

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

## GERMAN LABOR'S REVOLT

... page 3

## The French CP Line on N. Africa

... page 4

## Unemployment, Profits & Monopoly

... page 7

## The Futility of H-Bomb Politics

... page 2

AUGUST 16, 1954

FIVE CENTS

### CAPITALISM AND SWISS WATCHES

## U.S. Tells Its Allies: We Won't Stand Competition

By BERNARD CRAMER

If the U. S. is losing the political war to the Russians—as everyone knows it is—it is certainly doing no better in the economic wars. On this field too its policy is designed to lose the world to Moscow.

And its suicidal policy on this field is even more clearly tied up with the inherent contradictions of its capitalist system.

The "Swiss watch case" has attracted more attention as a symbol than anything else, perhaps, but it is a symbol.

**Of what? Of the fact that American capitalism's wealth is at bottom founded on the poverty of the rest of the capitalist world; more directly, that American capitalist production has no long prospect of expansion without crowding out and starving its allied capitalisms.**

For a long time the domestic watch industry has been yelling for the government to raise the tariff on Swiss-imported watch parts, to stifle this competitor from abroad. It has been peculiarly difficult for Eisenhower to heed their pleas.

From every side, from hard-headed American conservatives who understand Europe's economic problem, from Europeans, from diplomatic agencies, the government knows that unless Europe can trade with the American economic colossus, it cannot be economically healthy, and that aid-bills are no substitute for normal economic relations. But every time a European nation starts selling goods in America, a cry of pain goes up from the free-enterprisers here.

The real crux is made up by the multitude of restrictions already in force. Enlightened capitalists and observers have been calling for drastic liberalizations of foreign trade. The British raised the cry

of "Trade, not aid" and got nowhere.

But now, in the Swiss-watch case, Washington added a new tariff barrier. It was done by Eisenhower himself as a major policy decision. It was done after many refusals, showing that the government finally simply broke down under domestic pressure. The tariff on the item was raised 50 per cent.

**"With one blow the president proved, to the satisfaction of everyone in Europe, who cares about such things, that all that the Socialists, Communists, neutralists and home-grown anti-Americans say about**

(Turn to last page)

# A New Kind of Anti-Labor Drive Is On

By PHILIP GOBEN

A special kind of anti-labor drive is gathering momentum in this country.

It is not taking place through anti-labor laws, but through anti-labor administrative decrees of the Eisenhower-appointed National Labor Relations Board.

In this sense, it is a counterpart of the main front of the drive against civil liberties in the country; for here too the most serious inroads have been made not by witchhunting laws (though there have been such laws too) but by administrative decrees—above all, the loyalty-oath and subversive-list witchhunting of the government.

Sooner or later, a general drive against democracy—like the U. S. witchhunt—had to be bolstered by anti-labor action too.

How deep-going the present trend is may still be seen; but already there is a sufficient record piled up for the labor movement to cry the alarm.

**By one decision after the other, the NLRB has steadily been piling up a series of changes in labor regulations which add up to a new Taft-Hartley Act, or certainly, new teeth for the already well-toothed T-H Act.**

Twice in the last week, the board swung the whip against labor, by a vote of 3-2.

### DAGGERS IN THE BACK

• On August 7 it tightened restrictions on the right to strike over wage contract demands. The majority ruled out such a strike except at times when a contract, by its own terms, is up for change or termination. The union also must wait until the end of its 60-day notice of a desire to change the contract. Heretofore the NLRB ruling has been that a union is free to strike at any time during the life of a contract provided it has observed a 60-day "cooling-off" period following notice of new contract demands.

• Three days before that, the NLRB threw out a long-standing rule prohibiting employers from questioning their workers about their union affiliation or activities. This practice carries an atmosphere of intimidation and threat along with it automatically. But the NLRB decided to pretend that there was no threat implied as long as the boss does not openly threaten reprisals.

In the case under adjudication, for example (Blue Flash trucking company), the Teamsters' Union had notified the company manager that a majority of the workers had signed union cards. The manager then questioned each employee

(Turn to last page)

# International Whodunit: Who's Killing the UN?

*"Hey, remember me?" said little UN as she plucked at Big Brother's sleeve. "Sure, sure," said Big Brother, and put out one hand to pat the little UN on the head. However, his aim wasn't very good and instead of a pat one finger nearly took the little tyke's eye out. The big lummox was clumsy even when in good humor, and little UN didn't know when she detested Big Brother more, when he was booting her in a tender spot or when he was trying to act like Uncle. . . .*

In his annual report Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjold limited himself to the sleeve-plucking. Outside of these official channels, voices have been raised recently with more asperity.

The report, released August 8, allowed itself the humiliation of reminding the big powers that, even though actual diplomatic work might be going on outside it at conference in Geneva or Berlin, it would appreciate getting a postcard now and then. Or, as Hammarskjold put it:

"In those cases . . . the special interest of preventing any weakening of the position of the United Nations may be safeguarded if the organization is kept in the picture and its appropriate organs are officially informed about developments."

The UN had not even gotten a postcard from Geneva, certainly not any that said: "Wish you were here. . . ."

This aspect of the Geneva Conference has been noted recently in one of the rhymed editorials by "Sagittarius" which grace *The New Statesman and Nation*. He distributed the credits for the Geneva results with an Ogden Nash touch—for example, to Anthony Eden:

*. . . for smoothing over every awkward Conference occasion  
By dining so often and so impartially  
with French, Russian and Asian. . . .*

And to Dulles, for conceding that the U. S. would not sign but would not oppose:

*And to Mr. Dulles for his invaluable  
negative contribution*

*In announcing that he wouldn't actually atomize this unpalatable solution. . . .*

But the main help had come from the UN:

*The cause of the happy result of these difficult and delicate negotiations  
Was the tactful, total and conspicuous  
absence of the United Nations.*

If this is judged over-cynical by friends of the UN, certainly they cannot blind their eyes to the fact that the UN

(Turn to last page)

### CHRISTIANS NEEDED

Last month a prince of the church in England, the Archbishop of York, addressed his diocesan Conference on the subject of Anglo-American relations. He sought to reconcile his listeners to "the fact that the world supremacy which once was Britain's has now passed to the United States." He asked them to eradicate from their souls any feelings of resentment at American leadership. The reason: "Both in armaments and in wealth, Britain is now far weaker than America. As a result, America counts for more in world affairs than Britain. None of us likes this, but we have to accept it as a fact."

In a country where there is quite a bit of refusal to accept America's leadership over Britain or any other country, especially by left-wing Laborites, this argument can scarcely be misunderstood.

Leadership belongs to those with the most money and the most guns.

Not to the righteous, not to the pure—and certainly not to the meek, nor to the humble—but to the powerful.

This is a familiar idea, of course, and the archbishop has every right to put it forward. All one might want to know is:

Were there enough Christians left in England to throw the archbishop out of the church?

## Any Business Spokesmen Around?

The organ of the U. S. Chamber of Commerce, *Washington Reports* (July 16), wants to know:

**"Known, able, willing spokesmen for labor deal in human terms, in ideas. They talk to the mass public."**

**"What about business? Who are the national heroes of business? Who are the known, able, willing spokesmen for the business viewpoint who humanize business to the mass of people, who speak in terms of ideas the mass public understands?"**

**"Business needs more national public heroes. . . ."**

In case they really don't know, we'll let the secret out to the C. of C. Spokesmen for business who answer this description are automatically re-labeled: statesmen. The function of the government is to do just what the C. of C. editorial says.

If it is not true that the government is essentially the "executive committee" of the capitalist class, it would indeed be strange that this class (sometimes known under the pseudonym of the "business community") has no spokesmen of its own.



# SPOTLIGHT

## How the U. S. Booted Korean Independence

Syngman Rhee's recent visit to the U. S., as well as the issuance of a laudatory biography written by a sycophant, has served to draw attention to Rhee's past career as a "Korean patriot." The very facts which are being referred to in order to praise Rhee have another face to them.

**They illustrate how for a half century American imperialism did not give a tinker's damn for Korean independence, until the little country became a football in the cold war.**

Rhee first came to the U. S. as an advocate of Korean independence in 1904. Theodore Roosevelt was about to settle the Russo-Japanese War. Rhee's Korean Independence group decided they had to have a representative at the Portsmouth conference.

He even managed to get an interview with TR, who told Rhee to put his lengthy memorandum through State Department channels before it could be presented at Portsmouth. That was the brushoff. At the State Department he was told that Korea already had representatives in Washington (Japanese-dominated ones, of course). The memorandum never got to the president, as if Roosevelt didn't know.

In 1905 Japan took over Korea as a "protectorate," annexing it in 1910.

The second act took place after World War I. The year 1919 saw turmoil and demonstrations in Korea, and the formation of a Korean provisional government by resistants. Rhee came again to the U. S. to get recognition. The president was now one Woodrow Wilson, who had done a lot of talking about self-determination of nations, freedom, etc. Moreover, ex-Professor Wilson was an old friend of Rhee's.

**It didn't seem to help. Wilson went to Paris, and the U. S. State Department refused to give Rhee a passport to go there. It was commonly understood that the U. S. did not want to offend Japan, since a strong Japan was needed to stabilize peace in the Pacific. . . .**

That last phrase naturally brings us up to the time of Pearl Harbor. Rhee thought he saw a chance. Maybe the provisional government could be recognized now. But no: official doors still remained closed. This time, it seems, Washington did not want to offend . . . Russia.

But how things have changed now! Now this poor little "patriot," who was treated like dirt in Washington during three wars, has been welcomed with huzzas and acclamation, welcoming speeches, etc.

But he still couldn't get what he wanted. All this was, this time, was a little H-bomb war.

## The Patriot

Before leaving the subject of Rhee, who has been addressed so often as a great "Korean patriot," let us note a phrase out of his speech to Congress on July 28:

"I am Korean, but by sentiment and education I am an American." (Great applause.)

**Very patriotic, indeed. . . . We can imagine what would happen if any U. S. public figure went abroad and (let us choose America's closest ally) addressed the House of Commons with: "By sentiment I am an Englishman."**

Nor does this statement make Rhee an internationalist.

Not a patriot, not an internationalist—what then?

The alternative is clear: A bootlicker.

## Confessions

The U. S. government has issued a 56-page "White Paper" on the Guatemala affair, purporting to provide a study of the "Communist penetration" of that little country. From press reports it appears that no case is made out for the claim of "Communist domination" except by interpreting "domination" to mean "influence." This, of course, is the little terminological joker that has been behind all of the press fakery on the subject.

According to these press summaries the introduction to the document admits that "many [of the facts presented], taken by themselves, could appear to represent passing phenomena," and that in Guatemala the Communists were able to "achieve what is basically beyond their

strength" by their ability to create a so-called "united front" with non-Communists.

**That is an admission that Guatemala was in fact dominated by a coalition, of which the Stalinists were only one element.**

An item in Robert S. Allen's Washington column (Aug. 8) adds a sidelight. You must remember how the American Party Line agit-props hammered away at the statistics on how many Guatemalan officials had visited behind the Iron Curtain. You may remember also that the same criterion also cropped up in British propaganda anent its suppression of British Guiana.

Just how significant is it to count visits by Latin Americans to Iron Curtain countries?

**Last year (according to Assistant Secretary of State Holland, talking to a Senate committee) Russia invited more than 1000 Latin American officials, businessmen, educators, students, laborites and others, to come over; and they did. "In the same period, the U. S. invited only 221 Latin American leaders."**

There was no implication that these invitees were pro-Stalinist. They merely accepted a free trip, which the Russians offered to important people for their own reasons.

## Liberals DO Exist

We have to take notice in our columns of one liberal magazine which has taken a fairly decent stand on the Guatemala case, especially because of what we have had to say about American liberalism on this point. The August issue of the *Progressive* is now out and it speaks up.

**The editorial states directly that the Arbenz government "was driven from power by a military clique dominated by reactionary exiles and inspired by the United Fruit Co. and the U. S. government."**

It is also sure that the U. S. "did everything to arm and encourage those who waged" the rebellion, and that Washington's conduct in the UN on the case "provoked a new wave of cynicism over American motives and methods" both in the UN and all over Latin America.

The editors indicate at least skepticism about the claims of Communist domination and in any case do not use this to justify the U. S. intervention. And "The new regime—our regime—is not off to an impressive start in Guatemala," where 73 per cent of the people have been disfranchised.

## Deviation

After Labor Day, when the election race tightens up, we will of course hear the usual exhortations from the labor and liberal leaders about the necessity of voting for the Democrats. After all, they're better than the Eisenhowerites anyway, aren't they?

Pending those clarion calls for labor to throw away its vote, we wish to record the following indiscretion by the liberal and pro-Democrat N. Y. *Post*. Its August 9 editorial stumbled off the line.

The editorial urged the Democrats to adopt a principled liberal line, and not sidestep issues in the interests of party harmony with the right wing, and then it asked trenchantly:

**"Can millions of Americans be inspired to believe that the state of the nation and the world will be measurably improved if Johnson, rather than Knowland, holds the title of majority leader?"**

No, indeed, dear editor, but what then? If your Democrats fail to dust off the Fair Deal—even in words—are you going to say "A plague on both their houses?" and plug for a third party? Or will you eventually discover all kinds of unsuspected differences between a Johnson and a Knowland?

## SUBSCRIBERS—ATTENTION!

Check your NAME—ADDRESS—CITY—ZONE—STATE appearing on the wrapper.

If there are any mistakes or if anything is left out, especially the ZONE NUMBER, cut out your name and address and mail it to us with the corrections clearly printed.

18-33

If the above number appears at the bottom of your address, your subscription expires with this issue.

**RENEW NOW!**

# The Futility of H-Bomb Politics

Last month one of the most responsible senators in Washington told the upper house of the fantastic destruction of whole peoples and nations that could be expected in the next war.

It was not an "alarmist" speech such as can be quoted from less authoritative sources by the bushel. What is significant is that it came from the conservative Democrat, Stuart Symington, Missouri senator and former secretary of the air force under Truman. There is no doubt that Symington got his picture from air force briefing.

Below we quote passages from this speech, made on the floor of the Senate on July 21. It did not get headlines in the daily press but we believe LABOR ACTION readers should be acquainted with it.

But aside from its frankness, Symington's speech was a startling illustration of the complete bankruptcy of official U. S. thinking, of which the Missouri senator is as typical a representative as any Eisenhower appointee.

**The picture which he paints, it would seem, would preclude any possibility of talk about "winning" this war. The picture, it would seem, would make relevant only taking thought on how to prevent it, what to substitute for military methods of struggle, what kind of foreign policy can defeat Russian imperialism without an atomic war to the bitter end, and similar questions of POLITICS.**

But Symington, like his Republican similars, is incapable of this. On the background of his own awesome image of the holocaust of an atomic war, he proceeds to draw the conclusions merely . . . that the U. S. must out-arm Russia and that it should not "appease" Russia!

But while Symington can think only in terms of preparation for atomic warfare, the picture he presented demonstrates the futility of such politics.

Key passages from this Senate speech follow.

## SENATOR STUART SYMINGTON (July 21, 1954)

. . . I now want to discuss briefly two major developments which threaten the security of the United States as it has never been threatened before.

The first: Nuclear weapons, including hydrogen bombs as well as atomic bombs, can now be manufactured inexpensively and in great volume. . . .

Soon we can make enough of these weapons to devastate an area far larger than the United States.

The tremendous significance here is that, if we can do this, so can the Communists.

**Soon there will be sufficient weapons, of sufficient power, to destroy any and all targets which could possibly threaten either ourselves or our allies—not merely war industries and fixed military installations, but fleets and armies assembled anywhere.**

**Soon the Communists will amass a stockpile of these cheap packages of absolute destruction large enough to blacken with atomic fire not just our cities and industries but every square mile of our American landscape.**

Unlimited hydrogen destructive capability is therefore with us.

This fact is not entirely new. But the significance of this hydrogen potential has never been stated with either clarity or frankness.

It is this: The dispersion of targets, military or otherwise, no longer offers a solution—and accuracy in delivering these weapons becomes less and less important.

Random discharges of such tremendous power could devastate any nation on earth.

## FANTASTIC?

**The second development of supreme importance to the future security of the United States is this: Within a few years it will be possible to deliver atomic and hydrogen weapons by long-range, intercontinental ballistic missiles, descendants of the old German V-2. . . .**

The V-2 had a range of about 200 miles. The new missiles will have a range of 4,000 to 5,000 miles.

They will be far more accurate than

the V-2—and they will have hydrogen bombs for warheads.

These new units of destruction will climb so high, and descend so fast, they will need protection against destruction by atmospheric friction.

They will be guided only during the first portion of their climb, but guided so precisely that any error in accuracy can be measured not in miles but in hundreds of yards.

To those listening to the arguments of biased professionals who advocate fighting a possible future war with weapons of the past war—something which never happens—these developments may sound fantastic.

But the intercontinental ballistic missile is not fantastic at all.

It should be less surprising than the original German V-2, because it is little more than a logical extension of the V-2 in range, in accuracy and in power.

This second important development—intercontinental missiles—is closely related to the first: hydrogen weapons.

**The incredible destructive power of hydrogen warheads makes it possible to destroy a nation by launching a hail of ballistic missiles against it.**

The effect of such a missile barrage on an entire continent would be comparable to the effect of an ordinary artillery barrage on a few acres of battlefield.

The most ominous aspect of this new weapon, however, is that, once launched, there is no defense against it. . . .

The elaborate and expensive systems of radar defense we are being urged to build would be utterly useless against such a missile barrage. Practical prototypes of these weapons already exist. But no workable method of intercepting or deflecting them has been devised, even in theory.

There is no doubt whatever that intercontinental ballistic missiles will be produced in quantity years before any adequate defense against them is worked out.

Will the Communists have these IBMs before we do? There are many reasons to believe they will. . . .

## NO DEFENSE

**One of the dreams that lulls us into this hopeful make-believe [cutting down or not sufficiently increasing armed strength] is the theory of the so-called atomic stand-off. This is the argument that, when both we and the Communists have plenty of atomic weapons, neither of us will use them. To gamble on such a miracle is like betting that two men armed with loaded pistols will merely wrestle until one of them is thrown to the ground and kicked to death.**

Mr. President, nations, like men, know that terrible weapons can mean sudden death; but neither nations nor men have ever refrained from using their decisive weapons in a life-or-death fight. . . .

As for our own policy, would we allow ourselves to be defeated in another all-out war without using the only weapon which could bring us victory? Would we allow our allies in Europe and Asia to be overrun and enslaved without striking an effective atomic blow in their defense? If we did so allow, we would be sealing our own doom. . . .

However, one of the basic points of my talk this morning is that today there is no defense against the new intercontinental ballistic missile, regardless of whether we spend 5 billion dollars or 50 billion dollars in continental defense.

**There is absolutely no known method for defending the United States against an intercontinental ballistic missile attack.**

Hydrogen bombs can now be made inexpensively and can be delivered in large quantities. Therefore it is extremely important for the American people to understand why our foreign policies must be more decisive and more realistic than they are today. . . .

. . . I believe that within five years there is a chance there will be enough intercontinental ballistic missiles, with hydrogen warheads, in the possession of the Soviet Union to deliver an all-out attack against the United States. I am certain that that will be true in less than 10 years. . . .

My point is that it would be a terrible tragedy from the standpoint of our future security if we try to wave aside, with seductive remarks, the fact of the growing danger of the long-range intercontinental ballistic missile with its hydrogen warhead.



# German Labor's Strike Wave Is a Revolt Against Adenauer

By GORDON HASKELL

Some four million organized workers in Western Germany have served wage demands on their employers in the biggest concerted wage movement since the trade unions were reborn after World War II. And the workers of Western Germany mean business, there can be no doubt of that.

On August 9, 120,000 members of the Bavarian Metal Workers Union walked out on strike for a 12-pfennig hourly-wage increase in the face of an employer offer of 8 pfennigs. At the same time the strike of 15,000 public service workers in Hamburg entered its seventh day, with the workers rejecting an arbitration award of fifty per cent of their demands.

The wage movement in Western Germany has extended to almost every important section of the working class. It is so sweeping in its scope that a New York Times headline refers to it as a "Revolt on Wages." Its political implications are so broad that they cannot be gauged at this stage of the movement.

The Public Services, Transport and Communications Union of Duisburg, largest port in Europe, is demanding negotiations on a 10-pfennig raise. The same demand is being made by 90,000 Ruhr metal workers, and 300,000 Ruhr coal miners have also demanded new wage negotiations. The metal workers of Rhineland-Palatinate have canceled their wage agreement.

The National Executive Committee of the Transport and Public Service Workers Union, with 825,000 members, has asked the federal government and all municipal governments in West Germany to reply by August 11 whether they are prepared to negotiate for higher wages. The million-strong civil service workers' union is demanding a 15 per cent increase.

## STIRRING

The Chemical, Paper and Ceramics Union has canceled its contracts in Rhineland-Palatinate and Rhine Hesse. The policeman's union in Hesse is asking for a 20 per cent raise. The National Textile Workers Union with 428,000 members is reported to be demanding a sizable wage increase.

Even if nothing else were involved, the scope of this wage movement would indicate that something unusual is stirring in the West German working class. But the fact is that both the employers and the Adenauer government are resisting the size of the wage demands adamantly, and that the strikes, which are now beginning, are virtually unprecedented in the post-war German labor movement.

The background for this situation lies in the exceptional prosperity which West

Germany has experienced in the past five to six years. Rising from the rubble of a shattered, defeated and mutilated country, the West German economy has been reconstructed to a level at which it is again the largest industrial producer in Western Europe.

This reconstruction, furthermore, has been achieved by strictly capitalist methods. The government has, of course, helped to finance and stimulate reconstruction in every way possible. But the plants have been rebuilt by capitalists for profit, and the profits have been enormous. It has all been made possible by the proverbial energy, skill and discipline of the German working class.

The German workers rebuilt the plants under almost impossible conditions during the early post-war years. They worked in unheated factories, often without adequate protection from the elements. But unemployment was enormous in those years, and only those who were able to get a job could assure themselves of even the minimum with which to keep themselves and their families alive.

## NO MORE PATIENCE

As things began to improve gradually, the labor movement in Germany tended to accept the idea that the only economic salvation for the country was to regain the markets lost during the war. This could be accomplished if the workers were willing to work for wages which would put German industry in a favorable competitive position as against the industries of Britain, France, Italy and the United States. The government, the press of the country, and even a considerable section of the labor leadership kept harping on the theme that Germany

could not, as yet, afford a high standard of living, and that the workers had to keep their belts pulled in to make the reconstruction and rehabilitation of the country possible.

Thus, as late as April 24 of this year the executive board of the German trade union federation agreed to try to get their individual affiliates to desist from making "excessive" wage demands in the interest of West German economic conditions as a whole. Instead the trade-union leadership decided to concentrate on a movement for the 5-day (48-hour) work week.

It appears, however, that the patience of the workers with this conservative wage policy of the trade-union leadership has been exhausted.

The West German Federal Statistical Office estimates that a family of four needs 450 deutsche mark (DM) per month to live decently. The same office, however, estimates that 58 per cent of male workers in West Germany do not make more than 340 DM per month, and 72 per cent of female workers get less than 225 DM. The Bavarian metal workers now on strike average 38.5 cents an hour for skilled, and 33 cents for unskilled workers.

Furthermore, wages during the past few years have failed to keep pace, even remotely, with the increase of the productivity of labor. Productivity has been advancing by leaps and bounds in Western Germany due to the reorganization of industry after the war, and the introduction of the very latest machinery in the new factories.

Thus, the trade unions estimate that in 1951, when the workers got a general wage increase of 10 per cent, productivity increased 25 per cent. In 1952 wages went up 7.5 per cent while productivity rose 19 per cent, and in 1953 wage increases were held down to an average of 2.5 per cent while productivity jumped another 7 per cent.

## BEHIND THE CHANGE

But why has it taken the German workers so long to rise up and demand some kind of adequate wage adjustment? Or to put it differently, how is it that the same workers who have remained docile so long, and who, under the leadership of the trade-union bureaucracy, have so long been willing to subordinate their own interests to the alleged interests of the country as a whole, now appear to have changed their attitude so drastically?

Although the answer to such questions must necessarily be speculative (and this is specially true at the moment, pending the receipt of further information from Western Germany), some tentative suggestions may be made.

In the years right after the war the German working class remained badly demoralized by the defeat it had suffered at the hands of Nazism. Further, the economic conditions in the country were so terrible that any job, any source of food and shelter was regarded as the salvation from possible starvation.

As things improved, two factors began to influence the thinking of the German workers. One was the fact that for those employed there was a very real increase in their standard of living. Consumer goods, almost completely unavailable during the first years, began to flow freely to the market. Though the standard of living remained low compared to American or even British standards, it was vastly improved over the last war years and those which followed.

At the same time, unemployment remained very widespread in Western Germany. Not until 1953 did unemployment sink to one million, in a population of some 48.5 million. (For the United States such a ratio of unemployment would result in a figure of 3.3 million unemployed, and this was the lowest unemployment figure West Germany has had since the war.)

## CLASS CONTRAST

Thus there were two elements conducive to passivity in the German working class. One was the rising standard of living for the employed, and the other was the pressure of unemployment which could be held as a club over the heads of workers who might decide to strike for higher wages.

It is true that unemployment is still high in Western Germany. After it hit the low point in 1953, it rose again to almost two million in the spring of 1954. (Remember, that would be the equivalent

## Next Time You Read Of a Plane Crash...

By RICHARD STARK

According to facts broadcast by Frank Edwards, the AFL's radio news commentator, the danger of airplane crack-ups has increased as a result of action recently taken by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

The CAB, on June 15, voted to throw overboard its long standing safety rule in order to benefit the American Airlines Company.

The airline has been advertising non-stop flights from New York to Los Angeles. The record shows, however, that it has rarely been able to make the schedule within the required safety limit of eight hours flying time per pilot.

So the CAB, obviously under pressure from American Airlines, voted three to two in favor of extending the maximum flying time to ten hours per pilot per day—25 per cent more than it has heretofore regarded as safe operation.

Voting in favor of killing the old safety regulation were the three Republican members of the board, Chan Gurney, Oswald Ryan and Homer Denny. Voting to retain the present eight hours safety restriction were Josh Lee and Joe Adams. The latter is the only pilot on the CAB.

Pilot error is regarded as the cause of many fatal airline crashes, and pilot error is more likely as the pilot becomes more tired at the controls. The Airline Pilots Association argued that it was safer and more sensible to require American Airlines to change its schedule to one which would not require a pilot to fly longer than the safety regulation. But the CAB changed the safety rule instead.

In making its decision the CAB contended that it was better to have the pilot flying even beyond the 8-hour safety limit because "flying was less dangerous than taking off and landing." This is a ridiculous argument because no matter how long a pilot keeps his plane in the air he must come down sometime, and if his nervous system is drugged by fatigue the result can be a fatal accident.

Since the CAB refuses to enforce its own safety regulations to protect the public and its pilots, the Airline Pilots Association will take the matter to court.

lent of 6.6 million unemployed in the United States, something we have not had since the end of the great depression in 1942.)

But two other factors have probably put the workers in a fighting mood, regardless of the risks.

One is the ostentatious luxury in which the German capitalists have been rolling in recent years. While the workers' standard of living rose from a subhuman level to the minimums of decency and slight comfort, ten thousand new millionaires have been riding the roads in flashy big cars, have been building gorgeous new homes, and the like.

The bourgeoisie has not felt constrained to sacrifice anything to the national welfare in the post-war period. As usual, such demands were made only of the workers. The general prosperity of the bourgeoisie and the intermediate layers has no doubt finally convinced the workers that they too have some justified demands to make on the new national prosperity.

## SHAKING UP EUROPE

Another factor may well be the conviction that one way or another Germany faces a new period of rearmament. To the workers this may well mean two things: (a) the assurance that the present rise in unemployment will not last long, and hence is no real menace to them; (b) the feeling that once rearmament starts a new regime of austerity will be demanded of them, and that hence now is the time for them to establish a higher wage level as a defensive position against the future.

The development of the present wage struggle should be watched closely. It is, of course, quite possible that the government and bourgeoisie will yield enough to avert a really dangerous strike wave. On the other hand, it is also possible that the workers still lack the self-confidence and combativity to push the movement far beyond the bounds which have circumscribed their struggles since the war.

But the movement appears to have such scope that it is also quite possible that it presents a really new stage in the development of the West German working class. If this should prove to be so, the whole of Europe may be shaken up before this wave subsides.

## WDL Award to Courageous Pro-Labor Priest Who Aided Louisiana Workers

NEW YORK, Aug. 11—The David L. Clendenin Award for Distinguished Service to Labor's Rights for 1954, an annual citation of special merit from the Workers Defense League, will go to the Rev. Jerome A. Drolet, pastor of St. Charles Catholic Church in Thibodaux, Louisiana.

"No one in the United States is more deserving of such an honor than Father Drolet," said Rowland Watts, WDL national secretary. "His name became widely known last year because of his militant support of 3000 sugar cane field workers, members of the National Agricultural Workers (AFL), in their hard-fought strike for union recognition, a living wage, and decent working conditions. At that time Father Drolet came

to New York at his own expense, while on vacation, to get aid for the strikers. He had poignant stories to tell about unjust treatment of labor in the area around Thibodaux.

"The sugar strike was born of long resentment against an intolerable situation. Union recognition was refused by the employers on the ground that agricultural workers could not lawfully organize, because they were not named in the Taft-Hartley Act and kindred legislation. And the whole strike area, embracing 75 plantations, was turned into an armed camp. Workers were ordered out of company-owned shacks because they had joined the union; gas, light, and water were cut off in other homes; company stores suddenly demanded full payment of debts; growers held back wages through questionable deductions.

"One sugar cane worker was brutally beaten by a sheriff with a revolver butt; and Father Drolet denounced that atrocity in a sermon. In the end, the strike was lost, defeated by anti-labor injunctions. But the strikers proved the capacity of Southern agricultural workers to organize. Until then no union had existed in that area since 1879, when the state militia helped break a strike led by the Knights of Labor. And with valuable lessons learned in the 1953 strike, the unionization movement in Louisiana steadily continues to gain strength."

## There's No Angel Around

to finance LABOR ACTION. It has appeared every week since 1940 because it's been backed by the dime- and dollars of independent socialists — AND YOUR SUBSCRIPTIONS.

A sub is only \$2 a year—  
Subscribe now!



## WHY THE COLONIAL PEOPLES DISTRUST FRENCH LABOR—

**French CP and SP Betrayed North Africa**

By A. GIACOMETTI

PARIS, August 5—No understanding of the recent events in North Africa can be complete without examining the relationship which exists between the nationalist parties of North Africa and the French labor movement.

If the people of North Africa have suffered tremendous losses and hardships in its fight for independence, if terrorism has broken out and if part of the nationalist movement has been thrown back to reactionary solutions, the primary responsibility lies with the two major parties of the French working class, which, since the end of the war, have consistently failed to assist in the struggle for independence effectively and on time.

The question of the relations between the North African and the French working class was recently raised by an editorial which appeared in *Algérie Libre*, organ of the MTLD, the day after Mendès-France took office:

"The good people of France are not different from their representatives which exploit us here at the rate of 200 francs a day. Only in France they can strike a better posture because they do not live side by side with the subjected Arab. Their behavior is only revealed by contrast. If the Left seemed to us more pleasant and more helpful, let us only remember the hopes of 1936 and what has become of them. . . . Some will welcome the advent of a soft government, of the Mendès-France or Mitterrand type. . . . As far as we are concerned, even these 'enlightened colonialists,' who consider us as part of the 'soul and substance' of France, only think of ending the Indochinese war in order to unite their scattered forces against us and our most commonplace demands."

This is a sharply different tone from the usual reactions of the North African nationalists, for even the revolutionary MTLD had often pinned its hopes on an understanding with the "French democrats." Inasmuch as Mendès-France is concerned, however, no healthier judgment could have been rendered.

Mendès-France may be the most intelligent and the most capable bourgeois politician that has come to power in France since the end of the war; he may be personally more appealing than any of his predecessors. This does not make him a great progressive statesman; it only makes him an intelligent imperialist.

**CP Sellout**

The enthusiasm of the neutralists-Stalinoids for his government is understandable; its policy is aligned on the "co-existence" policy which they support along with Churchill and the Stalinists. The enthusiasm of some French socialists for Mendès-France, on the other hand, is as much a manifestation of opportunism as the enthusiasm of certain American SPers for Roosevelt's New Deal under similar circumstances.

As far as the colonial peoples are concerned, they can expect from Mendès-France only as much as he knows he must give to escape revolution; in other words, only as much as they can wring

out of him by the show of organized force. By stressing this fact in its editorial, *Algérie Libre* only expressed the experience of all colonial peoples in the French orbit.

But for saying so, it got a sermon from *L'Humanité* and a slap on the wrist from *France-Observateur*. *L'Humanité* in particular seems very displeased that the MTLD should have the gall to attack Mendès-France at a time when the CP is engaged in a strenuous though unrewarded effort to include him in its "Union of All Good Frenchmen."

This reaction casts an interesting light on the consequences of the CP's current "patriotic" line on its colonial policy. Compelled to abandon militancy in exchange for a "neutralist" attitude on the part of the French government, and on EDC in particular, the French CP has also been forced to drop the demands of the colonial peoples along with the demands of the French workers.

On the North African question in particular, it has shown a remarkable moderation throughout the current crisis. It is sufficient to compare its policy today with its struggle against the Moroccan war in 1926 to realize the extent of the sell-out.

In 1926 it opposed the Moroccan war with all means at its command: strikes, revolutionary agitation in the army, etc. Today, its "struggle" remains confined to the columns of its press, that is, to the hollow phrases of Léon Feix and to sporadic guest articles by the secretaries of one or the other North African CP. Nor did the recent Congress of the CP in Ivory consider it necessary to devote special time to North African questions.

This is not the first time a change in the CP line has led it to leave the colonial peoples in the lurch. This has happened every time the CP has been undergoing a social-patriotic period, i.e., every time Russia needed the good-will of the French government.

In 1936, at the time of the Popular Front government, Thorez himself called for repression against the Parti Populaire Algérien, the forerunner of the MTLD, led by Messali Hadj, and against the Tunisian Neo-Destour. In 1945, when the Stalinists participated in De Gaulle's government and explained to the workers that strikes were a weapon of fascism, Thorez again called for the prohibition of the PPA and for the imprisonment of the "Hitlerite" Messali Hadj. The government of 1945, and its Stalinist ministers, bear the responsibility for the massacres of 1945 in Algeria, in which the troops killed 40,000 people in the course of reprisals against demonstrations in different towns.

**Sinister History**

Yet, even more so than their role on France, it is their activities in North Africa itself that have revealed the Stalinists to be a powerful, if unexpected, prop of colonialism.

In Tunisia, the Neo-Destourian militants under the leadership of Ferhat Hached had to fight the CP every step of the way to conquer autonomy for the Tunisian labor movement. When this aim was eventually achieved in 1945 the Stalinists, rather than recognize the democratic option of the vast majority of the Tunisian working class and act as a minority inside the UGTT, preferred to split the labor movement and to create the small USTT which they themselves could control.

In Morocco the Stalinists have enjoyed full support of the Protectorate authorities, since the end of the war, for their operations within the trade-union movement, while the militants of the Istiqlal succeeded in winning over the rank and file and wresting the effective leadership of the UGSCM (Moroccan Trade Union Federation) from the Stalinists.

Today, the protection of the authorities alone allows the Stalinists to maintain juridical and formal control over

the Moroccan labor movement, against the repeatedly expressed will of the Moroccan workers. As a result of this situation, every independent mass struggle of the Moroccan proletariat had to be planned and directed not only against the French administration but also against the Stalinist bureaucracy of the UGSCM.

The Algerian workers have fared no better in their experiences with Stalinism.

There are at present over 400,000 Algerian workers in France, who live and work under conditions far inferior to those of French workers. The vast majority of these Algerians follow the MTLD. But the MTLD, which has been going through an ideological and tactical crisis for some time now, has been unable to organize its followers in France on the basis of its own revolutionary program and for its own aims. Consequently, the Stalinists have until now been able to use the masses of the MTLD in France as a pawn in their own game, while eliminating the MTLD cadres from positions of responsibility in the labor movement.

Thus, when the French police killed 6 MTLD members on Bastille Day 1953, the leadership of the MTLD could have easily mobilized public opinion in France and in North Africa in its support. Instead of so doing, it allowed the Stalinists to use the Algerian victims for their own propagandistic purposes, thereby depriving the incident entirely of its true political significance. Yet, in the elections for union representation in the Renault works in 1953, the Stalinists eliminated the MTLD candidate put up by the Algerians and replaced him by a phony UDMA candidate, who turned out to be nothing more than a docile party-liner.

After a long history of betrayals, it is not surprising that the Stalinists do not enjoy the confidence of the North African working class. Their aims and the aims of the latter have proven to be quite incompatible.

**SP: Any Better?**

On the other hand, one would think that such experiences would constitute an ideal basis for the SP to prove that, "in spite of everything," it still represents the legitimate aspirations of the North African as well as of the French working classes. Nothing could be further removed from reality.

The SP's colonial policy, for different reasons, has been fully as disgraceful as the Stalinists'.

While the Stalinists have sacrificed the interests of the colonial peoples to the needs of Russian foreign policy, the SP has done the same thing in the interests of its collaboration with the French bourgeoisie. It has participated in the colonialist repressions of 1936 and 1945—in fact, the Algerian massacres of 1945 were carried out by Maurice-Edmond Naegelen, SP leader, then French High Commissioner for Algeria.

The same Naegelen added to his notoriety early this year when he wrote an article, as specialist on colonial questions no doubt, in *La Dépêche* of Toulouse. In this article, discussing French policy in Morocco, he regrets that the French government has not shown more "authority":

"... under these circumstances, it is not surprising that we should have lost face in the eyes of these sensitive populations, respectful of just authority, but contemptuous of weakness and impotence. . . ."

Then, after berating the French government for not having taken its collaborationist Sultan on a tour through the country to give him "authority," our social-democratic imperialist proposes nothing less than the establishment of a new, improved stoolpigeon system over Morocco:

"... One could attempt to create a vast union against terrorism. . . . Even the most francophile Moroccans will refuse to denounce one of their compatriots. . . . [but] these same Moroccans find it natural to inform their traditional chiefs or the dignitaries of their tribe. . . . [yet] nothing has been done to organize the collection of such information by the authorities in charge of suppressing and preventing terrorism. . . ."

That the SP could present such a specimen as its candidate for the presidency of the Republic was already shameful. But that it should have proposed him as a High Commissioner for Morocco in June is a height of either cynicism or stupidity.

During the current North African

crisis, the SP was able to do nothing more than to follow timidly the lead of the more imaginative sections of the bourgeoisie represented by Mendès-France. In April, the SP Directing Committee adopted the motions of the SP Federation of Tunisia which "cautioned the government" against thinking that the Voizard reforms had solved the problem, pointed to the "uneasiness" created by the fact that Ferhat Hached and Hedi Chaker's assassins had not yet been caught, and by the fact that Bourguiba had not yet been transferred from exile in a Tunisian island to exile in France.

As to the July congress of the SP, it came out not for independence, not for autonomy, but for a "daring policy of reforms in Tunisia and Morocco," without specifying in any way what this "daring policy" might be.

This, and many other things, justify Marceau Pivert when he asks, "If Mr. Mendès-France has become a symbol of a revival and has such a success among the youth, is it not because the socialists have failed in their task?"

**Chauvinists**

This failure to pursue any kind of anti-colonialist policy is also painfully apparent in the behavior of F.O., the social-democratic trade-union federation.

Recently its National Committee went as far as to oppose the autonomous organization of North African workers, on the grounds that their interests are to be represented by F.O. This position, which is, incidentally, in direct contradiction with the policies of the ICFTU to which F.O. belongs, was correctly stigmatized by *Révolution Proletarienne*:

"To proclaim that international solidarity with the Tunisian and Moroccan workers cannot be expressed through other channels than those provided by a French trade-union federation, is to proclaim the right of tutelage of the French people over the peoples of Tunisia and Morocco. Whether the protector be benevolent or tyrannical, harsh or selfless, concerned with exploitation or with liberation. . . by stages, he still remains a 'protector,' that is a master and an overlord."

This is all the more true when it is remembered that, according to the testimony of Istiqlal militants in the labor movement, the F. O. federation in Morocco behaves typically like a company union, down to strikebreaking and to racial discrimination.

Under such circumstances, it is not surprising that the editorialists of *Algérie Libre* refuse to make any distinction between the pseudo-liberal bourgeois governments, the Popular Front and the French left. To them, the difference is negligible indeed.

Their criticism does not apply, of course, to all of F.O., as it does not apply to the whole SP. Both these organizations contain revolutionary minorities which have known how to defend the cause of the North African and of the French workers. Unfortunately, minorities by definition do not determine the policy of an organization, and the policy of the F.O. and SP leadership as far as the colonial question is concerned, must be denounced thoroughly.

It is also true that F.O. recently signed an appeal to the French government with the UGTT and the ICFTU, calling for negotiations with the Neo-Destour. However, it is more than likely, considering precedents, that F.O. was browbeaten by the ICFTU to do so, and that the resolution does not represent the sentiments of its leadership.

On the whole, only *Révolution Proletarienne*, the PCI and other small revolutionary groups can be said to have a consistent anti-colonialist policy in France. Evidently, the problem of anti-colonialism on the left is tied up with the political problem of the left in general.

Neither the Stalinists nor the SP in its present form are capable of effectively supporting the struggle for independence of the colonial peoples in the French orbit. But then, neither are they capable of representing the interests of the French workers themselves, and the reasons for one failure are the same as the reasons for the other. It is the most urgent task of the revolutionary minorities in the French labor movement to unite on the basis of a genuine socialist program which alone could liberate both the French and the colonial working-classes.

**LABOR ACTION**

August 16, 1954 Vol. 18, No. 33

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



## The Unique Example of a Trade-Union Youth Group

The following interesting account of a unique youth trade-union organization, the youth section of the Israeli trade-union federation, is reprinted from the May issue of Socialist Advance, the organ of the British Labor League of Youth.—Ed.

By LESLIE WALFORD

NOAR OVED is a youth movement which is both a trade union and an educational organization. It was founded in 1924 as an organization devoted entirely to the interests of young people, and although forming part of the Histadrut (Israel's federation of labor) framework it has complete autonomy in all matters affecting youth.

The trade-union section catering especially for youth has, so far as I know, no counterpart in any other country in the world. It is known as Hanoar Haoved (Working Youth), and it protects the wages and working conditions of 35,000 young wage earners.

There are 480 Noar Oved branches throughout Israel. One hundred and sixty branches having about 16,000 members are situated in the towns, villages and immigrants' transit camps, and another 320 branches are farm settlements, where 19,000 young men and women live and work. Besides the 35,000 young people who are working, Noar Oved has another 13,000 members who are still at school.

Noar Oved runs in three streams—trade-union organization, agricultural settlements and educational work—but the three streams share a common membership.

### ACTIVITIES

The trade-union activities of Noar Oved are concerned with employment, vocational training, and the defense of wages, hours and working conditions of young people up to the age of 18. At that age they automatically become members of Histadrut.

Noar Oved is responsible for a separate labor exchange for youths seeking employment. When boys and girls register at these labor exchanges they are first of all sent to a vocational-guidance center. There they are given psycho-technical tests which are designed to find out their natural aptitudes and abilities. These centers have brought to light some interesting trends. They have found, for instance, a general unwillingness to learn the traditional Jewish trades such as tailoring, carpentry, leather or any of the culinary trades. Instead, Israeli youths want to become mechanics or work in the metal, electrical or clerical trades.

The trade-union section also has a network of trade schools, where 3,000 of its members study after working hours, most of them concentrating on metal-trade courses. Two thousand members of Hanoar Haoved attend special high schools in the evenings, and over 10,000 are attending evening elementary schools.

Trade-union activity among teen-agers has been greatly encouraged by the passage through the Knesset (Israel's par-

liament) of two important laws dealing with the employment of young people.

It is now forbidden to employ children under 14, and boys and girls under 16 are barred from work in hotels, dance halls, mental institutions and other unsuitable places. The government is also empowered to forbid the employment of boys and girls under 18 in other places if it threatens their physical or mental development.

Israel's economy needs a large supply of skilled labor, and so The Apprenticeship Law compels employers in various trades to engage young workers as apprentices. It forbids employers to accept any payment for training apprentices and the government Apprenticeship Officer can forbid any employer to hire apprentices if working conditions are unsuitable. The employer is required to appoint one person to be responsible for the apprentice and to engage the apprentice only on work connected with learning the trade. He must also give the apprentice time off from work, without deductions from pay, to attend a recognized trade school.

The government has control over a system of examinations and tests under which apprentices receive bonuses for proficiency in addition to their usual graded wage rates.

As an educational movement, the main aim of Noar Oved is to bring its members toward an understanding of the basic principles and ideals of the Israel labor movement.

While the younger age groups are organized in a type of scout organization, the older groups do pioneer work on the land. Noar Oved trains these young men and women for all the forms of agricultural settlement developed by the labor movement in Israel.

One important type of farm settlement is the collective settlement. The land which members farm is owned by the settlement. Houses, schools, plant, etc., are all owned by the farm community as a whole, and not by any individual. Emphasis is on equality, and all phases of the settlement's life are run in a most democratic manner.

### POLITICAL LIFE

Another type of agricultural settlement is what is known as the cooperative settlement, where the farmers market their produce cooperatively. These farm settlements are not limited to agricultural development. Very often small factories and light industries spring up and become a part of the settlement. About 2,000 teenagers join farm settlements every year, either to get some farm training or as apprentices at the settlements' industrial plants. Of the Hanoar Haoved members who join the army, about 400 a year choose the special units which combine farm training with the two and a half year's period of military service.

Noar Oved aims to make its members good citizens as well as good trade unionists.

Recently Histadrut accepted thousands of Arab workers as members, and now Hanoar Haoved is admitting about 1,000 Arab youths into its ranks.

Like the Histadrut, Noar Oved membership is open to everyone irrespective of party affiliations or political opinion. Political parties are active within the organization, seeking, democratically, to influence policy. The two main parties are Mapai (Labor) and Mapam. At the moment both parties are equally represented in the executive bodies of the organization, but a general election is to be held soon throughout the organization to determine the actual strength of the two groups.

## Education Gets the Runaround Treatment

By EDWARD HILL

The CIO has just reported the most recent incident in the saga of the Department of Not-Very-Much Health, Education and Welfare. This time, however, the story continues right on up to the White House. The issue: schools for American youth.

Miss Maurice Walker is the newly-elected president of the National Education Association. She tried to see Mrs. Hobby of the Not-Very-Much Education Department, but the secretary ducked out on any appointment. After this rebuff, Miss Walker attempted to see President Eisenhower himself.

She proposed to the president that he meet with John Lester Buford, first vice-president of the NEA; James Carey, secretary-treasurer of the CIO; Mrs. Clifford N. Jenkins, legislation chairman of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers; Herschel D. Newsom, National Grange Master; and the national executive director of the Jewish War Veterans, Benjamin Kaufman. It will be noted that the organizations represented in the list run the political gamut—from the CIO to the Grange.

A week after Miss Walker made her request, Thomas E. Stephens, secretary to the president, announced that Eisenhower would be unable to meet with the group, "because of his heavily crowded schedule."

### PATTERN

The buck was passed to Samuel H. Brownell, brother of the attorney general and Commissioner of Education. Only a few months ago, Brownell had been blocked from testifying in favor of emergency school construction legislation by . . . the secretary of the Department of "Health, Education and Welfare," Mrs. Hobby.

The problem of school construction has been on the agenda for years, and as an emergency item under both Truman and Eisenhower. However, no positive steps have been taken under either administration to provide for the education of American youth, unless the give-away of tidelands oil—the income of which had been proposed for use in the education field—is counted.

This incident is, of course, part of a larger pattern. Another aspect of this process came forth in a recent Eisenhower press conference. When asked whether or not he favored the \$250,000,000 emergency federal school construction program, the president referred the reporters to Mrs. Hobby. Mrs. Hobby, however, had jumped the gun. She had gotten a state-

## MOSCOW CAPTURES THE GIRL SCOUTS

Growing up has become more complicated in the atomic age. As an example of the dangers which threaten American youth—Drink, Temptation and Lack of Application—we call attention to the newest: Subversion.

The Illinois Department of the American Legion has just discovered that the Girl Scouts are a hotbed of One-Worlders, Un-Americans and Who Knows What? The climax is that the Girl Scouts are "indoctrinating" their charges with UN propaganda. With this the Legion will have nothing to do "until such time as they restore the time-honored American, patriotic and historic ideals in teaching to American youth."

Next week: Peter Pan, Red Youth Leader!

ment out—perhaps to avoid having to meet the press.

Mrs. Hobby's comments were in the jargon which seems to be characteristic of this administration. The solution of the school construction program, she noted, requires "general understanding and support by the people of all parts of the nation." Having delivered herself of this political wisdom, the secretary got down to her own version of reality: "They must be convinced that the need is great enough and important enough for them to pay the taxes required."

This attitude was surprising in relation to two of the more recent parts of the Eisenhower program: tax-reduction for stock-holders, big businessmen, etc., and a large highway construction program. When Mrs. Hobby was talking of the "people" paying for any school construction, she was evidently talking quite literally. Under current tax policy, the people, the vast majority, do pay; the exemptions are for coupon-clippers. But then, the last "progressive" (income-shifting) tax law passed in the United States was in 1937.

This particular construction bill is so obviously needed that it received the approval of the House subcommittee which discussed it, and even of the well-known welfare-stater, Senator William F. Knowland. Yet, the administration seems determined to keep the youth away from education. They might read about Robin Hood.

## Chicago YSL Hears Analysis of Guatemala

By JIM BURNETT

CHICAGO—Comrades and friends of the Chicago unit of the Young Socialist League were treated to an informative and interesting analysis of the Guatemalan situation at a meeting of the unit on August 1. The talk was delivered by Max Martin, currently on tour for the YSL.

Comrade Martin gave the lie to those who would represent the overthrown Arbenz government as "Communist-dominated," by pointing out that outside of the labor unions, Stalinist influence in Guatemalan affairs was generally small. It was also noted that in the United Nations, Guatemala generally followed the U. S. line, including support of UN intervention in Korea. A strange way for a Stalinist-controlled government to behave, to say the least!

Since the unity, the Chicago unit has almost doubled its membership. Several new contacts attended the Martin meeting, their first YSL meeting, and seemed very favorably impressed. The rapid

growth of the Chicago YSL has proceeded without any sort of membership drive whatsoever. The Chicago comrades have high hopes for this fall when they plan to organize on the University of Chicago campus.

## Young Socialist CHALLENGE

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

YSL FORUM • NEW YORK

Gordon Haskell

on

THE THIRD CAMP

FRIDAY, AUGUST 20

at 8:15 p.m.

Labor Action Hall

114 West 14 Street, N.Y.C.



PART II *The Position of the***ARAB SOCIALISTS**  
*on* **ISRAEL**

By CLOVIS MAKSOUD

In the light of the preceding discussion:

(1) How should the Palestine controversy be resolved to prepare a healthy and socialist development in the Near East?

(2) Does the existence of Israel as an independent and sovereign state serve to block or aid this development?

(3) What should be the conditions for a political settlement that would guarantee the rights—the basic human rights—of the inhabitants of the area?

(4) What is the Arab socialist formula for the Palestine question, and the reasons for it?

**I shall not give a systematic answer to these questions. I pose them since they are the ones that come to my mind in attempting to formulate a plan for the question of Palestine.**It would be easy to settle the Israel-Arab conflict on the theoretical level. Even then, certain premises have to be accepted. What is necessary, however, is not a *settlement* but a *solution*. This, in our view, should be a socialist endeavor.

A settlement presupposes the existence of an active conflict of interests. It does not purport to eliminate its causes. All it hopes to do is to reduce the activism of the conflict and establish a modus vivendi based on the acceptance of a de-facto situation.

A solution is in a way a revolutionary form of settlement. It is a settlement that requires a change and a breakaway from the old forms, while settlement implies naked adjustment.

A settlement does not settle a problem. It makes adjustments of interests in conflict. A solution goes into the causation of the problem. It does not only resolve but, in the process of eradicating its causes, it unfolds its positive values and brings to the forefront the latent good will of those participating in the solution.

**Israel Is a Deterrent**

Applying the test mentioned in the first part of my article—namely, that the solution ought to serve socialist realization (in the Arab world)—and dismissing for the moment the moral ramifications involved, the question of rights, and whether Zionist claims are true or not, let us ask ourselves the question:

**Does Israel, the independent and sovereign state, serve as a generator of a progressive and socialist revolutionary development, or does it serve as a deterrent?**

This is a question that ought to concern not only Arab socialists but socialists everywhere. The answer, we submit as socialists, is that the presence of the sovereign state of Israel acts as a deterrent to the fulfillment of the revolutionary aspirations of the Arab masses.

Not only does potential Zionist expansion militate against the release of Arab revolutionary reserves, but Israel's expansion is checked only by active interference of the three Western powers who signed the 1950 Tripartite Agreement. To maneuver the Arab revolutionary forces into a position of choosing between potential expansion of Zionism and imperialist intervention to prevent it, seems to us a disservice to the cause of socialism in the Near East. Should the socialists in Europe and America continue in their one-sided support for Israel, they will not only contribute to the perpetuation of reaction in this area, but they will, in the long run, weaken their position by supporting forces that sap their own strength and appeal, namely, imperialism.

*The task of the Arab socialists is therefore to break the deadlock and disengage ourselves from this limited framework of choice. Our immediate task is to regain the initiative in the field of international relations in order to create a climate where the two alternatives would be proved to be two phases of one.***Israel's existence and its safety have given pretexts for more active interference by the United States and Britain in the affairs of the Near East. The evacuation of the Suez Canal by British troops is held up because the Israelis fear the "aggressive" designs of Egypt. The Israeli government then considers British occupation of the Suez a guarantee for its security.****Pawn of Imperialism**The Johnson Plan designed to promote "stability" and "order" in the area is a plan that will allow American capital to develop our resources. It is not necessary for me to repeat here the drastic consequences of such measures and how they will seek to undermine socialist or even democratic movements. *They will more-over saturate the possibilities of a native extractive and productive capitalist development.*Though such infiltration of capital will, by reason of a certain economic dislocation, effectuate a redistribution of social status and class structure, what will emerge is actually a class of entrepreneurs—commercial capitalists—drawn from the déclassé feudal lords and technicians, who will be transformed into an upper-bourgeois class closely connected with foreign interests and designs. This apparent change in the class structure of society is not at all a real and constructive change. It does, however, exploit the anti-feudal heritage of the progressive struggle of the genuine bourgeoisie. The time that elapses between this apparent "progress" and the discovery that *commercial capitalism is only an accommodating force for reaction and imperialism* and plays the same role of feudalism, this time is used to consolidate the new form of colonialism and its local stooges.By this temporary split of the democratic revolutionary forces brought about by the neutralization of the "moderate liberals," Arab socialists are again faced with the need to retrace their steps and regain the initiative. The "stability" of the area requires and necessitates the acceptance of these plans. One only has to read *Newsweek* and *Time* magazines to see the promises that this plan holds for the inhabitants of the area. More important is the "patience" and "objective" perseverance of Eisenhower's roving Near Eastern ambassador!**Again we see how Israel serves to obstruct socialist development in the Arab world.****"Emasculation"**

Arab socialists wonder why socialists in Europe and America—finding themselves supporting, as did the British Labor MPs, Sidney Silverman and R. H. S. Crossman, "stability" in the Near East to protect Israel—are completely indifferent to the consequences of "stability" in the Arab world?

**The alternative in our view is the emasculation of Israel's sovereignty. This is a view that must be shared by every socialist.**

As long as the Jews in Israel retain a sovereign, separate, isolated and independent existence, they will evolve interests which are exist-

**THIS CONCLUDES***the presentation by Clovis Maksoud of "The Position of the Arab Socialists on Israel," begun in last week's issue. Next week we publish a reply to Maksoud from the point of view of LABOR ACTION'S position on the subject.—Ed.*

pathetic to those of the inhabitants of the area. In addition, and by virtue of this isolated existence, they will not only alienate themselves from the inhabitants' aspirations but, in preservation of this isolation, they will move in an opposite direction.

As the Arabs are in a revolutionary situation expressed in an articulate will to change the social, political and economic systems under which they live, *Israel in preserving its "national" identity would exercise a counter-revolutionary influence.* This will, parenthetically, entail the frustration and isolation of genuine socialist groups among the Jews either by direct suppression, as they will necessarily become "subversive" and divisive elements with regard to Zionism, or by limiting the mobility of socialist appeal in the emotional and sensational mobilization where Zionists are master engineers.**Positive Program**

The emasculation of Israel's sovereignty will require positive action too.

The first step will be the resettlement of Arab refugees to their former homes in Palestine; also the resettlement of Arab Jews in their homes in Yemen and Iraq with guarantees of their civil rights and reinstatement of their status.

**The Jewish population in Palestine who lived there prior to the creation of Israel will be allowed cultural autonomy. The remaining inhabitants of Israel will be allowed to continue residence only in the light of the absorptive capacity of Palestine and the consideration of the human rights of the Palestinian population.***The remaining Jewish refugees cannot be considered an exclusive Arab obligation. They are an international obligation, as any victims of persecution ought to be. Some of the romantic Zionists who came as "pioneers" from their countries should not remain at all in Palestine, especially if they consider their stay there a matter of right. Socialists in the world should seek to liberalize their immigration laws and the presumption that anti-Semitism is a psychological component of certain national attitudes must be abandoned.*

Therefore the Zionist myths must not continue to dominate Western socialist and liberal thinking. Their reactionary and racial premises and prejudices should be rejected.

**Wider Problem****The cultural autonomy of the Jews in Palestine will mean the reintegration of these inhabitants into the broader framework of Arab unity. They will not be the only religious minority. The Arabs have always proved their assimilating capacities. Arabs have also a heritage of tolerance. Kurds, Armenians, Greeks and European Jews in many Arab countries assimilated into the pattern of Arab society.**

A social revolution is a negation of all religious and racial prejudices. It generates progressive dispositions, and transcends discriminatory arrogance that characterizes reactionary classes when their survival is in question. The revolutionary situation in the Arab world is a liberation movement. Though it is a liberation from an "other," the struggle itself has a purifying impact in the process.

Only where outside influences, endeavoring to exploit, seek to maintain permanent footholds in the area is the perversion of the socialist revolution possible. The perversion can be either the subversion of this tempo to Soviet designs or the derationalization of revolutionary impulses to succumb to anti-democratic forces similar in designs to the forces they claim to oppose. The success of these revolutionary and perverted direction is possible only by frustrating democratic socialism.

**Israel is an integral part of a wider problem. In its present Zionist structure and sovereignty***(Continued bottom of next page)*



THE ECONOMIC PICTURE IN THE U.S.—

# Unemployment, Profits, and Monopoly

By L. G. SMITH

In last week's survey of the economy we wrote: "It is quite likely that unemployment will show a sharp upswing in July, even though vacation schedules may have put off the evil day for a large number of workers till August."

As if to confound this tentative "forecast," the Department of Labor and the Department of Commerce released July figures on unemployment last week which showed a standstill in July as compared to June. According to them, there are still 62,148,000 civilians with jobs and 3,346,000 without jobs in July, almost exactly the same number as in June.

We would be among the last to question the authenticity of these figures (by this we simply mean that we would not question them until they had been questioned by others with access to information which we don't have). But it is interesting to note that by Department of Labor calculations there were 289,000 fewer people with non-farm jobs in July than in June, while the Department of Commerce said that non-agricultural employment increased by 191,000. That is a total difference of 480,000 jobs, or almost half a million. The difference is accounted for by the fact that the Department of Labor counts the number employed, while Commerce counts the unemployed, and considers people "employed" who are not actually at work because of temporary layoffs, vacation shutdowns, strikes or other reasons.

So . . . unemployment has not shown "a sharp upswing" during July. This despite the fact that the index of factory production for the whole month continued to lag at levels distinctly below the June figures. The slack appears to have been taken up by service and other industries, part of which are connected with the tourist and vacation trade.

## Profits

Everyone knows that though the workers have not been doing so well in 1954, business profits have never been so high . . . at least as far as some of the biggest corporations are concerned. Much of this profitability is a result of the tax hand-outs of the Eisenhower administration. Actually it is not that they have made more profits, but that they have been permitted to keep more.

Companies listed on the New York Stock

Exchange paid dividends during the first six months of 1954 of nearly \$3 billions, or at a rate of 7.5 per cent above last year.

Of course, profits varied widely among the different industries. Gains of 7 per cent were chalked up for manufacturing and for electric power and gas, 9 per cent for telephone and telegraph companies; while railroad profits were down 45 per cent and service and amusement profits down 23 per cent.

In addition, the profits of the giant corporations have been going up, while those of the smaller concerns have been going down. Large manufacturers, those with assets of at least \$100 million, had first-quarter profits this year which were 7 per cent above last year, while manufacturers with assets of less than \$100 million suffered a profit decline of 30 per cent.

## The Little Fellow

The "little fellow" has had very tough sledding during this "rolling readjustment." According to government figures there are over 100,000 manufacturing concerns which have assets of less than \$250,000 each. These make up 86 per cent of all manufacturing concerns in the country and are the basis of the claim that this is a land of free, individual enterprise. But during the first quarter of this year these companies "earned" an average of zero cents per dollar of sales after taxes (that is right, zero).

At first glance, this figure would seem to be fantastic, if not ridiculous. If 86 per cent of American manufacturing concerns made no money during the first quarter of the year, it would appear that the economy is on the verge of collapse. What difference could it make if the remaining 14 per cent of the concerns made a killing?

Well, much of the appearance of fantasy is a result of the statistical categories set up here. Of the 86 per cent of all manufacturers listed as making an average of no cents per dollar of sale, a third may have done right well, a third may have broken even, and a third may have lost about as much as the top third made, or two-thirds could have made a little while the remaining third lost their shirts.

Further, the fact that a concern does not show a profit does not at all mean that the owner is necessarily going broke.

That all depends on how his books are set up for this particular statistical report to the government. We know of the owner of a small concern with an investment of perhaps only \$50,000 who makes no net profit per dollar of sales. But each week he draws a salary, as manager of the concern, of something approaching \$200. It is not a fortune, but still . . .

Nevertheless, the fact remains that the big snakes are doing far, far better than the little ones in the capitalist snakepit. Those with assets over \$100 million averaged 6.1 cents per dollar of sales after taxes during the first quarter of this year, and the average for all manufacturers was 4.3 cents on the dollar.

Although the big and medium-sized corporations have their own ways of concealing real profits which are just as effective as those of the little ones, there is just too much gravy to conceal.

## Mergers

As part of this snake-eat-snake struggle in the capitalist world which is reflected in the profit figures is the growing rash of mergers which have taken place in recent months. The absorption of small units of capital by larger ones has been a constant process since the beginning of capitalism, which has actually never been reversed (even by the anti-trust laws) and has only been slowed up from time to time by special circumstances such as war booms.

The most dramatic mergers during the last year have been those in the automobile industry. First Kaiser and Willys-Ovèrland merged, and then it was Nash and Hudson. In the offing is a merger between the old, solid and respected firms of Packard and Studebaker.

Since America is so car-conscious, and since it is so widely known that the creeping sickness in the automobile industry is likely to affect steel, coal and every other major industry in the country, a lot of attention has been focused on the General Motors struggle with Ford for decisive dominance in the market which has pushed these smaller companies to the wall, and is even threatening the giant Chrysler Corporation.

In addition, however, there have been major mergers in textiles, transportation (ocean shipping) and oil and chemicals. Proposed mergers are pending, or have passed the theoretical discussion stage, in steel (Bethlehem and Youngstown Sheet & Tube), trucks and busses (Mack and White), and machinery (American Machine & Foundry and Martin-Parry).

Of course, not all of these mergers represent the gobbling up of small concerns by big ones. Many of them result from the natural tendency of firms to seek fusion when this can result in greater efficiency and higher profits for all. But in most cases a very real factor is the pressure of competition from the really big aggregates of capital which confront the small ones with the alternative of "merge or die."

## Shot in the Arm

After many months of voicing unrestrained optimism on every occasion, Commerce Secretary Weeks has admitted that the government needs to give the economy "a nudge here and there."

This is not exactly in line with his past speeches. For example, at Detroit in mid-June he dismissed all concern with recession by claiming that "our home-grown Communists, echoing their Moscow masters, are trying to start a depression."

Weeks said, at his latest press conference, that the economic picture "looks promising" and that he foresees a "real pickup" this fall (a few weeks ago it was predicted for spring)—but the nudge that he had in mind was something along the lines of giving the war economy a shot in the arm:

"There is a conscious policy to speed up procurement," he said. "We aren't trying to think up things to be done, but where there is something on which we are going to spend money 3 to 6 months from now, we will try to get started in a month or so."

## Warning

The AFL Executive Council pointed with alarm at the economic situation, at its meeting this week. It predicted that the country would "drift in the economic doldrums for the next few months."

The AFL economic statement directed

# 132 Million Equals 7000

A headline in the New York Times for August 9 was no doubt calculated to lift the hearts of the unemployed all over the country: "Tax Write-Offs to Cut Joblessness As Companies Invest 132 Million." That was right on page one of the paper which carries "All the news that's fit to print."

The story behind the story is this. Some months ago, a number of unions in industries hard hit by the recession demanded that the government funnel new armament contracts into the areas in which unemployment has reached dangerous proportions. The Eisenhower administration, after the usual careful study of the problem, decided to tackle it in its usual way: offer incentives to private industry to do the job.

The incentive offered was a quick write-off of the amortization of the capital invested for tax purposes. This means that the company can claim a fifth of its total investment as a charge against profits for five years, and reduce its tax payments accordingly.

The article in the Times starts off with the announcement that under the pull of this inducement, companies have agreed to invest \$132,541,990 "in defense facilities in chronic surplus labor areas."

That looks like a lot of money, even in these days when the armament budget reaches into the tens of billions. That much money should be able, it seems, to put a lot of men and women to work. Although one may be against the purposes for which the government may be planning to use the arms which will be produced; at least a lot of families will know where their next week's grocery bill will come from.

But in the very next paragraph, the Times informs us that "the additional facilities are expected to employ 6,943 persons." That is right! The government's whole program, to date, for helping distressed areas will, when completed, result in the employment of something like 7,000 workers!

## POOR JOKE

Not much relief, it would seem. But there is another fact, besides that of the puniness of the relief, which is highlighted by these figures. And that is the enormous amount of capital required, these days, to put a single worker to work.

According to these figures, it takes an average investment of \$18,934 to put one man to work profitably.

Is it any wonder that the dream the hucksters of American capitalism seek to implant in the workers—the hope that some day they will be able to stop working for the profit of others, and will be able to start a small business where they can work for themselves, or even better, where they can get others to work for them—is it any wonder that for the overwhelming majority this no longer is even a dream? How many workers can actually save \$18,934 in their lifetime to put themselves to work, let alone the additional \$18,934 with which to hire another worker?

Of course, that is just a theoretical figure which means almost nothing in practice. In most lines of business a capitalist can only hope to survive if he has many times that and can hire enough workers to make for an efficient production unit. In the fields where this sum, or less, is enough to set up a business, the "capitalist" is almost certain to remain what is popularly called a "cockroach capitalist," or one who is so small he can crawl into the woodwork of capitalism without being noticed. Very often he has to work more hours for himself for less than the organized worker in industry.

That is the story of the Eisenhower administration's big plan to attract new investment to the "labor surplus" areas. As usual, it turns out to be a very poor joke on the unemployed.

## Psychology

"An idea well worth considering, conceived by Mr. L. M. Rhaesa, of Bush Manufacturing Company in Clawson. He doesn't like the coldness of the 'No Help Wanted' signs on many factories, suggests that 'Sorry, No Help Needed' would do more psychologically for the disappointed worker."—From the Detroit Free Press, May 12.

# Arab Socialists — —

(Continued from page 6)

it will continue to be a source of tension.

Those who claim that the emasculation of Israel's sovereignty is "impractical" will have to face the justified Arab response that the maintenance and subsidization of Zionist sovereignty is also impractical. In my opinion the paramount interest of socialism should be the arbiter of this problem.

The socialists of the world should bear the responsibility of their decision. But their judgment will not be final or correct or socialist if it is motivated by a traditional dislike for the Arabs (as, e.g., Richard Crossman, Sidney Silverman, John Freeman) or by a self-publicized Zionist bias (i.e., Mallalieu, columnist for the London Tribune, Norman Bentwick, Aneurin Bevan, Michael Foot, or to a lesser degree Norman Thomas). Those socialists have closed their minds to an objective study of the socialist development in the Arab world. Though many have contributed to the cause of socialism they do not possess the objectivity to act in judgment on this issue. They are influenced by mistaken convictions or political interests.

## WE ARE PRACTICAL

When studied carefully, and when the doctrine of socialism is applied, I am sure that the Arab socialist position on the question of Palestine will not only be appreciated but supported by all democratic socialist forces.

We shall not be intimidated by imposed facts accomplished. Nor shall we be maneuvered by imperialism to lose our revolutionary initiative, or abandon our zeal for what we consider is right and just in order to be "practical" and "realistic." What is a practical situation is what we make. It is the result of our action. Nothing is practical unless we submit to it; we ought not submit to a situation that is considered wrong and unjust.

Nazism was a practical situation, too

practical; did that mean that socialists ought to have submitted to it? Colonial administration is "practical" in many parts of Africa; does that involve submission? What is, is not what ought be, unless it conforms at least to the minimum requirements of elementary socialism. Zionism is not, in the same manner as Arab reaction and imperialism are not.

I have tried in this article to expound our position. The formula for a solution cannot be worked out in detail in circumstances where socialists do not have the instruments to execute their policies. But these are general lines of policy which we consider equitable but which must be worked out later.

## IT IS A TEST

We do not seek sympathy but understanding. We will not try to exact from Western socialists a definite commitment, as the Zionists did. Their position has to be the conclusion of serious, objective and far-sighted studies. This is a vital issue and we will not be manipulated.

I have been frank because this is the only way to promote unity. If the forces of socialism remain divided on vital issues, fearing to give a clear-cut solution, they will become an auxiliary and secondary stream in the cross-currents of ideas and beliefs. In the long run it will be detrimental to all of us.

Arab socialists will do their best to prevent this befalling. Many Asian and African socialists share our determination. We will not be welcomed now in many fraternal circles in Europe, but we do not mind. Maybe it is a persecution complex, but we hope by our stand and perseverance to restore to the European socialists the confidence they have almost lost in their cause.

Palestine is a test for the socialist conscience. We hope they will not fail in helping Arab socialists to resolve this problem as a prelude to a socialist society in the Arab East.



# U.S. Tells Its Allies — —

(Continued from page 1)

United States trade policy is right, and that everything Mr. Eisenhower, the Randall Commission, the Chamber of Commerce of the U. S. and every U. S. ambassador in Europe says about it is wrong."

So writes the bitter Michael Hoffman, foreign economic correspondent of the N. Y. Times (Aug. 1).

"The U. S. has spent billions of dollars and trillions of words in trying to get Western Europe back into shape after the ravages of two world wars so that basically free economic systems could function. It has exhorted Europeans to learn the virtues of competitive private enterprise and to beware of trusting too much to state planning.

"If no other considerations but these were involved, it would be simply incomprehensible to Europeans how the U. S., with this record behind it, could take such an action. It strikes a grievous blow at the sturdiest private-enterprise economy in Europe, injures an industry that never needed a penny of aid funds, and demonstrates to the world that the largest private-enterprise economy, whose productivity is the wonder of the world, cannot stand the competition, in an essentially minor industry, of the smallest private-enterprise economy."

## PROGRAM KILLED

The strength of the reaction to this case,—Hoffman weakly reflects it—is due as much to the UNimportance of the specific issue as anything else. The Europeans reason this way: even in this MINOR case Eisenhower found it impossible to refrain from clubbing the economic competitor, even though it flew in the face of dozens of speeches and statements.

It is no wonder that when Eisenhower comes to Congress with a program for expanding foreign trade, the senators and representatives give it short shrift. In point of fact, Eisenhower's foreign-trade legislative program is practically dead.

The president had asked for a 3-year extension of the reciprocal trade law with several new kinds of authority for gradual reduction of U. S. tariffs. All he got was a simple one-year extension of the present law.

Obviously, no matter how much he may have been in favor of it in the abstract,

he could not and did not fight for it—not the same man who raised the tariff on Swiss watches.

Every other item in the foreign-trade expansion program was also killed in Congress, except for a minor item allowing for the simplification of import classifications, to improve customs procedures and eliminate a nuisance.

## DREAMERS IN BURMA

In this connection, a series of articles from Rangoon, Burma, in the N. Y. Herald Tribune is interesting. The correspondent, Philip Deane, is warning against the possibilities of "Communist infiltration" in that country. He stresses that the socialist government of Burma has done a marvelous job in countering Stalinist influence with a progressive economic and social program. But he stresses also that unless Burma is helped, there will be trouble.

The help that Burma needs, he says, is not hand-out aid. No gifts. "Its government believes that would sap the people's self-reliance, give the Communists a slogan and tie the country to obligations." They want loans, investments, etc.

# Killing the UN — —

(Continued from page 1)

has never been made as hollow a shell as it is now.

And more than one friend of the U. S. is pointing out that this has been Washington's doing as much as or more than Moscow's.

## MOANING AT THE BAR

In a recent issue of Collier's magazine, Carlos P. Romulo of the Philippines—who has been president of the General Assembly—cited instance after instance of how the U. S. bloc has "sapped the UN's strength by by-passing it, by cutting away at its political prestige, and by deliberately failing to tap its mine of potential power. We talk lots of sweet talk about it, but refuse to give it the political vitamins it needs."

Romulo's instances were Indochina, Korea, North Africa, South Africa and

But Burma wants investments on its own terms. Private U. S. investors will go in only if the U. S. government guarantees them safety. (The initiative of private enterprise!) But the Eisenhower bill to do this has died in Congress.

Deane's third point is that Western firms in Burma should staff their organizations not with Americans or British but with Scandinavians, Israelis, Swiss, Greeks, etc.! An intriguing and damning point, but not relevant to our discussion at the moment.

"The fourth point is the most difficult: An international organization is needed to buy Southeast Asia's surpluses (chiefly rice) and distribute them where these products are needed. This would clash with the short-term interests of U. S., Canadian and Australian farmers. . . ."

Fat chance for the fourth point! "These four points are the dream of the hard-headed Western experts in Rangoon. . . ." writes Deane.

As he says, it is a dream—a capitalist Utopian dream, a visionary yearning for "private enterprise" to do what it cannot do.

others. One of the biggest recent instances was the fight by the U. S. to keep the UN's hands off the Guatemala case, with the implied lesson that regional alliances came first.

Romulo warned that the UN is "wasting away of political malnutrition." Naturally, he knows all about the Kremlin's sins, but he warns that "the heart-sickening truth is that the UN's demise is being brought on by the free world."

As a matter of fact, Romulo's reference to the sweet-talk about the UN in the U. S. is a bit one-sided. It goes mainly for official statements and liberal articles. In no other nation of the world is there such a powerful anti-UN propaganda drive.

And even as far as official statements are concerned: a body-blow was given the UN when both the Majority Leader (Knowland) and the Minority Leader (Johnson) in the U. S. Senate joined in a statement that the country should pull out of the UN if China were admitted.

UN halls and offices are full of "heart-sick" friends of the U. S. like Romulo, who groan with disgust over small but revealing incidents as over bigger blows. For example, on the day this is being written, the press reports—

"The opportunistic attitude of U. S. policy toward the United Nations is unintentionally disclosed in a U. S. working paper up for discussion today in the Collective Measures Committee. . . ."

"The committee meets today to discuss six principles proposed by the U. S. designed to strengthen the concept of collective security under the UN."

"Principle No. 5 provides that when a regional organization such as the North Atlantic Treaty or the proposed South East Asia Treaty Organization takes action 'consistent with and in support of the charter' it is important that the UN 'provide support for such collective action.'"

"UN diplomats feel that this way of stating the relationship between the UN and regional groups unfortunately makes it seem as if the tail should wag the dog." (N. Y. Post, Aug. 10.)

# Anti-Labor Drive — —

(Continued from page 1)

individually as to whether he had signed a union card.

Here are a series of other NLRB decisions made in the last few months, each one sticking a new dagger into the back of labor:

- Where a union is bargaining jointly with a number of employers and strikes against one of them, the others are justified in locking-out their workers.

- Employers can preach against unions on company property and time, without giving the union a chance to reply. The workers are the captive audience.

- Union-sponsored work slowdowns, partial strikes and refusals to work overtime are now "unfair labor practices," subject to cease-and-desist orders. Formerly these acts were merely regarded as denied the protection of the T-H Act.

- An employer, faced with a bargaining election, can threaten that he "might" move or close his shop if the union wins. He can't say he "will" move, but he doesn't have to.

## Unemployment — —

(Continued from page 7)

its attack especially against a false line of optimistic propaganda:

"The American people must not be lulled into a false sense of security by comparison of current levels of economic activity with those of several years ago. It is not enough that there be as many employed in 1954 as in 1951 or 1952.

"It is not enough to have 1954 manufacturing production at the 1951 level but nine per cent below last year. It is not enough to have purchasing power barely equal to that of preceding years.

"Our country and its needs are constantly expanding. Steady population growth, with the formation of new households and the movement of young workers into the labor market, requires increased levels of activity even if we are only to maintain existing standards."

- When a strike is illegal, the boss can not only fire the workers who took part in it, but he can also fire those who did not take part in it, who showed up for work, but who "failed to take sufficient action to disavow positively their union."

- The NLRB encouraged inter-union raiding by abandoning the principle under which a newly certified union is protected for a year.

To be sure, all this does not yet add up to wide-open union-busting but then it is also true that the new Eisenhower majority of the board is just getting started.

The businessman's administration in Washington is giving labor the business, with a vengeance. In almost all cases, every doubt has been resolved in favor of management and against unions.

## THE GOP MAJORITY

The anti-labor majority on the board consists of three GOP appointees. Chairman is Guy Farmer, a Washington lawyer whose firm had done much labor-relations work for employers before he was named to the board. Another member is Philip Ray Rodgers, one-time assistant to the coauthor of the T-H Act, Senator Taft.

The third vote for the bosses came with the Senate confirmation (after a sharp fight) of Albert C. Beeson, a San Jose (Calif.) industrialist. Beeson was okayed last February by a 45-42 vote, after Senator Neely had accused him of having "lied five times" in the course of earlier hearings before the Senate Labor Committee. Beeson's firm was represented by the law office in which NLRB Chairman Farmer was a partner. One happy family.

The other two members are Democrats, one of whom, Ivar Peterson, often votes with the GOP appointees anyway.

Every advance of reaction, in any field, from civil liberties to foreign policy, thickens the atmosphere in which anti-labor drives flourish. At the same time, labor's immense political power has been frittered away futilely in support to the Democratic Party, instead of being used to build a labor party of its own.

## The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Get Acquainted!

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

the ideas of Independent Socialism and the ISL.

- I want more information about
- I want to join the ISL.

NAME (please print) .....

ADDRESS .....

CITY .....

ZONE STATE .....

## LOS ANGELES

Hear

**James Kutcher**

tell the story of his fight against the witchhunt

Auspices of the ISL

**FRIDAY, AUG. 20—at 8 p.m.**

Gary-Knause Hall—Studio Room, 245 So. Lucas Ave. (Midway between Alvarado & Figueroa, just north of 3rd Street) Los Angeles

Contribution: 75c. All proceeds to Kutcher Defenses Comm.

## 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 .....