters. Unfortunately, however, this gesture was not followed by any concrete steps which would have shown that a new policy was being actually carried out.

One does not expect a government to work miracles after its first two weeks in office. Nevertheless, it would have been easy to end the exile of Habib Bourguiba himself, who is now detained on an island off the coast of Brittany, or of Messali Hadj, leader of the Algerian (Continued on page 4 next page)

Labor Action FORUM
New York

August 5

International Resolution
HAL DRAPER

August 12

DEBATE

Political Action for Socialists
MAX SHACHTMAN vs. HAL DRAPER

Meetings start 8:30 p.m.

Labor Action Hall, 114 W. 14th St.

Indochina and Liberals — —

(Continued from page 1)

military intervention what had been lost by the support of French colonialism in Indochina? Had they really understood, at long last, that the Truman-Acheson policy of military containment could only lead to one Korean-type disaster after another, or worse, whether or not it is supplemented with the particular twists the Eisenhower-Dulles mentality has given it? Had they really come to the conclusion that a positive, democratic foreign policy through which the United States would actively support the colonial revolution rather than standing as a bulwark against it, that such a policy is not only a desirable supplement to military force, but is absolutely indispensable if Stalinism is to be turned back without an atomic holocaust?

Perhaps as good an example as any of liberal thinking on the Indochina truce is presented by Arthur Schlesinger Jr. in the *New York Post* for July 25. Schlesinger is, of course, a top leader of Americans for Democratic Action, stands at the most liberal wing of that organization, and generally represents American liberal thought at its clearest. All the more reason for amazement at what he writes on the Indochina truce.

Schlesinger starts by saying that Senator Knowland and Pravda are right when they both describe the Geneva truce as "a stunning and indisputable victory for the Communist world." He then points out why the truce is such a victory, lays some of the blame on the "shortsighted colonial policies" of the French, and continues: "But in the last six months it has been evident that only one action could avert Communist victory. That action would have been a United States decision to commit ground troops in force."

A FEARFUL PRICE

Since "practically all Americans" opposed such intervention, Schlesinger says they should not now blame the British and the French for making the best deal they could in Southeast Asia. The Republicans who have voted to cut the combat strength of American ground forces have no grounds to denounce other countries for unwillingness to send their sons to die

for a cause like Indochina.

"So long as [Senator] Ferguson and the others," continues Schlesinger, "are prepared only to fight to the last Frenchman or Briton or Vietnamese, they can hardly expect American pretensions and leadership to be taken seriously in the rest of the free world. 'Go on in there,' said the manager to the battered pug, pointing to the boxing ring. 'They can't hurt us.' If we want to be a world power, we must act like a world power—and pay the price, which is often a fearful one."

"The hard fact is that in Indochina we were no more willing than France or Britain to pay the price. As a result, we have no choice but to accept the consequences—as President Eisenhower did—without self-righteousness. Beyond this, we can do what we can to take advantage of these consequences...."

And Schlesinger ends up with some talk about the desirability of "constructive social policies in the parts of Asia which remain accessible to us—to apply the Point Four program, for example, with all vigor . . ." and the like.

FOR OR AGAINST?

Now, it is true that Schlesinger says that "practically all Americans" except Senator Knowland were against American armed intervention, and it can be assumed that Schlesinger counted himself in the majority. But how then account for the way in which he discusses the issue?

It seems safe to assume that Schlesinger wants the United States to be a world power—he is not an isolationist. From this it would seem to follow that he wants this country (which means, in this case, its government) to "act like a world power." He then goes on to observe that to act like a world power this country must "pay the price, which is often a fearful one." But, he concludes, the hard fact is that in Indochina we were not willing to pay the price.

From this line of reasoning one could easily conclude that Schlesinger, and the liberal-labor opinion in politics which he represents, was really for a U. S. decision to commit ground troops in force in Indochina. Or one could conclude that al-

though they were not really for it, they are somehow sorry that it did not take place. Or one could conclude, and this conclusion seems the most accurate, that one aspect of their reasoning leads them to be for such intervention, while another aspect convinces them that such intervention would have been futile or worse; that they cannot make up their minds between the two aspects; in short, that they are, if not in a contradiction, in a state of chronic political indecision.

A state of unclarity, indecision and even confusion is not always the worst thing which can befall an individual, or even a political movement or a social class. This is particularly true if this state represents a transition from one set of ideas and social policies to another one which is in closer harmony with reality and therefore healthier. The evidence is not overwhelming, however, that the soul-searching induced in a certain section of liberal-labor opinion by the Indochina crisis is clearly of this transitional character.

THE DIFFICULTY

The difficulty is that these liberals have not really discarded the idea that one can defeat Stalinism with guns, and even less have they really gained any confidence in the practical efficacy of a truly demo-

cratic foreign policy which would base itself on the fight for freedom of the downtrodden peoples and classes in the world rather than on the idea of maintaining political stability as the chief goal of policy.

What keeps them from being open, unashamed and vociferous advocates of American military intervention is primarily the fear that this time such intervention may lead to the atomic war itself. But since they don't appear to really believe in any other policy, their state of mind seems to be more frustration than anything else.

If only they were back in the good old days of Harry Truman, who used to act in such situations, and thus end the frustrating inaction, rather than in these miserable times of John Foster Dulles who only threatens to act!

Socialists are quite as sorry as are the liberals that the Stalinists have won a victory in Indochina. They remain convinced, however, that the Stalinists are going to continue to win victories, one after the other, as long as the only force which is mobilized against them, is the force of arms. It appears that the world is going to have to suffer a few more Stalinist victories before this lesson gets really learned by our American liberals.

Teach Communism — —

(Continued from page 5)

French Communist Party (a tight-knit "conspiracy" which gets millions of votes) or of the Vietminh. It could not explain why Asian peasants volunteer to fight in the armies of Stalinism while the "Free World" has to drag its youth by the scruff of the neck into the army.

If such a theory were propounded, the result might be far more disastrous from the ABA point of view than they have as yet imagined. I am sure that their greatest apprehension is over the possibility that a Stalinist will get into the program and use it to his advantage. But what if there actually is a discussion of Stalinism among American students? How are those embarrassing questions going to be

answered? What books are going to be used (Private Schine's pamphlet)?

Unfortunately, the American Bar Association, to be sure, has no intention of allowing a free discussion to take place. All fantasies aside, one of the reasons for this has been described above: it has nothing to lead a free discussion with, no theory, no understanding, no books. Therefore if we did not already know what kind of a program were being envisioned, this consideration would make us realize that it is not a break in the witch-hunt, not a free discussion which is proposed, but a carefully monitored indoctrination session, in which rambunctious teachers are "speedily handled."

Tunisian Revolt Enters New Phase — —

(Continued from page 6)

MTLD, who is in exile in the French provincial town of Niort. It would have required a little courage of a bourgeois government to return the Moroccan Sultan Mohammed ben Youssef to his throne, but Mendès-France knows as well as the next man that in Morocco nothing less will do.

Instead, the actions of the new government have all been pointing in the opposite direction. After Voizard had armed the French settlers, thereby openly proclaiming the impotence of the administration, the government did not disarm them but instead appealed to them "not to take the law into their own hands." At the same time, the government has poured troops into Tunisia: paratroopers and police have been flown in from France; reserves have been called up in Tunisia itself; recruits have been mobilized in France and are held ready to be flown to North Africa; Senegalese infantry has been flown in from Senegal—until such a time, one may suppose, when it will be needed in its own country. (It is not known whether the Tunisian police dogs which were flown to Morocco a few months ago have been flown back or whether they still uphold law and order in Morocco.) All this in addition to motorized troops, Foreign Legion, and Moroccan goumiers who have been in Tunisia much longer.

Instead of the intelligent, enlightened government they hoped to find, the Tunisian nationalists are dealing with the traditional brutal colonialism tempered by hypocrisy: a government ready to go to any length of mili-

tary repression to support the ruling class of the settlers and the finance capital that is exploiting the country; in turn, this government is being supported by the U. S., who sees a "communist" in every anti-colonialist.*

Algeria and Morocco Too

Faced with these facts which destroy the basis of their traditional policy, the Tunisian, as well as the Moroccan and Algerian nationalists were thrown into a political crisis which has been very well analyzed by the reformist leaders themselves. Ferhat Abbas, the leader of the very moderate UDMA, expressed his disillusionment in the party's paper *La République Algérienne*:

"For six years our Party has conducted an unremitting struggle for a return to legality, a return to the respect of the law the French parliament itself proclaimed. . . . We must admit that the gigantic mystification and the cynical imposture of which Algeria has been the victim since the enacting of the reforms, almost caused (our Party) to disintegrate. It is evident that a progressive party which bases its activity on the respect of legality, and which struggles in favor of legality, cannot grow when the public powers themselves

*A case in point is the visit of Admiral Fechteler, Commander of the U. S. 7th Fleet, to El Glaoui, which he described as a "pro-West Berber chief" capable of mobilizing "four hundred thousand berber warriors to help defend the American air bases."

elevate the arbitrary to a state institution. This is the dilemma of our Party."

The problem could not be stated more clearly: a movement which aims to achieve national independence within a framework of legality cannot exist when the colonial power does not keep its own laws! Even though the UDMA, like the Old Destour Party in Tunisia, is an outspokenly reformist party, its dilemma applies, in varying degrees, to the other nationalist parties. As the result of this situation, and in the absence of a clear and thought-out socialist program, the nationalist movement has been thrown back to rather primitive, chauvinistic positions. To the extent, however, that it has maintained its reformist attitude, it is being outflanked by new movements, such as the "fellaghas" in Tunisia, and the terrorists in Morocco, which the Istiqlal cannot control. Starting out from reformist assumptions, and faced with the realization that it cannot expect emancipation from anybody but itself, the North African people now seeks ways to transform its experience into a policy.

In this situation, it is the urgent task of the North African labor movement to provide a clear revolutionary, internationalist program. Effective revolutionary leadership in Tunisia can only come from the advanced elements of the UGTT. They alone can make the Tunisian people understand that its allies are not the Egyptian military junta and the theocracy of Pakistan, but rather the Conference of Asian Socialist Parties and the Congress of Peoples Against Imperialism.

Atom Power Steal Wins — —

(Continued from page 1)

power, water for irrigation and flood control are important. In these areas the power co-ops and public power groups exert their strongest influence. It also represented the interests of smaller scale industry who would be squeezed out by the provisions of the new law.

THE REAL LINE-UP

In the case at hand of the West Memphis steam plant, it is not simply a case of Republican vs. Democrats. The real line-up despite some of the votes is dominated by the old Republican-conservative Southern Democrat coalition. This was more clearly revealed in the vote on an amendment by Democratic Senator Anderson of New Mexico to ban the construction of a new private power plant in the Tennessee Valley area when 11 Democrats voted with the Republicans to defeat it 55-36.

Nor is the responsibility for this private power plant merely that of Republicans. It has been known for several years that there would be a shortage of power in the Memphis area as a result of feeding T.V.A. power into the Paducah atomic energy plant. T.V.A. planned to build a steam plant at Fulton, Tenn. to cover its needs, but even under the Truman administration the Democratic-controlled Congress refused to vote the money to build this plant. Therefore given the developing power shortage, and the refusal of both the Democratic and Republican Congresses to allow T.V.A. to add to its facilities, it became inevitable that it would open the door to the weakening of T.V.A. as part of the broader attack.

With the defeat of the Anderson amendment, the Democratic attempts were concentrated in an effort, which met with success, to ban the A.E.C. contract with the private power group from including any provision that the A.E.C. would pay the federal, state and local taxes for the private utility. This original part of the A.E.C. contract is one of the most brazen parts of the entire deal, and one has to wonder what else is included along these lines.

The passage of this amendment by democratic Senator Gore of Tennessee, and leader in this fight, seemed to mark the end of the filibuster. Gore called this a "notable victory" and that the "log jam is broken." It had been reported in the press that the T.V.A. issue was the main thing that held the majority of Democrats together in this debate.

NO WAY OUT

Senator Anderson is quoted as saying:

"The one thing that is holding up action on this (the passage of the revision of the Atomic Energy Act) is this Dixon-Yates (private utility-A.E.C.) contract. Unless something is done with this—unless we take this wholly extraneous matter from the bill and proceed on the rest" there would be no way out of the impasse.

And on this Senator Morse who has been the most articulate senator in the filibuster agreed. Even after the elimination of some of the more scandalous parts of the A.E.C. contract this bill still repre-

sents a tremendous victory for the private electric utilities. But it has provided a face saving way to end the filibuster.

The fact that it continued, seemed to be due to resistance to Majority Leader Knowland's attempts to cut down debate on a series of amendments. The number of senators supporting this talkathon after the passage of the Gore amendment was reduced to a handful. It appears that they continued as much from a feeling of personal animosity over the conduct of Majority Leader Knowland's handling of the filibuster as anything else.

"GIVE AWAY"

Of greater importance than the T.V.A. part of the filibuster are the provisions that have to do with the peacetime development of atomic energy. It is against this that the liberal Democrats have been yelling "give away."

Big business has been clamoring for some time for the revision of the law that would permit them to start commercial development of atomic energy. The basic development and research under government sponsorship and expense have proceeded to such a point where many of the giant corporations already active in the field have begun to lick their chops over the prospects.

When Admiral Lewis Strauss became White House advisor on atomic energy and later chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, it was an indication that the Eisenhower administration was preparing to give business a free hand and hand-out in atomic commercial development. Strauss, whom Business Week refers to as "a financial advisor to the Rockefellers," and who is a director of the Radio Corporation of America, was a well known exponent of giving private enterprises a free hand in the atomic field.

The problem for the representatives of the leading sections of American capitalism was to pursue a course, as an article in June 1953 *Fortune* points out, between taking it too easy in writing the law so that not enough is done to encourage private initiative; and those who favor "lets get going" in offering all kinds of subsidies, hidden and direct, and loosely worded sections that give free reign to giant corporations to benefit from the \$12 billion government research of the past decade.

FABULOUS HANDOUT

It appears that the "lets get going" boys won out, and the revision of the law is a handout far exceeding the brazen tideland oil steal. Although it also raised the opposition that was expected, this businessman's administration was correct in calculating that it could push the program through in its basic outlines.

However in the course of the debate, the Democrats managed to pass an amendment by Senator Johnson of Colorado that authorized federal construction of atomic power plants for commercial use. It also provided that preference for atomic electrical energy be given to rural co-ops, municipalities and other public bodies as is also provided in the Federal Reclamation Law for power from federal water-power projects.

Most attention in the press has

been given to the provision in respect to patent rights. The law provides that there should be a compulsory licensing system for five years during which all patents shall be available to anyone on a royalty fee basis after which the normal patent system of exclusive rights for 17 years shall be in effect.

It is this compromise with those who wanted no compulsory licensing that sets the stage for most of the big corporations who have had the prior experience under the law. It is only these giants who have the money to set into operation atomic reactors or furnaces, and since it is still a number of years away before atomic energy will be available on a commercial basis, the 5 year compulsory licensing will not seriously stop these giant corporations from consolidating their monopoly position in the field.

The Democrats while attacking this provision appear to favor a long period of government licensing. But even this will not prevent the inevitable monopolization of the field by a relatively few large corporations because the smaller companies do not have the capital nor experience to offer effective competition.

WORTHY PURPOSE

Some of the amendments offered to the bill indicate the hand-out aspects of this law which the Democrats tried to tone down. One by democratic Senator Humphrey,

which passed, gave the Federal Power Commission regulatory power over the interstate operations of power companies that may in the future generate current from atomic energy. Another by Senator Morse, which was tabled, would have set up standards in the pricing of fissionable material that the government might have to buy back from private industry.

While the purpose of the filibuster was worthy in raising the issue of atomic energy policy, it has not been one which can seriously stand in the way of the proponents of giving free rein to private exploitation of atomic energy by a few large companies. First it remains to be seen whether the Senate-House conference committee will jointly approve any of the limiting amendments to the give-away which were only passed in the Senate. Secondly, the history of government regulatory boards and agencies intended to curb the power of business is that they are eventually staffed by the very supporters of those corporations or policies they are supposed to curb. In the third place, the A.E.C. which will administer the law is headed by Lewis Strauss, a known spokesman and representative of big business. And last, the only effective utilization of atomic energy for peacetime use that can truly benefit the people and prevent its monopolization for profit is a plan for peacetime government development, along the lines of a nationwide plan.

A PROVOCATION — —

(Continued from page 1)

Only one Congressman, A. M. Miller, Nebraska Republican, is quoted as saying "somebody is spoiling for a fight and I don't like it."

Finally, we are convinced that this is a provocation by the United States government because the opposite assumption makes no political sense whatever.

The Chinese Stalinists have just won a great victory at Geneva in which they were willing to accept a compromise because this would divide their enemies. Two days later to shoot down a British plane deliberately would make no sense at all.

And does the provocative behaviour of the U. S. government make any sense? Yes, it does, in an insane sort of way. The U. S. "tough" policy lost out at Geneva. The allies deserted this government, leaving it without any effective policy whatever. In these circumstances, the provocative behaviour of the American forces could be either simply the product of frustration, or a move by the military to push their policy of preventive war on the government, or a snap decision to seek to convert the shooting down of a British airliner into the cement with which to bind Britain to the U. S. in a "tough" policy in the Far East.

Every socialist, every real liberal who has not lost his head, every person who

is opposed to imperialist war should protest the government's campaign in this matter.

The Handy Way to Subscribe!

LABOR ACTION

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

Please enter my subscription:

- 1 year at \$2. New
 6 months at \$1. Renewal
 Payment enclosed. Bill me.

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

"SONGS OF THE WOBBLIES"

The new LABOR ARTS recording of famous IWW songs, sung by Joe Glazer and Bill Friedland. On 33-1/3 LPs, unbreakable. \$4.00

Now available on 33-1/3 LPs—

"BALLADS FOR SECTARIANS"

Song satires on the twists and turns of the American Stalinist movement \$4.00

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, New York City

Mail orders will receive prompt attention. All orders must be accompanied by payment.