

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

**DEUTSCHER in the Role of APOLOGIST FOR STALINISM**

... page 6

**THE CLASSIC WITCHHUNT: DREYFUS AND ANTI-SEMITISM**

.. page 7

**A Labor Program on Automation**

... page 3

OCTOBER 10, 1955

FIVE CENTS

**SPOT-LIGHT**

## Torture-Training In U. S. Society Today

The "torture-training" schools being run by the army are probably the most grotesque demonstrations yet given of the official American incapacity to grasp the role of politics in warfare. To the challenge of "brainwashing," i.e., political conversion, the brass could think of nothing else than preparation for physical fortitude. (We leave aside the moot point whether the latter is possible even on the theory of the torture-training academy.)

All the evidence is that whatever physical torture or other atrocities were used by the Chinese Stalinists, this was subordinate to their political attack on the prisoners. On this field, American life today is a more potent school than any quickie course the army can set up. The Chinese were able to get a number of POWs to act as informers and stool-pigeons on their fellows. For this Americans are being prepared by a more serious school than the army's.

In this training field, Americans are taught that you **HAVE** to inform on others in order to save your own skin. In New York, the official schoolmasters (Board of Education, in fact) are demanding the ouster of a number of teachers, some of them admittedly no longer CP members, who are accused of refusing to name names. The idea is to make them an object lesson for anyone who might want to hold out against the pressure to turn stoolpigeon. Teachers, and other workers, who might have the guts to hold out could be considered as having passed an anti-brainwashing school with honors, but this kind of "torture-training" is not wanted.

The same kind of "torture-training" for hard characters who refuse to turn informer is going on in all corners of American society, not only among the lunatic-fringe witchhunters of (say) Los Angeles but also in sane, respectable quarters like the New York Times, which set a national example when it fired a copyreader, Barnett, for "taking the Fifth."

The Fuchs case at the end of last month may be considered as countering this tendency in its own particular way. In the nation's capital, Professor Herbert Fuchs was dropped from the law faculty of American University, after

(Continued on page 4)

## Americans in Cyprus

Britain is hanging on to its control of Cyprus, and the U. S. is supporting Britain in the UN. There is also another aspect of American involvement in Cyprus, besides the use of that island as a NATO base without asking the population. This was brought out in an AP dispatch from the island (N. Y. Times, Sept. 30) reporting the solid 24-hour general strike of Cypriote workers. The dispatch ended:

"The general strike call was obeyed by all Cypriotes of Greek blood except those employed by the government or by the American-owned copper mines, in which union membership is forbidden." (Emphasis added.)

## TEST OF THE 'FREE WORLD': American Party-Liners of Gov't and Press Forget 'Freedom' Talk as France Defies UN

By GORDON HASKELL

The representatives of the French government have walked out of the General Assembly of the United Nations, as a protest against the decision of the Assembly (by a 28-27 vote) to put the Algerian question on the agenda. The United States and Britain backed the French in their fight to keep the Algerian issue from being discussed on the ground that this is an "internal" French problem. Thus once again the "free world" demonstrates that its vaunted devotion to freedom stops where its own imperialist interests begin.

The French bourgeoisie has amply demonstrated that though

they cannot establish a strong and stable government to rule their own country, they can try to hang on to the countries of other peoples whom they conquered in times past.

They can try, but there is little pros-

pect that they will succeed. During the summer of last year they were able to negotiate a deal at Geneva which permitted them to hang on to some of the vestiges of their power in Indochina for a while yet. In North Africa they have the advantage of closeness to the homeland and a large body of fanatical and reactionary French settlers which they lacked in Indochina.

On the other hand, they face a native population which is fighting for its independence free of Stalinist control.

This is both an asset and a liability as far as French imperialism is concerned. It is an asset to the French insofar as the North African independence movement must learn to a large extent from its own experiences as it fights, without the benefit of the historical and organizational experience of the Stalinists. It is a liability as the French will have the greatest difficulty in convincing the American people and the anti-Stalinist masses everywhere that the French "presence" in North Africa is essential to the struggle against Stalinism on a world scale.

## MOSCOW BUTTERS UP

Of course, every attempt will be made, in the face of the clear facts, to link up the French effort to hold on to North Africa with the issues of the inter-imperialist cold-war struggle. If there is any connection between this struggle of 18,000,000 people in North Africa for national independence and the cold war, it is the Stalinists who are in a position to point out that most of the French troops being used in North Africa are part of the NATO command, and hence that all NATO countries must bear the responsibility for the fighting which goes on there.

The Stalinist leaders have actually chosen not to press their advantage, in the interest of the deal they hope to cook up with the French government against Germany. They had to vote against the French on putting Algeria on the agenda of the Assembly, but they tried to take the sting out of it by a special Khrushchev statement to Pravda in which he adopted an almost apologetic and certainly a conciliatory tone.

(Turn to last page)

## Peron's Fate Ripped Myth Of Support by Workers

By JUAN REY

Santiago, Sept. 21

The military uprising in Argentina was only the last stage in a long political process of anti-Peronist revolution.

After the rebellion of the Cordoba garrison and of the navy base in Belgrano harbor, the garrison of Mendoza, Santa Fe, San Luiz, Bahia Blanca, Rio Santiago, and the whole navy joined the insurrection. This time not only the navy and the air force but also a majority of the army openly rose against the dictator. In the course of three days the whole country had arisen against Peronism.

This means that the situation had matured for revolt through years of political struggle by the anti-Peronist opposition, and the military leaders performed the final operation of destroying the regime, whose time was past.

The best proof that this was true can be seen in the situation in Buenos Aires, where the Peron government controlled the situation "to the bitter end" while surrounded by the victorious rebellion. A vital and popular regime, one expects, would have fought for its life, would have mobilized the "working masses" and "beloved descamisados" in defense of their "social conquests," "against imperialism," and so on. Nothing of the sort happened.

In spite of Peron's incitement to violence against the opposition, in spite of the call issued by CGT head Di Pietro to the members of the CGT (the Peronist "trade unions"), the descamisados stayed home and refused to fight and die for the dictator. The only force which took up arms in defense of Peronism was the fascist Alianza Nacionalista, whose headquarters was destroyed in the fighting. For over 10 days the Peronist regime continued to control the situation in Buenos Aires, after the rebels were already winning all over the rest of the country, but it showed itself incapable of fighting.

This proves that the claim that the working class supported Peronism is a bourgeois legend, of the same type as the claims that the Russian proletariat sup-

ports Stalinism. Of course this does not deny that such support existed in the first period of the dictatorship. But even then the politically conscious workers was always against Peronism, as is shown by the struggle of the socialists, independent unionists, anarchists and even Stalinist workers.

The same Juan Domingo Peron who, only a few days before, had called for blood and incited to murder of oppositionists, set the example for cowardly capitulation. He did not fight; he waited for the descamisados to offer their "life" for Peron. He maneuvered in the hope to gain time, just in case of a miracle; but no miracle came. The workers, lacking all faith in their "beloved leader," stayed home and the regime died without glory, a putrid corpse.

If the pro-Peronist junta which controlled Buenos Aires was incapable of fighting and capitulated virtually without a fight under threat of a naval bombardment—in spite of all the material and armed power which it still controlled, its loyal army sectors, CGT

(Continued on page 6)

## A Man Who Appreciates the Russian System

Bright, up and coming young business executives attending the Oxford University Business summer school in August were invited by one of their lecturers, J. P. Wiles, a Fellow of New College, to admire the Russian government's way of handling trade unions. The London Times of August 11 reported his remarks:

"... Suggesting reasons why Russian industry was expanding far more rapidly than that in the West, he said that trade unions there had been virtually abolished, certainly wholly emasculated. Any attempt to enforce restrictive practices was criminal sabotage.

"It is all nonsense, this talk about trade unions being a stimulus to eco-

nomic growth which is sometimes put up by the left-wing economists," Wiles said. "The Soviets have the best way with trade unions."

The chief object of all Russian economics, he explained, was not to give immediate satisfaction to the consumer, but to promote the fastest possible growth of the economy. Consumer sovereignty through the profit motive and price mechanism were quite unknown. "This emphasis of mere growth at whatever cost seems to me to be right," Wiles added.

Perhaps one of the results of the "Geneva spirit" will be visits to Russia by Western businessmen to get a few tips on how to keep the trade unions in their place.

# Wechsler, Draper Debate Liberalism versus Socialism

New York, Sept. 28

Over 300 packed the hall at Community Church to hear the debate between James Wechsler, N. Y. Post editor, and Hal Draper, Labor Action editor, on liberalism and socialism, this evening. The meeting was sponsored jointly by the Young Socialist League and Students for Democratic Action.

Wechsler spent a good part of his 30-minute presentation explaining what he called the liberal "attitude toward life." These attitudes, he said, he has passionately favored ever since he left "the age of simplicity" when as a member of the Young Communist League he thought every question was "simple" and would automatically be solved by socialism.

Among the attitudes toward life that he discussed and recommended were: avoidance of "dogmas" and simple explanations; doubt of one's own position; a passion for justice, equality and freedom; adoption of opinions as "tentative hypotheses" rather than dogmas; "sanity" in foreign policy; the knowledge that "there are no quick, easy solutions," etc.

He also listed some of the objectives in political platform for which the ADA stood, and wound up with a cogent quotation from Morris R. Cohen on the liberal method.

At the beginning of his presentation, Draper pointed out that "there are liberals and liberals," noting that Wechsler stood out on the civil-liberties front. "One of the things wrong with American liberalism," he added, "is that there are so few Wechslers, and so many Sidney Hooks." His aim in the discussion, he went on to say, was not to try to prove the superiority of socialism in 30 minutes but to explain the relation between socialist ideas and liberal ideas, from the socialist viewpoint.

By genuine liberalism, he stressed, we must mean something which offers a platform for bettering and changing the status quo, not something which offers a complacent whitewash of it, or else it is no alternative to socialism. The tragedy of U. S. politics today is that there is so little liberal opposition. The Democratic Party refuses to fight for anything, and the ADA is tied to the Democratic Party, because labor and liberal leaders still reject the idea of a party of their own.

Liberals, he went on to explain, are pulled both ways between a desire for a meaningful program of social change and their conception of "practicality," a conception which gains them no real mass movement and which actually loses them in the swamp of conservative politics.

## LIBERALISM AND CAPITALISM

But while American liberalism is weak, Draper did them the service of pointing to a "smashing success" for liberalism: the program of the British Tories, who formally occupy a position 'way to the left of even ADA. This "success" for liberalism, he pointed out—which was of course accompanied by the death of the Liberal movement as such—was possible, as everyone knows, only because of the Tory fear of the power of socialism in Britain. Such a success for liberalism, he remarked ironically, represents "a service for liberalism which we are anxious to perform in the U. S. too, but our liberal friends are suspicious of this boon which we wish to confer upon them." And he went on to show that, over most of the world, liberalism as a movement has no roots in the world, because it is tied up with the capitalist system which is losing its roots among the peoples of the world.

What remains of liberalism's best values has largely been absorbed by democratic socialism; often its formal program has been absorbed by conservatives looking for a mask behind which to counter socialism; "but as for it, itself, the world is passing it by." This is so, Draper argued, because the fate of liberalism rests on the contention that a program of progressive social change is possible of achievement under the private profit system of capitalism, which no longer inspires anyone.

From here Labor Action's editor proceeded to the American "exception," where capitalism seems healthy: he showed briefly why this rests on the Permanent War Economy, a prosperity "more sinister in its own way than the breadlines of the '30s." "At bottom this frightening kind of prosperity exists only because of the war crisis, only because shortly we may not." On this basis arises an "aristocratic" political temper in the U. S. which blankets also the liberal mind.

For liberalism today, Draper explained, is not even what it used to be. He compared contemporary liberals with the more radical liberalism of the '30s,

when liberals typically attacked "profit" and "property rights" as against people's rights; when John Dewey called on liberals to support the socialization of the means of production ("I suggest," said Draper, "that ADA adopt that as a 'tentative hypothesis'") and when young idealistic New-Dealers thought they were working for a new society; when, in short, liberals were often "creeping socialists." Today they don't seem to mind the creeping, but recoil at socialism.

The reactionary use of "creeping socialism" as a bogey has this much of a kernel, said Draper: liberalism is a half-way house; there are liberals who are "creeping reactionaries," and a liberal who faces in an opposite direction can "graduate" to socialism when he understands the necessity of putting the commanding heights of industry under social ownership and democratic control. To-

day, however, the liberal movement has done most of its "creeping" in a different direction.

This, he said, is 100 times truer of foreign policy. "Where are the liberals who are willing to fight consistently against the systematic policy of the U. S. government to support most of the most reactionary dictators and colonial oppressors in the world?" Where are the liberals who are willing to speak for national freedom for all peoples—"even Guatemalans," he added, referring to the N. Y. Post's defense of the rape of Guatemala.

## FOREIGN POLICY

He quickly reviewed what had happened in the UN that week, as the U. S. went down the line in voting for colonialism on the issues of Algeria and Cyprus, and he pointed out that, right along, where crimes of American imperialism were concerned, no "burning editorials" had appeared in the Post. On the contrary he cited columnist Max Lerner's attack on Moroccan nationalism, and the aforesaid Post support to the overthrow of the Guatemalan government.

"What happens to the liberal's sense of elementary democracy when he confronts U. S. foreign policy?" he asked. "If you

can't be even a 'creeping socialist,' then at least be a 'creeping democrat!'" he said, explaining the independent socialist view of a democratic foreign policy against imperialism. Consistently carried out, he said, "you will find yourself fighting against the policy and supporters of both the Stalinist war bloc and the capitalist war bloc, and you will then have to look for the Third Way that you are going."

In conclusion, he emphasized that the Independent Socialist movement is a modern movement which "has absorbed the democratic and human values of labor and socialist history, and integrated these, not with pink-tea reform, but with a revolutionary challenge to the systems that are responsible for the world-as-it-is."

In the rebuttal period Wechsler posed what he apparently thought would be embarrassing questions about the use of "democratic processes," one-party system, etc., which were answered by Draper. Wechsler also tried to make much of the favorable things Draper had said about ADA national chairman Rauh as a civil-libertarian, arguing that ADA had elected him chairman and therefore presumably stood for the same thing. He insisted that the ADA had a thoroughly anti-colonial stand, but, although asked twice, refused to discuss his approval of the U. S. crime against Guatemala. Asked from the floor what victories had been fought for and won by contemporary liberals, he offered the recent minimum-wage bill as his reply. Draper also discussed some of these questions, as well as such things as Wechsler's claim that the Argentine workers support Peron.

# LABOR'S SCOPE

## Rewriting Labor History in Terms of Class-Harmony Theories

By BEN HALL

By some instinct for protective coloration and adaptation to the American climate, union officials almost invariably interpret labor's aims and accomplishments in the most innocent and inoffensive fashion. By this device they calm the public, reassure employers, neutralize politicians. Everywhere a search for respectability which fits so easily into today's social etiquette.

If the CIO and AFL prepare to merge in a historic massing of class power, their leaders hasten to explain that this is part of the process of uniting free labor, not against the capitalist class, but "against Communism." If the UAW, by the solidarity of its militant cadres and their readiness to fight, breaks through in the fight for a Guaranteed Wage, its leader is careful to doff his cap (in public at least) to the "social responsibility" of auto capitalists.

Two new exhibits, chosen at random, are provided by the United Mine Workers and the International Ladies Garment Workers.

### PERFUMING THE PAST

Justice, the weekly published by the ILGWU, editorializes on "Rights and Responsibilities" in its issue of July 1. The editor reminds readers of the great cloakmakers' strike of 1910, a successful two-month struggle involving more than 50,000 needle-trades workers in New York, which finally established unionism in the industry.

Describing the Protocol of Peace which terminated the strike, he writes: "Embodied in this agreement . . . was the idea that the welfare of the industry and its workers was of common concern to labor and management; that the prosperity of the industry required joint constructive efforts and that both parties at the bargaining table would benefit from efficient production and the recognition of social and industrial responsibilities."

Here the editor indulges a favorite predilection of some modern writers: to create class harmony in retrospect. It does not suffice that labor-capitalist cooperation has become the official philosophy of the modern labor movement; it must be rewritten back into the past and socialist class-consciousness wiped out even as a historic memory.

One would never realize that needle-trades unionism was led by socialist idealists, that cadres of leaders and thousands of rank-and-filers were inspired by the goal of replacing capitalist society by the cooperative commonwealth and that their union activity was to them but one facet in their life of struggle to

reach that goal. No, even history has to be pressed and perfumed to be a fit companion for today's official interpretation of the labor movement.

The moral of the editorial comes quickly: "Their sacrifice [the strikers of 1910] and determination became the basis of concepts of industrial responsibility, for labor as well as management, which formed the central core of our union's growth and also spread into other sections of the industrial community." And so, in a direct line of descent from the fighters of 1910 came the responsible employers and unionists of 1955.

The editor's enthusiasm for his task carries him over a big gap. There was a hiatus in the line of responsibility; in the late '20s and early '30s unionism in the needle trades, as elsewhere, was nearly wiped out; only a few tattered shreds survived the depression and the employers' anti-union drive; the union virtually had to be rebuilt and refounded and it recouped its strength in the general rise of the labor movement which came in the great class struggles of the mid-'30s. With the weakness of labor came a lapse in employers "responsibility."

With the mood of responsibility upon us, let us thumb through the very same issue of Justice that hails peace and cooperation. In its pages we are informed that:

(1) In Fayetteville, Tenn., ILG strikers at the Serbin Co. plants were arrested in a protracted stoppage. (A month later Justice will report that a local judge issued a permanent injunction against all picketing.)

(2) In Merrill, Wisc., "a bitter, three-month walkout at the Merrill Woolen Mills, topped by company efforts to bring in strikebreakers, ended this month in complete victory for the union."

(3) In Elizabeth, N. J., the union tacked down a plant that had run away.

(4) In Grayville, Ill., union organizers who were trying to organize the H. A. Satin Co. were arrested for talking to workers at the plant gate.

(5) In Los Angeles, the union is picketing to organize the sportswear industry.

(6) In Ashville, N. C., a strike goes on at the Glendale Co. "Since the start of the strike picket lines have held solid despite injunctions, law suits, and physical harassment." In Fall River, Mass., the ILG sues a union employer for sending work to the scab shop.

(7) In Raritan, N. J., one small company tries to drive out the ILG.

(8) In Boston and in Kentucky there are union drives to organize open shops.

Truly a busy week for responsible union organizers.

Returning to the Justice editorial, we note that in conclusion the editor writes: "Today, on the frontiers of our own organization where garment workers are again contending with employers' resistance, strikebreaking and 'concentrated capital and greed,' the pickets of 1955 are demonstrating daily that the spirit of the pickets of 1910 lives on."

Note the phrase, "on the frontiers." To this new frontier scores of bosses are fleeing, refugees from the centers of union power. What has happened to their sense of social responsibility?

### UN-MARXIAN BABBLE

On August 20, John L. Lewis signed a new contract with the Bituminous Coal Operators Association, representing 60 per cent of the nation's tonnage and 125,000 men. Workers won an increase of \$1.20 a day, to be followed by an additional 80 cents next April 1.

Lewis told reporters at a press conference: "This agreement is sane and in the public interest. It preserves the era of pacific relations, effective since 1950. It will not oppress the coal consumers, nor yet expose the brittle bones of the operators to the icy blasts of the coming winter. It is devoid of Marxian babble, and contains no wind or water. It is based upon the economics of a modernized industry. It is tailored to fit the future requirements of constantly progressive industrial techniques. It is in line with the established policy of the Mine Workers to share, with the public and investors, in a constantly increasing man-day productivity."

The miners too have their era of peace. But it is interesting to consider some of the factors that have gone into creating it:

(1) Declining coal production had put the miners in a tactically weak position. 1954 production was the lowest in almost 50 years.

(2) Non-union coal output accounts for about 30-40 per cent of all coal produced outside of the captive mines (that is, mines run by mills and utilities for their own coal).

(3) 200,000 union members are unemployed. For years, others were working a short week.

(4) Thus, the miners have been unable to win a wage increase for three years.

(5) Recovery is now under way in the bituminous coal fields. As production and profits of the dominant commercial producers rise, the miners get an increase.

This situation is hardly the basis for a gay camaraderie between coal digger and mine owner.

LONDON LETTER

## British Shop-Steward Conference

## A LABOR PROGRAM ON AUTOMATION

By OWEN ROBERTS

London, Sept. 29

**"Warning: Unattended Machines At Work."**

This sign displayed in the works of one of Britain's leading automobile manufacturers at Birmingham is a sign of the times. It is a sign of the growing application of automation techniques to Britain's industries.

It is a sign which spells out the need for new policies and new courses of action by British trade unionists.

The challenge presented by automation is being tackled in a vigorous fashion by the trade-unionists in Britain—but primarily by rank-and-file militants. Their swift reactions stand in marked contrast to the ponderous slowness of the right-wing trade-union leaders, and their attempts to hammer out a progressive and constructive policy illuminates the hesitant fashion in which the right-wing-dominated official trade-union machinery is approaching the matter.

At the Trades Union Congress at Southport earlier this month, when automation was discussed the right wing was obviously stumbling around in a gloom of their own making. The right-wing spokesmen constantly emphasized the problems and yet made little attempt to answer them. They tried hard to convey the impression that much of what had been said was purely speculative and, as yet, there was little real knowledge of the subject.

**In contrast to this "ca' canny" approach a meeting organized by shop stewards in the automobile industry, held at Oxford a few days ago, showed that the lads on the shop floor are already tackling the problems in a determined fashion. And they have left the right-wing leadership standing at the post.**

When the first meeting of the combined automobile shop stewards was held a few months ago it was largely ignored by the daily press and only journals such as the weekly *Tribune* and the monthly *Socialist Review* gave it a write-up. But this recent meeting has pushed the policies of these shop-floor representatives onto the pages of the big national dailies. Labor's official paper the *Daily Herald* and the right-wing Laborite *Daily Mirror* gave the meeting a big write-up. This in spite of the fact that the shop stewards organizing the meeting have constituted themselves into what the Labor leaders consider an "unofficial body," something to be treated with great caution and, as likely as not, to be manipulated out of existence as soon as possible.

## SEVEN POINTS

It would be hard for anyone to ignore this latest meeting of the automobile stewards, for there were 300 of them present and they represented something like a quarter of a million workers, a tidy slice of the total workers employed in the British automobile manufacturing industry.

**But their importance does not involve only the numbers of workers, for the policies adopted by the stewards are ones of action. The seven-point program gives a clear lead to the workers in the industry.**

● First they want detailed consideration given to the safety of op-

erators on automation systems.

● Second, no installation of new machines by the management until the workers have been consulted, have given their OK, and have obtained acceptable conditions and rates of pay.

● Third, the standards are going to launch an all-out fight for the 40-hour week and for a continued reduction in hours without loss of pay.

● Fourth, the stewards are going to fight an attempt by the employers to lay off workers; they want all workers displaced by automation to be retrained at the expense of the employers and without a reduction in wages.

## POLAND Moscow's Campaign Puts Polish Emigres Under Stalinist Pressure

By A. RUDZIENSKI

Poles in exile are the most numerous nationally in the migration from the satellite countries. Besides 200,000 exiled Poles in Great Britain, there are Polish émigrés in France, Germany, South America, Canada, Australia, Palestine and the U. S. Behind the Polish political émigrés, also, are eight to ten million "Americans of Polish origin" and people of Polish origin living in other countries.

One might say that this Polish "diaspora" represents a "second Poland," free from the Kremlin's control and the MVD's terror. As long as this Polish political emigration continues to resist, the Russian conquest of Poland can never be absolute and certain. Hence the emigration is a very serious problem for the Kremlin.

The political life of the Polish emigration is, of course, concentrated in Great Britain; here there is not only a Polish daily press and the headquarters of the Polish parties-in-exile, but also most Polish writers, literary men, scientists, magazines, etc.

Political conflict divides the Polish exiles between two centers mainly: the government-in-exile headed by August Zaleski (minority), and the National Executive (which represents the large majority), made up of representatives of the historical Polish parties, the Nationalists, the Socialists, and the Populists (peasant party). This division is due to the "coup d'état" by August Zaleski against Arciszewski, a socialist, who was appointed as successor by the last president of Poland.

**This gave rise to a lasting internal crisis, because Zaleski and his government represent the traditions of the Pilsudski camp, whereas the political parties represent continuity with Polish bourgeois democracy.**

Mikolajczyk's committee forms a separate group, opposed by both of the other two camps, because of his pro-Yalta policy and policy of conciliation with the Warsaw regime and the Kremlin. We must remember that Mikolajczyk, under the pressure of the then Big Four, accepted Russian control in Poland and for some time was "vice-premier" in the Warsaw government, until his escape from the country.

The political fight in the emigration is aggravated by long isolation from the country and by the setting in of a certain political decomposition, inevitable in every emigration. Up to now the political perspective has been quite unfavorable for opponents of the Warsaw regime.

Therefore voices arose expressing the feeling that continuation of the emigration is without any hope, because the overbearing strength of the Russian position condemns Poland to national slavery,

● Fifth, an improvement in apprenticeships schemes to provide adequate training for both young men and women.

● Sixth, the stewards want talks with top management in order to get the acceptance of their policies.

● Lastly, prices must come down as the lower costs and higher output consequent upon automation take effect.

## SHOWING UP THE TUC

These proposals are not revolutionary, but they knock the official policy of most British trade unions into a cocked hat. They show up the policies accepted by this year's Trades Union Congress as being completely out of tune with the mood of the workers.

**The TUC at Southport pushed the 40-hour week into cold storage, dampened down wage-claim fights, and generally asked the workers to go easy on their demands in the "interests of the na-**

**tional economy." The shop stewards at Oxford this week have refuted these policies, given the right-wing leaders a smart kick in the pants and mapped out a program which will be welcomed by the workers on the shop floor.**

It is a welcome sign—for it shows that in spite of all the smart propaganda of the right wing in recent years the rank and file are still keenly aware of the direction in which they want to travel; and that they are determined to get there in spite of the fact that the driving seat is occupied by the right wing.

Top shop steward from Briggs—the firm that makes the motor bodies in the British Ford setup—put the matter clearly in perspective when he said: "There is a terrific struggle ahead to awaken the trade-union and Labor Party leadership to the implications of automation."

assimilation and denationalization, and the emigration to political death. But the majority of the émigrés rejected these arguments and declared that the Polish emigration would continue its struggle as long as Poland remained under the Russian heel.

For the Polish emigration has a great tradition and an illustrious predecessor: the great emigration of 1831, after the first Polish revolution against the tsar. It was this emigration which preserved and maintained not only independent political thinking but also Polish culture itself, the culture which could not develop under tsarist oppression. The greatest Polish poets, Mickiewicz and Slowacki, historians like Lelewel, democratic revolutionaries and socialists like Worcell, Bem, Wroblewski and Dabrowski (two generals of the Paris Commune), the great composer Chopin, and others, carried on their work in exile.

Exile is the Polish fate and the Polish tradition in the struggle for liberation, for the Polish revolutionary democracy as for socialism. In their own day, Marx and Engels gave political support to the Polish democracy as the vanguard of the European revolution against tsarist Russia.

## TODAY'S CROP

Can the present Polish emigration play the same role as the great emigration against tsarism? I think it cannot. Not only is the present political constellation in Europe different, but the character of the present emigration is different too. While it is not true that the present Polish emigration is "white" [counter-revolutionary] like so much of the Russian emigration, still it is by no means a revolutionary emigration in the 1831 style. It defends only a program of national independence, and not a program of European revolution against Stalinism.

The socialist wing of this emigration, represented by the Polish Socialist Party (PPS), stands for the traditional social-democratic type of fight against "totalitarian Communism," and not for a modern program of revolutionary Marxism in the revolutionary tradition of Rosa Luxemburg's party and the Bolsheviks. But this weakness of the PPS is true, with few exceptions, of other groups of the working-class left all over the world.

**But politically the Polish emigration is a continuation in exile of the Polish underground and resistance. While the political leadership of the emigration is nationalist and conservative, its enemy, the Warsaw government, because of its totalitarian and counter-revolutionary character, is still more reactionary—in spite of all that the fellow travelers say; and therefore, in spite of its political weakness and incipient decomposition, the Polish emigration is playing an important role in the fight**

of the Polish masses against national slavery and for social and national freedom.

We must also remember that the majority of the Polish exiles are workers or proletarianized elements who are economically linked with the working class in Great Britain, France and the U. S. and so politically partake of the progressive influence exerted by the workers of these countries.

## MOSCOW'S FEAR

Therefore, I believe the fate of the present Polish emigration will not be as tragic as was that of the Great Emigration of over a century ago, for today's times are different, and the Stalinist dictatorship in Russia does not have the "solidity" of tsarism; it is of shorter historical duration. The Polish right wing does not have the perspective of coming back "on a white horse"; the masses of the Polish exiles are soldiers and fighters in the battle for Polish and human freedom against reaction. Their weight is greater than the Russian emigration. Their very existence disturbs the sleep of the Moscow and Warsaw hangmen.

**If in Poland the Stalinist terror is not as great as in the other satellite countries, and the pressure of the MVD is somewhat less than it is in Russia, then this is in substantial part the merit of the Polish emigration and the Polish resistance against Stalinism. This alone entirely justifies the existence and continued struggle of the Poles in exile.**

That this is true is confirmed by the policy carried on by the Warsaw government with respect to the emigration, recently indicated by its "winning over" of Minister Hanke of the government-in-exile, a man who (in this writer's opinion) was no more than the agent and stoopigeon of the Warsaw UB (secret police). But just as the agents of the tsarist Okhrana in its day could not liquidate the historical upsurge of Poland, so the agents of the UB will not succeed in substituting themselves for the legitimate role of the Polish emigration.

I would also express this opinion: I am afraid that shortly Russian policy will be compelled to admit the political weight of the Polish resistance in exile by trying to get a political agreement with this independent movement over the heads of the Warsaw puppets.

## YOU'RE INVITED

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

## Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

### Wants Proposals On 'Over-Age' Worker

To the Editor:

From the numbers of letters which have appeared in the daily newspapers and the every-day experiences of my neighbors and myself, it is quite apparent that the greatest single problem facing the American worker today is that of finding employment after they reach their forties.

This problem not only faces the unskilled or semi-skilled, but in many cases even the highly skilled worker. This situation does not apply only to those presently unemployed. As persons over forty and presently employed are finding out, in too many instances employers, in an effort to get rid of them, are creating conditions on the job that make the work intolerable and in many cases nerve-racking.

Among the factors contributing to this situation are the higher insurance rates on employees over forty-five; newer automatic processes and labor-saving devices which increase production while decreasing man power; the Taft-Hartley Act, which takes away from the union the prerogative of assigning workers to the job and gives to the employer the exclusive right to hire.

These factors, plus the knowledge of the employer that the worker, as an individual, is powerless to do anything about the situation, coupled with the fact that the rest of the American workers are apparently apathetic or unaware of the situation, have permitted the problem to grow into a national crisis.

From time to time editorials have appeared deploring the situation, but as Mark Twain once pointed out about the weather, "everyone talks about it but no one does anything about it."

Every problem has a solution if properly approached and evaluated and I believe this problem too can be solved. However, the solution can come only from the American workers themselves; so if you are over forty and up against this problem, why not write in and see if we can't work out the solution?

J. J. M.

### Asks Investigation of PR Nationalist's Charges

To the Editor:

Don Pedro Albizu Campos, only major Latin American political figure in this generation who, in the face of Yankee determination to dominate the hemisphere, has persistently chosen imprisonment instead of either changing his program or going into voluntary exile, lies near death today in a solitary confinement cell in the Insular Penitentiary in Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico.

His illness is from two major causes. During the past month he has suffered two heart attacks—a renewal of the disease that confined him for 2½ years in a private hospital in New York when he emerged from six years imprisonment in Atlanta Penitentiary. This crisis is superimposed upon his already critical condition resulting from a mysterious ailment from which he has suffered for nearly five years.

This illness baffles laymen and physicians alike. Government doctors—under whose care Albizu Campos has been during all but five months of this period—blithely declare it to be non-existent.

Their statements have been unconvincing to the Puerto Rican public, however, ever since it saw photographs released by *El Imparcial* at the time of Don Pedro's release on a full, but exceedingly temporary, governor's pardon in September 1953. These photographs showed the patriotic leader's legs swollen to elephantine proportions, with a band of open sores five inches wide circling the ankles. Dr. Franceschi, the family physician, who was called to Don Pedro's home on the first night of his release, diagnosed these open sores as burns, and in the absence of any visible means by which they had been produced, declared them to be "burns due to unknown cause."

A month later Dr. Daumy, eminent Cuban radiologist, spent two weeks in Puerto Rico for the sole purpose of studying the patriot's condition. He confirmed Dr. Franceschi's diagnosis, and stated in a letter later published in *El Imparcial*: "His clear mind and his complete integrity enlightened me profoundly; but what a grief it was to see this man in so precarious a physical state. *The burns in his lower extremities reminded me of the skin condition which, in treating cancer, we provoke in the skin of the patient with radiotherapy*; it made him seem to me still more like Marti, who carried for the rest of his days the marks of the shackles."

When I cross-examined Dr. Daumy, demanding of him alternative explanations, he became almost indignant, insisting that he knows a burn when he sees one, and that he is as puzzled as I am to understand by what process Don Pedro Albizu Campos could receive radiation burns while locked in a solitary confinement cell in a Puerto Rican jail.

To the Nationalist Party leader, who holds a Harvard degree in science as well as in law, no confusion is involved. Since May 1951, he has been accusing the United States government of using his body for experimentation, both in the application of atomic radiation to the human body by radar-guided radiation, and in the study of the effects of varying doses of radiation on the human body. Having denounced in the past the use of Puerto Ricans for experiments with cancer and with anti-tubercular vaccine, he is not at all surprised to find himself today apparently the victim of similar experimentation.

For friends and foes of Albizu Campos alike, it is impossible to learn the full truth. What our government is or is not doing, and does or does not know, about atomic radiation, is kept secret in "security" files. For clues as to the validity of Don Pedro Albizu Campos' hypothesis, one is therefore limited to the meager information our government allows the public to have regarding the effects of atomic radiation on the human body.

A study of it suffices, however, to convince one that this hypothesis cannot be rejected until an adequate alternative explanation is produced. To date our government has presented only the untenable thesis that Don Pedro's sores are caused by the creams and damp towels he used to alleviate the painful burning sensation he feels constantly. Since this treatment was devised, with medical approval, after the sores appeared, it can hardly have been their cause.

Pictures of Albizu Campos' legs, examined under a microscope together with pictures of victims of "flash burns" at Hiroshima, reveal startling similarities. A round black spot on his right forearm resembles the "petechia," or skin hemorrhages, which were very common among the Hiroshima survivors. Both these phenomena of Hiroshima resulted from strong exposure to radiation.

The symptoms of lesser degrees of exposure to radiation have also been experienced periodically by the Puerto Rican patriot, and not by him alone. I have had little opportunity to converse with the male political prisoners confined with him in La Princesa, and therefore I do not know except by hearsay what phenomena they encountered there. I do know, however, what the four women went through who were housed temporarily in that prison before, during and after trial in the District Court of San Juan. I was the first, and Doris Torresola Roura a year later the last, and all of us left La Princesa so weak we could scarcely stand, and recovered our strength only gradually over a period of months.

We all passed through a cycle of illness which began with vomiting and flashes of almost unbearable "fever" which did not register as such on any thermometer. The illness continued

through weeks of diarrhea accompanied by discharges of mucus and blood, loss of appetite, acceleration of loss of weight, falling out of hair, etc. We attributed this bodily distress to the fact that we had been on 28-cents-a-day rations for so many months, and to the fact that the diet in La Princesa was even less palatable than that in Arecibo, our "home" prison. Yet, in reading about the effects of radiation sickness on the human body, I have been astounded to note that, symptom by symptom and step by step, our experience coincides with the progress of radiation sickness from inception to recovery.

While only competently trained persons can appropriately interpret the meaning of this parallel, yet, taken together with the symptoms of more serious radiation exposure in the body of Don Pedro Albizu Campos, it leads inevitably to the conclusion that his allegations must be taken seriously, and that at long last the scientific investigation for which he has been pleading must be conducted and the facts determined.

The chief obstacle to such an investigation is the fact that the victim is held incommunicado in a solitary confinement cell. The governor canceled his unsought pardon without a hearing in March 1954, and the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico has refrained from passing on the legality of this action for nineteen months. Albizu Campos has been indicted for no new crimes since he was pardoned briefly two years ago. A patient with a history of heart ailment that confined him to a hospital for 2½ years, the Puerto Rican

patriot cannot live long, now that his heart ailment has returned, in a Puerto Rican prison where the food allowance for invalids is 40 cents a day. If he is not removed quickly to a hospital, he will die without the investigation he has been requesting for four years having been begun.

Americans don't have to be pro-Nationalist to desire the removal of Don Pedro Albizu Campos to a hospital. They don't even have to be anti-imperialist. They merely have to have some sense of humanity.

Americans don't have to be pro-Nationalist or anti-imperialist to demand a thorough investigation by competent non-governmental personnel of the charges of scientific torture made by Don Pedro Albizu Campos. They merely have to remember that the horrors of Buchenwald were unknown and would have seemed incredible to the majority of decent Germans, who wouldn't have wanted such things to happen "even to Jews." Decent Americans don't want them to happen "even to Puerto Rican Nationalists," but that is no guarantee that they are not happening.

The first step is to insure that Don Pedro Albizu Campos be permitted to live long enough to make an adequate investigation possible. Write the President today!

RUTH M. REYNOLDS

## SPOTLIGHT

(Continued from page 1)

being one of the targets in a congressional inquiry, where he admitted CP membership from 1934 to 1946 but pleaded "conversion and forgiveness." At first he refused to name other CP members, but later he capitulated.

This did not save him. He was fired anyway. In a Pickwickian way, his fate may illustrate the futility of stoolpigeining in order to appease persecutors, but it is doubtful whether the army will hold him up as their prize exhibit.

There is the same pattern in the American "torture" approach to the political element in Stalinist "brainwashing." Here in the U. S., the people who will become soldiers are taught that Communism is not a political question, certainly not primarily a political question.

**Item: On October 3 in Philadelphia, Assistant Attorney General Tompkins—who is not just any old idiot but one of the Justice Department's top experts on such things—told an audience that the Communist movement is a "criminal menace" and defended the informer system on that ground:**

"The only logical explanation for criticism of the use of former Communists by the Department of Justice is that our critics view these [Smith Act] trials not as criminal, but as political in character, Tompkins said," according to the press.

**Item: Americans for Democratic Action—who are not just any old confusionists, but liberals—at their last convention decided that the Communist movement was primarily a "conspiracy."**

As a result American POWs—who, let us say, are all ready to be heroes—find to their surprise that this "brainwashing" business means politics. Take the surprised report of the three U. S. turncoats Bell, Griggs and Cowart, as reported in an AP dispatch (cited in *I. F. Stone's Weekly*):

"The big thing is education. A man with an education can stand up to the Chinese or anybody else. But you got to know what they're talking about." (Bell.)

"And all those Chinese torture stories aren't true either. A lot of guys came back from POW camps and told some pretty terrible tales—just to cover up what they had done themselves. The first real step is to teach democracy." (Griggs.)

"A man had to know what Communism is." (Cowart.)

The government's POW Advisory Committee reported: "When plunged into a Communist indoctrination mill, the average American POW was under a serious handicap. . . . He had to tell what he knew about American politics and American history. . . . Many had never before heard of Karl Marx. . . . They couldn't answer arguments in favor of Communism with arguments in favor of Americanism. . . ."

So teach 'em how to stand up to "torture," even if they have no idea why they should.

## Another Harlem Rally Protests Till Case

By MYRON ROCHE

New York, Oct. 2

Lawson Auditorium on Harlem's 125 Street was the scene of another overflow rally this Sunday protesting the acquittal verdict in the Till lynch-murder case. Speakers included Ruby Hurley, NAACP southeastern regional director; Roy Wilkins, NAACP executive secretary; Shad Polier of the American Jewish Congress; Art Chapin of the New Jersey State CIO.

The lead speaker, Wilkins, emphasized that the Till murder was an outgrowth of the "system" created by white-supremacist resistance to Negro integration. The "system" also includes the advocacy and practice of violence against militant Negroes. He urged that Negro Democrats threaten to withdraw allegiance to the party unless it acts to end this latest campaign of racist terror, and he told Negro Republicans to demand action by the administration and Justice Department.

Chapin, speaking as a representative of labor, called on workers to support the NAACP, financially and otherwise, as well as their trade unions. Polier stressed the unity of his organization and of the Jewish community with the Negroes' struggle for full equality. Warmly applauded, Polier likewise ended his address with an appeal for wider support of the NAACP.

The afternoon's best speech was by Mrs. Hurley. Speaking plainly, in tones of deep contempt, she described the town of Sumner, and told of the anti-Negro atmosphere in the courtroom, inflamed by the bigoted remarks of Sheriff Strider, who addressed the segregated Negro reporters as "niggers." She spoke at length of the impossibility of obtaining justice for the Negro in any Southern court. Amplifying Wilkins' earlier point about the "system," she cited various kinds of economic strangulation used by white businessmen against Negroes who in any way protest the Jim Crow system, forcing them to leave the South. But she let the audience know emphatically that an exodus from the South was no answer, and that more militant action was.

One could sense a tremendous anger and hunger for action in the audience—a feeling which was far from satisfied by the speakers' continual urgings toward mere voting, pressure on congressmen and the major parties, etc.

One could not help feeling, also, the irony of the references, which were made by Mrs. Hurley and the other speakers, to America's struggle to "keep the world safe for democracy." In the light of the historical oppression of the Negro people and their historical exclusion from the benefits of democracy, Negroes' identification with these slogans would seem to be illusory.

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



**LABOR ACTION**

October 10, 1955 Vol. 19, No. 41

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

Associate Editors:

GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL

Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

## Opposition to ROTC Oath Flares at U. C.

By J. CHARLES WALKER

Berkeley, Sept. 24

Contrary to all expectations, there was a determined if brief resistance offered to the new ROTC "loyalty oath" presented at the University of California. A struggle by four non-signers was waged for about a week; even after they signed, the echoes reverberated for at least another few days.

In addition there is a backlog of letters and discussion columns which have been submitted for publication to the *Daily Californian*, practically all of them in agreement with the non-signers. But at any rate, the first phase of opposition is now over.

The issue began in Berkeley when three known lower-division students were allowed to refuse to sign the new oath during the registration period. Two of these were sophomores who had refused to sign the past "guilt by association" oath, who had been enrolled in "informal ROTC" last semester. The third student was a freshman majoring in forestry.

At this time both the army and the Regents had not settled on a definite policy; the students were allowed to proceed with registration until policy was decided upon. Attempts to prevent full enrollment in ROTC class were made, but the students insisted upon filling out regular class-enrollment cards, not simply slips of paper. The true test was to come the following week when uniforms were to be issued.

On the Saturday of registration week, the *San Francisco Chronicle* ran a news story indicating that the new ROTC oath was going to be exacted of all students enrolled in ROTC, and that "informal ROTC" was herewith abolished by the Defense Department. Actually this story was misleading since the army had not decided to do away with "informal

ROTC" at this time; in truth it was the unilateral decision of the Regents which was responsible for abolishing this category, as the *Daily Cal* announced the following Monday.

These are the same Regents who have made ROTC compulsory at Cal, beginning in 1917! These are the same Regents who went to court successfully, about 1940, to maintain their right to enforce compulsory ROTC against a pacifist. These are the same Regents responsible for The Year of the Oath (1949-1950) during which the UC faculty were compelled to sign a Regents-instituted "loyalty oath" subsequently stricken down in the courts as unconstitutional.

Naturally, there was no inkling that they were thinking along these lines prior to their decision. This helped to strangle possible student opposition, and reinforced the feeling of the students that the Regents were indifferent or hostile to the desires of the students on matters affecting them.

The non-signers were notified on Monday that they would have until Wednesday

to make up their minds, whether to sign the oath, or not sign and be expelled from the university for failure to enroll in ROTC. One of the students (the freshman) immediately announced his decision to sign the oath and his case passed into oblivion.

### HOW TO INSPIRE LOVE

The sophomore non-signers published a letter in the *Daily Cal* objecting to the oath. They said: "There is no reason why a student should be forced to sign a loyalty oath in order to attend a public university." They also criticized the oath as a "mild" and "devious" way of enforcing the "clumsy raw approach" of last year's loyalty oath, and called for the retention of "informal ROTC," despite its "stigmatizing" effect on the non-signers.

There was also an excellent editorial accompanying the letter entitled "An Oath in Vain." Some excerpts from this will indicate the attitude of more principled liberals in this area.

"The university's Board of Regents has met the new ROTC loyalty oath problem head-on and seems to have been stunned by the blow. Students will no longer be allowed to enroll informally in military science classes, as under last year's more detailed and offensive 'statement of loyalty'..."

"To ask a citizen if he will defend the Constitution is somewhat insulting. To demand an answer simply because he is being issued a pair of shoes, a military uniform, a few books and a non-functioning rifle defies description..."

"They have in effect said, 'If you swear that you're a good American, we'll let you in. One must be so careful these days.' The university is still living down the shame of the last Regents' loyalty oath, one which caused parents throughout the state to wonder if the University of California is 'safe.' Additional nonsense of this type seems uncalled for..."

"The Board of Regents has been given considerable responsibility by the university and the state, yet has the uncanny ability to pollute whatever amount of academic atmosphere can be salvaged from the present era of national uneasiness..." [Emphasis added.]

"Loyalty is a beautiful idea, but you cannot create it by compulsion and force. You make men love their government and their country by giving them the kind of country and the kind of government that inspire respect and love."

### NON-SIGNERS OBJECT

However, the anti-oath fight was handicapped at this point by divided opinion as to the content of the oath itself, as opposed to its forcible imposition on male lower-division students. The Northern California American Civil Liberties Union, for instance, found the content of the oath unobjectionable legally, and did not think that it was a civil-liberties case for that reason. The Student Civil Liberties Union tended to agree with this opinion, although there was some sentiment toward considering the oath as an anti-civil-libertarian act because of its forcible imposition, and because it interfered with the free atmosphere of a university.

The two non-signers continued their opposition with an "As We See It" in the *Daily Cal* the following day, which reiterated their opposition in principle to signing the oath (or any oath), but also objecting to certain ambiguities in the oath itself. They asked, as pacifists, whether defending the constitution against foreign enemies meant bearing arms, which they did not accept because they intended to become conscientious objectors later. (Actually taking ROTC seems to strike down later CO status legally, I am informed.) They also objected to being forced to defend ideologically the present anti-civil-libertarian interpretation of the Constitution by the courts and the executive. And finally they objected to being forced to deny their anti-oath convictions in signing the oath "without reservations." How could

they not have "reservation" about an oath rammed down their throats?

At this stage the *Daily Cal* indicated on its front page that "Oath Non-Signers Keep Firm Stand as Deadline Nears."

On Wednesday morning all non-signers (four in total, one new non-signer being discovered) signed and the oath fight seemed to be over. The two sophomore non-signers were interviewed by the *Daily Cal* and issued a final statement justifying their past position on moral and practical grounds.

They felt that they had been correct in opposing such an oath, and that their opposition was vital in stimulating opposition to the oath in the college community. However, because neither the ACLU nor the student body had backed them in successfully obtaining either a delay or a waiver on signing the oath, they were forced to sign it in order to continue their education. They also indicated that they would continue to oppose the oath, despite having signed it and presumably being bound to its nebulous (to them) statutes.

### KERR'S "MISTAKE"

At this point a very unusual and curious event happened.

A *Daily Cal* reporter apparently questioned the administration (the Chancellor's Office) about its reaction to this proposed statement by the non-signers. He was informed that Chancellor Kerr considered the publication of such a statement of continued opposition to the oath as prima facie evidence of "bad faith" in signing the oath, with regard to the "no mental reservations" clause.

When called up by the *Daily Californian* office and informed of this statement, the two non-signers naturally withdrew their statement until clarification of the administration's policy could be obtained. This decision—necessary at the time—naturally denatured the final interview of the non-signers just after everyone had signed the oath. It now appears, according to SCLU spokesmen, that the administration claims that it was misunderstood on its stricture against anti-oath statements by signers of the oath.

Now any approach to such a "mistake" must immediately detect a slightly fishy smell in the air. It is this reporter's belief that this entire episode was deliberately engineered by the "liberal" Kerr, as his move on behalf of the administration to smother anti-oath sentiment at its high point on the deadline day. Chancellor Kerr has never had any particular difficulty in making himself understood before!

Of course, if this policy had been official it would have raised the clear-cut issue of thought control. If such thought control were believed implicit in the wording of the oath itself, then a bonafide and widespread (even national) fight against its content could have been waged. However, this seemingly self-defeating bluster ended up in a very smart and temporarily successful maneuver to silence the last articulate non-signers.

It now appears that these two non-signers will re-submit their "statement of position" to the *Daily Cal*, and this should rake the embers of the anti-oath fight for another few days at least. However, despite the continued interest in the ROTC oath by such organizations as SCLU, it now seems necessary to consider that at least the first phase of the oath fight is over for a time.

During this ebb socialists will continue to argue against its presence on the university and its relatedness to the general anti-civil-liberties atmosphere in the country in recent years. Only in such times could such an oath not be laughed off campus by indignant liberals and conservatives alike, and it is for this reason that the fight against even such "mild" oaths must continue. This fight is part of the long-term effort to re-scale the positions abandoned and lost during the decade of the Cold War.

## Young Socialists Picket UN In Demonstration on North Africa



About fifteen members and friends of the Young Socialist League demonstrated in front of the UN building in New York last week. The pickets carried banners demanding freedom for North Africa, self-determination for Morocco and Algeria, opposition to all forms of colonialism, French, American and Russian as well as the others.

Because of an arrangement between the UN police force and the city police, the pickets were forced to demonstrate across the street from the General Assembly building. The UN sidewalks immediately in front of the General Assembly are one of the few examples of successful police action on the part of that organization. The possibility of raising the question of the right to picket on UN territory at another demonstration is now being considered.

Because of the police rules, the pickets were separated from the main entrances to the United Nations. However, members of the secretariat and of the various delegations passed by the line, copies of

LABOR ACTION containing the Giacometti article on Morocco were distributed, and, in at least one case, a delegation member was engaged in discussion by a YSLer. At the very beginning of the picketing, a Chinese who was passing by joined the line for a while.

The YSL participants felt that the line had a limited effectiveness because of the picketing situation, but that the demonstration was very worth while. It followed a similar demonstration some weeks ago held by the Los Angeles unit of the YSL, and plans are now being made for a larger line which would include a wide variety of organizations who are willing to come out in solidarity with the anti-imperialist struggle of the North African people.

The events in the United Nations which took place the day after the picket line, culminating in the General Assembly overruling the Steering Committee on the Algerian question, highlight the importance of Americans coming out and taking a firm stand against French imperialism and U. S. support of it.

# DEUTSCHER in the Role of STALINIST APOLOGIST

By ABE STEIN

In the current September 8 issue of *The Reporter*, the indefatigable Isaac Deutscher is writing again on the meaning of the shifts in the Moscow hierarchy.

Like everyone else, Deutscher was caught off-base and flat-footed at the time in his explanation of why Mikoyan was ousted as minister of Trade and Malenkov as premier. Analyzing the changes in the ruling circles, Deutscher linked Malenkov and Mikoyan as the representatives of a group which advocated a "soft" policy, with emphasis on more consumer goods. That is, the primary bone of contention within the Moscow clique was that of domestic policy, although of course it had its implications and consequences for foreign policy.

The only thing wrong with this interpretation, however, is that it does not explain why Mikoyan, who was apparently demoted, was then raised in rank and influence to a first deputy premier and has in the last few months taken a leading hand in foreign policy, where the relaxation and "thaw" continued.

In his current article, Deutscher writing with the wisdom of hindsight and after the fact, corrects his perspective to explain the changes in the regime as being dictated primarily by a struggle over foreign policy, and in the first instance over the question of Germany. It is now Deutscher's belief that Malenkov was propelled out of power because he had a "softer" line on Germany than Khrushchev and Bulganin, just as before him Beria was not only ousted but liquidated for having an even softer line.

Whether Deutscher's views, duly modified and corrected, are valid, we leave to one side. Rather, what is always of interest when reading him is his inveterate tendency to lapse into the role of an apologist for Stalinism.

**This is not due to the fact that Deutscher conceals the totalitarian nature of the system or the terror on which it rests. It is a result of his ingrained belief that Stalinism is progressive and even revolutionary in character.**

## PUFFING THE CP

In the article to which we refer, Deutscher presents the following line of reasoning:

Now that Russia has achieved a balance of power in the sphere of nuclear weapons, a relaxation in the armaments race between Washington and Moscow is possible. At the same time, and because of the nature of intercontinental nuclear war, the importance of conventional armaments diminishes and with it the importance of Germany as a military factor of first importance. Russia has nothing to fear from the rebuilding of the West German army, and it can afford to maintain a divided Germany while it waits patiently for an opportunity to disengage the country from the American bloc.

Since there is no likelihood of any agreement between Washington and Moscow, the only force that could impel Moscow to alter its policy toward Germany would be (writes Deutscher) the emergence of an irresistible popular movement demanding unification of the country. The Kremlin rulers are counting in the long run on a depression in Western Germany, and if it comes, bringing unemployment to millions of workers in the German Federal Republic, it may bring a revolutionary change of mood.

**And who will stand at the head of this popular mass movement? Deutscher unfolds the secret of the future and tells us: the German Communist Party, resting on the achievements of Russia and the East German puppet regime!**

To give his vision of the future a firm footing, Deutscher paints a fascinating picture of what is to come, and it is so

revealing of his mentality that it is worth quoting at some length.

In the first place, Deutscher writes: "Russia, I believe, is no longer interested in exploiting the Soviet Zone of Germany or in keeping down the German economy as a whole. . . ." And since the Russian economy is developing at a fast and furious pace, the gap between the living standards of the West Germans and Russia will vanish in the next ten years.

Furthermore, the cultural level of the masses in Russia is rising. He writes: "The time may not be far off when Germany coming into contact with Russia will no longer be repelled by the Asian element in Russia's outlook as it was in 1945." The combination of these material and cultural factors, in which East Germany will share, will have powerful repercussions in Germany favorable to Russia's future political strategy.

It goes without saying that everyone of Deutscher's premises are speculative and highly debatable. It would be worthwhile to have Deutscher map out an economic chart showing what the rate of expansion of consumer goods in Russia, let alone East Germany, will be in the next year. Hasn't Deutscher read that the primary preoccupation of the Kremlin hierarchy at the present time is to expand the cultivated area of grain just to keep up with the needs of the growing population? And hasn't he read his own remarks about the present curtailment of consumer goods production?

## LYRICAL PICTURE

**But these issues are debatable, since no one can prove one way or another what the next ten years will bring in Russia. Deutscher, however, makes one comment which especially reveals him in the unwitting role of the Stalinist apologist. He predicts that in ten years the Germans will no longer be repelled by the "Asian element in Russia's outlook" as they were in 1945.**

Now, there was nothing "Asiatic" in the behavior of the Kremlin in 1945. The behavior of the Russian army in Germany was not dictated by some brutal, primitive "Asiatic" instinct. Stalin and his cohorts had drilled the most vicious kind of chauvinism and hatred of all Germans into the Russian people and the Russian armies. And the policy of looting East Germany and creating a satellite was no more "Asiatic" than Hitler's attempt to carve an empire in the East. Whatever measures of liberalization Khrushchev and Bulganin may take, they are not, as Deutscher himself is the first to point out, going to liquidate the child of Moscow's totalitarian terror, the East German regime of Ulbricht and Grotewohl.

Deutscher paints a lyrical picture of the coming prosperity in East Germany while depression wracks the West German area. But how ludicrous! How does Deutscher know, for example, that the Russians are no longer interested in exploiting their zone? The cry has gone up from the Kremlin to modernize Russian industry, and East Germany happens to be the seat of a superb precision-instrument industry which not all the looting of the Russians and the mismanagement of their hirelings has been able to destroy.

## COST OF STALINISM

**But even if we accept Deutscher's notion that the Moscow clique will ease up in their requisitions from East Germany out of long-run political considerations, the essential fact is that the Russian-**

**occupied zone is not viable as an economic entity. It lacks the basic raw materials on which its industry rests, and for this reason alone has staggered from one crisis to another.**

Currently, the East German economy is being shored up by being integrated into a triangular combination with Poland and Czechoslovakia. From Polish Silesia, which the Russians took from the Germans and gave to Poland, the East German economy is to receive steel, iron, coal and other basic raw materials. But the East German puppet regime will not receive these goods as free gifts and will be compelled to pay in terms of the increased production that will ensue. As for any surplus: Is Deutscher serious in believing that a major share will go for the consumption needs of the masses?

While the looting and continued exactions of the Russians, as well as the economic deficiencies, are serious brakes on the development of the East German economy, the most crippling of all factors is the Pankow regime itself. Whoever reads the East German press day in and day out will discover all the proof he needs on the heavy cost the East German zone pays for the totalitarian-bureaucratic regime and its mismanagement of the economy. And, of course, it is the masses, and the workers first of all, who must pay for the waste, the corruption and stupidity of the Pankow regime. By what measures of liberalization is Moscow going to reform the police regime of Ulbricht, unless it reforms it out of existence?

## CP REVOLUTION?

**However, let us grant Deutscher his premises and see if his perspective of a revolutionary call for German unification from the East German government is a valid possibility in the future.**

Let us assume that unemployment exists in Western Germany and that there is no unemployment in Eastern Germany. Will it be possible for Ulbricht and Grotewohl to raise the banner of a mass movement for forcing the unification of Germany under Russian auspices?

If there existed no revolutionary socialist elements within the German working class in Western Germany, then the

perspective that the German Stalinist party might regain some of its prestige seems plausible. But the truth is that, small though they are, there exist strong left-wing tendencies within the Social-Democratic Party and the trade-union movement. And in the case of any radicalization of the German workers, they would move to the forefront to take the leadership.

But even more important, what would be the reaction of the working class in East Germany to any such radical program on the part of the puppet regime? This working class is bound hand and foot by repressive measures and terror. To guard against any mass movement such as occurred in the summer of 1953, the regime has had to install factory militants. That is, carefully hand-picked and loyal supporters of the regime are kept ready within the factory to suppress any unrest on the part of the workers.

How seriously can the workers both in East Germany and West Germany take the Pankow puppets when they know that the workers in East Germany have been deprived of the right to strike, that there are still thousands of workers in jail and concentration camps who participated in the June 1953 demonstrations? How seriously can they take Moscow's promotion of German unity so long as its occupation troops remain inside the country?

## WITHOUT A SPRING

**Any mass movement for German unity will be directed not only against the bourgeois regime in West Germany and the American occupation army, but also against the East German regime and the presence of Russian occupation troops. The day the Pankow regime unleashed a revolutionary program of German unification it would fall victim to it, just as Ulbricht and Grotewohl were threatened in the first days of the "liberalization" program in the middle of June in 1953.**

And such little faith, let it be said, do the Russians put in the ability of the Pankow regime to maintain itself, let alone lead a revolutionary movement of protest, that they have postponed the formation of a regular East German army. How, we would like to ask Deutscher, would such an army act in a period of mass upheaval? The disintegration of the "People's Police" in the days of June 1953 gives the answer.

A final word must be said about Deutscher. How does he arrive at such fantastic perspectives? The answer is that Deutscher is a "Marxist" who has left one not-unimportant ingredient out of his political and historical judgments: the independent role of the working class. But this is like telling time by a watch without a spring. And this leads him into strange by-ways indeed.

In the aftermath of the June 17 uprising, Deutscher advised the East German workers that it would have been better had they not revolted. And now, when this same working class has been temporarily suppressed, he remarks upon the curious lack of a popular mass movement and surrogates the revolutionary role in German politics—the regime of Ulbricht and Grotewohl!

## Peron's Fate Ripped Myth — —

(Continued from page 1)

bands, police, Peronist party, press, bureaucracy—then this was so because a corpse naturally cannot fight.

The country was ripe for the revolt. The cowardly "beloved leader," who had pretended to be lord of the continent, had to make a run for a Paraguayan gunboat. *Sic transit gloria.*

## PHASE TWO AHEAD

With the post-Peronist junta in Buenos Aires, the masses poured into the streets with the cry of "Liberty, Liberty!" Busts of Peron and Evita hit the pavement. Meanwhile the new regime organized by General Lonardi, a victim of Peron's persecution, and his arrival in the capital was greeted by hundreds of thousands of people, a mass turnout never seen previously at the biggest Peronist meetings. Lonardi gave out promises of full liberty for all citizens, freedom for the press, respect for trade-union rights and free elections. Political prisoners had been liberated by the rebels already, some days before. The secretary of the CGT, Di Pietro, begged for a benevolent attitude, offering his services and loyalty, as did also the president of the Peronist party, Leloir. *La Prensa*, the conscated paper which is now the CGT organ, wrote that General Lonardi will be a "father and brother for the workers." Such is the moral strength and dignity of the Peronist leaders.

**The new Lonardi government is a provisional regime for the political liquidation of Peronism. Presumably it is to be replaced by a new government which corresponds to the relation of political forces in Argentina. A second phase starts now: What kind of regime will be set up on the ruins of Peronism?**

The downfall of Peronism means that it lost, not only the support of the masses who backed it in its first period and who broke away from it because it did not fulfill its promises, but also the support of the bourgeois elements who have now withdrawn their support of bonapartism. The army and navy only performed the role of midwife. Does this mean that the bourgeoisie now feels stronger, strong enough to do without totalitarian bonapartism? that capitalism here is able to get along without military dictatorship?

The near future ought to answer this question, but there is no doubt that Peron's defeat is a help for the working class and for revolutionary socialism, not a defeat (as the Stalinists and their followers are crying). Socialism has nothing in common with bonapartist dictatorship, with Peron-type "justicialismo," or its cousin "getulismo" in Brazil, or Stalinism. The next task depends on the Argentine proletariat: how will it exploit the downfall of Peronism, in its own interests, for its political future. But this is another question.

BOOKS AND IDEAS

**Halasz: 'Captain Dreyfus'**

# THE CLASSIC WITCHHUNT: DREYFUS AND ANTI-SEMITISM

By JACK WILSON

For those independents and dissidents who managed to survive the slings and arrows of this reactionary period symbolized by McCarthyism, there are few if any books published recently which seem so timely, topical and (if we may be pardoned an enthusiasm) so inspirational as the splendid study on the Dreyfus case by Nicholas Halasz. This judgment, we are convinced, will be doubly reinforced by anyone who takes the time to read this extraordinary and fascinating account of an important and tragic event which changed the history of France.

Nor should anyone be misled by the absolutely disgraceful review of the Halasz book which appeared in the July 31 issue of the *New York Times* by one Albert Guerard, author of sixteen books on France, who used the *Times* to bolster his own scandalous deficiencies as a historian and do a grave disservice to the Halasz book. For Mr. Guerard in his review has the impudence to reassert two major points he wrote in his own history of France: He claims the conviction of Captain Dreyfus was a "pardonable error" and "anti-Semitism played a minor part in the affair." The whole of Halasz' book thunders with convincing evidence to the contrary.

## FRENCH SNAKE-PIT

The Dreyfus affair began in 1894 when Major Count Ferdinand Walsin Esterhazy of the French army offered his services as a spy to Colonel von Scharzkoppen, military attaché of the German embassy in Paris. Among other things Esterhazy wrote a *bordereau* (memorandum) listing some of the military material he wanted to sell. An inveterate gambler and part owner of a brothel, he was heavily in debt and desperate. How this *bordereau* and another document between the German and Italian embassies got into the hands of the French intelligence, known as the Second Bureau, has all the earmarks of a thriller detective story.

Now these incidents took place in a peculiar political and social atmosphere, in a France still suffering from the humiliation of defeat by Germany in the war of 1870, a France where patriotism had become chauvinism. It was a bourgeois France, still shaking from the nightmare of the Paris Commune, a country crawling with royalists scheming to regain power, a nation whose education and religion was dominated by the Catholic Church, and a French general staff heavily influenced by the Jesuit order and determined to blame other forces for its ignoble war record.

It was also just regaining part of its sanity from the frenzy of the mountebank Boulanger's movement. And it was a France which saw in 1892, two years before the Dreyfus affair began, the establishment of a powerful newspaper *La Libre Parole*, dedicated to anti-Semitism and financed by the Jesuits, who picked Edouard Drumont, an notorious anti-Semite, as its editor. Drumont was known as the "rabbi of anti-Semitism" because of his book entitled *Jewish France*.

## IN TEETH OF THE EVIDENCE

Oblivious to all these harsh facts in French political life, a brilliant young Jewish officer, Captain Alfred Dreyfus, from a fairly wealthy middle-class family, earned his promotion to the General Staff by hard work. He was disliked intensely by his fellow officers, distrusted and ignored, as became clear at his first trial. The anti-Semitic press, of course, had made quite a fuss about a Jew being on the General Staff.

It is no wonder then that Major Hubert Henry of the Second Bureau, who received the *bordereau* and the other document, easily concluded that there was a traitor on the General Staff and that it naturally was the Jew. Excitedly he rushed his preconceived convictions to higher brass and the ordeal of Captain Dreyfus began.

When an outstanding civilian handwriting expert declared that the *bordereau* was not written by Captain Dreyfus; he was dismissed, and the General Staff found other experts, including the notorious Bertillon, to make contradictory

**CAPTAIN DREYFUS, By Nicholas Halasz.—Simon and Schuster, N. Y.**

findings. Their minds steeped in anti-Semitism, the General Staff needed no further convincing. Dreyfus was a doomed man before his court-martial.

The trial itself violated French military code since the accused was not confronted with the evidence against him (something which we have seen our own share of in the past few years). Furthermore a confidential biased report was prepared for the judges to doubly convince them, and it worked.

The tragedy of Dreyfus in those days makes sad reading. How this poor soul lived through the ordeal and his frightful existence on Devil's Island is difficult to understand, but he did. No one except his brother, his wife and his lawyer, a conservative Catholic, believed in his innocence. The case seemed to be closed for good.

Fifteen months after Dreyfus was convicted, the youngest major in the French army, Marie-Georges Picquart, became the head of the Second Bureau and as a matter of duty looked into the Dreyfus files. The more he read the more astonished he became. Where was the evidence? he asked himself. There was none. Meanwhile he had received some information on Esterhazy that indicated Esterhazy was selling material to the Germans. He compared all the handwritings, he double-checked everything, and the conclusion was inescapable. Esterhazy had written the *bordereau*. Esterhazy was the traitor.

## "HE IS INNOCENT"

One of the many memorable scenes in this book is now written by Halasz. Picquart goes to General Gonse, his superior. (Their conversation was testified in court subsequently.) Picquart is told: "You should have kept the two cases separate. The Dreyfus case is closed." General Gonse asks him, "What do you care for this Jew anyhow?"

"He is innocent," Picquart replies.

"And how do you propose to get a new trial started with General Mercier and General De Boisdeffre personally declaring that it is an adjudicated case?"

"General," Picquart says, "the man is innocent."

"For me," General Gonse reminds Picquart, "truth is what the minister of War and the chief of the General Staff tell me is true." He adds, "If you keep silent no one need find out anything."

"General, what you say is abominable. I do not yet know what I am going to do. But I will not carry this to my grave," Picquart answered.

Dreyfus had refused to kill himself in prison, as was suggested to him before his trial. For Picquart the General Staff had another solution, assignment to a combat area in North Africa. But he was lucky, and he was able to return to Paris where he made an affidavit swearing to Dreyfus' innocence before a noted lawyer who could not keep it to himself.

This lawyer in turn revealed its contents, but not its author, to the vice-chairman of the Senate, Scheurer-Kestner, a respectable conservative. The senator couldn't keep a secret either, but unless he could use the affidavit he felt he could not speak. When word of this reached the General Staff and its many allies in the French press, a series of articles, etc., appeared adding further claims to the story that Dreyfus was guilty.

The Dreyfus family meanwhile had engaged a young literary critic, Bernard Lazare, who wrote a factual story of the Dreyfus case pointing out the illegal proceedings of the court-martial.

Enough was happening to scare Esterhazy, who contemplated flight or suicide. The General Staff and Major Henry likewise were worried. So Major Henry conveniently forged more documents to "prove" Dreyfus was guilty. These documents were leaked to the press. Is it a wonder that after Senator Scheurer-Kestner finally made a speech before the Senate everyone ignored him and he was denounced by the press?

He did, however, convince one man, Jean Jaurès, the great socialist leader. He also convinced Georges Clemenceau that the trial was illegal. Clemenceau, incidentally, at this point thought that Dreyfus was guilty.

## CATHOLIC POGROM

The General Staff found a very clever device to remove the irritant known as the Dreyfus case. They decided to court-martial Esterhazy, having in advance assured him through Marquis Du Pay that he would be cleared. The result was a world scandal, for Esterhazy was, of course, found innocent.

This seemed a propitious moment for the Catholic Church to take the offensive and seek to regain full power in France, using anti-Semitism as its weapon. *Civilita Catholica*, official organ of the Jesuit Order in Rome, wrote:

"The condemnation of Dreyfus was a terrible blow for Israel. It branded the forehead of all Jews in the world, most of all in their French colonies. . . . The Jew was created by God to serve as a spy wherever treason is in preparation. . . . Not only in France, but in Germany, Austria, and Italy as well, the Jews are to be excluded from the nation. . . ."

When the Vatican was queried on the foregoing editorial, Cardinal Rampolla, secretary of State of the Vatican, told a diplomat: "The attempt at a revision of the Dreyfus sentence is a Jewish-Protestant machination. The duty of every good Catholic is to stand by Premier Meline in his anti-Semitic endeavors."

The Catholic press began a crusade against "the enemies of the army and of Christ." Parish priests of 5,000 churches throughout France echoed the battle-cry. Chauvinism and anti-Semitism seemed to have carried and brought to the forefront all the reactionary figures of French society. It was a dark day for the handful of "eggheads" who thought Dreyfus was innocent.

## "J'ACCUSE!"

It was in this general atmosphere that Emile Zola returned from a vacation in Switzerland and heard the story of how Dreyfus was publicly degraded and how he repeatedly proclaimed his innocence while the mobs tried to lynch him. Zola was revolted at the indignity and began to show an interest in the case. He became convinced that Dreyfus was innocent after reading the speech of Senator Scheurer-Kestner, and he perceived what was really involved in the tragic event.

On January 13, 1898 Zola made his public declaration "J'Accuse!" It appeared in Clemenceau's paper *L'Aurore*. It was an open letter addressed to the president of the Republic and it had the moral force of a powerful hurricane. It surely was one of the great documents of the 19th century. Zola analyzed all the detailed events and proved not only that Dreyfus was innocent but explained why the General Staff was determined to keep him convicted.

Zola did not hesitate to come to the core of the matter. "Dreyfus cannot be vindicated unless the whole General Staff is indicted. . . . What a cleaning up the republican government must institute in that house of Jesuits, as General Billot (Minister of War) himself called it. . . . And what abominable measures have been resorted to in this affair of folly and stupidity, smacking of low police practice, of unbridled nightmare, of the Spanish inquisition. . . ."

Zola ended his famous document by stating he knew he was committing a felony by making these accusations.

He declared: "The action I take here is simply a revolutionary step designed to hasten the explosion of truth and justice."

"I have one passion only, for light, in the name of humanity which has borne so much and has a right to happiness. My burning protest is only the cry of my soul. Let them dare to carry me to the court of appeals, and let there be an inquest in the full light of day!"

"I am waiting."

The world-famous novelist, the greatest living Frenchman, staked his life, his reputation, everything, in the interest of simple justice and plain truth. He received 30,000 letters and telegrams from all parts of the world.

Mark Twain in New York declared, "I am penetrated with the most profound respect for Zola and (filled) with boundless admiration. Such cowards, hypocrites, and flatterers as the members of military and ecclesiastic courts the world produce by the million every year. But it takes five centuries to produce a Joan of Arc or a Zola."

## ZOLA TO JAURES

The French cabinet was in a crisis because of the Zola accusations. They decided finally to charge only criminal libel for one small passage in *J'Accuse!* so that the Dreyfus case would not be part of the court record.

On February 7, 1898 the trial of Zola opened and for sheer drama few courtroom scenes in modern history can begin to compare with what occurred. It was Zola, Clemenceau, the editor, the brilliant Fernand Labori, a lawyer of the Clarence Darrow type, and a handful of intellectuals, versus the army, the government and the whole popular press which had inflamed the passions of France. Many memorable events occurred during this trial. For those who have the phrase "Point of order, Mr. Chairman" still ringing in their ears, there was another phrase at the Zola trial, "The question is out of order," as the judge sought to keep the Dreyfus case from being discussed.

Zola was found guilty, to be sure, an inevitable verdict in the social atmosphere of France at this time. For a while he even had to flee to England to escape physical harm. But the battle had been joined.

Jaurès had meanwhile enlisted the support of the socialist movement; and the republican movements, based on the traditions of the French Revolution and aware of the trend of the anti-Semitic drive of the Catholic Church, fought back. Although a tidal wave of anti-Semitism swept France, more and more people became immersed in the struggle and truth slowly but surely began to go on the march.

## WORLD SHOCKED

The Zola conviction led to the following statement in the Chamber of Deputies by Premier Meline: "The Jews who foolishly unloosed this prepared campaign of hatred brought down upon themselves a century of intolerance. . . . the Jews and that intellectual élite which seems to enjoy poisoning the atmosphere and inciting bloody hatred. From today on those who stubbornly insist on continuing the struggle will not be considered as acting in good faith. We shall apply against them the full rigor of the law. If the powers we now possess are not adequate we shall ask you for new ones!" The Chamber enthusiastically voted to have the speech displayed publicly as a proclamation. It passed the following resolution by a vote of 428 to 54:

"The Chamber invites the government to repress energetically the odious campaign undertaken by a cosmopolitan syndicate and subsidized by foreign money to rehabilitate the traitor Dreyfus, who was unannouncedly convicted by the testimony of twenty-seven French officers, and who has confessed his guilt."

Picquart was retired from the French army for grave shortcomings in service. He had testified again that Dreyfus was innocent.

The Western world was shocked. It condemned the Zola conviction unanimously. Zola in the meantime had the audacity and courage to appeal his conviction.

At this point a new minister of War, Cavaignac, began an intensive study of the Dreyfus documents to make good his election promise that he would end the whole affair once and for all. In a dramatic speech before the Chamber he informed the world that his study had convinced him, especially on the basis of new documents, that Dreyfus was guilty. He was astonished when Picquart wrote a letter to the premier stating simply that if he had an opportunity to appear before proper authorities he could prove that the documents quoted by Cavaignac were forgeries and that the minister had been taken in by the General Staff.

Cavaignac thereupon called Major

(Turn to last page)

# Test of the 'Free World' — —

(Continued from page 1)

atory tone toward the "French Union" (French colonial empire).

All this does not prevent a solid, responsible American newspaper like the *New York Times* from trying to whip up pro-French and anti-North African sentiment in the United States around the Stalinist issue.

"If it is true, and we believe that it is," wrote the *Times* editorial writer on October 2, "that the political status of Algeria is a French domestic problem, it is also true that the whole question of North Africa is of international consequence. We in the United States are immediately concerned because it is the site of important NATO bases, largely manned by the United States. It is easy to understand that the Communist world would have an interest in making this region unstable politically and would foment any types of disorder that might come to hand. In such a situation, even honest 'nationalist' feeling can be made the tool of subversion. That has happened in North Africa."

## TRIES RED SCARE

Neither the *Times*' editorial writer, nor any of its correspondents, even attempt to prove the broad insinuation that somehow what has happened in North Africa is that honest "nationalist" [why the disparaging quotation marks?] feeling has become a tool of Communist subversion. They are desperately casting about for some formula which might make palatable to the American people support of the French empire in this situation.

Actually the case is about as clear and clean-cut as any could be. In Algeria, the French rule a territory four times the size of France itself, with a population of about 9,000,000. Despite the claim that Algeria is an integral part of France, this colony has a sort of legislature of its own in which less than 1,000,000 Europeans have equal representation with more than 8,000,000 Moslems. Further, if the population of Algeria were given the same representation in the National Assembly as that of other French departments, they would have 141 seats (eight-ninths of them elected by Moslems) instead of the 30 allotted to Algeria at present. (The French National Assembly has 627 deputies.)

In short, any claim by the French that Algeria is just another part of the homeland is completely spurious, and

everyone with the slightest acquaintance with the situation knows it. What is going on in this country is a national war for freedom. Although such a war does not threaten to explode into a worldwide conflict, the United Nations has just as much business taking it up as it has with other localized conflicts such as the Israel-Arab war.

## MOROCCO FIGHTS

While the French walked out of the UN over Algeria, it is becoming clear that the internal struggle within the French bourgeoisie over the Moroccan issue has not yet been resolved.

During the height of the August fighting in Morocco, the government made a deal with the nationalists which involved the return of Sultan Sidi Mohammed ben Youssef to France from his exile in Madagascar, and the replacement of the French puppet Ben Moulay Arafa by a regency council established with Ben Youssef's consent.

But French Resident General Boyer de Latour, apparently under the pressure of the colonialist element, clearly violated the instructions of his own government, and arranged for Ben Moulay Arafa to relinquish his throne to a distant relative rather than a regency council. While fighting broke out again in the interior, the French government demonstrated once again that it has little control over the very officers who are supposed to carry out its policies.

The apologists for French imperialism will shake their heads and mumble about how the French are moving too slowly and without sufficient decision in dealing with this colony (as does the editor of the *Reporter* magazine). The real point for democrats and socialists alike, however, should be that since French rule in both Algeria and Morocco is reactionary and undemocratic, and since this is doubly demonstrated by the inability of the French government to make democratic reforms, however partial and inadequate these might be even in conception, the only answer is for France to get out of these countries at once, and then try to establish special economic and political relations with them on a basis of equality.

## A LIBERAL SQUIRMS

The *New York Times*, like the American government, is openly on the side of French imperialism in the Algerian and

Moroccan situation. Where do American liberals stand on the issue?

We look with special interest to an editorial in the *New York Post* for October 3, entitled "French Revolution, 1955 Model." The special interest derives from the fact that *Post* editor James Wechsler is a "left wing" member of the national board of Americans for Democratic Action, the politically organized expression of American liberalism.

The *Post* editorial is a masterpiece of forceful phraseology concealing emptiness of content:

French behavior in the UN was "intolerably wrong," despite the fact that she may have had "every technical right on her side" in opposing UN debate of Algeria. It is true that many of those who voted against France don't have clean hands on the same kind of subject. It is even possible that open debate of the Algerian question in the UN might "in-flame extremists on both sides." But then, when all is said and done, France shouldn't threaten the UN with secession. "Algeria is another symptom of the total bankruptcy of French colonial policy..."

What follows from that? A cry for France to get out of Algeria? A demand that the United States stop supporting France in her suppression of Algeria? Not at all. Here is what seems to be the analytical if not programmatic climax of the editorial:

"There are important forces within France striving to change French policy. But France has faltered and fumbled too long. The agonies in Algeria climax a larger failure. Because our diplomats have wistfully hoped for the best, America has repeatedly been maneuvered into a position of apparent support for the twilight maneuvers of a desperate, dying French imperialism."

What might one conclude from this fighting statement of the liberal position on French colonialism? Perhaps that American support, having been more apparent than real, is nothing to worry about? Perhaps since these are twilight maneuvers, no one need get too excited about them, as they will end soon anyway?

In any event, the editorial does not say, or even imply, the basic democratic demand: *France, get out of North Africa! Americans, demand that this government stop supporting French imperialism!*

# Dreyfus and Anti-Semitism — —

(Continued from page 7)

Henry and after a lengthy interrogation obtained from Major Henry the admission that the document was a complete forgery. Major Henry was thereupon arrested and committed suicide. A retrial of the Dreyfus case now became inevitable.

As the "revisionists" (those who wanted to revise the verdict of guilty) began to grow in strength, a couple of important generals also decided to resign, since the pressure was beginning to grow. At this point Jean Jaurès published his book *The Proofs*, a penetrating analysis of the whole Dreyfus case, and the socialist movement began to hold meetings which often ended in free-for-alls with the anti-Semites, the royalists and the pro-army factions of the population. Surely Dreyfus would soon be free, one might have thought.

But that would be underestimating the power and the influence of the General Staff, whose prestige was now a matter of life and death. At one point they ex-

erted enough pressure to get the Chamber of Deputies to pass a resolution preventing the criminal section of the high court from hearing a retrial of the Dreyfus case.

Nevertheless, at long last, Dreyfus was returned from his imprisonment in solitary confinement on Devil's Island for his retrial, with over 200 journalists from the world press present. When the poor man returned he was astounded to find what a world figure he had become. He never understood the implications of his case, for, as Clemenceau put it, "Dreyfus was abysmally below the Dreyfus case."

## THE TIDE TURNS

The retrial itself was a repetition of the Zola trial, with spokesmen for the General Staff introducing "new documents" which could not be made public because they were "military secrets" and involved the "honor of the state" and "national security"; and, amazing as it sounds, Dreyfus was again found guilty of high treason "under extenuating circumstances," however.

But the tide was turning, as the shrill cries of the royalists and the anti-Semitic press revealed. Later Dreyfus was pardoned—a cruel blow, incidentally, to Picquart, who had sacrificed his whole career to proclaim without let-up that Dreyfus was completely innocent. The tide of French politics continued to turn, however, and in 1906 Dreyfus was completely exonerated by the high court of appeals.

The Church lost much power, its grip over the schools was broken, many special privileges were revoked, and republicanism triumphed. France was restored to a normal bourgeois republic and Captain Dreyfus lived to the ripe age of 75 after serving in World War I.

Just before he died in 1935 Dreyfus received from the widow of General von Schwarzkoppen a copy of his diary in which Dreyfus' innocence was affirmed.

For the ultimate triumph of justice and truth, credit goes to many brave Dreyfusards, but above all, this is great historical testimony to the immortality of Emile Zola, the man who dared all for the sake of truth.

Is it small wonder that one can only be incensed at the disgraceful opinions of one Albert Guerard in the year 1955 on the Dreyfus case? For Nicholas Harasz, the author, congratulations are due. Here is a real book illuminating the struggle of man to emancipate himself from himself, at a critical juncture of history.

Read the  
**NEW INTERNATIONAL**  
America's leading Marxist review

A New Collection!

## MARX AND ENGELS ON BRITAIN

Contains the whole of Engels' *Condition of the Working Class in England* in addition to dozens of their articles and letters. 538 pages—fully indexed—hard-cover—fine binding—but only \$2.50! All orders must be accompanied by payment.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE  
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

## 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.

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

NAME (please print) .....

ADDRESS .....

CITY .....

ZONE STATE .....

## 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 .....

ZONE STATE .....

CITY .....

## Labor Action FORUM New York

Thursday at 8:45 p.m.

Oct. 13—Sam Taylor

THE ECONOMIC BASIS  
OF AMERICAN PROSPERITY

Oct. 20—Hal Draper

SCHUMPETER'S THEORY  
OF IMPERIALISM

Labor Action Hall  
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.