

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

SEPTEMBER 27, 1954

FIVE CENTS

The Left Wing in Algeria

... page 6

UAW Turns the Tide at Square-D

... page 2

The Choices Before Brazil

... page 3

Zionism and 'Terminology'

... page 4

SEATO Treaty Cooked Up A Police Pact over Asia

H. W. BENSON

As a serious conservatively conservative, Walter Lippman does some sober thinking about the Manila Treaty in his *Herald Tribune* column of September 14. There are commentators who wax warm with enthusiasm over SEATO, hailing it as a giant advance of American diplomacy; but not Lippman. He is not critical of the treaty, far from it; he is merely realistic. And after a close scrutiny he reaches the conclusion that its main significance lies in an open, advance endorsement of intervention by the United States into the internal affairs of Asiatic nations. This he does not oppose; he simply notes the fact as a guide for American policy. But it also serves as an instructive lesson to those who can see evidence of "imperialism" everywhere except in American foreign policy.

TRIUMPH FOR DULLES?

Hanson Baldwin, in the *New York Times*, belongs with the cheering enthusiasts. "The Southeast Asian-Pacific alliance," he writes, "thus opened a new chapter in the struggle for the world." And, he goes on, "represents a definite political and psychological triumph for anti-communism and for Mr. Dulles' pertinacity." Another *Times* writer, Dana Adams Schmidt, puts it, "among the outstanding achievements of Mr. Dulles' foreign policy."

It would be an exaggeration to say that the pact has no "political" or "psychological" importance of any kind. But in the bleak, barren desert of American diplomacy the popping of a blank cartridge sounds like a powerful detonation. Even an enthusiast like Baldwin recognizes, in

an aside, that the real Asia of India, Japan, Burma, Ceylon, Indonesia is absent and that burning problems of the day: Formosa, Indochina, are evaded. Perhaps that is why he can call the treaty "the best Asian news for the United States and its allies since the fall of Dienbienphu"—which is like saying: it is the best thing that has happened today since yesterday.

AVOID SHOWDOWN

Lippman, as is known, is a conservative realist. Did the pact prepare for any new moves against the Chinese? "... the eight governments did not go to Manila in order to take measures against invasion of the territory of any of them by the Red Chinese army. About how we would react to such an invasion we have said everything that can be said and everything that needs to be said. We have said it time and time again. We added nothing by saying it once more in Manila."

Does the pact then represent a final pooling of strength—everybody, shoulder (Turn to last page)

INTERNATIONALISM MARCHES ON

The following priceless example of American obtuseness appeared in the September 13 product of the liberal Washington, columnist Doris Fleeson, now engaged in visiting France and seeing things for herself:

"When Americans grow angry with the French for their nationalistic rejection of EDC, they might think of Chaumont.

"At Chaumont, a nationalist American of World War I, General John J. Pershing, made his headquarters, having

U. S. IS MORE ISOLATED THAN EVER

UN Show Reopens: Is Anybody Listening?

By GORDON HASKELL

NEW YORK, September 21—The 1954 session of the General Assembly of the United Nations opened here today without causing much of a stir. If there was ever any doubt about the importance of the role the UN can play in the world much has happened to dispel it during the past few months. No major decision has been made through UN channels this summer. In fact, it is quite clear that when real diplomatic work is at hand, the relatively open arena of the UN is shunned in favor of the more intimate surroundings of secret diplomacy.

Outside of the United Nations, the French made a deal with the Russian and Chinese Stalinists over Indochina. The current diplomatic crisis in the capitalist camp was brought to a head over the French rejection of the European Defense Community, a project conceived, developed and killed without benefit of UN auspices.

Symbolic of the impotence of the UN in the context of cold-war pressure and the decisive weight of great power politics is the fact that the present Assembly session is completely overshadowed by the forthcoming London conference on the attempt to find a substitute for the defunct European Defense Community. Most of the foreign ministers of the governments which will meet in London will not even attend the opening sessions of the Assembly, while others will quickly leave the speech-fest on the banks of the East River for more important business on the banks of the Thames.

If there is any interest at all in the forthcoming sessions of the UN talking-shop, they revolve around the ways and means by which the Stalinists will be able to make diplomatic capital out of the exposure of the frictions and cleavages which run through the capitalist camp.

CHINA AND THE UN

The first Stalinist offensive is expected to be the renewed demand that the Stalinist Peiping government replace Chiang Kai-shek's Formosa clique as the government of China. A strong grouping of capitalist powers would be willing to back this demand, if only they were not sure that the United States, primarily for inner-political reasons, are determined to block it. The British have already agreed to keep Stalinist-China out of the UN, as a sort of salve on the wounds of U. S. prestige they helped the French to inflict at Geneva. For the rest, the State Department is lucky to have an almost solid block of Latin American governments in its pocket on this question, or it would find rough sledding.

The other matters which appear likely to find their way on the Gen-

(Turn to last page)

How to Stop Stalinism in Asia

A secret document of the Burmese Communist Party, which came to light in Rangoon, is made public in the organ of the Indian socialists. It is exceedingly interesting in casting light on the question: How to stop Stalinism in Asia

For in this document the CP leaders of Burma themselves survey the reasons why and how they WERE stopped cold in Burma, under the socialist government.

The CP document admits that the party organization is in a state of serious deterioration, that the government is gaining influence while they are losing steadily. On the whole it has to be admitted, says the report, that although the government did not completely succeed in wiping out the CP's movement during 1953, it undoubtedly scored a good measure of success. This is true, stresses the report, despite what it describes as the economic difficulties of the country.

The Stalinist analysis says that the reasons for this state of affairs is that the government has been able to create a favorable impression on the people by its social welfare programs, its "sham

fight" against Chiang Kai-shek's guerrillas within its borders, and its "pretensions" to neutrality in taking the step of renouncing U. S. aid.

The socialist regime—it complains—has based its attack on the CP on four slogans, namely: (1) it won independence for Burma; (2) it has maintained neutrality between the two power blocs; (3) it is building a socialist state; and (4) the Burmese CP is betraying the country's interests in favor of foreign powers.

AGAINST THIRD CAMP

In one section the report sums up the government's successes as follows: It convened the nation-wide All-Burma Peasants' Organization Conference in Mandalay. It held municipal elections in all the large towns of Upper Burma, in which it achieved outstanding successes. It was able to gain widespread popular support for the army through the "sham fight" against the Chiang guerrillas. It was able to make political use of surrendered Stalinists who revealed the secrets of the underground party.

A most interesting section is devoted to frantic urging that the Stalinists must at all costs try to refute the government's claim that it has remained "neutral" between the two power blocs. The report stresses that as long as the people believe that Burma is truly "neutral" the CP will not be able to gain the support of the masses. The party is exhorted to focus its efforts on destroying this belief among the people and demonstrating that the country's neutrality is only a "pretense."

The Burmese socialists, whose party controls the government, are not of the "neutralist" type so common in Europe, especially among Stalinoids. Its leaders speak in terms of a clear Third Camp position opposed to both capitalism and Stalinism in the world, and indeed distinguish themselves from the fuzzy "neutrality" of a Nehru.

And whatever other defects of the Burmese socialist government may be, the Stalinists admit that their influence is being steadily decimated before the people in the face of the social and foreign-policy program of the Third Camp socialists.

UAW Pickets Turn the Tide In Square-D Strikebreaking

By JACK WILSON

DETROIT, September 20—On the 92nd day of the bitter Square D strike in Detroit, a spokesman for the United Auto-workers Union (CIO) said that the international union approved of the aid given the hard pressed independent United Electrical Workers, by some UAW local unions.

And, with this virtual reversal of policy, the UAW put the stamp of approval on the strike of 1,200 Square D employees for a new contract. It further ended the most ambitious strike breaking campaign this city has seen in recent years.

Credit for the change in policy, and the much needed support to this legitimate strike goes, however, to Carl Stellato, president of Ford Local 600, Paul Silvers, another independent UAW local president, and other dissident elements who refused to stand by while scabs were hired and a strike was openly broken in Detroit, center of the UAW-CIO.

Each day in the past week, mass picketing, organized by sympathizers from the UAW has put life and courage into the strikers, and more than offset the heavily armed city police who guard 200 or so scabs.

The change in the situation was illustrated this week when police arrested ten scabs after work, for minor traffic and state motor vehicle regulations, something not likely to inspire them to march through picket lines.

Furthermore, it has taken the greatest restraint on the part of union leaders to keep the pickets from forcibly blocking the scabs each day from going into the plant, and even the Detroit police commissioner said kind words about the UAW leaders who have managed to keep things under control.

STRIKEBREAKING DOOMED

At present, the situation is nearly the opposite of that which an arrogant management had foreseen and planned. Their plans to break the Square D strike are doomed.

Square D management thought they had a perfect formula for busting the union. Back in May the independent, Stalinist-controlled UE union won an election against the International Union of Electrical Workers (IUE-CIO) by more than a two to one majority, in spite of a terrific campaign, with crude red-baiting as a major argument against the UE, (merely pointing to the UE as Stalinist dominated didn't suffice for a program of victory, the IUE-CIO found out, too late.)

When contract negotiations came up soon thereafter, the company indicated it expected to break the union, and a strike was inevitable. During the summer, the 1,200 workers on strike were hammered again and again with the theme that this was nothing but a "red plot." The UE leaders were pin-pointed by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, through Representative Kit Clardy of Michigan, as "Communists," and the atmosphere for a back to work movement was prepared.

The company figured also that in a city with 175,000 unemployed, many workers would be starved back to their jobs. They calculated, and correctly so, on a Republican city administration to furnish heavy police protection for strike-

breakers. And they expected a complete "hands off" policy by the CIO, because of the deadly rivalry between the UE and the CIO.

When the plant was re-opened on Sept. 2, and a hundred persons at the most resumed work, the company felt it had a good start, especially since 14 leaders of the campaign to get the workers to join the CIO were among those who walked through the picket line.

Emboldened, the company put ads in Detroit's daily papers openly calling for scabs. And a few persons responded, as scores of Detroit mounted police kept union pickets a safe distance away.

During these few hectic days, the UAW and the CIO kept a prudent silence, although bitter criticism of the pro-CIO leaders in the plant enabled the independent union leaders to have a field day in terms of argument against the CIO.

Each day saw an increase in the picket lines as many unemployed CIO workers, and secondary shop leaders of the UAW began joining the battle, provoked by the sight of scabs marching into a plant under police protection in Detroit.

UAW WORKERS JOIN

The appearance of Ford Local 600, and other locals, which are largely anti-administration put a new context to the strike. Two days after a mass picket line with many UAW members began bolstering the strikers, Emil Mazey, UAW secretary-treasurer came out with an ambiguous statement, denouncing the "Commie line" leaders but warning against breaking strikes by the management. Its misinterpretation by the press and radio led to a report throughout Detroit that the UAW was tolerating the union-busting. It took more careful explaining to resist the pressures and criticism arising in all CIO ranks here from that press release.

The Wayne County CIO council came out openly for support of the strike, and by Sept. 13, the UAW itself officially acted under the pressure of the local unions, and its members, and recognized their efforts to aid the strikers.

On Sept. 13, the 14 CIO leaders in Square D announced they would not report to work, and urged other men in the plant to do likewise. They urged the company to close the plant, and added, "in view of the fact that UE's significance in the strike is completely overshadowed by that of the CIO, it is our

hope that by staying away from our jobs at this time we will expedite both our affiliation with the CIO and the ultimate signing of a strike settlement with the Square D company."

The emphasis on "affiliation" illustrated, of course, how blindly factional some CIO leaders are today in face of a crucial strike situation, in which the most important issue is to keep Detroit from being the scene of a successful, open strike breaking campaign.

It used to be ABC in the UAW that the way to beat the Stalinist dominated unions and factions was to do more for the workers. The UAW today winning the strike for the independent union would provide an invincible argument for the CIO with the strikers, when another election could be called next year. The change in the strike situation itself testifies to the value of CIO support and affiliation.

LABOR SOLIDARITY

But having CIO leaders walk through picket lines simply provides the Stalinists with excellent propaganda material which they have not been slow in using. And the fact that it took the pressure of the dissidents in the UAW to force a public statement of support of the strike hasn't assisted any long range program to win these workers to the CIO banner.

Besides the direct support of hundreds and hundreds of CIO militants to the strike, and the active support now by "right wing" locals including Briggs 212 which was the first "right-wing" local to march in the picket line, the nearness of the coming election has dictated a more cautious policy on the part of city officials in seeking to aid the company in breaking the strike. Mayor Cobo has maintained a prudent silence, after his first announcement that police protection would be furnished scabs.

In various minor court cases involving strike leaders, a judge has been denouncing the company, and refusing to carry out the implications of an injunction previously granted.

No matter what the eventual outcome, in terms of an actual contract and union affiliation, the big lesson of strike has not been lost either on employers or conservative union leaders. The potential of the rank and file and the traditions of Detroit labor are not to be lightly dismissed.

The best laid plans do go astray: In this case, they certainly did.

Scientist Hits Falsification of A-Radiation Peril

By CARL DARTON

Two recent items in the news should, but probably won't rock the complacency of public officials who glibly discount the hazards to the general public of radioactive "fall out" from A- and H-bomb test explosions.

The first is from the New York Times of September 12:

"The human race cannot stand more than a few thousand large atomic explosions, whether they hit or miss targets, Dr. E. D. Adrian warned in the presidential address of the British Association for the Advancement of Science. 'We must face the possibility that repeated atomic explosions will lead to a degree of general radioactivity which no one can tolerate or escape,' the British physiologist warned at the opening session of the meeting Wednesday."

As a grim companion piece we find in Science of Sept. 10 an article by A. H. Sturtevant of the California Institute of Technology, "Social Implications of the Genetics of Man." Among other things Dr. Sturtevant discusses the harmful effects of A- and H-bomb explosions, to the radiations from which all of us have been subjected over the past several years. He points out that radiation damages are of two types: first that to the exposed indi-



vidual which occurs in a short time, and secondly, the harm to the genes in his germ cells. The first is more or less immediate in its results, while the second has detectable effects only in future generations.

The immediate effects of radiation, Dr. Sturtevant continues, are more easily guarded against. Recovery is possible, particularly if doses or exposure are well spaced apart in time. At least, that is the officially accepted viewpoint. However, the gene or germ effect may constitute a hazard to the individual resulting in the development of malignant growths years after the exposure. To quote Dr. Sturtevant: "There is, in fact, no clearly safe dosage—all high energy radiation, even of low intensity and brief duration, must be considered as potentially dangerous to the exposed individual."

MUTATIONS AND GENETICS

Relative to the hereditary effects it is indicated that high-energy radiation produces mutations (changes) in the germ structure which are cumulative and are passed on to succeeding generations. These changes in the germ structure are mostly harmful resulting in early death or defects in future generations.

Dr. Sturtevant states that "There is no possible escape from the conclusion that the bombs already exploded will ultimately result in the production of numerous defective individuals—if the human species itself survives for many generations. And every new bomb exploded, since its radioactive products are widely dispersed over the earth, will result in an increase in this harvest of defective individuals. Some such defectives would be present if the bombs had never been invented; the point is that the number due to the bombs will be added to this irreducible minimum."

Because of the above Dr. Sturtevant takes to task Chairman Strauss of the Atomic Energy Commission who in an official press release on March 31, 1954 stated that bomb tests result in only low radiation exposure which is not harmful. Such official viewpoints fail to recognize the delayed biological hazards for later life and future generations.

Here we have two incidents of scientists speaking out against the irresponsible position of public officials who find it convenient to disregard the findings of science in such matters of life and death.

LABOR SCOPE

American-Slovenian Organ Calls for Labor Party

We reprint here a section of the Labor Day editorial which appeared in Prosveta, official organ of the Slovenian National Benefit Society (SNPJ), an organization with 70,000 members in the United States.—Ed.

It is a fact that labor problems are never "settled." Instead of being satisfied with a low standard of living which halts progress, civilization demands that life for all of us shall become richer and fuller. This means constant change and adjustment.

Moreover, this means that these changes will never cease, but the objectives could be reached much faster through labor political action combined with the action of labor unions. However, it is regrettable that today the great American labor force is politically impotent because it lacks its own political party. In fact, out of some 60 million workers only about one third or 20 million are organized in labor unions.

Without real political power in local, state and federal governments labor cannot expect to play its historic role in domestic and foreign affairs, but must depend solely on powerful private interests to play politics, which are often harmful to the interests of the workers and highly advantageous to profiteers.

American labor sooner or later must become aware of its political potentialities, for the ability to see and understand these problems is not limited to the men at the top, whatever may be their professional position in education or economics or politics.

An important fact to be remembered in this connection is that labor will have an increasingly important place in world affairs only when it realizes its political power. Of course, with this development there will come to labor a larger responsibility for the well-being of all citizens.

It was this labor philosophy which was incorporated in our Society's Constitution and Declaration Principles by our pioneering founders 50 years ago.

World History—Year by Year

The bound volumes of LABOR ACTION

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

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

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

Independent Socialist Press
114 West 14 Street, New York City

Get All Your Books from
LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 West 14 Street, New York City

THE CHOICES BEFORE BRAZIL

Rising Discontent of Working Class Faces All the Contenders

By BRASILEIRO

RIO DE JANEIRO, September 20—President Vargas' suicide was a logical consequence of his dictatorial political career. It was, for the moment a sterile, fruitless political act, because it could not restrain the main political process in the country, that is, the attack of the bourgeois opposition against the ex-dictator's regime. Even if Vargas' tragic death shocked public opinion, it could not save the regime of the old "caudillo." On the contrary, it accelerated the seizure of the government by Vargas' political adversaries.

The suicide's constitutional successor, Joao Cafe Filho, has a completely different political past, and was himself the victim of Vargas' persecution. He belongs to the party of Adhemar de Barros, the PSP (Progressive Social Party), which was in the opposition. His election to the vice-presidency as Vargas' running mate was the result of a momentary political situation and of the formlessness of Brazilian political life.

The strong man in Cafe Filho's cabinet is the "brigadeiro" Eduardo Gomes, leader of the Union Democratica Nacional (UDN), candidate for the presidency and a political adversary of Vargas. The new cabinet is a coalition between the UDN and PSD (Partido Social Democrata de E. Dutra, who was president of Brazil after Vargas' first defeat), with the participation of other parties, including the PTB (Vargas party), represented by the minister of labor, Guimaraes. The minister of the treasury, Gudim, has promised anti-inflationary measures, and an "open door" for foreign capital. Thus the opposition has conquered the government of the country, in spite of the suicide, and is governing in spite of Vargas' corpse.

POPULAR SENTIMENT

It is true that the popular sentiment, which was against Vargas because of his "anti-consumer" policy, changed in his favor after his suicide. But this was a sentiment of human compassion, without political consequences. The strikes in Sao Paulo and Porto Alegre did not take on a "queremist" (pro-Vargas) character. They were the expression of popular discontent with high prices, low wages and the inflationary policy of the government. The strikes had been prepared while Vargas was still alive and were a manifestation of the disgust, grumbling and uneasiness of the masses with the policy of the dominant classes.

Of course, the strike in Sao Paulo was also directed against the "generals," in defense of democracy and the social legislation which the workers regard as their own. But it did not constitute a special success for Vargas' policies. On the contrary, the slight increase in the growing influence of the Communist Party is, in my opinion, proof of the growing independence of the working class. The general strike was, in the first place, an expression of the workers' economic dissatisfaction, and also a certain warning to the rightist opposition, that it should not go too far to the right, because the working class is watching.

WORKERS ARE NEUTRAL

Working class support for Vargas' policies is, in my opinion, overestimated. In any event, it is much weaker now than it has been in the past. The recent strike was precisely the expression of the independence and "neutrality" of the workers in the fight among different antagonistic bourgeois factions. The workers limited their policy to the defense of their wages, and to demands for the stabilization of prices and the defense of democratic rights. This was an expression of class independence in the face of the conflicting bourgeois camps. This spontaneous position of the workers cannot be changed by the clamorous propaganda claims of the "queremists" and Stalinists that the strike was a manifestation of their own influence. Politically the strike was limited to a warning by the working class that it will not tolerate a military or rightist dictatorship directed against the workers, or one which endangers the democratic political or social labor laws. Therefore the strike did not have any immediate political consequences, and did not restrain the organization of the new government.

What will the results be of the next elections to Congress and for the presidency of the country? That is the question.

It is true that the Vargas bonapartist regime is finished and that the party of the ex-dictator, the PTB (Partido Trabalhista Brasileiro) is incapable of assuming the political inheritance of the "caudillo." It is very weak and divided into two factions of which one is collaborating with the government under the leadership of Minister of Labor Guimaraes. The other faction, under the leadership of Jango Goulart, ex-minister of labor, suspended by Vargas under the pressure of the generals, is staying in the opposition.

The situation is so bad that some of Vargas' collaborators are talking about the organization of a new "revolutionary party" which would be more capable of leading the political struggle for "queremism."

A NEW PERIOD

The country is now entering a new period of political development. The 25 years of Vargas totalitarian and bonapartist policy are gone forever. Future political developments will depend to a great degree on the policy of the present cabinet, on its capacity to master the economic crisis (that is, to sell coffee at good prices in the North American market), to restrain the inflationary process, to stabilize prices and wages without inhibiting Brazil's process of industrialization.

This could only be made possible by

LONDON LETTER

Bread and Butter at the TUC Conference

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, September 15—On the home front, the TUC Congress in its last two days, Thursday and Friday, discussed some important matters.

The most important resolution was a vaguely worded expression of dissatisfaction with the Tory government's economic policies "... prices have risen, ... our export trade is threatened ... there is a danger of mass unemployment ... and our economic defenses have been weakened in the face of any recession abroad."

Ernest Jones, Mineworkers Union president, moved the resolution. He talked about growing foreign competition, and the impossibility of restricting imports which drained away our resources. More profits should be ploughed back into industry instead of being distributed.

H. Child (Tailors and Garment Workers) said that the Tories' promises of cheaper food when they come to power had not been kept. Since 1950 the cost of living index had risen by 29 points.

Ted Hill of the Boilermakers Union opposed the resolution on the grounds that the employers would use it to discourage wage rises by pointing to the TUC's statement of the necessity for higher investment.

Dr. Evans, of the Medical Practitioners Union, demanded more safety committees in factories. So far only 3,500 had been started among 243,000 factories. Dr. Evans was supported by Mr. Brothill of the Railwaymen, who said that while in 1952 over 17,000 railmen were injured very many railway workers were still not covered by factory legislation; their accident rate was 10 per cent of the whole country.

On the other hand, Alf Roberts, for the General Council of the TUC, opposed statutory safety committees which might decrease employers' liabilities for accidents. He said the resolution might tie the hands of the Congress' representatives on the Industrial Safety Sub-Committee, and got the resolution remitted to the General Council.

HEATED DEBATE

There was a heated debate on the question of extending the age of retirement. Jim Mortimer (Engineering and Shipbuilding Draughtsmen) proposed a resolution stating that citizens had the right to expect to retire at the age of 65, although they could continue working if they wanted to do so.

For the General Council Miss Godwin (Clerical and Administrative Workers) said that they wanted to remove from the

large-scale North American credits and investments applied in such a way as to prevent economic extortion without at the same time restraining the country's industrial development.

The United States now has a great opportunity to restrain a growing development of "anti-Americanization" in Latin America, and to deliver a blow to "Peronism" and Stalinism throughout the area. But it is very doubtful that the U. S. politicians will take advantage of this opportunity. This writer is also very pessimistic about the future policy of the Brazilian government. It will probably go farther to the right than it should from the standpoint of the progressive bourgeoisie. And it will probably prove incapable of solving the economic crisis in the face of the opposition of the backward "feudal-bourgeoisie" (a term known only in South America), so that it will in all likelihood nourish an upsurge of nationalism, a new "queremism."

The incapacity and the rudeness of United States policy in South America, and the voraciousness of the American monopolies can stimulate the regeneration of Brazilian "Peronism," which could finish with a "Yennan Way," that is, a duplication of the Chinese Stalinist experiment in South America. One must bear in mind that the Communist Party of Brazil is a uniquely organized party, and the enormous territory of Brazil is excellent for a "guerrilla" experiment.

From this point of view, the developments in Bolivia, Guatemala and Argentina are very significant indeed.

minds of the workers the idea that there was any particular date of retirement. At present over 800,000 men and women were taking advantage of legislation allowing them to work beyond the retirement age.

The General Council was defeated by 5,156,000 [bloc] votes to 2,794,000.

The same sort of disagreement as to whether a particular stand taken by the TUC would be good or bad for the workers as a whole occurred during the debate on Friday. Almost unanimously they voted for a resolution of the General Council calling for wage restraint, coupled with restraint on profits, so that money would retain its value.

The two main arguments for wage restraint were put by C. Smith (Post Office-Engineering Union), and Ernest Jones. Smith thought that "higher productivity is still the most important factor from which we can hope for reductions in prices, and improvement in real wages." Jones said that "if wage restraint is abandoned, it will give an unfair advantage to the big unions ... in coal mining one section could strike to the disadvantage of another, and lower paid men would lose heavily."

MORRISON ADDRESS

On Thursday, Herbert Morrison spoke to the TUC as a fraternal delegate of the Labor Party. In a wordy address, he used such platitudes as "The Labor Party and TU Movement must test policy by fact. It must adapt itself to changing circumstances if it is to keep up to date. ... Slogans are often substitutes for thinking. ... Large instalments of Socialism have been implemented by the Labor government, but legislation in itself is not enough, it does not bring the promised end ... we need the moral factor and the factor of public service."

He called Socialism "the democratic assertion of social responsibilities for matters which are properly a social concern." He therefore included UN, NATO and other organizations as implying the principle of Socialism. If, however, these organizations could not work, they must apply the principles of collective security to ensure peace ... etc., etc. In other words, Morrison in his half-hour address was in Disraeli's famous phrase "inebriated with the exuberance of his own verbosity." No more disappointing, uninspired speech was heard during the whole conference, yet it was met with a good deal of applause.

At a "private" session on Thursday, a levy of 12 cents to pay for the new TUC Memorial Hall was decided on. Two cents of the levy (amounting to nearly

...What the Right Hand Is Doing

While Secretary of Labor Mitchell acted out his part before the AFL convention, bitterly complaining at labor's unfriendliness to the GOP administration, other Eisenhower underlings spoke more sweetly elsewhere.

Speaking before a Chamber of Commerce meeting in Kansas City, Mo., Undersecretary of Commerce Lothair Tee-tor assured his fellow businessmen that "the attitude of this administration" toward "all business" is "one of complete friendliness."

This official with the unlikely name is himself a former state president of the C. of C. of Indiana. At the meeting he frankly itemized the reactionary measures for which the business lobby proposed to fight.

He predicted that T-H amendments to be submitted to the next Congress by the administration would be such as would have "the unanimous support of the state Chambers of Commerce." Business, he said, had won a major victory in the tax-law revisions, but "there is still much to be done." He also bragged about his department's role in putting through two of Eisenhower's most anti-labor measures: the "secret strike ballot" and the states-rights amendment.

A Democratic congressman has also warned labor to expect a new T-H drive. Rep. Kelley (Pa.) foresaw "more and more anti-labor employers trying to use Taft-Hartley to destroy unions" as unemployment deepened.

\$200,000 out of \$900,000 to be raised) is to be used for aiding colonial trade unions.

On Friday a composite resolution proposed by Frank Foulkes (Electrical Trades Union) expressed "the profound conviction that the extension of public ownership to decisive sections of the national economy is a vital prerequisite for the achievement of an ordered, efficient and progressive economy." The chemical and engineering industries were mentioned in the resolution. It condemned the bad record of the building industry in restrictive practices, and supported the Labor Party's proposal for a National Building Corporation.

NATIONALIZATION

In proposing the resolution, Foulkes said that it was urgent that the heavy sections of the electrical industry be nationalized. But Lowthian (Building Trade Workers) claimed the distinction of wanting urgent attention. "My industry is one of the oldest and one of the most inefficient in the country. It ought to have very early priority for nationalization."

The General Council had the resolution defeated because it was associated with the demand for abolition of wage restraint, and also because its proposers (the ETC) are under strong Stalinist influence. An anti-imperialist motion sponsored by the Stalinist-influenced Fire Brigades Union was passed over when Arthur Deakin made an attack on "the Soviet propagandists who have taken this rostrum today."

Resolutions approved included:

- (1) A condemnation of government encouragement of private air corporations competing with public ones.
- (2) A call for the abolition of entertainment tax on "live" shows, as the theatre industry is in great difficulties.
- (3) A demand for income tax deductions on workers' fares to and from work.
- (4) A request for more piped water in rural areas.
- (5) A resolution calling for expansion of trade with Russia and her satellites.

YOU'RE INVITED

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

A DISCUSSION: Zionism and 'Terminology'

By HAL DRAPER

Over at the righthand column, our valued contributor Al Findley has a letter which raises a point of view, at least a nuance, with regard to our anti-Zionism. He wrote the letter in (by editorial collusion) with the aim of evoking this comment and discussion, and so we are carrying out our part of the bargain here.

Comrade Findley puts it that he is raising a question of terminology ("semantics"). He basically agrees with the ISL views on the subject, but in effect he asserts that these views are directed against only one form of Zionism—that form of Zionism which claims that "all Jews must necessarily owe allegiance to [a] Jewish state." So he refuses to describe himself as "anti-Zionist."

It is tempting to agree that this is simply a "terminological" question and let it go at that. But—

After all, in a real but useless way almost anything can be reduced to "terminology." It is perfectly possible to define socialism as merely "one form of liberalism" by an appropriate extension of the term liberalism. It even has been done, especially by socialists whose own separation from liberalism is not very clear. It could be justified; but if Comrade Findley would demur, at least one reason is this: Such a "terminological" amalgam of socialism and liberalism would tend to blur precisely that difference which makes them, or ought to make them, distinct political movements in real political life. In point of fact, it is a "terminological" approach which has appealed only to those socialistic elements who do want to blur the line between liberalism and socialism in political life and not only in "semantics."

So we ought to beware of "terminological" approaches which blur understanding rather than help it.

Therefore we point out first that we are using the term Zionism in the same way as it is used by virtually the whole Zionist movement in real political life. Comrade Findley knows that—cf. his second sentence.

WHO ARE ZIONISTS?

But, he argues, there are Zionists who "reject the political ideas and 'ethos'" of the Zionist parties, yet continue to call themselves Zionists. He points to the existence of such people and rests his "terminological" case. But this is not helpful. There are all kinds of "socialists," all kinds of "liberals," "democrats," and "Zionists." It is inevitable that there be mixed-up Zionists and inconsistent Zionists, as there are such categories in every other field. Whom is Comrade Findley pointing to?

He is pointing to two examples. His examples help to show the trouble with his "terminological" approach. They are the "American Zionists" and the "cultural-Zionists."

(1) It is not true that the "American Zionists" reject the ideas of typical Zionism. Findley is thinking of something else.

The mass of "American Zionists" simply refuse to draw the personal consequences of their ideas, i.e., emigration to Israel. This is why they have been denounced by Ben-Gurion and Zionists abroad. The American Zionist movement is a scandal in the world organization. They are a case of people who proclaim their agreement with the full program of Zionism for others, but for themselves it would mean too much sacrifice. Their case has little to do with "terminology" except insofar as "terms" are used to cover up the smell of the fleshpots.

We have here pathetically inconsistent Zionists, that's all. And this should not confuse us into making Zionism a "terminological" question.

INCONSISTENT ZIONISM

(2) The second example is also a case of inconsistent Zionism, insofar as it bears on the question. The term "cultural-Zionism" means little by itself; as soon as some elementary questions are asked, it immediately breaks up into either (a) a clear form of Zionism, perhaps with a

secondary emphasis; or (b) a notion which cannot be labeled Zionism in any sense whatever.

If one looks to build a cultural center for Jews (a cultural "Zion") somewhere in the world, that may be in New York or Vienna or Rome or Palestine, or in any and all Jewish communities at once; but such aspirations have nothing whatsoever to do with Zionism in anyone's terminology—until the question is raised of the political and territorial context of such a cultural "Zion." When any given "cultural-Zionist" answers this question for himself, he must either accept or reject "the political ideas" of the Zionist movement. Naturally, not all people think such questions through for themselves. When they do not, they sometimes use the label "cultural-Zionist" as a label for their particular species of confusion.

Why should anyone think in terms of a single world cultural center of Jewry, unless he is already thinking in terms of a single political-state center? Birobidjan was, in its own way, a type of proposal for a Jewish cultural center (even a territorial center of a sort), without the Russians thereby becoming "Zionists." A cultural center can be established by minority treaty rights within another state, without anyone looking on the arrangement as fulfillment of Zionism. Similarly, a Jewish (or other minority) cultural center can be established and maintained simply by democratic toleration and support within another state. . . . None of this becomes "cultural-Zionism" until a sufficient admixture of the real Zionist ideology has been added: for example, the proviso that there must be a single cultural center and in Palestine at that.

So Findley's examples are not examples—not for his "terminological" point.

ZIONISM & CHAUVINISM

Now there are a couple of useful terminological distinctions that can and should be made, as long as the question has been raised. For example, there is the useful term "Jewish territorialism" as distinct from Zionism.

The Marxist (anti-Zionist) point of view does not automatically exclude all conceptions of some kind of territorial center for Jews. For example, the concept of a Birobidjan may be good or bad, and we are not interested at the moment in the Stalinist execution of it, but certainly our point of view does not automatically rule such a project out. It can fairly be considered a form of socialist Jewish territorialism in a broad sense, as distinct from Zionism. So also Trotsky had interesting ideas on the possibility, under socialism, of some kind of new territorial center for those Jews who wished to found a new life in such a way. All of this is outside the Zionist framework.

But if one insists that such a territorial center must be in Palestine; or if one insists that such a territorial center must be the homeland of all Jews in the world (Ingathering of the Exiles); or even if one insists on calling and making such a territory a "Jewish state" in the Israeli sense—then, we must conclude, a different set of political ideas is involved and this latter is the political ideology of Zionism.

A second "terminological" point is implicit in the ISL resolution on the subject, as Comrade Findley knows. Our resolution does not reject "Jewish nationalism" per se. It looks on Zionism as a reactionary form of Jewish nationalism (Jewish chauvinism).

None of this probably has much to do with the "anti-Zionism" of the Arab socialists (Maksoud). The latter's emphasis is on opposition to Israel, it would seem.

Lastly: the ISL resolution, it is true, "leaves open the theoretical question of whether the Jews are a nation, people, etc." It would be wrong to pass resolutions on mooted points of theory; resolutions are limited to settling political questions. Instead our resolution points out that the specific Jewish community in Palestine acted as a national people. I would add that this already indicates a correct approach. It does not speak of "the Jews" but of a given and existing Jewish community in a given territory and society. In my reply to Maksoud I wrote that I doubt whether it is at all meaningful to talk about "the Jews" in any other way. Outside of the tribal mysticism of the Zionists, I cannot see anyone looking on the Yemenite Jews as being a part of the same (separate) national people as the Jewish community in (say) Mt. Vernon.

To the Editor:

With reference to the exchange of views in LABOR ACTION on the position of the Arab socialists, allow me to point out a difference between the anti-Zionism of Draper and the anti-Zionism expressed by Maksoud.

Draper's anti-Zionism is opposition to the political ideology and program of the Zionist parties, including such ideas as the following: that all Jews must necessarily owe allegiance to the Jewish state; that the Jews must inevitably and for all time be alien and hated by their neighbors, etc.

Maksoud's anti-Zionism is that any idea of a Jewish territorial center is reactionary, and he opposes categorically any idea that the Jews may be a nation or a people.

Draper (or the ISL), as far as I understand, leaves open the theoretical question of whether the Jews are a nation, people, etc. He is in favor of allowing Jews the right of self-determination, and includes in that, the right to choose a territorial basis for their self-determination.

For my part Draper is wrong insofar as he identifies Zionism per se with the above ideas. Many Zionists accept the idea of a territorial center in Israel and reject the political ideas and "ethos" that Draper and I object to. This is true especially of American Zionists and "cultural Zionists." My disagreement with characterizing ourselves as anti-Zionist is therefore one really of semantics. Neither of our points of view has any connection with Maksoud's kind of anti-Zionism.

AL FINDLEY

YOU and SCIENCE

We Go Slumming in the Astrological Underworld

By CARL DARTON

When we meet an engineer or scientist who says he is a "socialist," we naturally get interested. We want to discuss with him, broach some ideas, etc. So we did in a recent case. We knew the person in question habitually showed a certain disregard for concrete and immediate social issues, so we tried to tackle a question of more general interest. Before we could say abracadabra, we found ourselves confronted with the following question:

"Do you believe in a vast Cosmic Ocean which surrounds us all, a sort of Soul of the Universe from which we receive our very thoughts, our ideas, our incentives for action?"

Before we could recover balance, the intended victim thrust into our hands two issues of a magazine named *Horoscope*.

He insisted on calling attention particularly to an article entitled "Astrology in the World Today," by one Sidney Omarr. The subtitle read: "An Interview with Dr. Gustaf Stromberg and Aldous Huxley."

Unaccustomed as we are to the esoteric terms and unusual style of the astrological underworld of pseudo-science, we did manage to arrive with some difficulty at a fair understanding of the author's thesis. Author Omarr is seeking some sort of endorsement from modern science for astrology. He is trying to show that he has got it, in these interviews with Huxley and Stromberg.

SWEEPING CLAIMS

It is naturally impossible here to list all the examples of sweeping claims and faulty conclusions which pepper the article.

We should remember that Huxley is not representative of modern science even though he—

(a) is an "author who is one of the most distinguished literary figures of our times."

(b) "belongs to a famous scientific family."

(c) "is noted for his provocative use of scientific and philosophic ideas in such novels as *Point Counter Point* and *Brave New World*."

(d) is "one of the rare minds of our time."

(e) is quoted as saying that "We had better admit then that there will probably never be a completely adequate science of man."

The same is true of Stromberg, who, the article claims, is "a simple man in the best sense of the word. He is enthusiastic, perceptive, and sympathetic to the problems faced by astrology in a generally hostile scientific world." Stromberg was trained, and for years was an astronomer, at the Carnegie Institute's Mount Wilson Observatory. More recently he has been analyzing "data on certain 'living fields' which seem to have their roots in a non-physical world, a world beyond the realm of space and time."

One can only agree with Omarr that the doctor is "unlike most astronomers."

In all fairness to Huxley and Stromberg, it must be reported that they did not actually endorse astrology. Omarr tries hard to make the identification with remarks such as: "Like students of astrology, Huxley has been concerned with man himself and the world in which he lives." To the direct question of what the

two famous "scientists" thought about astrology, the best he could get from Huxley was: "It is a strange subject. . . . The reason most scientists are inclined to veer away from astrology is that it falls in the philosophical realm."

That last remark of Huxley's would be nearer correct if it said "mystic realm." While it may be true that most scientists do not concern themselves directly with philosophical questions, this is an entirely different attitude from that toward pseudo-scientific quackery like astrology.

SCIENTIFIC BACKING?

Certain scientific observations and theories were dragged in by the *Horoscope* article to support the validity of astrology.

• Item: Terrestrial magnetic storms coincide with certain positions of the planets. These storms affect our physical environment and thus our lives. Therefore, it has now been "proved" by science that astrology is correct in one of its main claims that the position of the planets directly affects individual lives. . . .

• Item: Dr. Shapley of the Harvard Observatory has declared that there are 100 million planets which may be "life theaters." Omarr concludes that this is a rebuff to those scientists who are "only too ready to shut their minds to any influences, let alone life, from other planets." . . .

• Item: The menstrual period of women has much in common with the lunar cycle, being approximately the same length. This tremendous discovery then becomes a justification for the study of astrology.

Among the various quack devices for fortune-telling, astrology seems to be pre-eminent in its appeal to otherwise educated and intelligent people. Perhaps its reputed vogue in the Hollywood and entertainment world is exaggerated, but surely it is greater than the general level of intelligence among its victims would make plausible.

The background of this fact is undoubtedly composed of feelings of uncertainty and insecurity, perhaps more acute than elsewhere, but just as undoubtedly, one factor responsible is astrology's effort to cover itself with the mantle of science.



LABOR ACTION

September 27, 1954 - Vol. 18, No. 39

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

WEEK by WEEK . . .

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

A sub is only \$2 a year!

A New Test of Academic Freedom Arises as U. of Calif. Institutes Loyalty Oaths for All Students!

By EDWARD HILL

An Editorial: THE INFECTION SPREADS

This issue of *Challenge* must, unfortunately, strike a deeply pessimistic note as the school year opens. Many have wondered in recent months if the seeming retreat of Senator McCarthy did not augur well for the cause of civil liberties in the United States.

Yet the error of such a devil-theory should be apparent from the contents of this page: the drive against freedom is a far more massive phenomenon than Senator McCarthy. The very springs and source of our political life have been poisoned.

The California case is a frightening example of this. In 1947, an attorney general of the United States, under a liberal administration, undemocratically issued a list of "subversive" organizations. It was an act of executive fiat, without any kind of hearing.

In 1954, that list is being used to deny an education to all but the one-hundred per-cent politically pure.

In 1954, free public education as a democratic institution is under attack in the United States as a result of the terrible inroads upon freedom which have been made since the publication of the list in 1947.

And the other side of the coin is represented in the discussion of the *London Times* analysis of American academic life. An "official," patriotic, chauvinist version of history has been developing ever since World War II. The witchhunt has not confined itself to oaths and firings and the various administrative procedures of anti-freedom. It has permeated even the free intelligence of the scholar.

We have proclaimed over and over that America is not yet a police state. Yet we also must say once again that the process of recent years has moved in that direction. And here, at the beginning of the school year, is the specific evidence that the drive toward conformism has not abated. More than ever before, a principled defense of the freedom of the university is imperative. The Young Socialist League will call upon all of its resources in order to participate in this critical struggle.

California has long been infamous for its "year of the oath," as the center of one of the most massive attacks on academic freedom, one which resulted in almost one hundred firings and resignations. Now, at the beginning of the new school year, it maintains its grisly pre-eminence, this time with a violation of student freedom which is far-reaching.

According to the *Daily Californian* (University of California at Berkeley), September 16, 1954, all entering male freshman and sophomores will be required to take a loyalty oath in order to enroll in ROTC; and ROTC is now compulsory. In other words, every male student entering the university will be required to take a loyalty oath.

The loyalty oath had been required of juniors and seniors who agreed to take four years of ROTC training, but this is the first time that it is being extended to freshmen and sophomores who are compelled to take ROTC. The details of the story are sketchy at the present writing, but it appears that this procedure may be adopted at all schools where there is compulsory ROTC, and perhaps at all land-grant colleges (although the land-grant college is not required to make ROTC compulsory; it must simply offer such training).

So far, one case of refusal to take the

oath has occurred. Ralph E. Ornelas, a freshman English major, refused to sign the oath when it was put before him at registration. He was told that his refusal may well mean that he will be dismissed from the university.

Reaction at California to this far-reaching breach of student freedom has not yet crystallized. So far, there is a possibility that the Northern California ACLU will fight a test case if one is offered. And Raphael Hanson, head of the Student Civil Liberty Union at Berkeley, has characterized the law as a "political test for students" and as "indefensible."

Members of the Young Socialist League in both Berkeley and Los Angeles are beginning a campaign against the student oath immediately, and have already made contact with the American Civil Liberties Union in South California about the case. YSL National Chairman Max Martin denounced the California oath as "one of the most extreme invasions of academic freedom yet made, and one which the Young Socialist League sees as so important that an immediate campaign against it must be started."

POLITICAL TEST

This new California case is the first instance of a political test for students. In recent years, faculty freedoms have been under attack in various universities and oaths have been used. But the reactionary drive against the student has not, until now, gone this far. There has been suppression of student rights to organize, to discuss, to have a free and open press, and the like, but this is the first attempt to move in an organized fashion against all radicalism and non-conformism.

It is hardly necessary to add for *Challenge* readers that the basis of the oath which is being used is the attorney general's list of 1947. The various organizations on this list have never had a hearing. Yet now the reactionary drive has gone so far that membership in any one of these groups which were undemocratically listed may mean that a student is denied his right to free public education. If extended to all land-grant universities, the total effect of this procedure would be to limit the scope of higher public education to the politically orthodox.

The Pandora's box of the witchhunt which was opened by the liberals in the late forties has now yielded an attack on the fundamental basis of free public education in the name of conformism.

What's Happened to American Historians?

By MICHAEL HARRINGTON

There has been increasing evidence in recent years of the development of a chauvinistic patriotism among American academicians and intellectuals. In a speech to a conference of professional historians several years ago, Samuel Eliot Morrison (an admiral in the United States navy) put forth a position dangerously near that of the subordination of scholarship to American political needs. And in the *Partisan Review* symposium on American culture, the majority of the non-academic intellectuals were in various stages of "rediscovering" the values of their homeland—and of its cold-war politics.

A foreign source now provides further documentation of this new intellectual revisionism. In the *London Times Literary Supplement* on American writing, an anonymous reviewer considers "The Movement of History in the United States."

His conclusion is that American historical writing has been tending toward patriotism and political motivation ever since World War II. The older American tradition, that of the iconoclastic historian, the muckraker and the radical intellectual, is losing out in the tensions of the cold war.

Prior to 1929, the reviewer holds, American history had its partisans, especially those who dealt with the Civil War. Yet the popular image of the American past was that of Crevecoeur's "new man," a figure of the frontier. The depression altered this.

The reviewer writes, "What no scholars, what no best-sellers could have done, was done by the depression: it shook the faith of the average American in America and so made him ready to consider more favorably the results of the critical historical scholarship of a generation."

The result was that a Jeffersonian social critic like Parrington could exercise a tremendous influence, and Charles Beard's economic interpretation of the Constitution could achieve wide acceptance.

A further result was the appeal of Marxism, and also Stalinism, to the American intellectual. The Marxism which the reviewer describes is not the

substantial work was done in the thirties by writers like Sidney Hook or Louis Hacker. It is more the naive versions of Marxist thought which had their vogue. The reviewer writes, "A simple system of motivation that would have shocked Marx himself was briskly applied."

Yet even with his overly critical attitude toward the development of Marxism in the United States and his failure to cite some of the more important work, he nevertheless concedes a beneficial result to this phenomenon. What developed was a more realistic assessment of the American past and present, in which the focus shifted from the frontiersman and the farmer to the entrepreneur and the rise of capitalism.

Indeed, the loss of faith in the old myth of America which occurred in the thirties is still with us. Yet now, it has a new political form, one symbolized by Allan Nevins' defense of the big-businessman. A new revision was in the offing.

Still, this development in American historical thought in the thirties was a free response to a new reality. Intellectual opinion did not, of course, exist in a vacuum. Attitudes toward the past were affected by the collapse of American capitalism in the present. But as yet, it was not a question of official history, of patriotic and politically motivated revision of the image of the past. This did not really begin until World War II.

HISTORY AS A WEAPON

The *Times* reviewer writes of this development: "[the war] produced what posterity may well judge to be a masterpiece, Admiral Morrison's history of the naval war in the Pacific. But it also bred a bad habit of using history as a weapon of political warfare. Scholars or semi-scholars had hardly adjusted themselves to seeing in Germany the *fons et origo mali* [source and origin of evil] when they had to do the same job for Soviet Russia."

And a little later: "... American history has never been more flourishing. But (and American historians are conscious of this) it is also, because of its prominence, in danger. It is called on, too often, and too loudly, to perform specific

patriotic tasks. It is assumed, too simply, that a study of American history must breed hope and faith if not charity."

What is exceptional about this judgment of the *Times* is that it is obviously written by a professional historian, that someone in the profession has, so to speak, broken silence. An academician has realized that the American university is more and more becoming subject to the terrible pressures of the cold war, and the image of the past is changing according to the needs of immediate foreign policy.

Yet more important than his simple conclusion is a discussion of what underlies this process. Liberals and ex-radicals who generally take Sidney Hook's line that "things are bad but not that bad," are always asking for cases, specific cases, where academic freedom has been endangered. *Challenge* has documented many cases in the brief months of its existence, at the Universities of California, Chicago, Michigan, New York, Columbia, etc. Unfortunately, we add one more case to the dossier with this issue.

But the out-and-out "case" is perhaps not as important as the development of an atmosphere within the American university which leads to the voluntary surrender of integrity. Many historians, like Morrison, have been in the employ of the government. Yet I do not think this is the main cause of the development of official history as described in the *London Times*. It is a more general factor, and therefore one that is more vague and difficult to document, which is at the root of the matter.

The tragedy is that this development of patriotic history has occurred without the extreme measures of the police state being invoked. We have not had Nazi-like tactics of terror and intimidation. But what has happened is that the tension of the cold war and the attitude of critical support of the West taken by most intellectuals have created an atmosphere of surrender, of retreat, an orthodoxy maintained more by a gentlemen's agreement than by stormtroopers.

There are specific cases aplenty. But there is also this over-all process which the *Times* reviewer describes, a spreading rot in the traditions of integrity of American scholarship.

A brilliant study
of the labor movement,
Now out of print—

"THE UAW AND WALTER REUTHER"

by Irving Howe
and B. J. Widick

\$3.00 A Random House Book

Order from

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

THE LEFT WING IN THE ALGERIAN FREEDOM MOVEMENT

Socialists Fight to Keep Militant Policy Against a Reformist-Stalinist Coalition

By A. GIACOMETTI

PARIS, September 12—The crisis which has existed for some time in the Mouvement pour le Triomphe des Libertés Démocratiques (MTLD), the successor to the illegal Parti Populaire Algérien, recently came to a head in a de-facto split of the movement.

For several months now the reformist policies of the majority of the Central Committee brought it into conflict with the revolutionary socialist tendency led by Messali Hadj, founder and chairman of the organization. Last March the CC decided to convene an "extraordinary congress" of the party, which was held in Brussels in July, to settle the conflict between the opposing policies. According to the CC decision in March, all tendencies were to be democratically represented. However, the delegates for the CC majority did not show up. The Brussels congress accused the CC majority of "appeasement and collaboration with the imperialists," decided to dissolve the old CC, and to expel eight of its members for "political deviation."

The CC majority reacted by calling another "extraordinary congress" in Algiers, recalled Messali and Mezerna, one of his close associates, denounced the participants in the Brussels congress as "split-ters," accused Messali of having disregarded the principles of "democratic centralism" and "collective leadership," and of imposing a "personal and dictatorial concept of party leadership." Consequently there are now, in fact, two organizations, each claiming to represent the MTLD. It is difficult to tell as yet what

following in the party each of these factions actually has. It would seem, however, that the Brussels congress has a majority in the ranks.

Since the MTLD's official publication, the *Algérie Libre*, remained under control of Messali's followers, the CC majority has published a new paper, the *Nation Algérienne*. On September 7, the followers of the Brussels congress attempted to oppose the publication of the first issue of the new paper, and fights broke out in Algiers between the adherents of the two tendencies. Fighting also took place between the "messalists" and the vendors of the Stalinist paper *Alger Républicain*, which had published documents of the CC majority.

REFORMIST POLICIES

The reformist policies of the CC majority, contradicting the revolutionary tradition and experience of the movement, have been characterized by an inability to follow a consistent and autonomous course, and by a tendency to capitulate to foreign pressures, in particular, those of colonialism and of Stalinism. A significant incident in this respect was the approval, last year, by the reformist-dominated MTLD fraction of the Algiers city council, of the colonialist city budget, with the exception of the budget for the police. Khouane, a leader of the reformist faction, had declared after the vote that "a new era of understanding and cooperation had dawned at Algiers city hall." From his exile in Niort, Messali wrote, on the other hand, that the vote seemed "unbelievable" to him, so "contradictory with the principles of the party" it was.

On December 10, 1953, the majority of the CC submitted a draft program to the party to prepare the formation of an Algerian National Congress including, besides the MTLD, the Stalinists and the reformist UDMA (Union Démocratique du Manifeste Algérien). This draft program conspicuously separated two aspects of the political struggle: it contains a section called "principles on independence" and another section on the "immediate program," the latter supposedly representing a common ground acceptable to all elements of the future coalition. The policy leading to the formation of a "national congress" is itself open to criticism from a revolutionary point of view, since the MTLD, by far the largest of the three parties, has to bear in any case the brunt of the anti-colonialist struggle and has nothing to gain from an alliance with the UDMA and the Algerian CP. But in addition, the draft program already reveals in anticipation some of the consequences that can be expected from this policy. A number of demands, formerly considered as a part of the immediate action program, had now been relegated to the realm of general principles. Thus the crucial demand for a sovereign and unified assembly, i.e., for independence, disappeared from the "immediate program."

BASIC CONDITION

Yet, independence is a basic condition without which even the partial demands of the Algerian people cannot be satisfied. As Lambert pointed out in the "official Trotskyist" paper *La Vérité*—to give credit where credit is due:

"There will be no 'schooling' facilities for all Algerian children, as the authors of the draft program demand, unless the Algerian Assembly can allot funds as it sees fit. In turn, a sovereign Algerian Assembly is not possible without the suppression of the two-chamber system. . . . The practical experience of the struggles in Morocco and Tunisia have shown that there can be no more realistic slogan for the oppressed peoples than national independence."

Other points, such as the demand of

turning over "the land to those who work it" disappeared altogether. Nor was anything said concerning the concrete means of implementing even those vague and general demands that had been maintained.

In their document commenting on the split, the followers of the Brussels congress state: "It appeared more and more that these omissions are not the result of some lack of consciousness but the deliberate content of a reformist policy." Even more serious, the document continues to say, was the "neglect of unity in the struggle (against colonialism) on the North African level, which expressed itself in the scandalous abandon of the Tunisian and Moroccan liberation movements. . . ." (On this point, the CC majority had declared that it does not "risk the future of the Algerian people and of North Africa on the basis of sentimental reactions.")

The importance of the political developments in the MTLD cannot be overestimated, because of the leading role of this party in the North African liberation movements. Unlike the Tunisian and the Moroccan nationalist parties, the Algerian MTLD has represented from the beginning a proletarian movement with a revolutionary socialist program.

A WORKERS MOVEMENT

In Tunisia a strong native urban and commercial bourgeoisie had been able to develop and to take the leadership of the nationalist movement, while using the UGTT as a battering ram. In Morocco, a classical case of combined and uneven development, foreign capital had superimposed a highly developed modern industry on a medieval theocracy; the Istiqlal party had therefore started out as a heterogeneous coalition of pan-Islamic, semi-feudal elements with a new and inexperienced working-class. In Algeria, on the other hand, the old indigenous ruling class had been completely exterminated by the French conquest, and its remnants absorbed into the new land-owning and commercial French ruling class. As a result, the struggle for national liberation in this country was, more clearly than anywhere else in North Africa, a class-

struggle, and the nationalist movement had from the beginning a distinctive social content, being almost exclusively a movement of the agricultural and industrial proletariat.

The UDMA represents a petty-bourgeois tendency based on the intellectuals in the cities, whereas the CP and SP are small organizations based on the European workers' aristocracy. None of these parties ever compared in strength with the MTLD.

Consequently, the MTLD occupied from the beginning a leading position in the North African liberation movement and in the colonial liberation movement in general. Because of its revolutionary socialist program, origin and tradition, it is, among the North African nationalist parties, the least exposed to reformist illusions. At the same time, it is also the least exposed to the reactionary radicalism of the religious fanatics, and the most capable of providing a revolutionary socialist alternative to both.

FRENCH REPRESSION

It is therefore not surprising that it was singled out very early by the French administration for particularly savage repression. The relative quiet for which Algeria has been conspicuous in recent years, as compared to its neighbors, is based on the massacre of 40,000 people in 1945. Under the stunning blows of the repression the MTLD, after having led the national liberation struggles in the whole of North Africa, was temporarily thrown back into a state of inactivity and stagnation. As always in revolutionary movements, this situation favored opportunist and revisionist elements which could never have risen to positions of importance otherwise. This explains the rise of a reformist tendency at a time when the "official reformist" UDMA has just admitted the bankruptcy of its politics. (See LABOR ACTION, August 2.)

It is therefore fortunate that a clarification of the political issues before the movement has taken place, even though it had to be bought at the price of a split, for now, more than ever, it is urgently necessary that the MTLD be restored to a revolutionary socialist course.

Asian Socialists Call For International Anti-Colonial Day

The Asian Socialist Conference, through its central bureau in Rangoon, has called on all socialists and freedom movements to celebrate this October 23 as "International Freedom Day" for all dependent, colonial and satellite peoples.

The bureau originally set this date last May at its regular conference. A current circular appeals to "all parties (to) celebrate this day in the spirit of solidarity with all peoples who are struggling against colonialism, oppression, exploitation and political terror in all parts of the world." It asks for mass rallies on that day.

The Asian Socialist Conference, comprising all the leading socialist groups of the Asian world, is not affiliated with the Socialist International but has fraternal relations with it. Its call is directed not only to its member parties but also to the sections of the Socialist International and IUSY.

Attached to its call is a "Declaration on Colonialism" which the bureau proposes as a political guide for the day. The declaration says in part:

"The right of peoples to self-determination is a basic principle of the democratic system of society. . . . This right of self-determination, hitherto regarded by imperialist nations as their exclusive privilege, must be exercised equally by colonial and dependent peoples and satellite countries. . . .

"The colonial rulers and imperialist powers still cling to their 'Sacred Mission,' whether in its old or new interpretation, only to justify their self-interest and safeguard their domination as long as possible.

"As long as there are colonial powers and colonial peoples, there will always be a continuous and persistent struggle for freedom and against economic enslavement. . . .

"National freedom shall mean also social emancipation and economic equality of the suffering masses and the establishment of a democratic socialist society.

"The continuation of colonialism, besides economic disequilibrium and the politics of spheres of influence, is one of the main sources of international unrest and instability and serves as a constant threat to the peace of the world.

"All genuine democrats fully share with these fighters their passionate desire for human rights and freedom, and therefore associate themselves with the struggle against colonial oppression and for a world order free from slavery, hunger, political terror and war.

"We solemnly resolve that all nations and peoples of the world shall be free and dedicate ourselves to that endeavor with all the strength that we command."

Discussion: The SP of Vietnam

By A. GIACOMETTI

In reading the ISL and YSL documents concerning Indochina which have been available to me (*LA* of April 26; draft resolution on the international situation, *Forum*, July issue, p. 15; *Young Socialist Review* of August 15; NAC resolution and discussion articles) I have been struck by the absence of any reference to the Socialist Party of Vietnam, especially in connection with the discussion of those groups which can be considered as a basis for a progressive third-camp movement.

According to Louis Caput, of the French SP, the recently constituted Socialist Party of Vietnam has approximately 100,000 members and is supported by a million or so sympathizers. The latter are mainly to be found among the Buddhists (over 900,000 followers) and the independent, i.e., non-governmental, trade-unions, mostly Catholic-influenced, which have a membership of 60-80,000.

Like most Asian SPs, the Vietnamese SP is politically a reformist organization which has a third-camp position because of its geographical and historical situation. I have no detailed knowledge of its program, but the party has been in the news recently in the following way:

On August 7, the secretary-general of the SPV, Pham Van-Ngoi, issued a statement expressing the party's opposition to the Bao-dai government in South Vietnam headed by Ngo Dinh-Diem. After violent criticism of Bao Dai, Ngoi demanded the formation of a broad national union government "with a clearly democratic and socialist orientation." Ngoi further proposed the convocation of a "national congress of the most representative personalities of North and South Vietnam, which would prepare the formation of a government of all sincere patriots regardless of political affiliations." He concluded by saying that "nothing must be left untried in order to reconcile Ho Chi Minh's Vietnam with the national Vietnam." (Report in *Le Monde*, Aug. 11.)

Toward the end of August the position of the Ngo Dinh-Diem government had become untenable and the Bao-dai elements were looking for a possible successor. A government, headed by Tran

Van-Huu was proposed and met vigorous opposition from the SPV, as it did from the Cao-dai and the Hoa-hao sects. At that time Ngoi sent a telegram to the Directing Committee of the SFIO stating that "the Vietnamese socialists will raise strong protests and will fight the designation of Tran Van-Huu as the head of the government." (Report in *Le Monde* of Aug. 25. The report also makes it clear that the SPV is "in no way affiliated" to the SFIO, and should not be confused with the Indochinese section of this latter party.)

Remnants of the old Trotskyist movement still exists, and are apparently trying to set up some organization in the labor unions of the cities (cf. *La Vérité*, Nr. 335). Unfortunately, however, they have been decimated to a point where they are incapable of offering effective leadership to the labor movement in the next period.

Consequently it seems obvious to me that any progressive leadership, especially in a third-camp direction, should be expected from the SPV much sooner rather than, for instance, from the Catholics, not to speak of the motley crew of reactionary sects and gangs (Cao-dai, Hoa-hao, Binh-xuyen).

NOW—IN ENGLISH
THE FAMED "VOLUME 4"
OF "CAPITAL"

Karl Marx's
HISTORY OF
ECONOMIC
THEORIES

PART ONE

Langland Press—337 pages—\$5.00

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

BOOKS and Ideas

Robertson: *The Origins of Christianity***A Stalinist Historian Avoids an Analogy**

By EDWARD HILL

A while back, a LABOR ACTION review of the great Marxist classic *Foundations of Christianity* by Karl Kautsky remarked on the parallels between the development of an episcopal bureaucracy as described by Kautsky and the development of the Stalinist bureaucracy. An interesting insight on this question, as well as others, has just been made available by the publication of a Stalinist interpretation of the same subject, *The Origins of Christianity* by Archibald Robertson (International Publishers, \$2.50).

Before proceeding to the specific ideas of this book, a word is in order about the British Stalinist-Stalinoid intellectual movement. It is a terrible commentary on the state of socialist theory to realize that some of the most important present-day Marxian research is being carried on by a group of Stalinists. Acquainted as we are with the incredibly low level of most Stalinist theorizing, this fact seems at least a paradox, if not a contradiction, yet it is undeniably true.

Of course the intellectuals in question are mainly concerned with historical problems or archeology, subjects on which even Stalinist discipline may relax. Yet even here, it does not relax too much.

For example, a resolution of the Historians Group of the British Communist Party in 1948 established a party line on the Tudor and Stuart monarchies! They wrote: "The reformist and gradualist notions still dominant in the British Labor movement are linked up with mistaken ideas, especially about the transition to capitalism and the political victory of the bourgeoisie." And woe to the Stalinist scholar who had been seduced by the blandishments of Henri Pirenne or some other bourgeois academician.

A whole host of reasons undoubtedly play a part in the strength of British intellectual Stalinism: the failure of a mass Marxist movement like the German Social-Democracy to emerge, and the simultaneous existence of a mass working-class political party; the traditional role of the intellectual group around the British labor movement, and so on. Moreover, British Stalinism itself has long been something of a sport within international Stalinism—Harry Politt once refused to change the line for five days.

Within the context of this general grouping, Robertson would seem to be part of the outright-Stalinist rather than the Stalinoid wing. The party line is somewhat more visible in his writing than in that of a scholar like Gordon Child. Child is not above an occasional genuflection to Joseph Stalin, the great "inheritor of Marx" (whose intellectual patrimony has now, I suppose, passed on to Malenkov), but Robertson is able to involve napalm bombs in Korea in his discussion of Pauline Christianity.

ACT OF OMISSION

Perhaps the most amazing thing about Robertson's book is not his occasional Stalinist remark—it is his fantastic act of omission. Here is a book which purports to be a Marxist study of the origins of Christianity which never once mentions the Kautsky work! It seems impossible that this could be accidental, and perhaps it is tied in with the question raised in the previous article in LABOR ACTION: the uncomfortable (to a Stalinist) analogy which Kautsky suggests to the contemporary reader between Christian and Stalinist bureaucracy.

Moreover, Robertson has a tendency to be equally careless with his bourgeois colleagues. He remarks that all modern scholars are agreed on the non-historical character of the Old Testament narrative of the exodus, thus ignoring a scholar like Albright; and his separation of

the Gospel of John from the Synoptics is far too definite in the light of contemporary research. Yet it is the amazing omission of any mention of Kautsky's work which stands out.

Robertson's theory of the development of Christianity will come as no particular surprise to anyone who has read the Kautsky. The chief difference between this and the earlier work is that Robertson has available to him a much greater mass of scholarship on which to rest his argument. From this point of view, the book represents a complement to the *Foundations of Christianity*.

In brief, Robertson emphasizes the revolutionary political basis of Christianity within Judaism. He pictures Christ as a violent, insurrectionary leader, part Essene, part Zealot, who lead an unsuccessful movement against a tyrannical ruling class. The spread of the cult of the crucified rebel is facilitated by the existence of Jewish communities in all of the cities of the Middle East and the readiness of the slave and immiserated proletariat to follow a revolutionary program.

But then a counter-tendency arose, lead by Paul, which was rooted in the middle classes and the existence of various mystery-cults. Theologically this tendency attempted to spiritualize Christ and thus to destroy the revolutionary program of the movement. Robertson characterizes it in this fashion: "Pauline Christianity offered people whose ancestors had flocked to Epicurean lectures an ideology equally opposed to the official religion, but turning its back on the material world. . . ." In other words, an escapist mystery-cult infiltrated a revolutionary program and eventually conquered it.

ANALOGY TO STALINISM

On the basis of this general interpretation, plus a thorough background in scriptural scholarship, Robertson attempts to disentangle the various glosses, emendations and polemical changes made in the early texts of Christianity. He is far from exhaustive, yet always stimulating. In this section of this book, there is real value.

But what happens when Robertson approaches the question of the growth of this combined revolutionary and escapist cult into a bureaucratized adjunct of the ruling class? More or less the same thing that happens to him with respect to Kautsky's book. He ignores this development.

Kautsky's analysis had been remarkably suggestive of an analogy to Stalinism. He had written: "The organization of a proletariat, rebellious communism thus became the staunchest support of despotism and exploitation, a source of new despotism and new exploitation. The victorious Christian community was in every respect the exact opposite of that community that had been founded three centuries before by poor fishermen and peasants of Galilee and proletarians of Jerusalem. The crucified Messiah became the firmest support of that decadent and infamous society which the Messianic community had expected him to destroy down to the ground."

According to Kautsky, the process which led to this new system of exploita-

tion was fundamentally one of bureaucratization. In the primitive Christian community, the emphasis had been upon democracy. An initial division of labor was made with an elected functionary who was still immediately responsible to the demands of the membership. But under the pressure of the entry of wealthy people into the movement and a desire for a rapprochement with the empire, this group developed into a hierarchy, separate from the community, which was indeed able to make its eventual alliance with the ruling class. Thus, a formerly proletarian revolutionary movement became the supporter of exploitation.

Understandably, such an analysis would be embarrassing to a Stalinist. The analogy to Stalinism is far too pervasive. And indeed, Kautsky himself in his own day had not been unaware of possible analogies. He had written, "We are justified in imagining the beginnings of the Christian communities as more or less on the pattern of the beginnings of the socialistic societies, with which they have so many other resemblances." And cannot we then compare the bureaucratic degeneration of a socialist movement with the same phenomenon in Christianity? Robertson's answer is to ignore Kautsky AND the bureaucratization of Christianity.

A DEVIL-THEORY

It is true that Robertson brings in Paul as a counter-revolutionary. But the period of Paul's activity was within the democratic phase of primitive Christianity. Whether one goes as far as Robertson, I think it is obviously true that Paul represents a profound break in early Christianity. Yet his spiritualization of the messianic message cannot possibly (for a Marxist, at least) account for a degeneration which occurred over a century after his apostolate. Paul is the devil in almost every devil-theory of Christianity, and such an explanation is just as frail from the pen of a Marxist as from Robert Graves.

Thus, Robertson is simply inadequate when he writes, "In the second century the church-leaders had to turn round and fight another enemy—the ultra-Paulinists who would have cut out the Jewish roots of Christianity, and the Gnostics who would have so mystified it as to rob it of all mass appeal. The upshot was the emergence of the episcopate and the formation of the New Testament Canon." The episcopate was not, as Robertson implies, the result of purely theological disputes. If he were consistent with his own method, Robertson would analyze the class relationships underlying the theology. And at least one possible explanation for his failure to do so is the reluctance of this Stalinist to deal with the question of the bureaucratization of a proletarian revolutionary movement.

STALINIST INTEGRITY

Yet given Robertson's failure to consider this crucial question, and his amazing failure to even mention the classic Marxist study of his own subject, there is a real value to his *Origins of Christianity*. The author has a real familiarity with textual criticism of scripture (although not without a tendency to present it as more unanimous than it is) and his discussion does complement Kautsky's from the standpoint of its inclusion of recent research.

But the treatment of Kautsky and the bureaucratization of Christianity does raise another question: about the integrity of the entire British Stalinist intellectual movement. I remarked before that there is no need of a strict line on apparently remote questions of history. Yet, as is obvious from this instance and the "position" on the Tudor and Stuart monarchies, totalitarianism requires its tribute from every last part of society, even from the past. For if the transition to capitalism was by way of a long mercantile pre-capitalist development, and the bourgeois revolution in seventeenth century England was therefore not so sudden, what becomes of the bona-fides of a Stalinist theory of sudden revolution? If the bureaucratization of the primitive Christian community is a pre-figure of that of Stalinism, what then is the Stalinist scholar's attitude toward the earlier event?

As yet, the English Stalinists have concerned themselves with the distant past, and stayed out of Russia, and haven't encountered the fullness of this problem. But Robertson's book suggests that the problem is there, nevertheless, even among the gentile dons and scholars of English Stalinism.

PORTUGAL and GOA

A Page from Colonial History

Below, we quote from the Lucknow (India) paper *The People* as it recalls the circumstances under which Portugal consolidated its control of Goa, the tiny colony in the heartland of India which it is now seeking to hold on to in the face of the anger of the people.—Ed.

By YESHWANTRAO M. MUKNE

The latest statement of Dr. Salazar, prime minister of Portugal, to the effect that nothing but a ravaged land will remain in Goa if the Portuguese are forced to leave it, invokes the scorched-earth precedent of 1510, when the Portuguese, under the "Great Alfonso de Albuquerque," massacred every man, woman and child of the Muslim population in Goa and plundered the city.

In his first statement, Dr. Salazar invoked the Treaty of 1642 whereby Britain undertook to come to the aid of Portugal in holding down Goa. In his second statement, to a group of Portuguese Indian residents of Lisbon on April 28, he went back a century farther with the threat of ravage.

It was in November 1510 that the Portuguese made their second attack on Goa and succeeded in wresting it permanently from the Adil Shahi Sultans of Bijapur.

"The orgy of sack and massacre in which Albuquerque wiped out the offense of the city in having revolted against its Portuguese conquerors deserves to be noted," says M. S. Commissariat in *The History of Gujarat*, "for it presaged the atrocities committed by his successors on the coast towns of Gujarat during the decades that followed."

The details are given by Albuquerque himself in his *Commentaries*. When he had established himself in the fortress of Goa, he says, he gave his soldiers permission to sack the city, keeping for themselves whatever they plundered and owing him no part of the spoil. This done, he had them search the whole of the island, with orders to put to the sword all the Moors (Muslims), men, women and children, that should be found there, sparing none of them, for he had determined to "leave no seed of this race in the island." As a grand climax, he gathered a mass of Muslim prisoners in a mosque, to which he set fire. Among them perished a Christian who had deserted to the Adil Shahi ruler when Goa was taken the first time.

The consolidation of the Portuguese power in India is a blood-curdling story of piracy, treachery and intrigue, gloriously presented for European consumption as a crusade against infidels. The banners of the Egyptian Sultan, taken in the naval battle of Div, were triumphantly carried to Portugal and hung in the Temple of Tomar of the "illustrious military order of Christ." No less than the British in the following centuries, the Portuguese made capital of dissensions among Indian rulers and of rival commercial interests.

Goa is surrounded today, however, by a united India. Expert though they may be, through long experience, in plunder, intrigue and piracy, the conditions for ravaging Goa and leaving it a "part of no country," as threatened by the prime minister of Portugal, are hardly more favorable than the prospects of British intervention under the Treaty of 1642 which his earlier statement invoked.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Received from New American Library (Signet and Mentor pocket books), published Sept. 22:

Walt Whitman: *Leaves of Grass*, Mentor, 50¢. J. Z. Willing: *How to Land the Job You Want*, Signet Key, 35¢. *The Bible in Brief*, ed. James Reeves, Mentor, 50¢. E. M. Roberts: *The Time of Man*, Signet Giant, 35¢. Wm. Faulkner: *The Wild Palms and The Old Man*, Signet Giant, 35¢. Georges Simenon: *The Bottom of the Bottle*, Signet, 25¢. Ira Levin: *A Kiss Before Dying*, Signet, 25¢. Lindsay Hardy: *Requiem for a Redhead*, Signet, 25¢. W. M. Raine: *Guns of the Frontier*, Signet, 25¢. J. L. Weldon: *The Naked Heart*, Signet, 25¢.

READ ABOUT INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM

in the series of special pamphlet-issues of Labor Action

10 cents each

No. 1—The Principles and Program of Independent Socialism**No. 2—Independent Socialism and War****No. 3—The Fair Deal: A Socialist Analysis****No. 4—Socialism and Democracy****No. 5—What Is Stalinism?**

UN Show Reopens — —

(Continued from page 1)

eral Assembly's agenda are also mostly grist to the Stalinist mill. The Greeks are demanding that Britain permit the inhabitants of Cyprus to vote on whether they want to be united with Greece, or to remain a British colony. The North Africans are always likely to embarrass the French by demanding that their claim to immediate independence be passed on by the UN.

The American difficulty in such situations is a product of an unfortunate misunderstanding. At one time, when the United States was not so closely and intimately allied with the colonial powers of Europe, she posed as a champion of colonial independence. Though the Latin Americans always regarded this claim with a good deal of what the diplomats call "reservation" (in plain language, they didn't believe it at all), the impression got around in certain parts of Asia and

Africa that the United States was really an anti-colonialist and even anti-imperialist power.

This impression has died hard in the post World War II period, though the actions of the Roosevelt, Truman and Eisenhower administrations had gone far on the road to killing it. But now Greece, a NATO "power," is demanding that Britain, another NATO power, give the Cypriots the elementary democratic right of deciding their future political affiliation. The United States cannot hope to get out of this situation without embarrassment, while the Stalinists need only sit on the sidelines and cheer on the contending parties.

Actually, American prestige and power in the UN has never been at a lower ebb than it is today. Although the weaker and more dependent governments in the capitalist camp cannot afford to openly go against American wishes, the more independent ones find that there is safety in the strength of

numbers, and that the numbers of those willing at least to pull feathers from the eagle's tail has increased considerably.

Thus, the opening session of the UN Assembly points up two trends in world affairs. One is the decreasing importance of the UN in the context of the imperialist struggle for the world, and the other is the increasing isolation of the United States as the Stalinists retain the political initiative in that struggle.

These developments should give pause and cause for thought to those well-intentioned people who have tended to place all their hopes for world peace and world order on the instrumentality of the United Nations, and to those other well-intentioned people who have supported American foreign policy in the belief or hope that it could be somehow made to represent a rallying ground for the peoples seeking democracy, progress and justice in the world.

A Police Pact over Asia — —

(Continued from page 1)

to the wheel—in the battle against Stalinism, with each ready to sacrifice wealth, life and energy? Lippman is dubious, "for this is not a treaty of alliance in which we who would bear the main burden can expect much from the other members beyond their moral support." In fact, he is so convinced that the pact will bring us nothing in practice that he cautions: "The best thing to do with a treaty of this kind is to avoid, if that is possible, a direct and open showdown of just what everybody concerned is really prepared to do if put to the test." (What was that again that Baldwin said of the "new chapter in the struggle for the world"?)

If the treaty marks no new determination to resist Stalinist expansion; if it represents no massing of united power; there remains only its "political and psychological" value. What value? We strongly rec-

ommend a close reading of Walter Lippman before jumping to conclusions.

Lippman contends that the pact actually "marks a new venture" in American policy. But not for reasons that are ordinarily mentioned in public. Older treaties like NATO, he points out, "deal with the invasion of an innocent country by the organized military forces of an aggressor. . . . Most if not all of them expressly exclude intervention in internal affairs. . . . the Manila treaty . . . is the first formal instrument in modern times which is destined to license international intervention in internal affairs." He repeats, "The Manila treaty is designed to establish under certain conditions a legal basis for international intervention inside a threatened country." And again, "In a gingerly way the new treaty opens up the possibility of legalized and licensed intervention in internal affairs." By repetition alone, the writer forces us to grasp the significance of this pact.

But he hastens to qualify the point, "There can be no intervention 'except at the invitation or with the consent of the government concerned' that is to say, of the government that is threatened with revolution."

In other words, where a government is so discredited or so feeble that it faces imminent overthrow from within, the United States is to rush to its rescue. But, let us get more concrete. "The treaty, as is the fashion among modern pact-makers, is written in high-sounding generalities. But it is plain enough where the treaty is most likely to be put to a practical test. It is in Thailand where the government is threatened with revolution by Pridi Thanomyong, a former prime minister who is now in China working with the blessing of Peking to house the Thai population in southern China and in northern Thailand against the existing government in Bangkok."

REDRESS GRIEVANCES

Direct military intervention in Thailand would not be "prudent" right now because "we would arouse sharp antagonism in India and the other uncommitted countries of South Asia." Lippman advises that we restrict ourselves to "pressing the Bangkok government to redress the worst popular grievances [only the worst?] against it and by measures to strengthen the internal security of the police and the army." And we might add that Lippman is a man whose advice is highly regarded by responsible bourgeois diplomats.

Thailand? But the country is a police dictatorship! In the words of Dr. Richard J. Coughlin, in the staff of the Division of Southeast Asia Studies at Yale, writing in the Foreign Policy Bulletin: "Thailand has been ruled by a military dictatorship . . . the promise of truly representative government has never been fulfilled. Instead, under the military, has been a consistent disregard for the political and civil liberties, supposedly guaranteed by the revolution and a concomitant tendency to suppress any serious political opposition by force if necessary. Elections are manipulated and the National Assembly is thereby packed with government partisans. Since the 1932 revolution all political parties with the exception of the one encompassing the military group have been outlawed." And what will be the effect of American aid to Thailand? "It is more likely that the military group headed by Premier Pibul or his most likely successor Police General Phao Siyinnond, will be further entrenched in power by the greatly increased American military assistance program now planned for Thailand."

The United States has aroused millions in the uncommitted world of Asia by its policy of supporting imperialism and reaction and thrown millions of others into the Stalinist camp. The Chiang-Rhee line is now emblazoned on the cover of the Manila Treaty. Can one expect any different "political and psychological" results?

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

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

The Party Line on Coca-Cola

When the CP goes in for American patriotism, of course, its approach is as totalitarian as ever.

With the new line of the Stalinists, the CP has decreed that its obedient hacks must not only Love America, but also Drink Coca-Cola.

In the *Party Voice*, issued by the New York State CP (July-August issue), an article by Andrew Montgomery lays down the line as it shrills its piece about the "deep-seated national pride with which all Communists are endowed."

"Take the question of Coca-Cola. It is one thing for the French people to wage a struggle against this drink which symbolized the role of Wall Street in their country. But it is an entirely different thing within the United States. Coca-Cola

is an accepted and popular drink here, and does not symbolize the policy of the government.

"Those comrades then who stop drinking it for political reasons demonstrate nothing but their own inability to understand that it is impossible to substitute internationalism for national pride at this stage of the struggle."

Any good hack caught refusing a bottle will be brought up on charges of left-sectarianism.

Incidentally, the last phrase of the quotation is a give-away. Any half-educated Marxist would have said that it is false to counterpose internationalism to proper national pride at any time. The sentence makes sense only if you read "internationalism" as a code-word for "open pro-Russianism."

The *Daily Worker* has found it expedient to take note of the publication of Isaac Deutscher's *The Prophet Armed*, his biography of Trotsky. Have its readers been asking about it?

A review would have been too much to expect. The hack assigned to the job began—

"Every once in a while the book publishers come up with a glorification of Leon Trotsky, the most recent that comes to mind being Isaac Deutscher's *Prophet Armed*."

And then he launches into the real, genuine, actual and true facts of Trotsky's political career as recorded in the 6th volume of Stalin's *Collected Works*.

For example, the fact that Trotsky played no "special role" in the Russian Revolution; plotted to murder Lenin; murdered Kirov and Gorky; and started the great Chicago fire disguised as Mrs. O'Leary's cow.

The CASE of COMRADE TULAYEV

A Novel of Modern Russia by Victor Serge

Formerly \$3 . . . now while our special stock lasts \$1.50

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