

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JANUARY 23, 1956

FIVE CENTS

Sympathy-as-Usual Isn't Enough to Help Westinghouse Strike

By JOHN WILLIAMS

The nation-wide strike against the Westinghouse chain of plants, by the International Union of Electrical Workers (AFL-CIO), is now in its 14th week. It has been met by the corporation with such ferocity that the fight bids fair to have a decisive effect on the future policy of the rest of the capitalist class with respect to labor.

All employers must be watching closely what happens on this front, feeling that Westinghouse is fighting their battle to teach the newly united labor movement a "lesson"—the lesson that it had better not get too rambunctious about interfering with "management's rights" in determining production norms and speedup.

The challenge is there because production is being revolutionized by the advance of automation, which creates new kinds of jobs, and there have to be new methods worked out and new precedents set to determine the new working standards.

The adamant savagery of Westinghouse's strikebreaking drive has publicly introduced a new national note in this "great and prosperous" era of labor-statesmanship and class-collaboration.

From all "normal" standards in this period, the strike would have been settled long ago.

First, the company desperately needed the production of its plants. It lost huge amounts of business during this last Christmas period; and this was so at a time when it had already been seriously weakened by its competitors and its own engineering snafus. Today there are virtually no Westinghouse appliances or products on the market. Nobody can estimate how enormous the losses will eventually amount to as a result of Westinghouse's long absence from the competitive market.

STRIKEBREAKING

In short, the company had the most compelling reasons to settle. Instead it is opening up a national offensive against the union.

It is doing this not only in relatively weaker locals of the union, like the one in Columbus, O., but also in Bloomfield, N. J. The latter is in the heart of the IUE's District 4, one of the biggest and best organized sections of the union.

The company is pulling out all stops. Nationally we are witnessing almost daily now attempts at smashing picket lines, police brutality, etc. To all of this the IUE, all things considered, has been standing up surprisingly well.

While the company has had every economic reason to settle,

(Continued on page 2)

ITALY: The World Oil Cartel Moves In . . . page 6
FRANCE: The Decay of Parliamentarism . . . page 3
SPAIN: Youth Declares Against Franco . . . page 5
BRITAIN: Labor Is Acting Tougher . . . page 7
INDIA: The Program of the New SP . . . page 4
YALTA: Notes on the New Documents . . . page 3

THE FACT COVERED UP BY THE STORM: Democrats Fellow-Traveled To the 'Brink' with Dulles

By GORDON HASKELL

Secretary of State Dulles' now internationally notorious "brink of war" article has led to a lively political battle early in the campaign season. The verbal fireworks set off by Senator Humphrey and Adlai Stevenson on one side, and the replies by Harold Stassen and Vice President Nixon on the other, might lead one to think that at long last "the great debate" on America's foreign policy has begun.

A closer examination of the statements issued in such harsh and defiant partisan tones reveals two things:

First, that the Democratic critics of Dulles do not offer a policy which is significantly different from that followed by the Eisenhower administration.

Second, that what they object to is not so much the policies pursued by the Republicans as their attempt to make private political capital out of a policy which was worked out, accepted and put over on the American people by both parties, as well as the exaggerated and even extravagant terminology used by Dulles in describing his policy.

The particular instance which has hit the headlines now is as good an example as one could wish.

In an interview incorporated in a *Life* magazine article (the whole of which reads like a Republican campaign document) Dulles claims that America's policy of containing Stalinism by the threat of A-bomb warfare has "worked" to deter the Stalinists from seizing territories which they were preparing to seize. The policy of "deterrence," Dulles explained, not only held the Stalinists at bay, but prevented small wars as well as the "big" nuclear war from breaking out.

Generalizing from the examples he had outlined, Dulles went on to say in the most quotable passage:

"You have to take chances for peace, just as you must take chances for war."



"BRINK 'EM BACK ALIVE" DULLES

Of course we were brought to the verge of war. The ability to get to the verge without getting into the war is the necessary art. If you cannot master it, you inevitably get into war. If you try to run away from it, if you are scared to go to the brink, you are lost. We've had to look it square in the face—on the question of enlarging the Korean war, on the question of getting into the Indo-China war, on the question of Formosa. We walked to the brink and we looked it

(Turn to last page)

Who Wants What Dulles Is Selling?

The conclusion of the *Life* article written for John Foster Dulles by James Shepley reads as follows:

"Today the world, free and slave, knows not only where the U. S. stands on the question of Communism but what the U. S. intends to do about it. And they know because the U. S. secretary of State himself has told them, in the greatest display of personal diplomacy since the great days of the Franklin-Adams-Jefferson triumvirate in the Europe of the 1780s.

"Dulles himself best described his kind of diplomacy when he said to me, 'What we need to do is recapture the kind of crusading spirit of the early days of the Republic when we were certain that we had something better than anyone else and we knew the rest of the world needed it and wanted it and that we were going to carry it around the world. The missionaries, the doctors, the educators and the merchants carried the knowledge of the great American experiment to all four corners of the globe.'"

In the thousands of words which precede these paragraphs both Shepley and Dulles reveal nothing about "What the U. S. intends to do about Communism" unless they mean that they intend to scare it (and the rest of us) to death by going to the brink of war each year; or, just as likely, to get the Stalinists to laugh themselves to death at Dulles' announcements.

There was, perhaps, a time when a lot of people in the world wanted what American missionaries, doctors, educators and merchants had to bring. Since the only "great American experiment" which Dulles threatens to export to "all four corners of the globe" appears to be the product of the experiments in nuclear weapons, we doubt if the rest of the world needs and wants it as badly as he claims. They would probably much prefer to have back the crusading spirit of the missionaries, doctors, educators and even merchants than a crusade carried on by intercontinental missiles tipped with nuclear warheads.

McCarthyite Right Cheers Westinghouse

The far-right-wing *National Review* of Buckley, Burnham & Co. appears to recognize the significance of the Westinghouse strike better than the lib-lab journals. Few strikes rate a whole boxed editorial page in this organ of the intellectual McCarthyites.

The whole piece in the current issue is an unqualified endorsement of the company's position and an attack not only on the IUE and its Pres. Carey but on unions in general. These militant reactionaries, too, look on the Westinghouse battle as an opportunity to settle accounts with labor, not as a routine contest.

They immediately focus on the issues of five-year contract, control of time-study, the union's demand for a "veto over company affairs." On all questions they back the company to the hilt, with free back-patting thrown in: "Westinghouse management has decided to fight. Their course was honorable and just."

These right-wing ideologists, who look on themselves as the last-ditch defenders of unreconstructed private enterprise, are cheering precisely at Westinghouse's display of ferocious adamance.

Above all, they see the strike's broad significance for all of capital and all of labor. It would be good if that were true for labor's brain-trusters.

Overcoming doctrinaire doubts about injecting new interfering laws into the "free economy," the editors come to their point: If the unions are going to be so "irresponsible," then the current laws which support a "damaging imbalance" in favor of the unions will have to be revised. . . . In other words, they threaten the reprisal of labor-smashing legislation to out-Taft and out-Hartley the present weapons.

This is the temper of the Right. It will take the whole labor movement to answer properly, not only the workers of Westinghouse.

Westinghouse — —

(Continued from page 1)

the union has been bending over backward to come to an agreement.

At present it is offering to go back to work while the demands go to arbitration. This is indeed a very modest position.

Yet the company demands nothing less than unconditional surrender.

It hopes to break the IUE, which is engaging management in its first nation-wide fight. Above all, it hopes to permanently crush the union's right to stop speedup as a result of automation (see story in last week's LA). Mass production bosses, while often willing to grant economic concessions, have been notoriously guilty of speedup and reluctant to yield anything worthwhile on work norms.

Even in the United Auto Workers, where some considerable economic gains have been made, there is a long way to go in eliminating speedup.

The picture points to Westinghouse's role as a "vanguard" in the

Opposition in Steel Union Lost Election

By EMIL MODIC

Pittsburgh, Jan. 12

Official returns in the special election recently held by the United Steelworkers indicate that USW President David McDonald's slate was elected. Howard Hague defeated Joseph P. Molony for vice-president by a vote of about 400,000 to 200,000.

In Cleveland the McDonald candidate, B. W. Ohler, won over Nicholas Radlick by 13,000 to 8,000; and in Homestead, administration candidate John Sullivan got 7,700 votes to 7,100 for Paul Hilbert.

The election was a special one caused by the death of three office-holders. All offices will again be up for election in February of 1957.

Paul Hilbert, defeated candidate in Homestead, has charged that voting was irregular. Hilbert's followers claim that although they counted only 600 members entering one local union hall to vote, 950 votes were cast in the local. In another local, 1500 people voted, but only 1300 votes were counted, according to the charge. The Honest Ballot Association checks election returns from the locals, but does not supervise voting in the locals.

So far as this writer knows, the opposition forces have announced no plans since the election. Whether they will present a slate in next year's election, and whether the administration will take reprisal against them, remains to be seen.

Some observers see in the recent fight a definitive break between McDonald and the Association of Catholic Trade-Unionists. The real leader of the opposition was not Moloney, but William Hart of the Allegheny Valley region, who has long been a leader of the ACTU. Most of the opposition leaders had also been associated with the ACTU; but so had many McDonald supporters.

According to this interpretation, McDonald has opposed the ACTU, not on religious grounds, but simply because he is opposed to any faction or grouping in the union which might serve as a possible center for opposition.

In a statement on the unity convention, McDonald has assured USW members that (1) the USW will continue to fight against Jim Crow in the union movement; (2) no steel locals would be carved up into craft unions (3) the USW would continue to organize on an industrial basis; (4) USW grievance committees will not be replaced by AFL-type business agents; (5) craft unions would not dominate the new AFL-CIO; and (6) a labor party was not being planned by the united movement.

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

capitalists' aim to prevent workers' checks on speedup under conditions of automation changeover.

In Ohio, Governor Lausche, a Democrat presidential hopeful, warns the Westinghouse workers not to violate injunctions prohibiting mass picketing at the Columbus plant. He says nothing about police brutality which results in the death of a striker. He says nothing about the murderous assaults made by company cars against pickets on foot.

This is understandable. Lausche and his Democratic regime are acting as tools of the bosses.

What is less understandable is that the united union movement does not protest the action of the judges, governors and police as the latter attack the strike.

This strike has had the usual, almost routine, support from the rest of labor—collections, help on picket lines, etc.—but it needs much more than that.

Since the issue of setting rates and norms for day-workers is one which concerns all labor most deeply and directly, and since in any case the loss of a strike of this size and scope would inescapably have serious consequences for all labor, it behooves all labor bodies—locals, councils, districts, internationals, and top bodies of the AFL-CIO up to Meany and Reuther—to begin to act as if a crisis really exists, as it surely does.

WHAT IT NEEDS

Unionism-as-usual will not suffice. The labor movement cannot permit a "Kohler" on a large scale.

Giant labor protests and demonstrations should be organized nationally by the union movement. Cities where police brutality against strikes takes place should see massive rallies called by the united trade unions, to show the vicious strikebreakers that they can't get away with it.

In such cities demands must be raised to remove from the force any officer or cop guilty of brutality against strikers. Labor must see to it nationally that no picket line grows thin because of the intervention of capitalist judges and policemen.

A concerted effort for more material aid must begin. Westinghouse strikers themselves should go before central labor bodies to ask for help on their picket lines.

In New Jersey the Democratic Governor Meyner, elected by labor's votes, must be made to understand that Westinghouse workers in his state are being clubbed by his state's policemen, and that he cannot afford to stand by in studied "impartiality" like Eisenhower while picket lines are being attacked.

There is enough verbal support. What is needed now are giant actions on a national scale. The time to act is now!

HOW TO HELP THE WESTINGHOUSE STRIKE

The Seafarers International Union in Baltimore has already shown how the united labor movement can back the Westinghouse strikers and not with money alone.

On December 18, the IUE called a strike rally at the SIU hall in Baltimore. SIU seamen were there and \$5000 was collected. Strikebreakers were being pushed through picket lines in automobiles at the company's two plants at Lansdowne and at Williams Avenues. Seamen joined in

LABOR SCOPE

Brownell Does His Bit for Westinghouse

By BEN HALL

On December 20, Attorney General Brownell cited the United Electrical Workers Union (UE) as "Communist-infiltrated" under the terms of the Communist Control Act of 1954. He is to go before the Subversive Activities Control Board to prove his charge, aiming to strip the union of its collective-bargaining rights and its rights before the National Labor Relations Board, and finally to destroy its contractual position with the employers.

Brownell thus combines the government witchhunt with strikebreaking.

Westinghouse is now on-strike, a strike initiated by the International Union of Electrical Workers (IUE-AFL-CIO); but the UE, which controls a big section of the company's workers, called out 10,000 of its members to join the stoppage.

The strikers are under enormous pressure from the company, which has been spending millions on anti-union propaganda. The courts, the press, the police are joining in to undermine the strikers' morale. And at just such a moment Brownell moves against a union which represents 20 per cent of the strikers.

Westinghouse has already taken steps, under the Taft-Hartley Law, to decertify AFL-CIO Local 759 in Mansfield, Ohio. Brownell's move to decertify the UE, although not directly aimed at the AFL-CIO, becomes part of the anti-union pattern.

Coming in the midst of the strike, his action is not a simple coincidence but a coldly calculated strikebreaking action, a repetition of previous moves.

Last July, the International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers was engaged in a bitter strike against the country's three major non-ferrous mining companies. In the midst of the copper strike, Brownell cited the union as "infiltrated," just as he has done in the case of the strike-embattled UE.

The "security" program becomes a prop to the security of Westinghouse profits.

RUEPING STRIKE

Packinghouse workers will soon have one united union. The Amalgamated Meat Cutters (formerly AFL) and the United Packinghouse Workers (formerly CIO) have already announced a merger agreement. About 450,000 workers will be joined together in a single industrial union.

Its first drive will be to organize employees in the Swift chain who are now in an independent union.

By this merger, packinghouse workers overcome a serious division in their ranks, a division which led to near-defeat in a nation-wide strike about 7 years ago.

As they pool their strength, union members will be thinking of the strike of Amalgamated Local 360 at the Rueping Leather Company, which began on August 8, 1955 in the city of Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, not far from the Kohler plant in Sheboygan. The Meat Cutters Union reports:

"Rueping threw everything in the strikebreaking book—and some things that had never been written there before—at the men and women who had produced its leather. Fond du Lac newspapers, and newspapers in neighboring towns, blossomed out with ads appealing to all and sundry 'Wanted, Male Help—Good Steady Jobs' signed 'Fred Rueping Leather Co.' City police were persuaded to barricade off mass picket lines from the tannery. Workers were arrested for using impolite language to scabs. The anti-labor machinery of the Wisconsin law was used to grind out an injunction against the strikers and their sympathizers. They were forbidden to have

more than fifty pickets or ten at any one gate of the tannery . . . to congregate on the public streets . . . or to be guilty of an unamiable act toward the strikebreakers which could come under the legal description of 'coercion.' Strikers sometimes wondered if they were violating the law in publicly blowing their noses."

BACKSLAPPING DAY

In October the United Rubber Workers Union celebrated its 20th anniversary and decided to hold a two-day open-house party at its headquarters in Akron. Rubber workers and their families were, of course, invited. And in a spirit of good-will, cooperation, harmony, mutuality and brotherhood, the union invited top-ranking executives of the rubber companies to come too. And they did.

Just to mention a few, there were: P. W. Litchfield, 80-year-old chairman of the Goodyear board, who brought a bunch of company pals. President Lee Jackson of Firestone, who came with his vice-president and his counsel. Charles Jahant, General Tires vice-president, showed up. John Collyer came with W. S. Richardson from Goodrich. John Seiberling of Seiberling. And E. M. Cushing, director of industrial relations for U. S. Rubber, flew all the way from New York.

The *United Rubber Worker*, proudly reprints a friendly account from the *Akron Beacon Journal*, together with a nice editorial from this paper which did its impotent best to undermine unionism in the early critical days:

"In its continued efforts on behalf of the employees in the rubber industry the union naturally does not always interpret facts in the same way as the employers do. But where there is honesty on both sides of the bargaining table and mutual respect, satisfactory answers can usually be found."

This is what the *Beacon Journal* writes, today. So, without comment and exclusively in the words of the *Beacon Journal*, the union reports how it celebrated its anniversary.

We are reminded of the cozy social gathering by the 20th anniversary edition of the *United Rubber Worker*, which is devoted entirely to a history of the union, 1935-1955. The writer, John Newton Thurber, of the union's research department, is not quite so overwhelmed by the respectful attentions of rubber executives.

"Yet, at the same time that the companies with whom the union has dealt over the years have come to accept the existence of the union and to see some measure of merit in it, these same companies as well as the managements of firms not yet organized are just as determined in their opposition to the union when it starts to organize a new plant as they were in 1933, 1934, or 1935. The union has demonstrated its value, its responsibility, and the fact that the firms with which it deals make greater and greater profits year after year. Yet the firms after all the years would still be happier if there were no URCLPWA [Rubber Workers Union]."

Just no gratitude!

At last available!

The **SECOND** volume
of
Leon Trotsky's
THE FIRST
FIVE YEARS
OF THE
COMMUNIST
INTERNATIONAL

384 pages.....Paper covers

\$3.00

All orders must be accompanied
by payment.

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

Upset Election Mirrors Decay Of Parliamentarism in France

By ANDRE GIACOMETTI

Paris, Jan. 6

Rarely have there been more useless elections in France since the end of the war. From the standpoint of socialism nothing has been gained; but then, neither has anything been lost, except another opportunity of the kind which the labor movement is not yet ready to take.

The deadlock between Stalinist reaction on the one hand and bourgeois reaction on the other has not been broken, and it will continue to paralyze the new Assembly as it did the preceding one. What is new is the dangerous increase in the know-nothing protest votes on the Right, reflecting, along with the increase in socialist and Stalinist votes, a general rebellion against the Faure government and everything it stood for.

The defeat of the government is all the more remarkable when it is remembered that the object of dissolving the Assembly was to return the old government majority to power.

It is necessary to recall here that the previous Assembly had been elected in 1951 on the basis of an electoral law designed to keep the "anti-parliamentarian" groups from totaling a majority of the seats in the Assembly, and to create a majority for a center party government. The law gave a tremendous advantage to the parties connected by electoral alliances: it enabled them to distribute their left-over votes among each other, while the left-over votes of the isolated parties were lost.

This device deprived the Stalinists of about 60 seats, which they would have had if each party had been represented in proportion to its popular vote. By the same token, the Gaullists should have had another 20 seats. The conservative parties and the SP both gained from the system: the SP won about 20 seats more than its popular vote would have justified, while the bourgeois parties, other than Gaullist, were over-represented by about 80 deputies.

In anticipation of the regular elections in June, the followers of Mendès-France began to fight this electoral law—not on the basis of proportional representation, however, but on the basis of another system that would have increased the number of their deputies and made possible a "center coalition" based on the SP and the Radical Party.

The right-wing parties, which made up the Faure majority, wanted to maintain the old electoral law, which, according to their calculations, should have guaranteed their return to the Assembly. The government therefore pressed for early elections, to prevent either a "Popular Front" or an SP-Mendès "Republican Front" from materializing, and supported the old electoral law.

When the government was outvoted on the issue of early elections and overthrown on November 29, it broke off the debate and forestalled all electoral reforms by dissolving the Assembly, an exceptional step that had not been taken since 1876.

HOW VOTE WENT

These ingenious calculations did not help at the polls.

Under the present law, an electoral alliance has to obtain the majority of the votes in order to win all the seats in an electoral district. If it doesn't, each party in the alliance is treated as if it was isolated, i.e., the seats are distributed according to proportional representation.

In this election, the Poujadists, more than any other factor, contributed to the government's defeat by cutting into the right-wing vote to the extent of preventing the government alliance from winning the majority and taking advantage of the electoral law. Consequently, the Assembly of 1956 was practically elected by proportional representation. It reflects rather faithfully the following of the various parties and, in spite of the record turnout, the low level of political consciousness of the voters.

Even though the returns from the colonies are not yet all known, the figures for France itself give an accurate picture of what the new Assembly will be like.

The Stalinists, increasing from 93 to 145 deputies, emerge as the strongest single party in the Assembly. They also increased their vote by about 400,000; this, however, is a consequence of an increase in the total voting population,

rather than an increase in popularity.

In terms of percentage of the total vote, the Stalinist following has remained constant, i.e., in the vicinity of 25 per cent. The CP is now represented roughly in proportion to its actual voting strength, having been able to recover, in spite of the electoral law and thanks in part to the Poujadists, the seats stolen from it in 1951.

It is useful to note that the Mendèsist propaganda has made no inroads at all in the following of the CP. It is clear that the electoral following of the CP is much less concerned with Stalinist politics than with casting the strongest possible protest vote from the "Left."

This goes for the mass of the workers in the CP strongholds as well as for the dissatisfied petty-bourgeois who make up an increasing part of the CP following, as the Stalinist press itself complains. Regardless of what happens in the CP, these elements vote Stalinist, and will continue to do so until a revolutionary and independent socialist movement replaces the Stalinist party as the main party of protest.

The weakening of CGT influence and the expulsion of old Stalinist leaders such as Marty and Lecœur are developments which concern the Stalinist cadres, the most active and conscious elements of the CP ranks and the political periphery of the CP in the New Left and elsewhere; it has no effect on the voters.

SP SHOWING

In this election, an independent socialist alternative seemed more remote than ever. The SP, followed by the small "Jeune République" Party, allied itself with the Mendèsist Radicals and the Gaullist pseudo-left, that is, with politicians who support the war in Algeria, oppose the demands of the trade unions, and who, in the case of the Gaullists, have taken reactionary positions on almost all important issues. The SP in particular had little to gain from such an alliance, since it carried the main burden out of the "Republican Front" to begin with and could "go it alone" without great risk.

Thanks to its recent rejuvenation bath in the opposition, however, the SP did not have a bad showing. In terms of numbers, it gained 500,000 votes. Percentage-wise, it maintained its vote at 15 per cent of the total; in terms of seats, it lost only those not belonging to it in the first place, and dropped from 94 to 88.

The New Left, which had raised hopes in certain socialist quarters by its feeble fumbblings in the direction of independence, acted again as a passive appendage of the CP. On December 18, issuing a joint statement with the Stalinoid MLP ("People's Liberation Movement"), it explained that they had set up over thirty tickets in the hope of forming "Popular Front" alliances with the SP and CP but, since the alliances had not materialized because of the perverse obstinacy of the SP, they were going to withdraw all but one or two tickets in order not to interfere with the tickets of the "Left"—CP and "Republican Front."

The Trotskyist PCI did not take part in the elections under the pretext that the electoral law was crooked; probably also because it could not afford the campaign expenses. The Anarchist FCL presented a ticket in Paris and polled a grand total of 2,217 votes, somewhat less than 0.5 per cent of the total vote of the district. Pivert, in *Correspondance Socialiste Internationale*, recommended that all socialists vote for the SP.

SHIFT ON THE RIGHT

Among the bourgeois parties, the most spectacular development is the collapse of the Gaullists, who lost 41 seats and melted down to 16 deputies.

The Gaullists had been elected to the Assembly as enemies of the parliamentary system; however, soon after the retirement of De Gaulle himself, and after a series of splits, they became one of the mainstays of the "system," participating in all its more obnoxious features. Many disappointed-Gaullist voters therefore voted for Poujade, the new, "dynamic" hope of the militant Right. Others voted for Mendès-France, who combines the appeal of the Great Leader figure with a technicians insistence on efficient administration.

Of the Radical "center" groups, the Mendèsist candidates were the most successful, benefiting from the oppositional landslide and gaining about 300,000 votes.

The government parties lost heavily: the conservative Radicals, the Christian-Democratic MRP and the right-wing

"Independents" lost over 50 seats, and keep about 200 delegates altogether.

On the extreme Right, the Poujadist advance was the big surprise of the election. No other ticket has so clearly brought out the low opinion the French people have of Parliament and of the government, and the feeling that it is "time for a change"—any change. As a potential mass basis for a fascist movement, Poujade's UDCA is extremely dangerous; its success is a warning which the labor movement, in its present divided and paralyzed state, cannot afford to take lightly.

The "official" fascists succeeded in getting three candidates elected, for the first time since the war. Their success is not the least repulsive symptom of the decomposition of bourgeois democracy in France.

POSSIBLE COALITIONS

Where does the Assembly go from here? What will the next government be like?

Fortunately, a right-wing majority is no longer possible. Even with the support of the Poujadists, which they are by no means certain to get, the parties of the Right are not strong enough to form a government by themselves. This leaves two unlikely possibilities, and a possible one, all of which are unprincipled hodge-podges.

The first theoretical possibility, already proposed by Faure and the SP politician Vincent Auriol, is for a government of "national union," including all parties but the CP, the Poujadists and the fascists. This would be the nearest thing to a straight right-wing government, and would mean another spell of stagnation, reaction and colonial warfare.

Fortunately it is not possible because the SP majority will not join, and the Mendèsist Radicals do not seem eager to lose their new-found political virginity in the company of groups they successfully discredited during the whole electoral campaign.

The second possibility is the "Popular Front"—an equally unprincipled coalition of the SP, CP and Mendèsist Radicals. That possibility too is rejected by the majority of the SP and by the Radicals.

This leaves a "Republican Front" government: a coalition of the SP and the Mendèsist Radicals, based on a reformist program of the "New Deal" type. Such a government, although based on a minority of the Assembly, would occupy a key position between the conservative bourgeois parties on the one hand, and the CP on the other. It would govern precariously, at one time with the votes of the CP, at another with the votes of the Right; it would never achieve real stability but seems the most likely alternative to materialize at present.

It hardly matters much one way or the other; the main fronts of social struggles do not run through the Assembly.

Dust Flies in Symposium on Israeli-Arab Conflict

New York, Jan. 13

In one of the liveliest symposiums held recently, sponsored by the New York ISL, three speakers discussed "Which Way to Israeli-Arab Peace?" before an audience of about 75 at Adelphia Hall.

The first speaker, supplied for the meeting by the local Israeli government office to represent its position, was Dr. Arieh Plotkin, an Israeli lecturer and teacher, long-time Haganah member and former Princeton professor.

Dr. Plotkin spent the greatest part of his 20-minute presentation sketching the historical background of the present crisis in the Middle East, going back to the reasons for the rise of the Zionist movement, the Nazi exterminationist drive, the period of British rule in Palestine and the mandate, the partition of Palestine and the setting up of the state of Israel. He summarized the achievements of the Israeli regime—cultivation of the desert, building of a democratic outpost in the region, a haven for Jews fleeing from persecution, etc.

Deploping the looming UN censure of Israel for the Syrian raid, the Israeli representative further talked in general about the need for military security from Arab incursions and "massive retaliations" against Arab border attacks. At the beginning of his talk Dr. Plotkin had expressed the opinion that there was no "ready-made solution" for the situation, but indicated of course how important he thought it was to help Israel against Arab pressure.

As second speaker, Max Alexandrovitch, of the Central Bureau of the Jewish Labor Bund, also devoted a few minutes to the

historical background and then presented a cogent and powerfully formulated case to show why Israel must come to "an understanding with the Arab world" if it is to ensure the safety of the Jewish community.

"The policy of the Israeli government," he charged, "is giving help and encouragement to the Arab League."

The Bund, he explained, although deeply concerned with the future and safety of the Israeli community, does not consider that Israel is any solution for the Jewish problem in the world, as it is in the opinion of the Zionist movement.

SPOTLIGHT ON ARAB MINORITY

Hal Draper, editor of LABOR ACTION, as third speaker, concretized a program for a democratic and socialist Israeli policy that could defend Israel against Arab rulers' threats to wipe it out as a state and begin to solve the problem of Arab relations.

Early in his talk he formulated "four principles" which, he said, had to guide such a program:

(1) Israel must be looked on as a Middle Eastern state—not as a Zionist fulfillment, or a ghetto, or a pro-U. S. beachhead. (2) It must be looked on as a state of Jews and Arabs, not simply as a "Jewish state"; he stressed the close connection between policy toward the internal Arab minority and toward the external Arab world. (3) The problem is not how to appease the Arab rulers, or please them, but how to appeal to the Arab masses against these rulers. (4) The Arab countries must not be looked on as zombie-like feudalities hopelessly backward, but

as states which are rent with ferment and social stirrings from below by the discontented masses.

After an analysis of the futility of relying on the American "big brother" or the UN, and an explanation of the crucial importance of abolishing the internal anti-Arab policy of the Israeli government, which discriminates against the Arab people, he listed under 12 points a series of steps which would work toward the aim of making a revolutionary appeal to the Arab peoples who are now being inflamed by their rulers. This, he explained, would take a revolutionary transformation within Israeli itself, now dominated by Zionism.

It was in the question-period, in which there was also an opportunity for cross-rebuttal among the speakers, that the dust began to fly. Much of this centered around the charges of Israeli discrimination and segregation against its Arab minority.

After a general denial by Plotkin that any serious discrimination of this sort existed, Draper presented evidence to prove it. The "military security" argument was given a raking-over; in response to questions, the LABOR ACTION editor documented the expansionist potential of Zionism; explained why religion had such a hold on the state (as against Plotkin's assertion that the tie-up was merely a hangover from the British mandate); showed why the internal anti-Arab policy could not remain directed only against border Arabs or refugees but had to lead to making an enemy of every Arab in Israel, etc.

LOHIA'S FORCES MEET IN FOUNDING CONVENTION—

The Program of India's Left-Wing Socialist Party

By PHILIP COBEN

The founding convention of the All-India Socialist Party—the new left-wing socialist movement organized under the leadership of Rammanohar Lohia—met in Hyderabad for a week, from December 28 to January 3. Judging from an air-mailed packet of detailed press reports now received here, it was a lively, businesslike and fruitful gathering which systematically devoted itself to setting down its political positions on all the main questions.

The first day of the conference heard Lohia's address, in which the chairman sketched out the new party's orientation.

First and foremost, said Lohia, the socialists must direct themselves to the working class and the peasantry, particularly the landless laborers, artisans and women whom politicians ignored. One of the chief defects of the Indian socialist movement, as it has been built up to now, is that it has been based largely and overwhelmingly on the lower middle classes, he said.

"Those who were expected to make history," he charged, "were out. To bring them into the great halls of collective life, as creators and not as objects, should be the supreme aim of the Socialist Party of India."

Lohia traced the development of the Indian socialist movement before the delegates.

"The socialist movement now enters its fourth chapter," he said, "and whatever else happens, it should never again make mistakes on the twin issues of radical politics and internal democracy."

The national organization report was given the next day by P. V. G. Raju, socialist leader in Andhra, who estimated that the party was starting with over 60 per cent of the active cadres of the Praja Socialist Party. In some of the states, reported Shri Raju, the PSP was now "completely dead." The new party already had functioning organizations in all the states; and all of these had held state conferences and elected new executives.

Raju made a particular point of discussing the necessity of party control over its parliamentary deputies. He described the bad situation in this respect that had grown up in the PSP—a typical social-democratic development, of course—in which the opportunistic parliamentarians tended to become the spokesmen for the whole party while refusing to be accountable to the party rank and file.

Later this same day the convention formed itself into different sections to discuss, separately at this stage, draft resolutions on various subjects like work among youth, work among artisans, etc.

FOR MILITANT UNIONS

On Friday, discussion in the section on trade-union work established agreement on the party's policy in this vital field. SP trade-unionists would continue to work in the trade-union federation Hind Mazdoor Sabha as a militant left wing seeking to make it a fighting workers' movement.

The Hind Mazdoor Sabha was criticized as having ceased to be an effective instrument in shaping the working-class movement in accordance with socialist ideals, but "it would be improper for us to start another central organization or associate with other organizations."

Agricultural workers also should be organized into it. Steps should be taken to unify the organization with the right-wing union center, the Indian National Trade Union Congress (INTUC) and some independents. But trade-union unity should not be hurt for political-partisan reasons. The party's trade-union work should be coordinated through a Central Labor Committee.

In a later session a program for a trade-union offensive was also taken up. The employers had "mounted an offensive" leading to speedup; the unions' attitude was too timid and defensive; a "counter-offensive" was needed, the party said in its declaration, to oppose the management drive.

The convention, of course, was vigorous in its denunciation of the policies of the Nehru government. The main political basis for the split from the old PSP was in this area—the PSP's drift toward a policy of coalitionism with Nehru and his Congress Party.

Lohia had hit this theme hard in his opening address. There was no real opposition party at present, he said; only "a number of misleading farce opposi-

tions." The new SP had the opportunity to become the real spokesman of radical politics.

Attacking the government, he discussed at length the issue of "police-firings," i.e., the shooting down of unarmed demonstrators by trigger-happy cops; and said that in the whole history of the world no democratic government had opened fire on its own people as often as the Indian government.

This is something of a commentary on the pretensions of the leaders of this government, including Prime Minister Nehru and the titular president, to be disciples of Gandhi, in whole or in part; and also a broader commentary on the unviability of the Gandhian-pacifist tradition in the face of societal pressures.

Incidentally, Lohia (who has long been a non-Marxist) also seems to have taken the occasion to throw a punch at Gandhism, according to the *Free Press Journal* report: "Gandhism and Marxism, he thought, were in fact being reduced, by and large, into curiously anemic doctrines."

NO BLOC WITH NEHRU

The position of the party was defined as opposed to coalition; "A government with a clearly held purpose and a clear majority in the legislature can alone enjoy leadership over the nation. Such a government cannot be a coalition government." Yet a door was left open, it seems, in a provision permitting "toleration," of, though not participation in, a government where there is no clear majority; i.e., it will be permissible to decide to support a bourgeois government with parliamentary votes, though not with ministers.

The left-wingers want to face away from coalitionism but have not entirely broken with it.

On the field of economic policy, the convention attacked the Nehru program and his first and second "Five Year Plans." The government has "squeezed" the already heavily taxed masses of the poor for the sake of obtaining public capital; it did nothing to reduce unemployment; it completely neglected low-cost housing; etc. To the Nehru conception of state-capitalist planning it counterposed a "totally different approach" based on the nationalization of key industries, mines, banks, insurance companies, foreign trade and internal wholesale trade, with workers' control.

THIRD CAMP LINE

Foreign policy was taken up extensively. Here too heavy attacks were made against Nehru's "policies of adjustment [between the two war camps], of brokerage, of running to and fro between the two great camps in order to be of some use to both of them" (we quote from the report of Lohia's address). This was a policy of postponing war, not of avoiding it, and even this policy was suffering a setback, he said.

The resolution on war and foreign policy separated itself from this Nehru approach of making its policy subservient to one bloc or the other bloc, alternately, instead of striking out along the independent lines of a Third Camp.

The party's aim, it said, is to build a new "Third Camp," independent of both the "Atlantic" camp and the "Soviet" camp, and aiming at a society of free men in an equal world.

It attacked both capitalist imperialism and Stalinist imperialism down the line. It condemned the whole concept of American or Russian-style "foreign aid":

"Distribution of foreign aid from the nations of treasure to the nations of poverty will not serve the purpose. Foreign aid in its present form is not only humiliating and dangerous to the receiving countries but can never be adequate to meet their needs.

"Such aid corrupts the backward countries and invariably maintains in power the forces of the status quo. Aid to the underdeveloped countries must come through a world development authority to which every state contributes according

to its ability and from which every nation receives according to its needs."

In contrast to the kind of broadened and strengthened world organization which it envisioned, the present UN was labeled "a clearing-house for international intrigues."

All struggles against colonialism must be supported, said the resolution, with particular stress on the fight in Africa. To better assert India's independent policy, it advocated, the aim should be to dissociate India from the British Commonwealth. An amendment was passed to denounce exploitation of Africans by Indian tradesmen in Africa "who by their activities have created an anti-Indian feeling among the African people."

A section of the resolution tore into "Communist imperialism," which was differentiated from the "old colonialism" of the capitalist world but effectively attacked as "this new and in some ways more reprehensible form of imperialism."

SEVEN-YEAR PLAN

Given the pacifist background of Indian socialism, it was inevitable that much stress be laid on this document on disarmament proposals. In this connection the following remark is made: "In this race of armaments a harmful and misleading distinction has been allowed to grow between the nuclear bombs and the so-called conventional bombs. The latter in sufficient numbers may be as

deadly as the former. . . . Ban on nuclear weapons should be sought but disarmament in its entire scope must always be kept in view." However, it went on to say, "True and effective disarmament can be achieved only when the world becomes equal. . . ."

On the eyebrow-raising side, however, is the Seven Year Plan of party development "to capture power" enunciated by the convention, in a form which had been launched by Dr. Lohia. According to this scheme, a course of training of the party machinery is proposed in "a plan spread over seven years—neither a shorter period to tempt one to an opportunistic path, nor an irrelevantly long period—at the end of which it is determined to capture power in the country."

The time-table calls for recruitment of 500,000 members during the first year, one million in the second year, and a total membership of 3 million before the end of the seven years.

Reading this plan for a deadline on "capturing power," this writer's memory goes back to what happened to the PSP in 1952—in fact, to what was the starting-point for that party's degeneration. The party had looked forward to the first general election in the country with excited high hopes; it made a powerful showing in that election, it seemed to us, but obviously one that was far below what the party people had hungrily hoped for. Governmental power, they saw, was not around the corner. The result was the sharp swing by the leadership to dump left-wing baggage, merge their identity with another group, and start out on an opportunistic course. It is all this which led to the past year's split.

Many things are different, but it is to be hoped that the seven-year deadline of the new party is not associated with similar reactions to possible disappointments in this relatively short period.

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

From the Bahamas: Editor Asks for Help

To the Editor:

I have always read with interest your publication LABOR ACTION. Your views are in accordance with my own, and like yourself I am endeavoring through my own paper to fight for better conditions for our working people.

Our problems in the Bahamas are mainly racial. Negroes here have little or no rights whatsoever in labor matters. In fact there is no manhood suffrage, but voting is permitted only to those who either own property or lease it. Consequently perceptually the voting rights are given to less than one-quarter of the adult population.

A man owning several companies or properties is actually permitted a vote per property. Thus those with the most money control the country through power of bloc votes. One man may hold voting rights in several constituencies, and the fact that Bahamas elections are spread over several days permits unscrupulous politicians to "arrange" several blocs of votes in the various islands. The whole system is antiquated and shameful, and certainly affords no rights to the Negro workers who constitute the largest number of inhabitants.

The constitution is over two hundred years old, and the laws are made by a handful of rich whites who continue to dominate the lives of thousands. Through my paper, *The Nassau Herald*, and through the formation of the first political party in the Bahamas, the Progressive Liberal Party, of which I am secretary-general, we work and plan to change matters this year. Our general election is scheduled for June and our party is putting up 15 Negro candidates.

Because the old political group see the writing on the wall, they have used every means within their power to curtail our work. They effectively, for a time, caused *The Herald* to cease publication by buying out two Negroes who were weak enough to fall for the old bait. The public, however, rallied round and *The Herald* will be back in publication this week. I purchased several thousands of dollars worth of printing equipment from the States, and we shall be in full swing with a bigger and better paper than ever.

I am enclosing one of our last issues so that you may see the type of political article we use. Part of the proceeds of the paper are to be put aside to help the Negro candidates in their election expenses this year.

Needless to say, we too are faced with a Communist element here. Of course, anything Socialistic is considered "Red" by ignorant people, but in fact we are doing exactly what you are doing: Fighting both capitalism and Communism

with the best means in our power.

Our people are poor. Although we have thousands of supporters and readers, few are able to contribute more than a mite to help the cause.

Perhaps you may know of friends who would be interested in helping Bahamian Negroes to achieve their victory. To this end the *Herald* is offering shares at the rate of \$2.80 per share in blocks of 5 shares, i.e., \$14 for 5 shares. Should either you or any associates be interested in purchasing shares, a draft could be sent to me personally, and by return mail I would despatch the receipts and shares.

We would also solicit subscriptions from those who wish to read our paper weekly. The yearly subscription is \$5.00 including postage. This rate is higher than your own, but again postal expenses from these islands is considerably higher than in the States.

If at any time you would like news items from the Bahamas affecting labor conditions or general interest, we would be only too pleased to act as correspondents. We should also like to use any items of interest to our readers that appear in your publication. Perhaps in the near future you or your colleagues might care to visit the Bahamas for a firsthand view of conditions here. Certainly you will find enough to shock you.

I shall look forward to hearing from you in the near future.

CYRIL STEVENSON
Editor

Nassau, Jan. 4



LABOR ACTION

January 23, 1956 No. 20, No. 4

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

Inside Spain, Youth and Student Majority Declare Against Franco, For Socialism

By MAX MARTIN

Young people in the United States are so quiescent and so conservative today, as compared with previous periods, that many despairing radicals and ex-radicals (the latter to justify their own apathy) have come to believe that this is the eternal situation of that section of mankind which is classified as "young." *How can we expect anything from the current young generation (the complaint runs)—just see how timid and intimidated it is, how concerned with its own petty personal interests and with the quest for personal advancement, and with that alone. That's how young people are today and that's how they will always be.*

The extrapolation from today's situation of a theory which ascribes the existing apathy to the eternal condition *humaine* requires a forgetting of the many struggles waged by American young people in the past, and particularly of the student and working-class struggles of the thirties.

It requires also the turning of a closed eye to the political interest and activity of millions of young people throughout the world, to the struggles being waged by so many students and young workers in Europe, Asia and Latin America for democracy and socialism.

The following round-up of "youth news" from Spain is a reminder of what young people can and do perform, and a harbinger for this country, as well.

The hostility of Spanish students to the Franco regime made the front-page of the *N. Y. Times* recently, as the students of the University of Madrid delivered a stinging slap in the face to the Spanish dictator.

About 400 students in a dozen different faculties filled out questionnaires or were interviewed anonymously on their political opinions in a poll conducted by the Institute of Public Opinion, a department of the Ministry of Information.

One can only speculate on the reasons which led the government to take such a poll. Perhaps the Franco regime, alarmed by rising opposition to its despotic rule—opposition which is becoming so intense that Franco's New Year's message had to admit its existence—wanted to gauge the degree of reliance it could place on university students. Or again, perhaps the initiators of the poll actually expected a favorable response and intended to publicize the results as propaganda supporting its continued existence.

80 PER CENT AGAINST

If the latter were the case, the results which the pollers tabulated were such that they had to immediately abandon all thought of publicizing them. Only through a government leak did the information become public.

The students of the University of Madrid, among whom we can be certain there are few, if any, working-class youth, in the main undoubtedly, come from families that in the material sense

have not fared badly under Spanish fascism. Yet they are in their overwhelming number opposed to Franco.

Sixty per cent indicated their opposition to all totalitarianism and authoritarianism, while 80 per cent—that is, the 60 per cent who oppose authoritarianism in general and half of the remaining 40 per cent who did not indicate a principled opposition to despotic rule—oppose the present regime.

Overwhelming majorities indicate that they have no confidence in the military hierarchy and in the ecclesiastical authorities. Sixty-seven per cent feel the same way about their teachers—"we are a generation without teachers," they say, referring to the government-picked university professors.

These and other statistics led Jose Maria Pinillos, Professor of Experimental Psychology at the university, who analyzed the poll for the information of the regime, to conclude that dissatisfaction with present social and economic conditions, together with "each of political experience," made the youth an easy target for what the apologists of the regime call "Communist propaganda." According to the *Times* account Franco himself was informed of the results of the poll.

As the regime undoubtedly knows, it is merely whistling to keep its courage up when it "deduces" the above from this poll. The results of this poll, together with other similar indications (for some of these see LABOR ACTION, June 20, 1955, and CHALLENGE, August 8, 1955) are of great significance, for they give a decisive answer to an important question.

That question concerns the attitude of the young generation, the generation which has grown up since the Spanish Civil War, and which from its own personal experience does not remember the struggle against fascism.

STUDENTS DEMONSTRATE

This new generation—has it learned from its experiences to detest the Franco regime?

The above poll as well as the other indications listed below answer the question unambiguously as far as the students are concerned. And given the hostility which middle- and upper-class students feel to Franco who can doubt that such feelings are present among working-class youth, and among peasant youth, to a degree even more intense than it is among students?

The students again showed their feelings in connection with the death of Ortega y Gasset.

The January 15, 1956 issue of *Iberica*, a liberal anti-Franco magazine published in New York, reports that the students utilized Ortega's funeral to express their political views in general. A thousand students marched through the streets handing out announcements of the death of one whom they called the "liberal philosopher."

At the cemetery one of the students made a speech on the students' situation, referring to "the university students without a university," expressing thereby the same feelings that had been expressed in the poll. A policeman asked them why a prayer for Ortega had not been said, and received (says *Iberica*) "a correct but fitting reply."

The students use all opportunities to manifest their opposition to all fascist brutality, to censorship of learning and the arts, and to the regime in general. The

same issue of *Iberica* informs us of an incident which took place at the performance of a new play, *La Canasta*.

The students at the performance did not like the play and indicated their disapproval. The theater's impresario thereupon administered a fatal beating to one of those most vocal in disapproving of the play, one Grinda, a medical student. The next day a thousand students gathered in the streets, tearing down and burning posters advertising the play, also hurling stones at the building of the newspaper *ABC*, which had printed a lying version of the incident. That evening they gathered at the theater and created a disturbance which led to the cancellation of the performance.

Thus does political opposition in totalitarian countries manifest itself, in one way.

USING THE SEU

Through what channels does the discontent express itself? What organizations do they have?

Needless to say, no independent organization is permitted. On the contrary, all students must belong to the Falangist students' union, the Sindicato Español Universitario (SEU). As is the case with other sections of the Falangist movement, opposition develops in and through the SEU to some extent.

Thus, in the "La Canasta affair" the students appear to have used the SEU in part in their protest and later they forced the SEU leadership to intervene in their behalf, with the result that the impresario who beat the medical student had to pay a fine and publicly apologize to the students. In addition, they use their clandestine political organizations, which do exist underground, and spontaneous actions.

What are their political views? With what do they wish to replace Franco?

To some extent they are obviously uncertain and are looking around. But a number of things are clear.

They are anti-monarchist and pro-republican. The poll indicates this unmistakably.

There is additional evidence as well: an interview with a Spanish student, held in Paris by the editor of the review *Cartes d'Europa*, which is published in the December 15, 1955 issue of *Iberica*. The student reports on the developments which occurred in Falangist circles in general and the SEU in particular, when Franco proposed a return to the monarchy; and the students used the vehicle of the SEU to express their opposition. The Spanish student interviewed in Paris lists a number of incidents:

The Falangists "in a recent gathering in Valladolid, shouted down the minister of the Falange, Fernandez Cuesta, who had gone there as the voice of his master to propose the change. . . ." At this gathering, "Jordana Fuentes, National Delegate of the Student's Syndicate (SEU), slapped the face of this minister. . . ." A group of student Falangists refused to sing the national hymn and refused to join in the ritual shouts of the party, when these were intoned by the minister of Labor.

As this Spanish student put it: "You can well imagine, if this is what is going on right before the public, what may be going on backstage in this great theatre of Francoism."

EXPECT SOCIALISM

What political orientation do the students hold within the framework of republicanism?

Sixty-five per cent, according to the poll, are certain that Spain will "inevitably wind up with a socialist type of regime." While it cannot definitely be asserted that all of these students also favor socialism, there can be no doubt that the overwhelming majority of them do in fact favor it. Other aspects of this poll, as well as other indications, testify to the strong

socialist sentiment which is found among the students of Spain.

Even among those students whose orientation is Christian-Democratic we find "left" and "socialist" tendencies. Rodolfo Llopis, secretary-general of the Spanish Socialist Party, writes in the December issue of *Iberica* of a letter smuggled to him from a Christian-Democratic student in Spain, and quotes portions of this letter. The student describes his nascent Christian-Democratic movement as one which is to the left of the most left sections of the French MRP. "Have no fear that we are trying to retain the old bourgeois and capitalist concepts in the shadow of the Cross," he writes. And furthermore: "Nor do I want you to think that we are trying to revive a feudal socialism, as Marx called it. It is not in a nostalgia for medieval Europe that we look for inspiration. We accept the social and economic opinion, which you socialists have formed of capitalist society. . . ."

It goes without saying that we do not accept this student's view that he can build a Spanish Christian-Democracy which will in any fundamental sense be different from the reactionary French MRP, or that there is any road to the creation of a socialist society other than through building a secular revolutionary socialist movement of the working class. But this need not concern us here, for what is important is that the inclinations of this Christian-Democratic student are democratic and socialist.

NO HELP FROM U.S.

In his New Year's message Franco admitted that Spain is rife with unrest and called upon the Spanish people to join with him in "an absolute discipline and unity, without fissures. . . ." At the same time, a group of Spanish university youth in Madrid wrote a New Year's greeting of their own, one addressed to the Spanish anti-fascists in exile, and printed in *Iberica* for circulation to them. It is a fitting answer to the dictators call for "discipline and unity."

We quote portions of this greeting: "Spain's youth saw only the last stages of the Republic's downfall, but we know what happened and we do not forget. To forget would be to desert our struggle for a better Spain."

"For sixteen years our Spain has been sunk in the most abject ostracism, thanks to a series of reactionary traitors, who with the aid of the Nazi-fascist forces, succeeded in completing their betrayal of the very Republic to which they had sworn allegiance."

"At the world wars end, the Spanish people held hopes that the democracies would help overthrow our regime. . . . Now we are convinced that we should expect no help from the misnamed international 'democracies,' when governments calling themselves 'democratic' have no scruples about making pacts with Franco tyranny, even admitting it into the United Nations. . . ."

"We want our protest to be heard: the protest of Spain's democratic youth, whom they have tried in vain to deceive so many times. . . ."

"We wish to send our fraternal greetings to all those Spaniards who chose exile rather than to live with the traitors of our country. We know that you represent the real Spain, the Spain which seems dead, but lives on in the soul and mind of every good Spaniard."

"You must know that the struggle against tyranny continues. This struggle is your struggle; we ask you not to be faint-hearted in your exile, as we do not slacken our efforts to overthrow the tyrant and to establish a new regime of peace and freedom. . . ."

"Do not forget that you should unite your efforts with ours, and do not let up for even a moment: already the tyranny is very much weakened."

YSL CLASS • NEW YORK

THIRD SESSION OF
Max Shachtman's Class
on the Theory of
BUREAUCRATIC
COLLECTIVISM

Tues., Jan. 24 at 8:15 p.m.

"The Bureaucratic-Collectivist
System in Russia"

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

Oil Cartel Moves in for the Loot: Will Italy Be Another Iran?

The Struggle for Italy's Oil

By LUCIO LIBERTINI

Rome, Jan. 3

Italy has always been considered a country lacking raw materials and natural wealth. As is known, fascist foreign policy was based on the assumption that Italians had to conquer territories rich in raw materials lacking in their country.

In the course of the past thirty years, isolated scientists had repeatedly put forth a different view, albeit timidly. Their voices, though, were always stifled as their optimistic thesis contradicted the premises of the regime's foreign policy. Officially it was always believed that the only source of energy in Italy, other than hydro-electric power, was natural gas.

A state monopoly, the *Ente Nazionale Idrocarburi* (ENI) was set up for its exploitation. Under the direction of the engineer Mattei, a courageous partisan fighter during the last war and a member of the Christian-Democratic left, the ENI developed rapidly and built up a powerful organization for the prospecting, exploitation and distribution of natural gas. The ENI confined its activity to Northern Italy, and in particular to the Po river plain. The organization also repeatedly prospected for oil in this region, but with no success.

Following the indications of the scientists, private groups also started prospecting, first in Sicily, then in the Abruzzi Mountains. This prospecting met with success, and led to the discovery of large oil beds. We now know that Italy has considerable oil reserves of excellent quality which can be cheaply extracted.

However, the discovery of these oil beds led to a sharp conflict between the ENI and private monopolies, Italian as well as international.

The international oil market is dominated today by eight great companies: British Petroleum (the former Anglo-Iranian), Royal Dutch Shell, the Compagnie Française des Pétroles, and the five American groups: Gulf Oil, Socony Vacuum, Texas Oil, California Standard, and New Jersey Standard. These industrial giants—the annual budget of the five American companies is three times larger than the Italian state budget—are connected by secret agreements determining in their own interests the volume of oil production and oil prices internationally.

The "eight sisters," as they are jokingly referred to, are now directly interested in controlling the Italian deposits.

CARTEL'S TECHNIQUE

Today the international price of oil is adjusted to the price of American oil, the most expensive of all. Thanks to this price-fixing, the "eight sisters" split among themselves each year \$400 billion, that is, the surplus profit on non-American oil (Arabian, Iranian, etc.). If the Italian deposits, which seem to be even richer than was officially announced, escape the control of the international cartel, the monopoly of the "eight sisters" could be threatened: greater quantities of oil than authorized by their agreements could be thrown on the market at lower prices.

Artificial restriction of production and price-fixing: this is the policy which the international cartel wants to enforce in Italy also. We all remember the brutal intervention of the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company into the internal affairs of Iran; and the commercial blockade organized by the cartel against the nationalized oil from Iran.

If similar developments occur in Italy, the Iranian precedent shows with sufficient clarity the objectives and methods of the "eight sisters."

In 1954 and 1955 the cartel, collaborating with the Italian monopolies, started to move in. A number of societies were set up by the international group. It is interesting to list a few examples of this technique.

Standard Oil officially declare to the AP that "it has associated itself with Italian private capital in order to create a new oil company." In this way the A.R.P. was formed, a society operating in the region of Augusta, as well as the R.A.S.I.O.M., which holds concessions in Southeastern Sicily.

The R.A.S.I.O.M. is a coalition of in-

terests including the Italian rubber trust of Pirelli and Standard Oil. The latter, in order to strengthen its position against ENI, has absorbed the private natural-gas companies of the Po valley. On behalf of Standard Oil and Gulf Oil, the chemical trust of Montecatini and the electrical trust of Edison have received important concessions in Sicily, on the basis of a special regional law.

The review of the Italian Socialist Party, *Mondo Operaio*, recently revealed that the Aquila Company of Trieste, which controls hundreds of square miles in the Abruzzi, had handed over the majority of its shares to the Cie. Française des Pétroles. This company, in turn, is part of the Anglo-Franco-American consortium called Iraq Petroleum Company, in which Jersey Standard and Gulf Oil hold the majority of the shares. Aquila Company was actually a holding of the FIOT monopoly in the first place. FIAT merely yielded its control over the company following its pattern of close cooperation with the American trusts.

SNIA-Viscosa, the textile and electrical trust, which was established as a part of Mussolini's policy of economic self-sufficiency, has acquired control of many concessions in Sicily and in the Abruzzi for British Petroleum; SNIA-Viscosa has now become an Anglo-Italian holding company. The Petrosud Company, created by an association of the Montecatini trust and Standard Oil, has

acquired vast concessions all over Southern Italy.

This looting expedition by the oil cartel has been enthusiastically and officially supported by the right wing of Christian-Democracy. The neo-fascists and monarchists, always ready to disregard their own nationalistic rhetoric, have also supported the attempt of the cartel to grab the Italian oil resources. For the occasion, they have been extolling the virtues of "private enterprise" and have advocated an "open door" policy in regard to foreign capital.

GREASING THE WHEELS

The "independent" press, strictly controlled by Italian industrial groups (especially by the electrical and cement monopolies, the Montecatini and the FIAT) has conducted an intensive campaign to convince Italians to willingly accept the establishment of the great oil companies in the Abruzzi and in Sicily. In addition, the "eight sisters" have done everything possible to "grease the wheels," as we say in Italy, and thus many journalists and politicians were unexpectedly converted to the cause of the international cartel.

However, the right wing of Christian-Democracy, having a more direct influence in the government, is conducting the oil cartel's case even more efficiently. The honorable Togni, first a teacher of fascist corporate law, and now a Christian-Democratic deputy and trusty defender of the Confindustria [the Italian NAM], prepared an oil bill which, in the name of "private enterprise" and "free competition," gave a free hand to the cartel, with only a few, tenuous juridical limitations.

Sharp opposition, not only from the left and from the CP, but also from the left wing of Christian-Democracy, compelled the government to amend the bill.

Notes on the New Yalta Papers

By HAL DRAPER

On December 29 the State Department released a new batch of Yalta papers, odds and ends rummaged together from the Roosevelt archives and department files, etc.

They add nothing of any importance to the story as provided by the documents to which they are addenda (published earlier last year). Here and there, they dot an I or cross a T.

A frequent note struck is that of the inter-imperialist rivalry within the "Grand Alliance." In the *LA* special issue devoted to the Yalta papers last year (Apr. 4), I explained the tug-of-war between the U. S. and Britain over France, British support to De Gaulle, etc.

There are several echoes of this here. The British tried to keep it clear that it was the U. S., and not they, that had blocked De Gaulle's attendance at Yalta. Roosevelt wanted the British, not the French, to occupy the Saar as well as the Ruhr. Or take the following passage from a report of a high-level Washington discussion a few months before Yalta:

"Secretary [of the Treasury] Morgenthau said . . . that the president did not want his hands tied in his dealings with the French and that Churchill, who was present at the discussion [at the preceding Quebec conference], was also strongly opposed to giving Lend-Lease aid to the French. Secretary [of State] Hull commented that we would have to watch that situation because that might mean that the British were cooking up something with the French; that Churchill in the past had talked against De Gaulle, on different grounds to be sure, but at the same time the Foreign Office was going ahead with negotiations of a different character."

Hull's nasty suspicions of Churchill's integrity and honesty, incidentally, were perfectly well founded.

The case of Denmark is similar to that of France. Because of British influence over that small country, Churchill pushed it forward and the U. S. shunted it aside.

Britain wanted the Big Three (at this

time consisting of the U. S., Russia, and Britain) to issue a joint declaration recognizing the Danes as allies, fighting under German occupation. The U. S. officially struck a "lukewarm" attitude on it, really opposed; while the Russians indicated they would refuse to participate in any such statement.

To appease the Danes, however, for not being given status, the U. S. came up with a consolation prize: it would send "a secret message to the Freedom Council and the Danish political party leaders, acknowledging their communication and lauding the contributions . . ." etc.

BATTING FOR OIL FIRMS

There are several documents here, also, on the Iranian sector of the inter-imperialist permanent war, where the prize was oil. American oil barons, British oil corporations and the Russians all rushed in for concessions from the Iranian government; it had to be decided, finally, to postpone this fight till later, and Iran announced suspension of concessions for the duration.

The Russians took it with bad grace, grumbling aloud. In October before Yalta, Ambassador Harriman in Moscow was instructed to speak to the Kremlin about the "indications of Soviet annoyance" in the Russian press.

Harriman was also instructed to let the Russians know in firm language that "when negotiations are resumed we expect American firms to be accorded no less favorable treatment than that given to any other foreign national or government" and that the U. S. would not stand for "any action which would constitute undue interference in the internal affairs of Iran"—that is, it wouldn't stand for any interference except by the hordes of Americans who were already swarming all over Iran's government.

Roosevelt himself took a hand in this with a memo to the Secretary of State: "I think this Soviet-Iranian matter should be taken up by Harriman with Stalin in person. . . ." Secretary Stet-

More precise limitations and more rigid rules were established to avoid a monopoly on the part of one trust alone over concessions and to favor the ENI. The new bill, which will be discussed by the Chamber of Deputies within the next few weeks, also established a higher level for royalties.

Nevertheless, the oil companies will have a profit that may amount to as much as 100 per cent of the invested capital.

FOR NATIONALIZATION

Naturally, the parties of the left (SP, *Unione Socialista Indipendente*), the CP and even fractions of the government parties do not accept this second bill any more than they did the first. They advocate nationalization of oil, and the turning over of the extraction and distribution of the oil to the ENI alone. At the same time, the ENI would have to be reorganized and its structure democratized.

The left believes that an Italian oil policy should be completely free from the cartel's manipulations and should be based on a high rate of production and on low prices. Moreover, it is difficult to place one's trust in the legal restrictions of the government bill, since the large companies not only have the means to corrupt but also know all the devices by which the law can be twisted. The partnerships, the holdings, the fronts will multiply if the government bill is passed, and, behind these useful screens, the cartel will proceed as before.

The supporters of "private enterprise" claim that foreign capital alone can provide the financial means and the equipment necessary to develop the oil fields. The recent discovery by ENI of oil beds in Vallescura, believed to be the richest yet in Italy, has proved the contrary.

In fact, ENA now has at its disposal a staff of expert technicians as well as sizable and growing equipment. Besides, the supporters of nationalization do not necessarily exclude the recourse to international loans; what they reject is the control of the Italian oil resources by the international cartel.

The "battle of oil" that has begun in Italy over a year ago cannot be resolved by an ingenious compromise. It can only lead to a victory of democratic national control over the sources of energy and fuel, or to a victory of the "eight sisters." The next months will tell whether Italy will follow the path of Iran.

tinus memored back: "We are following the developments minutely. . . ."

TERROR IN POLAND

A subject which these statesmen followed somewhat less minutely was Poland. When they got to Yalta they seemed to be, or at least pretended to be, ignorant of the inroads of Stalinization that had already taken place in that country; hence, after Yalta, they could claim that an agreement for a free Poland had been reached but was broken by Stalin later.

In one of the new batch of documents, on the eve of Yalta the Polish prime-minister in exile, Arciszewski, appealed to Roosevelt to do something about a concrete issue then arising: "The so-called provisional government of Lublin [Stalinist] has openly declared its intention to try as traitors all soldiers of the Polish Home Army and members of the Polish underground movement. Mass arrests and deportations have already taken place." The Stalinist terror was already well on.

There is no record in the Yalta minutes that Roosevelt ever brought this up. He thought, perhaps, that he could prevent the full Stalinization of Poland by exercising his charming smile on his friend Joe. After the Yalta conference, when the Stalinist machine speeded ahead in Poland, points of friction broke out.

It is interesting to note that the great democrat and Democrat, Averell Harriman, then ambassador to Moscow, never turned a hair while negotiating with the Russians for the shipment to them of German slave-laborers. His report to Washington included this along with straight reports on the stripping of Germany's heavy industry.

Maisky, whom he talked to, had "mentioned two or three millions" as the number of slaves Russia wanted. "He said they had been talking principally about men, but some women might be required." The Russians wanted to "re-

(Continued on next page)

LONDON LETTER

British Labor Is Acting Tough

By OWEN ROBERTS

London, Jan. 10

Cold winds have been blowing round Britain for the past week; they have brought with them snowstorms, blizzards and gales which have played havoc with normal life in the country. But these cold winds of nature are not causing the Tories half the worry that the political winds are—winds which are whistling around 10 Downing Street and causing Prime Minister Anthony Eden considerable discomfort.

It is a long time since a Tory government faced such a considerable blast of unsympathetic propaganda from its own supporters. The Tory press, from the sex-and-comic-strip *Daily Sketch* to the maiden aunt *Times*, have been almost unanimous in their recent nagging against the government and Eden.

The discontent has its origins in various places.

First, there is the tanks-for-Egypt row which has stirred up opposition from all quarters.

Secondly, there is the dissatisfaction over government policies in Cyprus; from the Tories this is not so much opposition as impatience at apparent government inaction.

Thirdly, there is the bunch of disgruntled members of the Tory party who are not at all pleased with the switches Sir Anthony Eden made in his government just prior to Christmas.

But all of these are only superficial. Deep down inside—stoking up the bitter feelings against the government—is the mounting anger of millions of industrial workers.

Most newspapers don't say it because they are afraid to recognize it, but the blunt fact remains that if this government is in for a rough-house then it won't be over arms for Egypt, policies in Cyprus, or Tories who have been left out in the cold. The big hammering will come from the workers who are rapidly losing all patience with a government pursuing economic policies which threaten to rip the bottom out of their wage packets and once again line them up in dole queues.

At a rough count there are seven million workers who have filed claims for wage increases, and the signs that they mean business are appearing all around. Just before Christmas, as previously reported, the acting secretary of the Transport and General Workers' Union, Frank Cousins, told the government that his union was not prepared to sit around and wait for wage increases resulting from increased productivity while Tory policies were pushing up prices.

This statement, which horrified government and bosses alike, has now been

repeated by Cousins. In the current issue of his union's journal he says that "We are not prepared that our members should stand still whilst the government continually hand out largesse to those who are more favorably placed."

URGE A FIGHT

Yesterday Labor's *Daily Herald* joined in the fray and, probably for the first time since 1937, encouraged trade-unionists to fight for all-round wage increases. After showing how the government's policies had lined the pockets of the businessmen and shareholders, its editorial said:

"A change of government is the only real answer, but in the meantime the unions take the only action they can by putting in wage claims, and meaning it."

With the *Daily Herald* expressing such sentiments it is small wonder that the bosses and the government are getting worried—particularly as recent effects

of the government's policies are causing even greater anger in the factories. The credit squeeze is now beginning to take effect and already the automobile industry is finding the going tougher.

This week 18,000 workers at the Longbridge works of the British Motor Corporation have been put onto a four-day week because unsold models are piling up all around. Other automobile manufacturers have begun to put workers on short time or have announced that they will be forced to do so in the near future if the situation remains unchanged.

This rough patch of the automobile industry can be pinpointed as directly attributable to the Tory government's policies. The credit squeeze, increase in purchase tax and restrictions on hire-purchase [installment buying] have caused a drying up on the home market at the same time as export sales are becoming more difficult.

Automobiles, unlike many other commodities, cannot be stored in warehouses until wanted. Finished cars, choking up every square foot of space around the automobile plants, are the sign that it is possible that the 700,000 unemployed (which the organs of big business, *The Economist* and *The Banker*, want) may not be so far away.

The troubles of industry were underlined today when the Standard Motor Company turned down flat a claim of in-

creased wages made by its 11,000 workers. Said the company, when rejecting the claim:

"In our view 1956 will be a serious year for our industry, and its ability to maintain employment will be jeopardized by any increased costs arising from recurring wage claims."

THE TEMPEST IS AHEAD

The Stock Exchange—a barometer of what the City thinks—has been reflecting the situation in industry. During the last two days share prices have been steadily falling and it is estimated in cash terms the fall in share prices has been around the 85 million dollar mark. Automobiles and aircraft came tumbling—but the biggest knocks were taken by stores, electrical and building shares.

Rumors that the bank-rate is to be increased, thereby squeezing credit even harder, are gaining currency and piling up fresh bundles of shares that no one seems inclined to buy.

According to reports reaching London today the *N. Y. Times*, in an editorial headed "Storm Over Eden," is of the opinion that what is happening in Britain now "is most likely a tempest in a political teapot." The article also apparently expresses the opinion that Eden has got what it takes to be a prime minister "in a critical time like the present."

The answer to the *N. Y. Times* is short and sweet. The tempest isn't going to be in a teapot, but in dozens of factories and workshops up and down Britain. And if Eden has got what it takes to handle millions of fighting trade-unionists, then he has kept those qualities carefully hidden from the public eye ever since he was born.

"DOWN ON THE FARM"—III

A SHORT HISTORY OF FARM UNIONISM

The history of trade unionism in agriculture is long and tragic and hopeful....

The first recorded effort to organize farm workers occurred in Louisiana in 1879.

Former slaves working as hired laborers on sugar cane plantations were inspired by an organizer of the Knights of Labor to set up an association to raise wages. Bands of workers marched through the plantations calling on everyone to stop work. The state militia was called out to suppress the uprising and the leaders of the strike were arrested and sentenced to long prison terms for "trespassing." The following year they were paroled by the governor upon a petition being filed by a Negro member of the state legislature.

Near the end of the nineteenth century, the American Federation of Labor chartered the first in a long series of local unions of farm workers. Cow punchers on a huge cattle ranch in West Texas were the first group to organize under AFL auspices.

Some years later, the AFL chartered a national union of sheep shearers, which became part of the Meat Cutters International in 1936. Ten years later the AFL chartered its first national union of farm laborers which is known today as the National Agricultural Workers Union.

The plight of farm workers on large plantations, ranches and farms early drew the attention of the Industrial Workers of the World, popularly known as the Wobblies. The IWW organized the fruit "tramps" of the far West and many of the Wobblies' battles for civil liberties grew out of farm workers' attempts to organize.

Early in the 1930s, the Communist Party discovered the nation's farm workers and began exploiting their plight for propaganda purposes. Campaigns to organize farm labor were undertaken in the South, the West, and the Atlantic coast. The Communist Trade Union Unity League sponsored a cannery and agricultural workers' organization that had considerable success for a time but with tragic results.... The response of the growers was the organization of a vigilante group known as the Associated Farmers. The movement to organize collapsed, but the Associated Farmers flourished and is today a powerful anti-labor force....

The Communists also formed an organization of Negro sharecroppers in Alabama in 1933 but this was virtually wiped out in a race riot two years later. The movement disappeared completely when the CP organizers were transferred to New Orleans in 1936. Similar efforts were made by Communists to organize workers on New Jersey vegetable farms. These efforts persisted until 1940 when the Communists turned all their

attention to key war production industries.

Since the forties the Teamsters and Amalgamated Meat Cutters have had some success in farm workers organization.

STFU IS BORN

In 1941, Local 56 of the AFL Amalgamated Meat Cutters obtained, in conjunction with their organizing campaign among New Jersey canneries, the first closed-shop contract covering all farm as well as processing workers employed on a large-scale corporation farm. This union on the 50,000-acre Seabrook Farms is today an outstanding example of successful unionization among corporation farm employees.

Over a decade ago, following the organization of a majority of workers in the processing and distribution of dairy products in California and Connecticut, the Teamsters International formed a number of Milkmen's Unions on the larger dairy-farm factories in those states. For over ten years these local unions have negotiated excellent contracts and their members have enjoyed good wages and improved conditions of employment.

The most enduring movement among farm workers to organize originated among Negro and white sharecroppers on the cotton plantations of eastern Arkansas. Initially known as the Southern Tenant Farmers Union, it was at first unaffiliated with the labor movement. The National Agricultural Workers Union, AFL, is the outgrowth of that union of sharecroppers.

From the first, the organization attracted nation-wide attention to the problems of farm workers. It continued to receive encouragement from many outstanding liberal Americans who were impressed by the integrity of its officers and the devotion of its members. Both before and since its affiliation with the AFL, it has received limited but continuous support both from liberal organizations and from segments of the labor movement.

In 1937, the Southern Tenant Farmers Union participated in the formation of the United Cannery, Agricultural, Packing and Allied Workers (UCAPAWA) chartered by the CIO. After a year, the STFU withdrew from UCAPAWA because of Communist domination.

UCAPAWA made various attempts to organize both field and processing workers throughout the country, and had some success among processing workers in food and tobacco plants. Its name was

later changed to Food, Tobacco and Agricultural Workers, and in 1950 along with other Communist-dominated unions, it was expelled by the CIO.

After the expulsion of the international union, a number of FTA locals were taken over by the CIO, among them the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Packing Shed Workers Local 78, an area-wide local union operating throughout California and Arizona. The introduction of new machinery enabled the processors and shippers to pack the produce in the fields with imported Mexican labor, at the same time causing a loss of 9 out of 10 of the union's membership.

DIGIORGIO BATTLE

In 1954, the remnants of this union group were turned over by the CIO to the United Packinghouse Workers. Another effort by a CIO union to unionize farm workers was made in 1951 in the campaign of the Brewery Workers International to organize all workers employed in the Florida citrus fruit industry. This also proved abortive.

Several significant strikes, led by the AFL National Agricultural Workers Union, took place on the West Coast from 1947 to 1953. A strike of 1,100 workers on the DiGiorgio Corporation ranch in California was lost in 1948. From this experience, the union learned that it was not possible to organize successfully a single large corporation farm unit in a closely knit agricultural area.

In 1949 the union led a strike of 40,000 cotton workers employed on all farms in the same area of production and won recognition as the bargaining agent. Due to lack of finances to employ organizers, it was impossible to capitalize on this victory. Similar demonstrations in other agricultural areas have occurred during the past eight years.

In the fall of 1953, 2000 sugar cane workers in Louisiana went on strike, after exhausting all other means to better their miserable living and working conditions. Average family earnings were from \$700 to \$1200. Within two months the strike was broken through anti-labor injunctions, a type of court interference that has long been a thing of the past in industry.

A year after the injunctions were appealed, the Louisiana Supreme Court ruled that the injunctions were valid because the strike took place during the harvest season and jeopardized a vital segment of the state's economy. In a decision shattering to the cause of free labor and free men, Chief Justice Forunet said,

"...The guarantees of freedom of speech, even if picketing and speech are held to be identical, cannot be maintained in the face of such irreparable injury to property...."

(Turn to last page)

Yalta Papers — —

(Continued from page 6)

educate" these slave-laborers, Harriman explained, not "to treat them badly."

FAST WORK

There are some comic-opera details on how the Latin American satellites of the U. S. snapped to attention when, from afar, Roosevelt sent out cabled orders.

As we explained in the April 4 issue, the Yalta conference decided that only those states would be permitted to found the United Nations who had declared war against Germany. They set a deadline for all declarations of war to get in under the wire. From Yalta, U. S. orders went out to get as many Latin American states into the war as possible in a hurry, although up to now the U. S. had advised them otherwise; for every declaration of war meant another vote in the new UN.

Stettinius wired Acting Secretary Grew from Yalta: "It is absolutely essential that this be accomplished by the end of this month [February]...." Press them to declare war, he said, but don't tell them why they have to; just make sure they do.

Medina of Venezuela, replied Grew later, was "somewhat taken aback" but staunchly promised to deliver the country forthwith. By Feb. 5, he wired, Ecuador had already declared war—fast work! (When Stettinius promptly reported this victory for the Allies to the next day's Foreign Ministers' meeting at Yalta, Eden laughed.)

Grew also gave a rundown on how fast the others could be expected to follow suit. His note on Uruguay: "The government is looking for a justification for acting."

The war for democracy marched on.

To the 'Brink' with Dulles — —

(Continued from page 1)

in the face. We took strong action." But what happened in these three situations in which the American government's chief officer on foreign affairs says he walked the American people and the world "to the brink" of nuclear warfare?—where, peering over the brink, he "looked it in the face," and, by implication, by doing so scared the Stalinists from launching war.

Were these actions in which free nations were fighting for their life against imperialist armies launched from the Russian or Chinese heartland of Stalinism? Were they, perhaps, instances in which the Stalinists, faced with a popular revulsion against their movements and policies, were on the verge of redressing their political losses with military action when Uncle Sam, fixing the eyes of the feral enemy with an aquiline gaze, halted him in his predatory tracks?

FALSIFICATION

The events themselves were not exactly according to this script.

In the first case, there was a danger that the Korean war might be resumed when America's "gallant ally," Syngman Rhee, attempted to torpedo the truce negotiations once and for all by releasing 22,000 prisoners of war from the prison camps. It is entirely possible that the Stalinists refused to permit themselves to be provoked by this open, blatant, pre-mediated provocation by the Korean dictator because they feared that if the war were resumed the United States might use atomic weapons against Chinese cities.

But if they had reacted to Rhee's provocation by starting the fighting, and if the United States had attacked Manchurian cities with nuclear weapons, what would the result have been? What single ally would have remained at the side of the United States in such a war? What single Asian ally, outside of Chiang Kai-shek and Syngman Rhee, would have rallied to the American cause?

To ask the questions is to answer them. For Dulles to boast, at this time, that the threat of nuclear war deterred the Stalinists from reacting to the provocation of America's chief ally is to affront the conscience as well as the intelligence of mankind.

But once they have rejected Dulles' claim, what do the Democrats have to offer that is better? Not a thing. Not a solitary single little thing.

Under the Democrats the United States got into the Korean war. By the time Eisenhower was elected, they had proved that with their policy this was a war which could not be won by military means short of launching a direct attack on China.

OUR NOBLE ALLY

As to trying to win it by political means (to which the military would be an auxiliary arm), they had no idea of even how to start in that direction. Rhee and his political gangsters and big landlords were America's allies in this war, not the Korean people.

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

HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE

LABOR ACTION

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

Please enter my subscription:

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

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

True, the Stalinist imperialists have been prevented to date from taking over the whole of Korea. But the country has been converted into a permanent political no-man's land between the great war blocs. As long as Rhee and the dictatorial regime he controls run South Korea, there is not the slightest possibility in the world that the Stalinists can be forced out of North Korea by any democratic political means.

This could be done only by a regime in South Korea which could attract the passionate support of a majority of the people on both sides of the military lines. Neither Democrats nor Republicans have any means by which to help such a regime into existence, for to do so would be to allow, if not to assist in, the overthrow of the only guarantor of a pro-capitalist Korea: Rhee and his clique.

If we turn to Indochina, things stand even worse for Dulles—and for his Democratic critics.

After years of guerrilla fighting, a popular movement under Stalinist control had pushed the French imperialists to the verge of utter collapse in Indochina. The whole Indochinese people, except for a tiny handful of French hirelings or French-protected gangsters, were against the French. The United States had poured millions upon millions of dollars in economic and military aid into the effort to hold Indochina for the French Empire.

Despite this aid, the French position had been gradually deteriorating, and reached a point of dramatic collapse at the battle of Dienbienphu. To this day no one has been able to prove that Chinese Stalinist troops participated in this battle, or in any other in the war in Indochina.

Here was a classic example of the struggle for independence from imperialist rule being FORCED into the arms of Stalinism because no other movement or force in the world appeared to be effectively and unambiguously committed to help it.

DULLES SCARED WHOM?

The crisis of Dienbienphu could have been seen coming a long, long way off.

The Democrats were in office when Indochina was liberated from Japanese rule in 1945, and when it was turned over to its old French masters shortly afterward. They were in office for seven of the eight years which passed between the end of World War II and the fall of Dienbienphu, and proved absolutely helpless to change the course of events. The Republicans, while in opposition, had proposed no better policies than those pursued by the Democrats.

Faced with the actuality of the French collapse which had been foreseen by every capable analyst of Asian affairs, Dulles began to wave the A-bombs and threaten American intervention. Whether he frightened the Chinese by his bellicose gestures it is hard to say, as their forces were not involved in the war. That he struck fear into the hearts of his European allies was quite clear, however, when the British government categorically refused to be associated with an attempt to use a few aircraft carriers to reverse political forces which had been gathering and moving for at least twelve years.

It is quite true that if it were not for the danger of bringing on World War III, the Stalinists might have tried to exploit their crushing victory at Dienbienphu to take over the whole country in one swift military lunge. French imperialism and the bipartisan foreign policy of the United States had rendered the country rotten-ripe for Stalinist plucking. Future historians may discover what combination of inter-Stalinist rivalry and fear of the possibility of launching World War III might have deterred the Stalinists and led them to adopt the longer-range tactics for the complete taking over of Indochina which they are now pursuing.

GENEVA TO THE BRINK

For Dulles to claim a "victory" for his policy of "deterrence" in Indochina is as brazen an attempt to rewrite history as anything tried by those masters at the art, the Stalinists, in recent times.

If there was ever an example in history of the utter collapse of a policy of a major power in front of the whole world, that example was given by Dulles at the Geneva conference at which the truce and partition of Indochina was negotiated. Since he could get no other country to join him in walking to or over the brink in Indochina, he had nothing to say at the negotiations. He had hurled his bolt and his quiver was empty. He

could not even think up a big phrase with which to fill the gaping hole.

The representatives of the greatest power in the world, armed to the teeth with the biggest and most destructive nuclear weapons, performed no function at that conference other than to mumble and grumble and glare from the sidelines.

And finally, we come to that other area in which Dulles has not been "scared to go to the brink," the Formosa Straits.

It is true that in this area the Democrats, who (or at least some of them) have supported Chiang Kai-shek so fulsomely for so many years, are beginning to make noises which appear to imply that they are finally getting a dim glimmering of an inkling that something is wrong with the policy of unconditional and perpetual support for the ruler of Formosa.

But for year upon dreary year, interrupted only by the episode of the White Paper on Chiang, their administrations supported Chiang as the savior of freedom and democracy (really, of capitalism and landlordism) in China. They poured far more millions into supporting him than they ever got around to pouring down the Indochinese rat-hole. Neither the incomparable corruption of his regime, nor its brazen suppression of democracy, nor its utter military incompetence dried the wellsprings of their generosity.

When he was finally defeated and driven off the mainland to his Formosa refuge, the American government continued to support him and his regime as the legitimate and "democratic" ruler of China. When the Chinese Stalinists, who had been aided in conquering the whole of China by the legitimacy with which they could claim that Chiang was the "running dog" of foreign imperialism, got around to organize a military assault to drive him off Formosa, Democratic president Truman threw the Seventh Fleet into the Formosa Strait as a shield between Chiang and his destiny.

No influential voices in the Democratic (or Republican) Parties were raised in protest. No one suggested an alternative policy.

"KEEP 'EM GUESSING"

When the incredible Mr. Dulles became secretary of State, the only change in the policy in the Formosa Strait was to announce the "unleashing" of Chiang Kai-shek against the mainland. Since this "unleashing" was never transferred to the real world from the realm of Dulles' fantasies, the actual policy remained exactly as it had been shaped by the Democrats.

The Seventh Fleet stood between Chiang and the mainland. The fact that the Stalinists cleverly transferred the scene of possible action from an attack on Formosa itself to an attack on Quemoy and Matsu confronted the administration with the necessity of a narrower application of the bipartisan policy. The result was, perhaps, the crowning Dullesism of them all (to date).

One of the bases of Dulles' approach to foreign policy is (the *Life* article claims) never to leave the enemy in doubt as to what you are going to do, so as to avoid the danger that he will miscalculate your intentions and thus get into a war neither of you really had counted on. This time, however, a "keep 'em guessing" tactic was used. Congress was prevailed upon to pass, by bipartisan vote, a resolution which gave the president a free hand to use America's armed forces in the Formosa Strait. The president, however, refused to let it be known whether or not he would use them to defend Quemoy and Matsu.

Life magazine, however, stated that "Dulles has never doubted that Eisenhower would have regarded an attack on Quemoy and the Matsus as an attack on Formosa."

It would seem then that (a) Eisenhower "kept 'em guessing" even unnecessarily; (b) he falsified his views to Congress.

The Democratic outcry at Dulles statements in the *Life* article is quite understandable. Putting the administration's foreign policy, which is also their own party's, in such abrupt and dramatic terms is bound to alarm America's allies, to further antagonize millions of people all over the world who believe the United States is a would-be military aggressor, and to give the Stalinists plenty of propaganda ammunition.

Further, they see it as a political danger at home, inasmuch as it attempts to give the Eisenhower administration credit in the public mind for keeping America out of war (three times). The

bulk of the Democrats feel that their party is entitled to at least as much credit as the Republicans for the fact that no new wars have broken out recently, and the wiser heads among them realize that if the deception involved in Dulles' claims should really be accepted by the American people, this country might find itself in a very dangerous situation.

NO REAL DEBATE

For the basic fact is that Korea, Indochina and the Formosa Strait remain extremely dangerous areas for American foreign policy. Nothing has been settled or solved there which might not erupt any day with disastrous consequences.

That is the trouble with any policy based primarily on military force. It does not solve the conflicts which make force necessary in the first place. Force can be the midwife of history, but, no matter how much of it is applied, the results will be negative unless there is something which is struggling to be born.

America's bipartisan foreign policy has been full of force (from military containment to massive retaliation), but force applied to prop up a crumbling status quo all over the world.

Thus, however much the Democratic leaders may howl against Dulles, they cannot and will not open the great debate on America's foreign policy which is so badly needed. Truman's policy of "containment," if actually put to the test by the Stalinists, involved just as much risk of walking to the brink of the nuclear war as does the Eisenhower-Dulles policy of "massive retaliation."

The fact that Truman and his secretary of State usually had the sense to talk more softly than the gun-toting Presbyterian who now heads the State Department does not erase the fact that under their administration a British prime minister had to fly to Washington to keep them from dropping the A-bomb on China during the retreat from the Yalu River.

It is high time that the labor and liberal movements in this country detached themselves from the Democratic Party sufficiently to be able to take a long, hard look at the kind of foreign policy which is needed if America and the world is to start the long, hard road back from the brink to which the bipartisan foreign policy has taken us three times in three years, and near which we continue to live to this very day.

Farm Unions —

(Continued from page 7)

If this doctrine is accepted in other states, the workers in a major industry may be prevented by court action from striking at a crucial production period.

In the spring of 1955, 1400 sugar refinery workers went on strike against Godschaux Sugars, Inc. Hundreds of strike-breakers were brought into the small southern Louisiana community where the plant is located and violence flared.

A HISTORY OF COURAGE

Trade-unionism in agriculture has thus had many setbacks but also a few limited successes confined to local areas. But because there has been no sustained, serious, large-scale effort with adequate financial backing, the organization of farm labor in this country cannot be said to have failed. It has simply never been tried.

Yet, despite the overwhelming power of the big farming interests, men and women in the fields have been willing time and time again to try to organize. The story of their courage and their desperation is largely unknown and unrecognized. Into the organizations which they have created they have poured their hopes and their dreams. The price they have had to pay for failure has often been high — blacklisting, prison and sometimes death.

A strike of agricultural workers is very rarely a business-like affair, and it is never a contest between giants. All the power is on the other side—the big farmers, the banks, the money, and often the law. Because farm workers suffer from so many manifest injustices—not only low wages and poor working conditions, but miserable housing, few educational opportunities, little medical care and that feeling of always being on the outside looking in—their protests have a quality of tragedy which most Americans in this rich, comfortable and comfortable country of ours have almost forgotten.