

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

SEPTEMBER 17, 1956

FIVE CENTS

RUSSIA 1953-56:

FROM STALIN TO KHRUSHCHEV

... page 6

BRITAIN'S BIGGEST UNION PUSHES LEFT

... page 3

PROTEST GROWS ON ATOM-PLANT PERIL

... page 4

Br. Guiana Leader Dissects London Plan

... page 8

SPOT-LIGHT

Negro Children, Bayonets— And Presidential Candidates

By GORDON HASKELL

One of the major battles in the struggle for desegregation of education in America was fought in the border states during the first two weeks of September. The battle resulted in a clear-cut victory for the Negro people and the anti-Jim-Crow forces in America, and once again demonstrated the hopelessness of the white-supremacist cause in this country.

Once again the leading antagonists in this struggle, exposed to the glaring light of national publicity, showed up in marked contrast to each other. In Clinton, Sturgis, Mansfield, and in other towns where attempts were made to block integration by mob violence, the symbols of the struggle were, on the one hand, the Negro children walking courageously through the howling mob, and on the other, a small minority of the white population whipped up to a pitch of mindless fury by a tiny handful of bigoted agitators who had, in many cases, bolstered their courage with liberal doses of whiskey.

Once again, a central fact about the struggle for integration which is all too often blurred over, even in the pro-integrationist press of the North, was emphasized: Segregation can only be main-

tained as long as the power of the government and the ruling class stands behind it. Where such support is lacking, even the most fervent agitation cannot keep it in force.

That is the lesson of Clinton, Tenn., and of every other location in which Negroes sought to enroll in previously lily-white schools and were met by mob action. Wherever the government stood behind those citizens who were seeking their elementary rights, and defended them against those who sought to violate them, the issue was quickly resolved. Where the government shirked its duty, or openly supported the white-supremacists, the Negroes either made no attempt to join the issue, or they were defeated in this round of the struggle.

The fight for integration is far from won: that goes without saying. In the deep South, not a single public school below the university level has been inte-

Miss Freda Zuerchen has been teaching in the Louisville schools for forty years. She now has about thirty Negroes in her five English classes.

"I thought it might bother me, but it doesn't one bit," she said. The children act as though they have been going to school with colored pupils all their lives. I think it's marvelous. I really can't understand it. But I like it."

New York Times, Sept. 12

grated, and the process has only barely begun in such border states as Arkansas and Tennessee.

The responsibility for the fact that there has been no break in the defiance of the Supreme Court's integration order in the Deep South rests to no small degree on the shoulders of the national leadership of both major political parties. Their shameful capitulation to the Southern racists has actually encouraged the latter's defiance of the court order: there can be no doubt of that.

Clinton pointed up this aspect of current American politics more clearly than anything else could have done.

While the dramatic struggle was at its hottest in this town, Adlai Stevenson and Estes Kefauver, standard-bearers of the Democratic Party, drove through it on their way to a meeting with Southern party leaders. They did not stop; they did not say a word for publication. They turned their faces away from the children who were walking through the school doors under the protection of National Guard bayonets, and hurried on to shake hands and plan joint political strategy with the leaders of the anti-integration forces of the South.

Further, Stevenson addressed a Labor Day rally in Detroit and spoke to labor gatherings in other Michigan cities. He did not yet find it possible to say a word, even a cheap campaign-year word, to encourage the people who were fighting for equal educational opportunities for their children in the South. His silence on this subject became so thunderous that Democratic Party leaders in New York City decided that it would be better for him not to try to address a meeting in Harlem at this stage of his campaign.

(Continued on page 3)

'Leave That Kind of Talk in Detroit...'

By JACK WILSON

Detroit, Sept. 10

The New York Times story that Adlai Stevenson was advised not to appear in Harlem right now, due to the hostility of the Negro people over the weak civil-rights plank in the Democratic Party platform and their anger over the mob violence against Negro school children down South, coincides with an incident involving a minor Negro official of the United Auto Workers, who just returned from down Arkansas.

This union official was asked not to come down and do it again. During his vacation there, he attended a political rally of about 150 Negroes and took up their invitation to express his views.

As he puts it, since he knew most of the people, for it was his home town, he decided to sell them the UAW line of supporting the Democratic Party candidates, Stevenson and Kefauver. When he finished, the silence was painful. Everyone else who spoke was for supporting the Republicans against the Democrats, who were identified as the source of racial oppression in the South.

A good friend of the UAW official told him: "You are invited back again, but only if you leave that kind of talk back home. Maybe it will go in Detroit. But never down here."

The incident almost spoiled the vacation of the union official, who had a time

explaining himself privately. As a matter of fact, if he had known how bitter the people were about the Democratic Party down there, he would have kept his mouth shut, he said.

Now we do not pretend to claim that this incident is typical, or that even the Stevenson rebuff in New York is portentous. But we do know that the debate among the Negro people over political action is more intense and less partisan than any we have experienced in the last 25 years, and that the dissatisfaction with status-quo politics is the most obvious feature of this debate.

The feeling of frustration will increase, of course, as events in the South deepen the anger of the Negroes, and the actions of the politicians up North emphasize a thousand times over that there is no basic difference in the programs of the major political parties on the vexing issue of civil rights and liberties for America's biggest minority, the Negroes.

DETROIT NOTES

With a candor that is almost refreshing, L. L. (Tex) Colbert, president of Chrysler, has sent out a personal letter to all employees stating that at the start of the 1957 model Chrysler is going to put into effect a set of new work standards, to wit, like those Ford and General Motors have.

What this signifies is that in many large divisions Chrysler workers will be expected to increase production by at least 25 per cent per man per hour. Colbert uses quite an argument for this move: *We gave you the GM package in terms of a union contract; we expect in return a GM package of work standards.*

Since the UAW has not been able to improve working conditions at GM and Ford notably in the last negotiations when all pressure was on to get the principle of the Guaranteed Annual Wage, the net result is that Chrysler workers, who had achieved far superior working conditions, are in danger of losing them.

All of which foretells a story of internal stresses and problems in the UAW as the secondary leaders are caught between the pressure of the ranks and the drive of management for more production, with the top UAW officials standing by a policy of "live up to the contract"—which means: give up the better working conditions.

Unlike his flop at the opening of the 1952 campaign in Detroit, Adlai Stevenson was far superior in his appeal to the huge crowd at the Labor Day rally here. But the biggest applause and response came whenever Walter P. Reuther talked somewhat in the vein of old, with a few cracks at General Motors. Interestingly enough, there were more signs for a 30-hour week than in other years.

LAND OF REFUGE

"U. S. is quietly helping Korean President Syngman Rhee solidify his position. Admiral Won Yil Sohn, who resigned as defense minister under fire (over his handling of defense monies) is in this country as guest of our State Department. With Sohn out of the country, he can't be called by Korean National Assembly for questioning. He'll 'study American methods of government.'"—*"Washington Calling" column in Scripps-Howard papers, Aug.*

He has to study yet?

TWO BOOKS ON LABOR

'When Labor Votes'

WHEN LABOR VOTES: A STUDY OF AUTO WORKERS, by Arthur Kornhauser, Harold L. Sheppard and Albert J. Mayer—University Books, 1956, 352 pages, \$5.

By BEN HALL

On the eve of the 1952 elections, a team of Wayne University sociologists interviewed 828 United Auto Workers members in the Detroit area and, when the election was over, went back to speak to 351 of them. This is a report of their findings—facts and figures of great significance to anyone interested in the labor movement or active in politics.

Some of the conclusions could have been readily anticipated. We know, for example, that workers vote Democratic by a large majority. But how large? In this sampling, UAW members indicated a party preference for the Democrats by more than 7-1; they voted for Stevenson 3-1. "Defections from straight Democratic voting were to candidate Eisenhower rather than to the Republican party."

In sum, from this study of how UAW members voted, how they thought about the campaign issues, what they feel about their union, we get a picture of the dominant, pervasive union-consciousness of the American working class represented here by one of its most important sectors. For other details, we refer our readers to the current issue of the *New Internationalist* and, of course, to the book itself.

Union-consciousness in these auto workers borders upon class-consciousness. In the second interview, the question was put: "If you were asked to use one of these four names for your social class, which would you say you belonged in: the middle class, lower class, working class or upper class?"

The answers must be startling to those who are convinced that American

workers are happily "middle class" in outlook. Here is how 280 unionists replied:

Upper	1
Lower	1
Middle	71
Working class	207

The authors find too, that the evidence suggests that a majority of those interviewed "see the political world in terms of opposed goals and group interests as between organized labor and business."

Is union-consciousness a relic of the past or is it deeply implanted in the minds of a new generation of workers? The answer to this question is of decisive significance in an estimate of the state of the American working class; it tells volumes about tendencies within it.

Is the trend away from the union spirit that swept the militant vanguard of the working class along in the thirties and toward a middle-class outlook? Or is the idea of unionism, class organization of labor, inherited by one generation from the other? In one case, the class-consciousness of the workers would prove to be in a state of continuing dissolution and disappearance. In the other, class-consciousness must tend to be in the process of formation and solidification.

For these reasons, the book's conclusions about the younger unionists are of enormous symptomatic significance. Speaking of those members who are most strongly for the union, it concludes:

"This type has the smallest proportion of persons 55 years of age and over and ... the largest proportion of persons under 35. The fact that the two types with a high labor political orientation ... are younger than the other types has an important bearing upon the future trends regarding union loyalty, and it calls into question the notion that such sentiments are strongest among the older workers, the ones who helped establish the union in the early organizing period."

Frank Edwards and the AFL

MY FIRST 10,000,000 SPONSORS, by Frank Edwards.—Ballantine Books, 1956, 185 pages, \$2 hardbound, 35 cents paperbound.

When Frank Edwards was a young fellow, just in radio, he went to his boss, manager of station WHAS in Louisville, with a novel idea: how about a regular series of news broadcasts? That was 1925. When the chief recovered from the shock he said stiffly, "Young man, I shall excuse you because of your age and inexperience.... Radio is not in the news business."

Edwards went on to gain a certain modest fame as a radio news commentator. This autobiographical story is an entertaining and lively account of how radio has changed in thirty years.

He is best known to us as the man sponsored by the AFL for four years (1950-54) until it suddenly, without explanation, cancelled his broadcasts. It was the AFL that gave him his "first 10,000,000 sponsors."

In passing he gives testimony from his own experience on the sad state of liberalism today:

"One of the most significant changes in Congress in recent years has been the virtual disappearance of real liberals. The breed is not altogether extinct but the specimens are extremely rare. You can count on your fingers the liberals remaining on Capitol Hill.... You can still hear much talk, both in and out of Congress, that might conceivably be interpreted as indicating latent liberalism, but when the chips are down you will find

that it was just talk, little else. The favorite strategy of the pseudo-liberals, both individuals and organizations, is to lie low while the battle for liberal legislation is going on. Then, after the battle has been lost, they come trumpeting to the fore, issuing statements of righteous indignation. You can spot them coming out like mushrooms after the storm."

Why did the AFL fire him? His account is worth recording; after all, he is the man that was fired.

He relates that he went for two years without censorship of any kind. Sometimes he was invited to address union conventions; but he became too popular. When the delegates to one convention gave him a big hand, a wise union official tipped him off that the top brass were not pleased to see a mere hired hand go over so well with the ranks. Not long after, he was instructed to end all personal appearances before union gatherings.

Censorship began, first in a mild form. He was given an "assistant" who was actually a censor.

"One of the orders he passed on to me was a mandate from Mr. Meany to the effect that I must not mention the name of Phil Murray, president of the CIO, Walter Reuther, president of the CIO United Auto Workers; John L. Lewis, president of the Mine Workers; or David McDonald, president of the CIO Steel Workers. I could mention them in case they died; otherwise their names were to be kept off the AFL program."

Tough rule for a labor news commentator!

Later he was discussing the merger talks with Meany, asking for advice on how to handle it.

SPOTLIGHT

(Continued from page 1)

two parties. He cheerfully conceded that it was a conundrum but he claimed that he at least could tell the difference between a Demo or GOP headquarters just by looking around. If assorted characters were scurrying around with droopy coffee containers in a somewhat disorganized atmosphere, they were Democrats.... That doesn't purport to summarize Mr. White's secret key, but it will give an adequate idea of the distance from politics that he maintains.

Now this idea that there were no political, programmatic or ideological differences between the two old parties worth talking about used to be a socialist accusation—in fact, a soapbox standby. The old parties were Tweedledum and Tweedledee. No difference. You're voting for the same old system on either line of the ballot. Etc.

So today we socialists ought to be saying "We told you so." We hereby do that. But just in order to be contrary, we have something else to say too:

(1) There is an important difference between the Democratic and Republican Parties.

(2) The bourgeois commentators are as wrong today with their glib talk of "no difference" as they were when they were sure that a political gulf divided the two parties.

(3) Paradoxically, today only socialists can explain what this difference is—the same socialists who often, if sometimes simplistically, spoke of Tweedledum and Tweedledee.

WHERE TO LOOK

To be sure, we are obviously not talking about any basic political distinction between the Democrats and Republicans. Only political hacks, or people working hard at talking like political hacks, can give out today with speeches about how the Great Democratic Party is the party of the People while its evil rival pursues only in the clutches of the Vested Interests. We are not talking about any reason to support or vote for one or the other.

We certainly are not talking, furthermore, of what is written in the political program of one or the other. As we have stressed, on civil rights and the Negro fight the Democrats have the more reactionary plank by a shade. On the vital area of foreign policy, a case could be made out (though we wouldn't be interested in doing so ourselves) that here too, the formal platform of the Democrats is at least a shade more bellicose than that of its rival. On civil liberties there is little to choose.

Or are they simply rival power-complexes? They are that in part, of course, whatever else they are; but are they simply that? The observation, to which sociology professors are prone, does not say anything. Every party must be a power-repository if it is to exist at all, and every real political situation must be characterized by the rivalry of such power-complexes whether the parties are virtually indistinguishable or whether they are at each other's throats in a social paroxysm.

In 1956, when the Democrats and Republicans seem so indistinguishable in so

many ways, and indeed when the Stevenson-Democrats are striving to look as much like Eisenhower-Republicans as possible, certain things have not changed.

The main difference between the two parties does not lie in the heads of the generals but in the social character of the armies behind them.

When the Democrats seek to take on the conservative ("moderate") aura of reasonable Republicans, their central problem is how far they can go in this direction without overstretching the leading-strings which they hold in their hands and which are attached to the laborite politicians. When the Republicans seek to make gestures in the direction of the workingman, their problem is how far can they go without angering their rockribbed tycoons.

The couple of hundred millionaires who were delegates to the Democratic Convention were quite used to the idea that they had to keep chucking the working class under the chin—with planks like T-H repeal, for instance, in spite of the fact that they do not mean it seriously, in spite of the fact that they don't even think that labor thinks they mean it seriously.

CLASS ANGLE

The difference between the two parties is, from this angle in the type of lies they have to tell—that is, in the direction to which they look for their appeal.

No matter how indistinguishable from the GOP the Demos seek to become (and with a great measure of success), the core of their power-complex remains the working-class vote. Of course, the fact that organized labor provides this particular one of the two capitalist parties with its voting cattle is a fact that itself is to be explained historically. We are concerned here with the fact.

Whether the Demos woo this class vote with conscious and cynical demagoguery, like Truman, or whether they pretend to be above such things, like Stevenson, is secondary. The intentions even of the party's standard-bearer do not determine the social role which the party plays as an *ersatz* instrument of laborite political action, in this period when labor's politics are still tied to capitalism.

So behind the apparently twin façades of the two-party system lies the continuing clash of class interests in the social system. This clash has not yet worked itself out to taking the form of rival class parties; the antagonistic forces are bottled up within the bipartisan format, milling about blindly behind the old façades, in the old houses of politics owned by capital.

So the pundits say Tweedledum and Tweedledee, and we enthusiastically agree with the thought that there is no reason for throwing one's vote to either. The important difference between the two parties, however, they cannot see—because it involves a class analysis, and they all know that this is subversive, un-American, all but illegal and immoral and very likely fattening too.

This class analysis tells us also that labor cannot long remain bottled up in the Democratic Party ménage, and that its departure to build its own will be a social explosion.

Meany: "Sure it's goin' to happen! It's gotta happen now. Just don't overplay it, though."

Edwards: "What about Reuther's part in the merger?"

Meany: "Reuther! He's dead and don't know it."

Meany left the room; and Edwards asked William Schnitzler for an explanation. Schnitzler said, "George means that all we gotta do now is to pick up the pieces."

In 1954 Edwards flatly rejected a long list of censorship rules invented in Meany's office and a few days afterward his contract was cancelled.

His labor career and opinions are interesting, but there are other facets to his character:

He tells proudly how with his radio he sponsored a big Mother's Day celebration for a group of old ladies in an old folks home. But then, there are many who love mothers. He details, deady serious all the time, his civic services in publi-

cizing flying saucers, suggesting strongly that they may have been visiting flying craft from outer space, probably Mars. But then our many science-fiction fans will find nothing astonishing, amazing, or astounding in that. He claims that he began his fishing career by landing a 10½-pound black bass in a Florida lake. Only fellow freshwater fisherman, a jury of his peers, can judge him. He played Santa Claus to orphans one snowy Christmas night, flying not by reindeer but by specially chartered helicopter. There are others who have played the role, if in more commonplace fashion.

But the achievement that must universally be hailed by all—sportsmen, children of mothers, gift-givers, workers and bosses—was his public solution of a child-kidnapping and murder case. He reveals how he did it in this book. It was nothing; he simply consulted an omniscient talking horse. That's right, a talking horse.

LONDON LETTER **Britain's Biggest Union Sparks New Militancy by Labor**

By OWEN ROBERTS

London, Sept. 8

After a week of debates the 88th annual meeting of the Trades Union Congress came to an end yesterday afternoon, and with it ended the five-year-long honeymoon between the TUC and the Tory government.

The divorce came when the thousand delegates adopted with acclamation a resolution which tossed overboard wage restraint, put the blame for Britain's current economic difficulties onto the shoulders of the Tory government, and called for a return to a "planned economy."

The resolution was that outlined in my last London Letter which had been placed before the Congress by the Transport and General Workers' Union, Britain's largest union. It was unopposed by the right-wing leadership of the TUC General Council; this, however, did not signify agreement—it was merely an indication that the right-wing is very much aware of the mood of the rank-and-file. If the right wing had offered verbal opposition the resolution would still have been passed and the right-wing leaders would have been placed in a more difficult position than they are at present.

As anticipated, Frank Cousins (sec-

tary of the TGWU) moved the resolution with some force. He acknowledged that the resolution had a large political content but said that this was justified by the circumstances; the workers, he said, could only expect a straight deal from a Labor government.

This was, for the TUC, a statement slightly tinged with heresy and was generally taken to be an answer to those union leaders who advocate that the unions should pay no attention to the political color of the government but should work amicably with any government for the benefit of "the country."

This, however, was not the only heretical statement made by Cousins. He promised that his union did not intend to content itself with the mere passing of resolutions, but would take action to back up its words.

He also said that his 1¼ million members would use their strength to help smaller and weaker unions, and also people like retired workers living on old-age pensions, to fight their battles for better living standards. These statements were also a direct reply to a right-wing spokesman of the General Council who had earlier given a hint that it would be folly for the big unions to exert their full bargaining power because it would worsen the position of the smaller unions and people living on fixed income.

Just how far Cousins was prepared to go in taunting the right-wing old guard was shown when he said: "The government have told us that if they could save 750 million pounds sterling (\$2115 million) on the Defense Bill they would be economically sound. Let them save it there and not on wages."

This statement was greeted with stormy applause by the delegates on the floor and pained silence by the right-wing leaders decorating the platform.

TORIES SQUEAL

Cousins is himself a member of the General Council, and by way of revenge the General Council two days later put him up to oppose a resolution calling for immediate action for a forty-hour week. It is said that behind the scenes Cousins let it be known that he had no desire to be used as a chopping-block by the right-wing, and he warned that the resolution would be passed in spite of the opposition of the General Council. In the event he was proved right; when the votes were counted the majority line-up was for the forty-hour week and the General Council went down to defeat.

The decision of the trade unions to ignore the Tory government's plea for wage restraint has been met with alarm by the government and its supporters. Already there is wild talk by some sections of the press that the trade-unions have set themselves up against the government and are therefore acting uncon-

stitutionally. From now on it can be expected that every demand for a wage increase by the unions will be immediately seen by the Tory press barons as part of a nation-wide plot to overthrow the government.

This line of thought is not arrived at by any accidental process, for the Tories can well remember that the 1926 strike was largely broken because of the allegations that the unions were out to usurp the functions of the government and the state.

The union right-wing leadership also find some comfort in this line of thought; for they hope that it may act as a brake upon the militant feelings of those members of the rank and file who are prepared to go all-out for higher wages but at the same time are not prepared to get involved in any action which seems to run counter to the "democratic process of parliamentary democracy."

The leftward turn of the trade-union movement is bound to have interesting repercussions on the Labor Party, particularly as the TGWU holds the largest vote at the Labor annual conference and has frequently set the pace for the party as a whole. In four weeks' time the annual conference will meet, and the right wing will be waiting with great anxiety to hear what contribution Cousins has to make on behalf of his great union.

"COUSINITES"

The role played by Cousins has led to a number of newspapers coining a new word for the Labor dictionary—"Cousinites." This is supposed to describe those like Cousins who represent a leftward tendency in the trade-union movement in opposition to the right-wing old guard which has dominated the scene for so long.

The coining of this word, however, does not signify that a revolution has taken place in the British trade-union movement—although to judge from some press reports one would think that the TUC and its affiliated unions were standing ready to burn down the Houses of Parliament at the earliest opportunity.

What has happened is that Cousins has appeared on the scene at the precise moment when the patience of many slightly left-of-center trade-union leaders has been stretched to breaking-point. He has become the point around which this feeling has crystallized. Whether Cousins is now prepared to use his power and influence for a big leftward push remains to be seen. And the Labor Party conference will provide a pointer.

Negro Children — —

(Continued from page 1)

President Eisenhower, the Republican standard-bearer, was no better at this point. He spoke up against mob rule and force and violence, but federal authorities were prominent by their absence in every case in which quite likely federal laws were being violated. Imagine the political impact if Eisenhower had gone down to Clinton, taken a Negro child by the hand, and led him or her into the school!

RACISTS ENCOURAGED

As a matter of fact, the capitulation of official Northern liberalism on the integration issue in both parties at their recent conventions has actually encouraged the racists in the South. Their yielding on the platform in both parties made it possible for every racist agitator, and every racist governor and legislator and public leader in the South, to tell his followers:

You have nothing to worry about. We have shown that if the South takes an adamant stand, the leaders of the North will give in to them on this issue. The only thing to worry about is to keep our own ranks solid and determined. They may talk big in the North, but it is only to win the Negro vote in the big cities. They don't really mean it, and they have shown that by giving in to us at their conventions.

The leadership of the labor movement, who went along with the capitulation at Chicago and are now whooping it up for Stevenson, have to bear their share of the responsibility too. Men like Reuther are as opposed to racial discrimination and segregation today as they were yesterday. They will speak against it and act against it. But they remain tied to the Democratic Party, and are now campaigning for Stevenson.

However serious they may be about fighting Jim Crow, it is clear that they are much more serious about trying to win this election, let the issues fall where may.

The importance of the failure of the labor-liberal movement in the North to make an all-out fight against the South in the Democratic Party can hardly be overestimated. The fact that the issue of integration will not be one of the campaign issues this year is taken by the Southern leaders to mean that they can pretty well count on a continued hands-off attitude by the federal government on this question for the next four years, regardless of which party wins.

Events may well prove them wrong. But in the meantime, they are reinforced

in their conviction that they can successfully duck and buck the issue for some time to come.

ROLE OF FORCE

And the importance of the attitude of the federal government in this fight has been underlined once more by what happened at Clinton, Mansfield and the other towns in which attempts were made to prevent school integration by mob violence. Where there is sufficient determination on the part of the Negroes to press their fight, and where the government is willing to protect them in the exercise of their rights, it has been demonstrated that integration can be "forced" against the desire of a majority of the white population.

This has been demonstrated time and again before, especially in the North. Initial opposition to mixed housing, admission of Negroes to jobs from which they had been previously barred, and the like—in a thousand instances—have crumbled and evaporated when the tiny hard core of racist fanatics found themselves confronted by any kind of resistance to their agitation and action.

Reluctant as many, even a vast majority, of the misguided and miseducated Southern whites may be to see the Negroes achieve a status of legal equality, there are few indeed who will risk a lump on the head, let alone a jail sentence or a loss of income, for their racist convictions.

In Clinton, by all reports the men on both sides of the National Guard bayonets were opposed to integration in the schools. But this led to no indiscipline, let alone mutiny among the guardsmen.

Some were no doubt convinced that, whatever they might think about the rights and wrongs of the issue, their higher duty was to keep law and order. Others may have simply been more worried about what might happen to them if they refused to obey the orders of their superiors than they were about school integration or the threats of the boozed-up scum who opposed them.

But the fact remains that given a firm stand by the governor of Tennessee, Southern soldiers protected the right of Southern Negroes to attend a Southern school. That is something for those to ponder who claim that there are no circumstances under which force can be used to guarantee equal rights!

But it is obvious that what is required of the federal government is not a call to arms at this time, but the same kind of firmness in enforcing the law by the

(Turn to last page)

Even Candidates Have to Say Something

As we go to press, Adlai Stevenson and President Eisenhower have both made gestures of support, if not so much to the Negroes who are fighting for their rights, at least for those officials in the border states who have complied with the Supreme Court decision and have protected Negro children from the racist mobs.

Stevenson, who could find his tongue on this question neither in Clinton nor in Detroit, finally found it at a rally of the Liberal Party in New York City which endorsed his candidacy for the presidency. He said that he is for the Supreme Court decision, praised the officials in the South who are seeking to comply with it, and attacked Eisenhower for his failure to use the office of the presidency to "create a climate of compliance" with the law.

In his prepared speech Stevenson had apparently included a sentence which he dropped when he was speaking: "All who voted for my nomination knew where I stood." This omission, one may guess, was made so as not to embarrass the Southern democrats who have been telling their followers that the retreat of the Stevenson forces at the Democratic convention demonstrates that whatever he may say on the civil-rights fight for Northern consumption should not be taken too seriously.

At a press conference, Eisenhower denounced the mob violence in the South, and said that in the event a district judge finds someone in contempt of a court order, the Justice Department would assist in every way in prosecuting the offender. Even this "bold" statement seemed to exclude any real initiative on the part of the executive department of the federal government in enforcing the desegregation order.

It would have been almost unthinkable for Stevenson to fail to say something about the civil-rights issue in a speech to the Liberal Party. What he said was an attempt to shift attention from the responsibility of the Democratic Party which rules the South to the shoulders of the Republican president.

This was made amply clear when he introduced his remarks on the desegregation fight by saying that "It is the nature and tradition of the Democratic Party and of the Liberal Party to care about people—and care about them not, if you please, as statistics in a market survey, but as individual men and women and children. . . . Now it's this dedication to the ideals of human welfare and of individual liberty which makes us all so sensitive to what is happening today in the desegregation of our public schools."

If that is not cynicism, we would like to see a real example of it!

The fact that, in however mealy-mouthed and cynical fashion, both Stevenson and Eisenhower have been compelled at last to deal with the desegregation issue illustrates a point made elsewhere in these pages in reverse.

Just as the capitulation of liberals to the South on civil rights encouraged the racists and thus contributed to the mob violence in the South, so the successful integration fight in the border states and the continued struggle elsewhere makes it impossible for the Democrats and Republicans to completely ignore the issue in the election campaign. The more the struggle succeeds, and the hotter it gets, the greater the pressure on the Democratic Party with a tendency to explode it into its different parts.

UAW Joins Protest Against Michigan Atom Plant Peril

By PHILIP COBEN

Opposition has been mounting to the construction of the potentially dangerous atomic power plant in the Detroit-Toledo area, as written up in LA for August 13.

The issue is not a local one, in spite of the fact that the immediate issue concerns one plant at Lagoona Beach, in Monroe County, Michigan. A national precedent and a national pattern is being laid down.

The case is such as to convince many—scientists and congressmen included—that the Atomic Energy Commission is seeking to develop profitable atomic power under private enterprise without even some elementary precautions for the safety of the population in the neighborhood of such plants.

The issue is whether the industrial development of atomic power will be allowed to take place with the public-betrayed spirit of earlier industrial capitalist expansion.

Walter Reuther, for the United Auto Workers, a union with a concentrated membership in the affected area, entered the controversy with a press statement August 29, backing up previous protests that had been made by Reps. Anderson and Holifield of the congressional committee that is supposed to act as watchdog on the atomic-energy program.

On August 31 Marquis Childs' Washington column allowed a peek at the report, suppressed by the AEC, of the AEC's own Safeguards Committee, which had maintained that the plant proposed for Lagoona Beach could possibly blow up, scattering radioactive products over the surrounding area. An AEC permit to construct the plant was issued at the beginning of August to a private corporation, the Power Reactor Development Corporation, a financial combine set up by a number of public-utility companies and others.

Childs wrote that he had obtained and read a copy of this warning report, which was being kept from the press as "administratively confidential."

"While it is phrased in highly technical language," he said, "the doubts expressed by the scientists and industrialists comprising the [Safeguards] Committee are seen to be even more serious than were indicated by isolated paragraphs previously quoted."

He quotes this from the report: "The committee as a whole was not satisfied with the evidence presented that no credible supercriticality accident resulting from melt-down could breach the container."

Non-technically this means that the committee rejected the contention which ruled out an explosion of the reactor.

The Reuther statement for the UAW announced that the union was filing a request for an AEC public hearing on the reactor permit. It called the proposed plant "an unproved and exceptionally hazardous type of reactor."

It quoted the Safeguards Committee as finding that "there is insufficient information available at this time to give assurance that the PRDC reactor can be operated at this site without public hazard," and then pointed out that the AEC has "suppressed" this report.

"MOST HAZARDOUS"

The rest of the UAW statement follows:

"The fast breeder is 'the most hazardous of all the reactors,' AEC Chairman Lewis L. Strauss told a congressional committee on June 28, only one month before he voted to issue this construction permit."

"A similar but smaller reactor operated by AEC at Arco, Idaho, went wild in November 1955, and for six months was so radioactive it could not be taken down for repair. The AEC Reactor Safeguards Committee, whose report AEC disregarded, said the reasons for this instability of fast breeder reactors are not understood but must be determined before the Monroe reactor can be approved for safety."

"The Arco fast breeder developed 1000 kilowatts and was located in a sparsely settled Government Reserve of 400,000 acres. The Monroe reactor would develop 300,000 kilowatts of thermal power and

would be located 30 miles from Detroit and 20 miles from Toledo.

"The permit issued by AEC for the Monroe reactor admits there is uncertainty as to 'whether there is a credible condition of melt-down and reassembly of the fuel of the PRDC reactor which could result in an explosion that would breach the gas-tight building surrounding the reactor.'

"In every-day language this means that the reactor might convert itself into a small-scale atomic bomb. This is one of the hazards which the Reactor Safeguards Committee wants to be assured against before it gives approval to the Monroe reactor."

"Issuance of this permit in disregard of the Reactor Safeguards Committee's adverse report violates the regulations established by the commission to govern such permits. Two prior permits for reactor construction by private industry complied with the regulations. This is the first instance in which AEC failed to make a finding that the public health and safety would not be endangered."

"The PRDC permit also fails to meet the requirement that the applicant be financially qualified to carry out the project. It states that the evidence to date does not justify a finding with respect to the financial qualification of PRDC."

FACE THE ISSUE

"AEC asserts that a license to operate the Monroe reactor will not be issued until it is proved to be safe. Such final approval, however, will be based on safety standards established by AEC which can be changed or ignored by AEC as was done in issuance of the construction permit."

"When the date for issuing an operating license arrives, some \$40 million will have been spent on the Monroe reactor. Will a government commission which scraps its safety standards when only minor investment is involved adhere rigidly to those standards when refusal of an operating license would wipe out \$40 million of private investment?"

"The public has placed its confidence in AEC to protect the public health and safety in the development of atomic energy. This confidence has been betrayed by its action in issuing a construction permit for an unproved and hazardous reactor. In the interest of public safety, and to restore public confidence so that our progress as a nation toward the benefits of the atomic age shall not be impeded, this issue must be faced now."

"If the irresponsible action of AEC in this instance is allowed to stand, precedent is established that will open all future reactor projects to doubt and suspicion. This must not happen. Nothing could do more to slow down the application of atomic energy to peaceful uses that mean so much to our country and to the people of the world."

ATTACKS AEC'S SOOTHING-SYRUP

Storrs, Conn., Aug. 28—An Atomic Energy Commission scientist declared today that the AEC has underestimated the danger of fallout from atomic bomb tests.

Dr. John Wolfe objected to a recent AEC statement the present level of testing would not be harmful to the human race.

The question is whether the amount of radioactive strontium released in the tests could be harmful. The atomic by-product may cause cancer if it enters the body.

Four of the five-member AEC said they foresee no damaging effects.

But Wolfe, who is a scientist studying the relationship between animals and

YOU and SCIENCE

The Anti-Scientific Climate in the U.S.

By GENE LISTER

In a recent issue of *Chemical and Engineering News*, Isaac Asimov discusses a problem indicative of one of the contradictions of American capitalism. Dr. Asimov, besides being a well-known science-fiction writer, is a professor of biochemistry at the Boston University of Medicine.

Under the title "The Byproduct of Science Fiction" he describes a typical television play involving a librarian who gives up her intellectual life to become a good all-around American drinking girl. Dr. Asimov admits he enjoyed the play, like most of his fellow viewers, but laments that it portrays an American stereotype; that it fosters the notion that only in ignorance can happiness be found; that education is stuffy and leads to missing much of the fun of life.

The ironic part of the program, according to Dr. Asimov, was that the sponsor used his commercial time to appeal to scientists and engineers to come and work for his company, thus emphasizing the great scarcity of highly educated and trained men today.

The conflict between the need for education in our highly complex society and the cult of ignorance was all too apparent. Industry, government and educational institutions are embarked on a campaign to lure young students into the scientific professions but must run counter to the general distrust and avoidance of the intellectual life which is so much a part of the American literary and entertainment tradition.

SOCIETY'S PROBLEM

Dr. Asimov feels that the way to replace the literary stereotype of the bad boy, the Tom Sawyers and the Henry Aldriches, who have good times but are not very bright, is by good science-fiction. By this means will the thirst for entertainment be combined with an appreciation of the scientific approach, and the recruitment for the scientific professions will thereby be facilitated.

What is needed, according to Dr. Asimov, is not the science-fiction of Hollywood with its Bug-Eyed Monsters, but stories in which the rational approach to problem-solving is properly presented. Then will the scientific and intellectual professions be placed in a more favorable light. Such scientific science-fiction will then be a potent force for recruitment of future scientists.

Not being a particular admirer of science-fiction of any type, we feel that his brief for this form of literature is weak. It does however highlight the problem in a complex technological society of providing skilled professional people for its operation.

How can a basically irrational society develop sufficient sane and intelligent people for its own guidance? Can "know-how" be developed when those "in the know" realize that the best way to success in a competitive repressive economy is to "know who?" To put it bluntly, it is the impossible problem of how to build a healthy society on a dung heap.

Increasing technological complexities demand an enlightened free scientific at-

titude and understanding of social functions, industrial processes and life itself. Yet the social, political and psychological bonds restricting such an approach are becoming ever greater under capitalism. Within the corporate structure of industrial life workers of brawn and brain are driven (the polite word is "motivated") to distraction in the competitive fight for profits. This particularly when during their leisure time they are continually bombarded and miseducated by the mass entertainment and communication media.

Capitalism to survive must continue its complex technological developments, and in the interest of the few, endeavor to stave off as long as possible the day of economic liberation for all. It is one of the axioms of capitalism that it must be expansive. Up to the 20th century the geographic frontier made this possible, but now the only frontier remaining is the scientific one.

RATIONAL?

The misuse of science by a class ruling from the top down raises the specter of an Orwellian 1984 society—that is, providing it can avoid self-destruction from the poisons of its own activities or a retrogression following widespread atomic warfare. But if science is to expand under capitalism, that can come only by raising, even if to a limited degree, the general scientific and educational level of the people. That is, even a repressive society must "loosen the bonds" somewhat, if it is to have available the manpower to continue and to expand.

Thus recently there have been moves toward easing the "security" straitjacket on scientists. But there are still numerous glaring contradictions between the needs of science and the climate of capitalism.

Scientists who need an atmosphere of openness to flourish are continually harassed by secrecy and loyalty restrictions. The restraints on public knowledge of atomic-energy matters run counter to the need for an enlightened citizenry if protection from radiation hazards are to be provided.

Another contradiction is that while good sound psychological knowledge about individual health has increased, the general irrationality of the social climate has permitted the revival of pseudo-scientific and superstitious movements such as cultist hypnotism, reincarnation, and other psychological manipulations.

Speaking of the latter we cannot resist repeating a current publicity blurb on the ultimate in self-help gibberish. Advertising a new book, *Auto-Conditioning, A New Way to a Successful Life*, the copy reads: "By use of a Moodmeter, Auto-conditioning is the revolutionary new technique for conquering emotional and personality problems. It constitutes a basic breakthrough in psychology comparable to the discovery of antibiotics in medicine and jet propulsion in aviation."

A society that rewards such appeals can hardly be considered as having attained the level of scientific rationality.



LABOR ACTION

September 17, 1956 Vol. 20, No. 38

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

Young
Socialist

CHALLENGE

September 17, 1956

Edited and Published by the YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE

FIVE CENTS

YSL Camp and School Was a Big Success

By RUTH KAREL

The third annual summer camp of the Young Socialist League was a huge success. The facilities of Mountain Spring Camp in Washington, New Jersey, including delicious food, delightful surroundings, and an extremely generous and cooperative staff, helped make the week, which began with Labor Day and ran through Sunday, September 9, extremely enjoyable to the nearly seventy members and friends of the YSL who attended some time during the week.

The number of campers present varied from day to day, with the high point—some fifty-five—coming on the final weekend.

The warm and sunny weather which prevailed during most of the camp period made possible a varied recreational and athletic program of swimming, hiking, mountain climbing, volley-ball and badminton, with ping-pong and billiards as less strenuous fillers. The delightful and more than ample cuisine prepared by the camp cook contributed mightily to the enjoyment of all.

Folk dancing and social dancing, group singing, excellent guitaring, elbow-bending at the camp bar and the gala party on Saturday night made the evening social hours extremely pleasant ones.

And above all, the educational aspects of the camp provided important socialist education for the campers.

The rich and varied educational program which highlighted the camp began with Hal Draper, editor of *Labor Action*, speaking on "Marxism as Method." Discussing dialectics as an extension of scientific method, Draper aimed to dispel the myth that dialectics was some sort of mystical key to an understanding of the universe. Instead he analyzed it as a guide to dealing scientifically with the relationships and interrelationships between various phenomena in the world.

The next talk in this series on Marxism, by George Rawlings, picked up the topic of social science and dealt with contemporary bourgeois social science, primarily the field of history, from the point of view of Marxism. He examined the various schools of historical analysis which are to be found in American universities ranging from those close to Marxism such as Beard and his successors, to the most reactionary right-wing historians, measuring the strengths and weaknesses of each.

LIVELY DISCUSSION

Michael Harrington, national chairman of the YSL, speaking on "Marxism and Culture," attacked the use of "social" criticism as the sole means of evaluating literature. Contending that such analysis can play a role along with the biographical, technical and other approaches to the work of art in helping us to fully understand it, he nevertheless emphasized that social criticism, particularly but not exclusively as crudely used by the Stalinists, does not determine the evaluation one makes of art as good or bad, an evaluation which must flow from the work of art itself.

Provoking a good deal of discussion, the talk raised questions such as the varying relevance of social content depending on the particular art form, whether it be painting or literature, or even within the field of literature, between poetry and the novel, for example.

After this series of three talks on various aspects of Marxism, Hal Draper gave two talks on imperialism: American and Stalinist. In the first he discussed the role of America as the mediator and super-arbiter among imperialist powers, in the imperialist rivalry that exists in the world today. Using the Suez crisis as example, Comrade Draper traced the pattern of interlacing interests among

the imperialist powers which the U.S. must try to steer through.

On the question of Stalinist imperialism Draper dealt with the contention that the lack of strictly economic analogues to the export of capital in the capitalist system denies the validity of applying the term imperialism to Stalinism. In good part he took as the butt of his discussion the sections on Stalinist imperialism in Fritz Sternberg's book *Capitalism and Socialism on Trial*.

The next and very interesting class was on automation, by Abe Kimbay, dealing with both the meaning and effects of automation in capitalist society, as well as the increased possibilities and necessity for organizing the white collar and professional workers who are and will be the most hard-hit by automation in the coming period.

Another talk, on "Socialists in the Unions" given by Archie Winters, stressed the need for rooting the socialist movement in the working class and the trade unions in order to achieve that

union of the workers and socialism which alone can result in the emancipation of mankind from capitalism. A lengthy discussion of the role and function of a youth organization in this period, as related to this fundamental requirement for the fight for socialism, followed the talk.

WEEKEND PROGRAM

The highlight of the camp educational program came on Saturday when Max Shachtman, national chairman of the Independent Socialist League, spoke on "Aspects of American Socialism." Dealing with the origins and development of socialism throughout the history of the United States, Shachtman emphasized the agrarian nature of the movement prior to World War I as one of its outstanding and unique characteristics.

Pointing to the lack of feudal background and the wide expanse of virgin territory available to the new and growing nation, he stressed the effects these and other factors had on the growth of industrial capitalism as well as on the weakness of the socialist movement.

In discussing current American politics, Shachtman stated that in his opinion a break between labor and the Democratic Party was unavoidable and not far-off. In examining the recent Democratic Party convention, he saw the capitulation of labor on civil rights as the

manifestation of the more or less conscious recognition that the choice was capitulation or split. The further unfolding of the class struggle, the strength and unity of the unions, the fight of the Negro people for democracy; all of these must lead to a break between the workers and the Democrats and to the establishment of an independent labor party.

As a result of the length of Comrade Shachtman's talk—nearly three hours—the discussion and question period which was to follow it was postponed until the following day. The discussion held on Sunday focused around various aspects of the socialist movement in the United States, as well as on future perspectives.

Comrade Shachtman expressed his view that the elimination of "sect-existence" and the reassembling of socialists into a unified organization was a highly desirable goal for American socialism in the coming period, so that such a movement could play a role in bringing a labor party into existence and in constituting a socialist wing of such a labor party when it was formed.

The 1956 YSL summer camp has served to solidify our organization personally and politically and to heighten interest in and commitment to the ideas of independent socialism on the part of members as well as friends of the YSL. From this as well as from many other points of view the camp proved to be an outstanding success.

Notes on the First Day of School

The doors of the nation's elementary and secondary schools opened on September 10, with the universities and colleges of the country scheduled to follow suit in a week or two. An ordinary event, one might think. Just millions of children and young people resuming their educational work as the 1956-1957 school year gets under way.

Nothing very special or comment-worthy. Just a clam, peaceful, harmonious return to school. It happens every fall.

And yet as capitalist society reflects itself in the United States in the year 1956, this ordinary event is fraught with the most far-reaching political implications; around it vast social struggles take place; it presents a turbulent and crisis-ridden picture which refracts the crisis of capitalist society as a whole.

The struggle over integration and the creeping paralysis which is afflicting the educational system are the two most glaring aspects of the picture, although they do not exhaust it.

The headlines of the nation's newspapers during the past week have dramatically presented the stories of the heroic efforts of Negro children—and their parents—to breach the school color line in such places as Clinton and Oliver Springs (Tenn.), Sturgis and Clay (Ky.), and Mansfield (Texas). The inspiring struggles in these communities, and the successes and failures registered to date therein, deserve great attention.

They must not, however, obscure the total picture on integration, one which presents few gains to cheer about so far.

The Supreme Court decision declaring segregation unconstitutional was issued two years ago. Following are the results so far:

Full compliance: The District of Columbia.

Major compliance: Missouri 88 per cent integrated, and Maryland 85 per cent integrated.

Partial compliance: Arkansas, Delaware, Kentucky, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Texas and West Virginia. In these states, desegregation varies from a few isolated school districts up to about a third.

No compliance: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina and Virginia.

What must be kept in mind, of course, is the fact that the last group of states, the ones in the Deep South, contain 1,900,000 of the South's 2,700,000 Negroes of school age. Moreover, of the 800,000 who live in the states in which some desegregation has taken place, fewer than half, some 300,000, will be attending desegregated schools this year.

The over-crowding of the schools, and their under-staffing, grows from year to year. School enrollment has again reached an all-time high, being just double the figure of ten years ago.

1956's school population will reach 41.5 million this year, breaking down as follows: elementary 29.6, secondary 8.1, college and university 3.2. School construction and renovation and teacher recruitment have fallen far behind the increase of school enrollment, with the gap growing each year.

There is a shortage of 120,000 qualified teachers throughout the country this year. The rise in school population requires 51,000 more classrooms, in addition to the repair and re-equipment of thousands of others.

The states and communities cannot meet the problem. Federal aid to education has been a must for years now. But just try to get it from the Republicans and Democrats.

The result: overcrowded classrooms, part-time students and sub-standard teaching. As Benjamin Fine puts it in the *N. Y. Times* of September 9, "The

schools need more teachers, more buildings, more supplies and more money."

The chief reason for the difficulty in recruiting teachers is no secret. It consists of the inadequacy of teacher salaries.

In various cities the teachers have been conducting struggles for pay increases for many years now. New York's secondary-school teachers have been conducting a partial boycott of the supervision of extra-curricular activities for a number of years. On September 5, the New York High School Teachers Association announced that its action would continue this year as well. Officials from the Board of Education pleaded with the association to end the boycott, but to no avail. The New York City Teacher's Guild, affiliated with the American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, has also endorsed and sponsored this teacher action.

As was reported in a recent issue of *Challenge*, a most hopeful sign for gains by teachers took place at the last convention of the AFT. This teachers' union has decided to begin to act more like a union than it has in the past, by seeking nation-wide collective bargaining for its members.

EVERY WEEK—
**Young Socialist
CHALLENGE**
appears as a section in all
regular issues of *Labor Action*.
Published, and independently
edited, by the Young Socialist
League,
it is the only socialist youth
weekly in the country.
Don't miss it!

RUSSIA 1953-56

FROM STALIN
TO KHRUSHCHEVBy
Tony Cliff

Tony Cliff's booklet "Russia from Stalin to Khrushchev" was published in England earlier this year. Here we publish a good portion of it. All of our readers, of course, will want to own this informative booklet in its entirety.

We have taken the liberty of Americanizing some British usages, and condensing to fit our space.

Tony Cliff is also the author of the excellent book *Stalinist Russia*—A Marxist Analysis.

Stalin has been buried with indecent haste. Has Stalinism and Stalinist totalitarianism gone with him? To listen to the new leaders—yes. But facts tell a different tale.

Even at the famous 20th Congress held recently there was no departure from the rigging and ritualism of Stalin's days: every one of the resolutions passed was passed unanimously. Not one of the more than 1300 delegates dared oppose or even abstain from the smallest amendment. If the line was to convene plenary meetings of city committees of the party once every three months, that was the holy writ. Once in four months or once in two months would be unthinkable—now, as before under Stalin.

"Election" practices are also unchanged under the new "collective leadership." In the March 1954 elections to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, the traditional poll of 99.89 per cent of the electoral register turned out to signify almost unanimously their approval of the single list of candidates (Soviet News, March 22, 1954). In other words, 9,989 out of every 10,000 eligible voters actually voted—illness, death, childbirth can hardly be known in Russia!

In the elections for all the government organs of the RSFSR in February last year there were 833,376 candidates. Each one of them—every single one—was duly elected (Soviet News, March 8, 1955).

THE NEW
CONSUMERS' PARADISE

The speechmakers at the 20th Congress of the CPSU promised the Russian workers a haven of consumer goods on this hitherto barren earth. These promises echo the ones already given immediately after Stalin's death.

Unfortunately for the Russian people, the record shows that delivery does not follow the order form.

Look at the figures: In 1954 the budget allocated 133 billion roubles to heavy industry and 36.6 billion to light (consumer goods) industry. In the following year (1955) the budget raised heavy industry's share by 33.6 billion to 163.6 billion roubles, and cut the allocation to light industry by nearly a quarter, to 27.9 billion roubles. For 1956 heavy industry is promised 158.7 billion roubles, while light industry's share will be 26.0 billion, or less than it was two years ago.

Military expenditure has not changed significantly either, since Stalin's death and the inauguration of the "New Era."

Stalin spent 93.9 billion roubles on defense in 1951, and 113.8 billion in 1952 (more than twice the wartime total of 56.1 billion in 1940). His successors show a similar record: 1954, 100.3 billion; 1955, 112.1 billion; and 1956 (plan), 102.5 billion.

Complaints about the daily hardships caused by the lack of consumer goods frequently reach the press.

A director of one of the biggest department stores in the USSR wrote to *Izvestia*: "Customers have been complaining for some months that they cannot obtain an ordinary broomstick in our department store. They are right to be dissatisfied, but we cannot help them." (*Izvestia*, Sept. 8, 1954.)

Another letter, to *Pravda*, complained that "woolen stockings tear the second or third day." "We pay from 22 to 25 roubles for a pair and use them only because there are no better stockings to hand." (*Pravda*, July 2, 1954.) (The average worker's monthly wage is some 600 roubles, equal to some 40-45 pairs of stockings!)

Another paper wrote: "Razor blades are very scarce." "Trade organizations in Sverdlovsk asked for 20,000,000 blades for 1955 but only 3,300,000 were allotted to them. The city of Kuibyshev received 2,400,000 instead of 8,000,000 and Chelyabinsk received 1,400,000 instead of 5,000,000."

The planned target for blades for the whole country in 1955 was 515 million, although the number required was 1½-2 thousand million (*Trud*, Aug. 3, 1955). The number planned is enough to give less than 8 blades a year to each man above the age of 18! As for the quality: "... a good blade can be used four or five times while a poor one can be used only once or twice. Often shaving even with a new blade is a torture." (*Ibid.*)

Again the paper wrote: "Where can I buy work clothes?" Working people constantly ask this question at various central establishments. "As early as the beginning of 1954, officials of the Chief Clothing Trade Administration of the Ministry of Trade reported that extensive trade in workers' clothes would begin in the very near future. Then the indicated time was postponed to the end of the year. And in March of this year a new date was fixed: July." But still nothing happened (*Trud*, Aug. 20, 1955).

BUREAUCRATIC MANAGERS
IN CONTROL

One of the main features of the regime in Stalin's time was the absence of any vestige of workers' control in the factory, all power being concentrated in the hands of the managers.

As one Soviet paper put it: "It is necessary above everything to strengthen one-man management. It is necessary to proceed from the basic assumption that the director is the supreme chief in the factory. All the employees in the factory must be completely subordinated to him." (*Za Industrializatsiu*, Moscow, Apr. 16, 1934.)

Nothing has changed in the official attitude since Stalin's death.

Only seven weeks after he died, *Pravda* (of Apr. 26, 1953) called for "a further strengthening of one-man management and an increase in the role of the leader."

B. P. Beshchev, Minister of Transport, stated: "The managers must be granted greater power. . . . We must increase the role and importance of the middle and lower commanding levels, particularly the chiefs of stations, depots, road sections and construction sections and foremen at shops and depots" (*Pravda*, May 19, 1954).

Premier Bulganin said in a speech to the Central Committee of the Party: "We must strengthen one-man management. . . . The extension of the director's powers and the enhancement of the foreman's and section manager's role are ur-

gent problems in industry and building." (N. A. Bulganin, *Tasks of the Further Development of Industry, Technical Progress and Better Organization of Production*, Moscow, 1955, pp. 57, 80.)

The Central Committee accordingly resolved: "The powers of directors, shop managers and foremen must be extended." (Decision of the Plenum of the CC, CPSU, held in July, 1955, Moscow, 1955, p. 25.)

Though Stalin has left the scene, the power of the factory managers has not diminished. On the contrary, it has gone from strength to strength.

SOME STILL MORE
EQUAL THAN OTHERS

Factory managers and top party and state bureaucrats get fat salaries; they own a dacha (summer residence) or two, have a chauffeur to drive their cars, and many other privileges which seem outrageous luxuries amidst the prevailing poverty.

Their incomes are some 50-100 times greater than that of the average worker.

To take one example only. If a private in national service dies his family gets a pension of between 40 and 240 roubles a month (I. I. Ectikhiev and V. A. Vlassov, *Administrative Law of the USSR* (Russian), Moscow, 1946, p. 164), but the family of a deceased colonel gets 1,920 roubles a month (*Ibid.*, p. 418).

And when Colonel-General V. A. Yuskevich died, his widow was granted a lump sum of 50,000 roubles and a pension of 2,000 roubles a month for life (*Pravda*, March 17, 1949).

It is impossible in this short pamphlet to show under what conditions of poverty and oppression the mass of workers and *kolkhoz* (collective farm) members live. But some idea can be gained from the law's extreme harshness towards any violation of property.

Just as men were condemned to barbarous punishments for the theft of a few shillings in the Elizabethan England of 400 years ago, so in Russia today punishment for stealing is extremely severe. The Soviet press—after Stalin's death as much as during his lifetime—is full of particulars of thefts and the punishment meted out to the thieves, punishment so harsh that there can be only one reason for risking it—extreme poverty.

Thus on June 28, 1953, the *Komsomolskaya Pravda* reported that two youths who demanded money from two students, threatening them with a knife and a razor, were condemned to 20 years' confinement in a corrective labor camp.

Four days later the paper reported a case in which four thieves were arrested, one of whom was condemned to 25 years' imprisonment in a corrective labor camp, two others to 10 years each, and "the girl Nina Nedilko, a minor," to eight years (*Komsomolskaya Pravda*, July 2, 1953).

Two other thieves who assaulted a citizen and tried to take his watch from him were condemned to 15 years' imprisonment (*Leningradskaya Pravda*, July 18, 1953).

Another three who tried to rob a citizen of 285 roubles (less than \$56) were condemned to 10 years (*Ibid.*). In another case three youths who stole and robbed were condemned to 25 years' imprisonment and a fourth to 20 years (*Komsomolskaya Pravda*, Nov. 18, 1953).

Another four thieves were condemned to 25 years, three more (two women and a man) to 20 years (*Pravda*, Dec. 4, 1953), and so on in daily succession.

The law's harshness—and its frequent violation—are inevitable where great privileges exist in the midst of general

poverty. Stalin's departure has left the subordination of man to property, the oppression and exploitation, untouched.

GREAT-RUSSIAN
IMPERIALISM PERSISTS

Stalin kept a tight hold over his empire under the guise of "Socialist Federation." Today Moscow continues to exercise firm control over the non-Russian peoples.

The clearest indication of this is the fact that the ministers of the Interior (those who control the security police) in the "National Republics" are not appointed from the local nationalities but are Russians. After Beria's downfall, practically all the ministers of the Interior of the National Republics were removed.

On Aug. 22, 1953, a new minister of the Interior was appointed in the Azerbaidzhan Republic—Anatoly Mikhailovich Guskov, whose name alone betrays that he is not an Azerbaidzhani.

On August 23, 1953, Kirgizia got a new minister of the Interior—Aleksander Vladimirovich Tereshchenko.

On Sept. 11, 1953, Turkmenistan was presented with a new one—Vasily Timofeyevich Vaskin.

In Tadzhikistan, Dimitry Konstantinovich Vishnevsky was appointed in Sept. 23, 1953.

The Kazakhstan Republic got its new minister on Sept. 29, 1953—Vladimir Vladimirovich Gubin.

No trouble was taken to cloak the clearly Russian names of each of these. Imagine British ministers of the Interior in India, South Africa or Canada!

Part and parcel of Russia's imperialism under Stalin was the glorification of the tsars who built the empire, and their generals: Ivan the Terrible, Peter the Great, Suvorov, Kutuzov, etc. Stalin's heirs continue in the same tradition.

On May 18, 1954, *Pravda* announced that a special memorial plaque was to be put up for Admiral S. O. Makarov who commanded the tsarist navy in the 1904-5 war against Japan.

Voroshilov, president of the USSR, sang the praises of "the great Russian general, Aleksander Vasilyevich Suvorov and the glorious Admiral Fyodor Fyodorovich Ushakov." (*Pravda*, Oct. 15, 1955).

The following slant was given to the occupation of the Ukraine by Tsarist Russia: "The reunion of the Ukraine with Russia (in 1654) . . . was of tremendous progressive significance for the future political, economic and cultural development of the Ukrainian and Russian peoples." "Reunion with the strong centralized Russian state assisted the economic and cultural development of the Ukraine." "The admission of the Ukraine into Russia was also of great international significance. It struck a blow at the Poland of the gentry" (*Soviet News*, January 21, 1954).

Imagine a British Communist writing: "The union of India with Britain was progressive. It had great international significance as it struck a blow at the aggressive aspirations of imperialist France!" Again, imagine a British Communist praising Clive, Rhodes or Kitchener!

Finally, today as under Stalin, the only people in the USSR referred to as "great" are the Russian people.

Though Stalin exists no more, the Russian empire continues!

THE PARTY—STILL
A BUREAUCRATS' CLUB

Khrushchev's party, like Stalin's, is a political weapon of the bureaucracy. This is clear from its policies. Its social composition shows this even more clearly.

It is true that the practice of publishing information on the social composition of the party was stopped in 1930 and never resumed (in itself a highly significant omission), but it is still possible to gain some indication from data published on the educational qualifications of its members.

While not one in ten of the adult population in Russia gets more than elementary education, the percentage of party members who did was 33.7 per cent on

Subscribe to LABOR ACTION—
\$1 a year for Student Subs

Stalin Showed Khrushchev How to Buy Time by 'Liberal' Concessions

Jan. 1, 1939, and had risen to 63.6 per cent by Jan. 1, 1954 (Partiinaya Zhizn, No. 9, Aug. 1954). The percentage of First Secretaries of Party District Committees who received only primary education or incomplete secondary education fell from 47.5 per cent in 1946 to 5.3 per cent in 1954; the percentage fell from 49.6 to 6.2 per cent for Secretaries of District Committees in general, and from 61.3 to 15.8 for Chairmen of Party District Executive Committees (ibid.).

There are thus almost no ordinary workers on the District Committees of the party, not to speak of the Central Committees of the republics, or the Central Committee of the CPSU. The Central Committee, CPSU, elected by the 20th Congress, contains some 40 generals and admirals, tens of factory managers and high state officials (including a number of secret police officers, like the infamous General Serov), but not one rank-and-file worker from the bench.

That the party is still made up of the bureaucracy and the aristocracy of labor is clear. It is quite ridiculous to expect anything but the defence of privilege from it.

THE NEW "COLLECTIVE LEADERSHIP"

But what of the newly established principle of collective leadership? Is it not a fundamental change in the nature of the regime?

Real collective leadership implies democracy. As such it is incompatible with the hierarchical structure of Russian society, with the division between state capital and the mass of toilers, and with one-man management—the guiding principle in the economy. The fact that the present leaders proclaim that a collective leadership has now been established suggests one of two possibilities:

Either a faction fight is being waged at the summit and each group of bureaucrats is struggling to remain alive by upholding the collective principle;

Or Khrushchev has actually emerged as the supreme leader—Stalin's real heir—and finds it expedient to use the mantle of "collective leadership" to cover his personal rule.

There is good ground for accepting the second hypothesis, if only by analogy with Stalin's rise to power. Stalin repeatedly pledged his adherence to "internal party democracy and collective leadership."

Thus, for instance, he said: "The Russian Bolsheviks would have wrecked the cause of the Russian revolution if they had not been able to subordinate the will of individual comrades to the will of the majority, if they had not been able to act collectively. The ability to act collectively, readiness to subordinate the will of individual comrades to the will of the collective—it is this which we call genuine Bolshevik courage. Because without such courage, without the capacity to overcome one's own pride, let us say, and to subordinate one's will to that of the collective—without these qualities there is no collective, there is no collective leadership and no Communism." (Stalin, quoted in Pravda, July 4, 1953.)

The fact that Khrushchev is not worshipped as Stalin was during the last eighteen years of his life does not contradict the possibility of his supremacy.

On Stalin's fiftieth birthday (Dec. 1929), when he was already established as the supreme ruler of party and state, modest enough praise was bestowed on him: "The best disciple of Lenin," "one of the leaders of the Revolution," wrote M. I. Kalinin (not the leader); "it must be said that the party can be completely satisfied with Stalin's leadership in his struggle (against the Opposition)," etc., etc.

Such praise is daily bestowed on Khrushchev.

Again, the fact that Khrushchev does not carry out mass executions (if we exclude Beria and his protégés) does not contradict the existence of one-man rule.

In 1934, seven years after the Trotskyist Left Opposition was smashed, and six years after the elimination of the Bukharinite Right Opposition, the "Lefts," Pyatakov and Ossinsky, and the "Rights," Bukharin, Rykov and Tomsky, were re-elected to the Central Committee of the party. Bukharin, until his arrest and execution, was editor-in-chief of Pravda, while Radek, the former Trotskyist leader, was a major contributor.

Indeed, it was only eight years after the consolidation of his power that Stalin found it necessary to resort to mass purges and executions (and then only after the success of the two first Five-Year Plans had resulted in no tangible advantage to the Russian masses and had thus increased the opposition to the regime and the necessity for finding scapegoats).

KHRUSHCHEV ON THE LADDER

Nothing is frozen under the present "collective leadership." Khrushchev is, not idle. Like Stalin (until 1941) Khrushchev prefers to remain outside the government while consolidating his position. Like Stalin he uses his First Secretaryship of the Central Committee of the CPSU as the greatest lever of power.

Besides he has created a special organ of his own in the Bureau of the CC, CPSU, for the RSFRS, whose Secretary he is. He has also managed to strengthen his hold over the security police by replacing Kruglov as minister of the Interior of the USSR with his protégé Dudorov, who was head of Moscow City Party Committee's Building Department during Khrushchev's Secretaryship (1949-53).

There are a few other signs pointing to Khrushchev's possible supremacy; one was the sacking of Malenkov from the premier's post for his self-confessed "responsibility for the unsatisfactory state of affairs in agriculture." (Pravda, Feb. 9, 1955).

In fact, it was Khrushchev, and not Malenkov, who was the author of all the resolutions on agriculture in the period between Stalin's death and Malenkov's resignation. During this time the whole press left no doubt that Khrushchev was the manager of Soviet agriculture; Malenkov did not deliver a single report on the subject in the Central Committee or the Supreme Soviet during this period.

Suddenly, the blame for all the troubles in agriculture was laid at Malenkov's door without anyone daring to mention Khrushchev's responsibility. By then Khrushchev must already have gained tremendous power. The fact that immediately after Malenkov's "resignation" Khrushchev proposed Bulganin, a man who had had no experience at all in agricultural matters, as premier, showed even more clearly the strength of Khrushchev's position.

Soviet press reports are even more explicit. Reports of the speeches of the Soviet leaders follow a single monotonous pattern: while speeches of simple deputies to the Supreme Soviet are never followed by "applause," those of ministers are, members of the Politbureau gain "prolonged applause," while Khrushchev and Bulganin—and only Khrushchev and Bulganin—are met with "prolonged applause turning into ovation; all rise" at the end of every speech.

The consistency with which this procedure is followed makes a mockery of the "collectivism" of leadership, and shows the strength of Khrushchev's position.

WHY WAS STALIN PURGED?

The present leadership is after Stalin's blood. The more they denigrate their former chief the more do they expect to gain popularity both at home and abroad.

For many years Khrushchev, Bulganin, Malenkov, Mikoyan and the rest of the present leadership did Stalin's dirty work without a murmur. Malenkov was Stalin's private secretary for a number of years. Then, during the great purges of the thirties, he was appointed deputy to Yezhov, head of the NKVD.

Khrushchev rose to head the party and government of Ukraine (in 1938) on the bodies of all thirteen former members of the Ukrainian Politbureau, and practically the whole of the Ukrainian government.

Bulganin was an official of the security police for four years and headed the Moscow administration during the great purges.

They must have all served Stalin well during this period if they managed to keep alive and even rise in the hierarchy—for of the 139 members of the Central Committee of the party elected in 1934, only 24 remained members five years later. (A few, perhaps, died naturally,

but the overwhelming majority were executed or imprisoned.)

But the present leaders want to start with a clean slate. Even if they benefited from and were active in the mass murders, even if they helped create the slave camps and implement the forced collectivization and the other monstrosities of the state-capitalist regime, it serves their purpose to put the responsibility at the door of the dead master. Even the most sordid gangsters aim to achieve respectability.

After nearly thirty years of quick industrialization the people of Russia are still poverty-stricken. Fact upon fact shows this.

For instance, in 1953 there were less cows than in 1916, as Khrushchev himself admitted. (N. S. Khrushchev, Measures for the Further Development of Agriculture in the USSR, Moscow, 1953); butter production in Siberia (a famous butter exporter before the First World War), was smaller in 1952 than in 1913; the output of vegetables was extremely low (ibid.); housing conditions are terrible, whole families live in one room, sharing a kitchen with other families; queues form in shops to buy bad-quality expensive consumer goods—a sure testimony to their scarcity.

On the other hand, production of steel, coal, electricity, machines and so on increases continuously. This disproportion between production and the satisfaction of their daily needs must certainly make the Russian people very disgruntled, to say the least.

When Stalin was alive he claimed all industrial achievements as his own, putting the responsibility for all scarcities, defects and poverty on subordinate officials who were duly liquidated. With Stalin dead, the leaders have a choice.

They can either raise living standards by greatly increasing capital investments in light industry, by encouraging livestock production, building houses for the people on a large scale, cutting armaments and investments in heavy industry, curtailing the privileges of the bureaucracy, and so on—all of which goes very much against the grain of bureaucratic state-capitalism; or, alternatively, they can choose a much cheaper and easier way. They can put the responsibility for the suffering of the people on the dead dictator and his executioner Beria, and ask the people to wait. "After all, it is only three years since the devil died. You can't expect us to undo his works in such a short time."

GETTING RID OF THE EXCESSES

But even if the main reason for purging Stalin is to buy time for Stalinism, there is no doubt that the present leaders would like to get rid of a number of the excesses—excesses in terms of the needs and interests of the totalitarian bureaucratic regime itself—of the last few years of Stalin's rule.

For instance, the campaigns against "cosmopolitanism," the notion that Russia invented everything and needs to learn nothing from abroad, the prohibition on marriages with foreigners, etc., led to a chauvinism (far beyond that accepted even by such ultra-nationalists as Mussolini or Franco) that had detrimental effects on economic effort (see Bulganin's Report, *op. cit.*), that were a standing insult to the great Chinese people and state and that put the country to ridicule abroad. What damage could be done by a handful of Russian women marrying foreigners?

Again, slave labor, once welcomed and encouraged by the bureaucracy as a method of breaking bottlenecks in the economy and of using the abundant unskilled labor force as "shock troops" for capital accumulation, is becoming too expensive.

Slave labor is not very productive, and when labor becomes short, as in Russia today (because of the expanding industrial economy and the stagnation of agriculture which still keeps two-thirds of the population in the countryside) it becomes uneconomical.

Thus it is most unlikely that in future there will be mass arrests for filling the camps; repeated amnesties will continue depleting many of the existing ones. The camps in Russia would then fulfil the same function as Hitler's or Mussolini's, which served as weapons of political terror and not as a means of economic ac-

tivity (except during the war years).

In this connection it is significant that when Moscow declared a partial amnesty for inmates of slave camps on March 27, 1953 and Sept. 17, 1955, so-called political crimes were specifically omitted.

Section 58.1 (c) of the Criminal Code, for example, was excluded. This is the section which stipulates that in the event of flight abroad by a person in military service all adult members of his family who abetted him or even knew about the contemplated flight are subject to imprisonment of from five to ten years; all dependants who did not know of the planned flight are subject to exile in Siberia for five years.

While terror is part of the bureaucratic state-capitalist regime, and therefore is retained by the new rulers of Russia, some of its most blatant excesses—the irrational and unnecessary ones imposed by the one-time omnipotent Stalin—will doubtless be removed.

After all, even Stalin found that the mass purges of the thirties sometimes had the opposite effect of what was intended. They were supposed to tighten discipline, to get the Russian people to toe the line. But they achieved such proportions that very often the lower bureaucrat was afraid to obey his boss, lest the boss be purged as a counter-revolutionary. On the other hand, not to obey would leave him open to charges of counter-revolutionary activity himself.

To keep the state going, Stalin had to stop the purges. Beria was brought from Georgia to purge the arch-purser Yezhov in 1938, and therefore no mass purge took place, although the terror continued and took its toll of individual victims from even the highest places (such as Voznessensky, head of the State Planning Commission, who disappeared in 1949).

Small reforms after the death of an autocrat are not new in Russia. When Tsar Nikolai I died and Aleksander II succeeded to the throne (1855), serfdom was abolished, new organs of local government were established, the censorship was relaxed (the Russian edition of Marx's *Capital* was published shortly after), and many similar measures were taken.

So far Khrushchev has done nothing as far-reaching as this in the way of reform.

STALIN IS DEAD, STALINISM LIVES

Khrushchev is distributing a largesse of "liberalism" in his first steps of power. But he is not the first. Stalin showed the way.

At the congress that sealed the fate of the Trotskyist Opposition and showed that Stalin was the unrivaled boss of the party and the state (Fifteenth Congress, 1927) the work-week was cut from 48 hours to 40.8 (until the 48-hour week was restored in 1940). In his speech to the 20th Congress Khrushchev declared that the working week in Russia would be cut during the coming Five-Year Plan to 41 hours!

During 1928-9, only a short time after the 15th Congress and the banning of the Trotskyist Opposition, Stalin let a couple of thousand former Trotskyists come out of prison or return from exile in Siberia on condition that they ceased all organized Opposition work.

Unfortunately for Khrushchev, he will find it very difficult to do the same. He cannot release thousands of old Bolsheviks simply because only a handful can be alive after twenty years of persecution. However, the few that he might release would serve him in the same way as they served his former master—a bait of leniency and democracy for the unwary.

Whoever believes that one person's death can change fundamentally an economic, social and political order is himself a victim of the cult of the individual.

Even the megalomaniac Stalin did not believe that the history of Russia, and of the world, would be affected greatly by his death.

The dictator's death will not break the bureaucratic state-capitalist regime. Its overthrow, whether under Stalin or under Khrushchev, is a historical task to be accomplished not by bureaucrats, but by the working people of Russia.

BRITISH GUIANA **British Guiana Leader Dissects London's Phony Plan**

This article is by the leader of the nationalist Progressive People's Party of British Guiana, L. F. Burnham. The PPP split last year into two wings—one led by the Stalinist Cheddie Jagan and his wife Janet, and one led by Burnham, who has all along been the leading non-Stalinist in that movement. (See LA for Aug. 1, 1955 for more information on this.)

Early this year the British colonial administration proposed a new phony constitution for the land whose democratically elected government they had suppressed with armed force and violence in 1953. Both wings of the PPP rejected it as a fake.

This is the analysis of the British proposal which was published by Burnham in the PPP organ *Thunder*, as reprinted in *The African & Colonial World* (London).

Two things will be seen:

(1) Britain has no intention of returning Guiana to the autonomous control of the Guianese people.

(2) The rumors, no doubt spread by the Stalinists after the split, that Burnham was capitulating to the British are once again shown to be quite false. As far as we can make out, L. F. Burnham is the authentic leader of the militant and principled nationalist movement of British Guiana which rejects Stalinist domination without compromising its own fight against imperialism.—H. D.

By L. F. BURNHAM

On Wednesday, April 25, two days before the third anniversary of the 1953 General Elections, the governor undertook to give Guianese a lecture while announcing what he would have us believe was a substantial advance towards democracy in British Guiana. As if to persuade Guianese of his good intentions and solicitude for their national aspirations, on the same date he "graciously" revoked the Restriction Orders restricting the movements of two leaders of our party.

His gift of constitutional progress was disclosed in the form of proposals for the amendment of the Constitution. "The time has come—" he said reading a statement by Mr. Lennox-Boyd, Secretary of State for the Colonies, "to take steps to introduce an elected element into the Legislature and Executive."

Obviously the basis of any Constitution for Guiana for a long time will be nominated and official members under the absolute control of the governor; but a few powerless elected members will be included as window-dressing in an attempt to delude the unthinking.

The twenty-four constituencies of 1953 are to be reduced to twelve—two less than there were in 1928-1953. There will be eight nominated members and four officials in the single chambered Legislative Council. There will also be a speaker, no doubt chosen by the governor and probably with a casting vote.

This is the twentieth-century version of British democracy in Guiana—reduced representation of the electorate and the ensuring that its representatives are outnumbered by the governor's creatures.

The Executive Council, the policy-making body, will consist of four officials, one nominated and five elected members of the mock Legislature and will be presided over by the governor. The latter will undoubtedly have a casting vote so that if on any issue the five elected members were to vote together against the officials and nominee, the result can still be as the omnipotent governor desires.

Incidentally all the non-official members of the Executive will be chosen by the

governor in his absolute and unfettered discretion.

JAILERS' LANGUAGE

It was stated by the governor that the new Constitution will be like the British one—flexible. Of course there will be this difference, that whereas an elected Assembly, the House of Commons, changes and moulds the flexible British Constitution, in British Guiana it will be the governor, an appointee of the British government, who will mould and change the Constitution backwards and forwards.

As a concession, no doubt, universal adult suffrage will be retained and we were assured that plans were on foot for the revision of the electoral roll. But once again it will be the governor who, in his absolute discretion, will decide when elections will be held in 1957, or later. Anyone listening to or reading the Governor's speech could not help noting the unlimited powers with which he will be invested.

"Whoever is elected," said the governor, "I shan't be shy in taking risks nor in correcting things if they go too far wrong." How have Guianese been reduced to the status of juvenile delinquents at a political Reform School!

This is the substantial step forward which Her Majesty's Government hopes "will encourage healthy political development and enable experience to be gained upon which further progress can be based." But then Her Majesty's Government is correct so far as the anticipated result is concerned; for all sections of Guianese will now realize what colonialism means and be more united and determined in their desire to cast off the chains that bind them.

BOGY OF COMMUNISM

These reforms or proposals were described as a means of ending the frustrating period of marking time—a description with which we find it difficult, indeed impossible to agree. Marking time indicates not merely an absence of elections but also and alternatively the absence of any semblance of control or voice in the government of the country by the people through their elected representatives. The end of marking time promises freedom to meet, move and speak which cannot be enjoyed so long as the Emergency Order remains in force. Yet His Excellency was unequivocal in announcing a continuation of the Order and the use of additional powers if necessary.

The excuse given for this contradiction was the threat of Communism. He himself admitted with what he thought the adroitness of a debater "that the mass of voters is not concerned with communism; they don't even know or care what communism is; they are concerned with fair play and better standards of living."

This analysis is not without accuracy but what he should also know and should have said is that the mass of voters from experience are convinced that fair play and better standards of living can only be assured them when their own representatives freely elected are in control of the government.

Listeners to the speech were regaled with the evils of Communism. They were told that Communism as a system of government brings not happiness but misery. Assuming this to be true, and Guianese do not know for they have never lived under a Communist dictatorship, why should the governor believe that Guianese who show such restlessness and determination to be rid of one foreign rule will be prepared to accept another in exchange? Furthermore our geographical remoteness from the Soviet Union makes it impossible for Guiana to be used as an hostile military base.

It is difficult to escape the conclusion that all this lambasting of Communism and Stalinism is irrelevant to our situation and introduced with the intention of obscuring the dictatorship which we have enjoyed since October 1953 and which is planned for us for some time to come.

If I were a Guianese, said Sir Patrick [Rennison, the governor], "I expect I should be an ardent Nationalist. I am sure we need ardent Nationalists." But has he stopped to ponder that no ardent Nationalist will accept with equanimity this latest Constitution that Her Majesty's Government has planned for us without consulting us? Indeed, the governor admitted that he had not consulted even his nominated legislature and Executive.

No ardent Nationalist will be grateful for an "advance" which takes the country back into the nineteenth century, for it must be noted that the 1928 Constitution was a step backward from one it superseded and was opposed by Mr. (as he then was) Eustace G. Woolford. No excuse or lurid pictures of things to come can swerve an ardent Nationalist from his aim of freedom for his country. This is the story of India and of many a country that has achieved independence.

GET OFF OUR BACKS

All Guianese are certainly interested in hearing of the British Commonwealth's devotion to freedom which means "respect for the individual and

equality before the law" but it was not a Guianese or a Communist but an Englishman who wrote the booklet "Our Freedom Is Not For Them" reviewed in the PPP *Thunder* two weeks ago. Guianese will not question this devotion to freedom by noting what happens to Africans, Coloureds, and Indians in South Africa, but will be satisfied with wondering what form this devotion takes in their own country, Guiana.

Guianese are grateful for the concern our rulers show for us by seeking to protect us from the evils of a Communist dictatorship, but we will show more and deeper gratitude if they were to remove from off our backs the oppressive system which we know from personal experience.

It is easy to sneer haughtily at the colonial's opposition to imperialism, but one has to be a colonial to understand what it feels like to be a colonial. Colonialists can try to understand the governor's hatred of Communism, which is a threat to everything which his religion, education and upbringing taught him of the dignity of man. On the other hand he cannot or would not understand that for a colonial the colonial system is a denial of the dignity of man.

This is a darker hour in our history than that of October 9, 1953. There is no doubt of what our masters have in store for us.

Their representative backed by armed might says he is not afraid. So spoke the Roman procurators and governors on the eve of the collapse of the Roman Empire. Guianese must not be afraid either even though they are pitted against the armed might of the British Empire.

Our cause is just and only unity and determination are necessary. Of course we "appreciate" the Governor's desire for us to be on the Queen's Highway, but we are entitled and will fight for the right, to move on the Highway and in an automobile of our choice. At the moment, the would-be ardent Nationalist and those whom he serves would have us bogged down in the quagmire of colonial reaction. Will they succeed?

Negro Children — —

(Continued from page 3)

many means at its disposal which are appropriate to the many aspects of the problem, as was shown by the governors of Kentucky and Tennessee in calling out the National Guard when that was the only means by which to solve the particular aspect of the problem with which they were confronted at Sturgis and Clinton.

GUERRILLA STRUGGLE

But the Republican administration has shown that it has no intention of doing this, and Stevenson, in his pursuit of victory via unity in the Democratic Party, has demonstrated in advance that no more can be expected of any administration that he might head.

The struggle against school segregation, for the right of Negroes to vote, and against all other aspects of Jim Crow will go on. The Negro people have shown a sustained determination to achieve equality in America which will not be denied. The attempt of both parties to banish this fight from the forefront of American politics may succeed in this electoral campaign, but it will break through in the years ahead.

Walter Reuther, and all that he symbolizes, may still think it necessary to live in the same party with Senator Eastland today, but they will find it impossible tomorrow.

One thing is fairly clear. Until the labor-liberal forces in the North are willing to break with the Southern racists, the struggle for equality in the deep South will remain a semi-guerrilla semi-underground struggle. The great moral and actual victory against Jim Crow which is being won in the border states will encourage the fighters for equality in the deep South, and will make the vacillating and capitulatory attitude of the liberal wing of the Democratic Party in the North less tenable. A final and complete victory in the South can come only as part of a victory for a new political alignment in the North, led by labor. The continuation of the struggle for equality will be one of the chief factors in bringing about such an alignment.

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.

NEW YORK

LABOR ACTION FORUM

THURSDAYS AT 9 P.M.

Sept. 20—Ruth Reynolds
PUERTO RICO'S
"OPERATION BOOTSTRAP"

Sept. 27—Hal Draper
Coolie Labor Under
The American Flag
THE HUSHED-UP SCANDAL
IN GUAM AND SAMOA