

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JULY 12, 1954

FIVE CENTS

AFTERMATH IN GUATEMALA

The Guatemala-U.S. Junta: Will It Continue the Reform Program?

... page 6

The CIO Deplores, Chides — And the Rest Is Silence

... page 2

Jobs for All

"The cult of the paid informer is growing in the federal government." Thus a N. Y. Times survey (July 7) summarizes the growth of a new American industry.

The Treasury Department's system has been in operation for a long time, using tipsters to spot customs violations, etc. But the big new industry is on the "anti-subversive" front, FBI, CIA, etc. Pioneers in this flowering of the stool-pigeon, the fingerman and the informer have been about 35 "professionals" paid by the Immigration Service but used freely by other agencies, led by Paul Crouch, recently exposed as a professional liar as well as a professional informer.

In case any bright young men are thinking of a career, it appears that the stipend is not enormous. Crouch, the highest paid, got only \$9,675 over a 2-year period. But then, the alternative would have been to earn an honest living, and besides, in every field innovators must expect to start low. Maybe conditions will improve. Meanwhile apprentices have to start at the bottom—'way, 'way low down.

Knowland Threat Against UN Typifies U.S.'s Blind-Alley Policy

By SAM TAYLOR

The shambles that passes for a foreign policy in this country has produced another furor that will not subside with the passing of the summer heat. The announcement of the Republican Senate majority leader, William Knowland of California, that he will resign as majority leader if Stalinist China is admitted to the UN opens up a new schism in the Republican Party.

Senator Knowland's statement is the direct result of the visit of Prime Minister Churchill to this country. It is an attempt to head off any shift in U. S. policy toward the admission of the Peiping regime to the UN. There is the feeling that Churchill may have argued the Eisenhower administration into an acceptance of the inevitable, that is, a token resistance and not the last ditch stand advocated by the reactionaries in the U. S.

Not that any one believes that Washington is for the seating of the Peiping regime; not even Knowland charges that. The horse that Washington backs is sitting on an island off the China coast, an impotent satrapy. But what the architects of U. S. foreign policy cannot do is to convince the rest of the Western world that they too should build their foreign policy

around the defense of Chiang Kai-shek.

The position of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles as announced at the time of the opening of the Geneva conference is that the U. S. would oppose the admission of Peiping to the UN until it "purged" itself of aggression in Korea; that is, until it is ready to agree to a Korean peace settlement

acceptable to Washington.

This could only mean that the Eisenhower administration is prepared at least at some time in the future to write off its Formosa satellite. Now there could be a great deal of quibbling and hair-splitting as to the precise moment when Peiping had "purged" itself, but this is not the thing that Senator Knowland is arguing about. The Senator from Formosa, as the leading spokesman of the powerful China Lobby and of a sizable bloc in Congress, is ready to take an adamant stand against any basis for admission.

EXPLOSIVE ISSUE

The preparations for the partial abandonment of the Formosan regime are being discussed because from the military and strategic viewpoint, which is the only one that ever seems to get serious con-

(Turn to last page)

A Conservative Business Survey Indicates — It Looks Like Economic Stagnation Ahead

By GORDON HASKELL

What is happening to the American economy?

To the millions of unemployed, to the other millions on short work-weeks, this is a matter of the deepest daily concern. They have been sweating it out during the past nine months in the hope that things would take a turn for the better.

The leveling-off of the decline in the economy during the past three months, and the small rise which took place during the last weeks of May and the first weeks in June, encouraged them to think that their hopes might be fulfilled. And the hucksters of American capitalism have sought to keep these hopes alive by proclaiming that the recession has proved very mild, that there is every reason to expect that it is about over, that the economy is basically healthy and there is nothing to worry about for the future.

During the last week of June, however, the index of business activity turned down sharply again for the first time since April. And even during the brief rise which preceded that, the real figures for unemployment never fell below the three and a half million mark.

Nothing in the economic picture today gives reason to expect that these workers will get jobs again in the near future. In fact, the like-

hood is that they will be joined by at least another million unemployed workers during the next year.

The National Planning Association, a conservative private organization which includes members from agriculture, business, labor and the professions, just issued a report in Washington which states that this country must INCREASE its production of goods and services by at least \$25 billions over the next twelve months if the economy is to remain healthy and strong.

This increase, according to the NPA, must come either from a sharp step-up in armament spending, or through such incentives for consumer spending as price and tax cuts, plant and equipment modernization, and public spending for schools, hospitals, roads and similar public works.

Unemployment to Double?

The danger in the present situation, according to the NPA, is that economic activity has been leveling off at a rate of production which is more than \$15 billion below the rate of reasonably full employment.

"Unemployment is still between 5 and 6 per cent of the civilian labor force," according to the report. "Including allowance for involuntary short hours and for temporary layoffs, one

may estimate that an even larger proportion of the labor force is idle. And looking at the now visible factors of demand, it is difficult to see what forces of the market under present programs and policies would be likely to lift business activity to the full employment level.

"Hence there appears to be a possibility that, for some time, business activity might move approximately sidewise, considerably below the full-employment level. With a continuing rise in the labor force and a rather rapid rise in output per man-hour, a sidewise movement of business conditions would result in an increased idleness of available human and material resources."

In fact, unemployment would nearly double in a year at the present rate of economic activity.

Sidewise, They Say

A year from now, according to the NPA, a gap of about \$25 billions would exist between the realized output of goods and services, and the full employment level.

"If demand and production," the report continued, "should continue over some time to move considerably below a full-employment level it is likely that the existence of idle capacity would make business more reluctant to

(Continued on page 2)

The CIO and Guatemala

It Deplores, It Chides, It Recommends Virtue—and the Rest Is Silence

By BEN HALL

A thousand dollars was cabled to the Central Strike Committee of the Honduran Banana Workers by the CIO on June 29. It was an act of international working-class solidarity, announced the CIO, "with you in your efforts to secure economic justice for your members."

And in a cablegram to the United Fruit Company, the CIO put forward its demand, "Strongly urge conclusion of an honorable settlement with Honduran banana workers and grant of full recognition to their union."

There was a strike. The Honduran union was not dominated by Stalinists. It was possible for the CIO to take a simple, firm, and clear position: it was for the strikers.

But whenever the complexities of international politics obscure the distinct line of union-versus-boss, the CIO is lost. All its good intentions are clouded in dust and its public declarations become masterpieces of doubletalk.

SHARP CRITICISM

It complains, it laments, it deplores the acts of American foreign policy. But after all its wailing is over, the CIO feels obligated to express its lasting faith in the democratic, good intentions of the administration that holds power, here and now, in the United States.

Yesterday, CIO leaders bemoaned the debacle of Indochina while

standing ready to support Eisenhower in any crisis. Today, Guatemala.

The CIO Executive Board on June 29-30 adopted a special resolution on the situation in Guatemala. Its criticism of the real role of the United States, obliquely expressed, is as sharp or sharper than any resolution it has ever adopted on foreign policy: "Nowhere is the lack of a clear, affirmative foreign policy aimed at meeting the needs of people hurting us more in our fight against Communist imperialism than in Latin America, specifically and at this moment in Guatemala." The basic social problem is posed starkly: "peasants and wage earners lack land, jobs, bread and freedom."

"TOO OFTEN . . ."

In 1944, the resolution points out, a "revolution" in which "the Communists played a very small part" took place as a "genuine democratic upheaval with objectives of greater national independence and economic and social reform." As a result, "Big landowners, including foreign corporations and most notably the United Fruit Company, lost some of the privileges of exploiting the poverty and need of the Guatemalan peasants and wage-earners. They had to undertake new obligations, such as better wages, a small measure of social security and somewhat better working conditions."

And where did the United States stand in all this? The words of the

CIO resolution are clear enough: "Too often in Guatemala, as elsewhere in Latin America, the United States government is identified with the United Fruit Company and other corporations which are bent on holding down wage levels and blocking economic and social reform."

SERMON, PLEASE

The CIO demands an investigation. Meanwhile, it calls upon the State Department to announce in all Latin America "that in no event will the United States government support efforts to defeat, repeal or evade such [reform] legislation; that any attempts directly or indirectly to foment or finance armed resistance, seizure or aggression will be treated as unwarranted interference in the internal affairs of friendly peoples and as such undermining relations between the United States and our allies."

But it is exactly all these misdeeds which the State Department abetted in Guatemala while the CIO resolution was being typed and mimeographed. Does its role in this affair come in for indignant denunciation; does the CIO demand hands-off-Guatemala? Not at all. It requests only that the State Department mouth lofty sentiments while encouraging reaction. By such reasoning, we would overlook murder so long as the criminal delivered a sermon on virtue.

And the United States, which in a previous paragraph is "identified

with the United Fruit Company and other corporations," is called upon a few paragraphs later, in concert with Latin American nations, to "serve notice on world communism that we will tolerate and will resist any effort to subvert free governments in this hemisphere or elsewhere." But the tragic problem of "this hemisphere" is not that Stalinism threatens to "subvert free governments" but rather that the existence of reactionary, dictatorial, oppressive governments enables Stalinism to thrive by feeding upon the real grievances of the people.

IMPLEMENTATION

Let us assume that by some devious process of reasoning, the CIO could justify the intervention of the United States government in the internal affairs of a Latin American nation to stop "communism." But the role of this government, under this administration or any other capitalist regime, can only be of one type.

The intervention of this State Department can only lead to the strengthening of all the reactionary plutocratic tendencies in South America. The CIO resolution recognizes this truth only for the past.

The noble generalities proclaimed periodically in its pronouncements on foreign affairs will take on flesh and blood when the labor movement realizes that a genuinely democratic foreign policy is possible in this country only under a labor government, as a first step.

Economic Stagnation Ahead —

(Continued from page 1)

go ahead with expansion plans. Thus, a sidewise movement of business is possible only for a limited period of time. It would be likely to lead a new downturn if continued over an extended period."

This "sidewise movement" is a new, polite word for stagnation, or for stabilization without growth.

But the one thing American capitalism cannot do is to stand still for any length of time. Corporate profits, which have been at unprecedented levels as revealed in dividend payments during the recession, cry out for reinvestment. But if there is no increased demand which can justify an expansion of industry, the profits, and the surplus of goods which they represent, begin to clog the pores of the system, and another downturn becomes inevitable.

Propped by War Economy

The press reports do not indicate what the NPA proposes, aside from government expenditures on public works or armaments, as a way of lifting the economy by \$25 billions in 1 year.

The stabilization which has taken place since April is due primarily to a continued heavy activity in the construction industry, but this cannot be expected to last unless there is a general economic expansion. Housing construction is bound to weaken in due course, and some of the giant corporations which have taken advantage of their excellent profits and the tax gifts given them by the government to expand their capacity will tend to let up in this activity, and even to curtail production in their older, less efficient plants as the new ones come into production.

The armament expenditures which are still being poured out on a vast scale constitute the platform along which the economy is crawling

in its "sidewise movement." Without them, it would take a dive off the deep end into a real depression.

The NPA recognizes this, as does every honest economist in the country. But unless these expenditures are increased drastically, how is the American Way to be held up to the world as an example of the superiority of capitalism, when it is run right, over Stalinism or all other possible economic systems?

Who Has an Answer?

This country has become so accustomed to the armament prosperity which has kept it booming since the war that most Americans have become reluctant to admit that it has strict limitations. The fears which were generated by the recession have tapered off as the decline itself leveled off and even seemed to show a tendency toward a new rise. The country has been distracted by the McCarthy hearings, the crisis over Indochina and the overthrow of the Guatemalan government from the deep economic problems which beset it.

But the lines of the unemployed still stand for blocks outside the state employment offices in many cities, the coal industry cries out for government assistance, auto production is still on short work-weeks. And as we approach the campaign season for the November elections these problems will have to be dealt with in one way or another by the Republican and Democratic parties.

How will they be dealt with? The Republicans will continue to insist that what is good for business is good for the country, and if things look worse in October than they do now will no doubt make some kind of vague promises of "taking vigorous action" to do something about it. The Democrats will simply point back to the "you never had it so good" slogans

of their past campaigns, and hope that the voters will buy that instead of a program.

But the unemployed are there, and the probability is also there that there will be even more of them. These are hard facts which no propaganda about "free enterprise" and no demagoguery can dissolve.

Labor's Trust

The organized labor movement is the moral and organizational trustee of the unemployed; it is responsible to them as their collective representative before both industry and government. It is duty bound not only to work out a program for the unemployed and for full employment, but to refuse to give its support to political candidates who are not bound to such a program. Even more, on the positive side, labor has the responsibility to organize itself politically so that it can run and support candidates who will be bound to such a program.

At the moment there appears to be no serious movement in the ranks of organized labor to form a political party of its own which can put such a program before the people on a national scale in November. But in cities where unemployment is far above the 5 per cent level, where whole industries are sick and are making the community sick with them, what is to stop the labor movement from running independent candidates to represent the interests of the workers, employed as well as unemployed?

It is high time the labor movement shook itself out of the prosperity-induced daydream of the past few years. The NPA report points to the stormier economic times ahead. Militant trade unionists could well consider whether now is not the time to raise the demand in their organizations for independent labor political candidates who will fight for labor's program on a national as well as local scale.

Letter by Norman Thomas on Case Of Barry Miller Blasts at Army

Last week we gave the details of the Barry Miller case of "Army McCarthyism." The following letter on the case, by Norman Thomas, was published in the letter column of the Chicago Tribune of June 28:

It is evident, whatever reports the senate committee may make, that the process of deflating and ultimately deposing Joe McCarthy is proceeding fairly rapidly in this country. Unfortunately, McCarthyism is bigger than McCarthy, and the army, either to appease him or to prove that it doesn't need McCarthy to teach it to be unfair, has instituted processes for dealing with alleged subversives among enlisted men as bad as anything McCarthy has done or proposed.

Witness the Barry Miller case. Briefly, Mr. Miller was kept in the army at Fort Monmouth teaching radar for six months after he had been informed that derogatory information had been received against him and after he had replied and asked for a hearing. He never got a hearing. Toward the end of his term of duty, he was lauded by his superior officers, then suddenly on June 7, without any warning, he was told that he would be reduced from rank of corporal to the lowest sort of private and given an "undesirable" dismissal. After he reported this to his lawyer over a telephone, he was called back and discharged immediately, which indicates wire tapping.

Mr. Miller had been recommended to me and to two committees, in which I am active, the Workers Defense League and the American Committee for Cultural Freedom, by very responsible professors at the University of Chicago, where he had been a student. I protested his case to Army Secretary Stevens and after some days' delay was informed by Asst. Secretary Hugh Milton that everything had been done according to a code of procedure adopted on April 7 of this year, a code of which Mr. Miller knew nothing, nor his lawyer; a procedure plainly adopted in imitation of McCarthy, or fear of him. As a final irony, Asst. Secretary Milton said that now that Miller's career has been more or less blasted, even in private employment, by an "undesirable" discharge indicating possible subversive activities, he could appeal to an army review board. That is, he was convicted, sentenced, and then may be tried.

Mr. Miller's crime was that he was at one time, but not when he was in the army, a member of a Shachtmanite organization, a splitoff from the Trotskyists, very anti-Stalinist. I am often the target of Shachtmanite criticism, but I believe the inclusion of this organization on the attorney general's list unfair, as I would testify in a hearing for which the organization has asked, but which it has not yet received after months of delay.

Mr. Stevens assured West Point graduates, young officers and gentlemen, that he would protect them against abuse. Who is to protect ordinary enlisted men, and who is to protect the honor of America toward her drafted citizen soldiers?

Norman THOMAS

LABOR'S SCOPE

Saskatchewan... CIO Warns on Anti-Labor Bills... Beck and ILA

By BEN HALL

A glowing tribute to the government of Saskatchewan comes from the CIO Oil Worker, which in its June 28 issue devotes two whole pages to a report on this province of Canada. It is no mere travelogue. Saskatchewan has been governed for ten years by the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation, a socialistic party based upon the labor and farmer movements of Canada.

The Oil Workers Union representative in the province, says the union's paper, "asserts flatly that Saskatchewan has the best labor laws on the North American continent." Curiously, the article comments, "Those who believe in unlimited 'free enterprise' or 'capitalism' would not find Saskatchewan much to their liking, in view of the fact that government and cooperative ownership accounts for a big part of the business done."

Yet the Oil Workers Union, like the

CIO as a whole, will hasten to express its faith in capitalism whenever it has to. And while commending the independent labor-farmer socialistic party of Canada, it will raise its own hand to continue supporting capitalist politicians in the United States.

The same contradiction annoys logic in the UAW. In Canada, its locals enthusiastically campaign for their own CCF. But in the United States. . . . ?

ANTI-LABOR BILLS

The CIO opposes two administration-sponsored bills ostensibly designed to fight "Communist infiltration" of unions. One bill provides that in an emergency the president may bar from war plants "individuals as to whom there is reasonable ground to believe that they may engage in sabotage, espionage or other subversive acts." The other provides for the dissolution of "organizations which have been established for legal and legitimate purposes" but which have become "Communist-infiltrated."

The CIO points out that the mere publication of charges, whether they are substantiated or not in the end, against an alleged Communist-infiltrated organization could very well destroy it. The bills would "place in the hands of irresponsible private individuals an insidious device for

undermining legitimate trade unions."

"To wreck, through government regulation the whole edifice of American trade-union democracy in order to try to deal with the control of a tiny handful of Communists in trade unions is unreasonable."

Neither the AFL nor the CIO trust the government, Republican or Democratic, to interfere in the life of the union movement to root out Stalinism. We wonder then how they can become so trusting in foreign policy! They are ready to back the same government in its efforts against Stalinism in other countries.

BECK AND ILA

The longshore situation in New York comes up for cogitation in the June issue of *The Labor Leader*, published by the ACTU. "How come," asks John C. Cort, "the men on the docks are still voting for this rat-infested, mob-ridden, bankrupt, waterlogged, thieving old union?"

And he comes up with one suggested theory: "The New York longshoremen have been taken so often . . . in so many different ways over so many unhappy years that many of them just don't know how to trust or believe in anybody anymore. And so they fell for the ILA line that the AFL meant to take them once again, sell them out to Beck's Teamsters or Hall's Seafarers and give their jobs to strangers. Faced by an imaginary choice between sell-out by old friends and sell-out by strangers, the longshoremen naturally voted for their friends."

We are reminded of the roots of this cynicism by a series of articles on Dave Beck in the *New York Post*. Beck, remember, was one of the key AFL directors of the new AFL longshore union.

Irving Ross, the *Post* writer, reports an interview with Beck in which he quizzed the Teamster leader on the questionable borderline activities of Jimmy Hoffa, a powerful Teamster Union vice-president. Beck replied that no one had ever presented proof that Hoffa had done anything wrong.

"I suggested to him," writes Ross, "that enough suspicious circumstances had been spread on the record to warrant an investigation. Beck scorned the thought. He conceded, though, a measure of concern about how the welfare funds were operating. . . . But let the state insurance department investigate Hoffa and friends, he urged, they have regulatory power."

The ILA said no less. When the AFL demanded that it take steps to get rid of racketeers and gangsters, the ILA leaders replied: It is not our job; if anyone has been guilty of violating the law, let the police take care of them; it is not our responsibility.

But the AFL turned down this argument, expelled the ILA, and turned over the task of purifying the air, among others, to Beck. But he and his machine were "strangers" to the longshoremen.

SP Left-Wingers Form a New Group, 'Shocked' at Trend in Last Convention

The formation of a new left-wing group within the Socialist Party has been announced to party members, as one aftermath of the recent SP national convention in Philadelphia.

The party convention had been noteworthy for its quite consistently right-wing tone. In past conventions of recent years, the rank-and-file delegates had usually succeeded in giving the convention sessions a more militant air, and often in affecting the formulation of resolutions in a left-wing direction. In no case was the conservative course of the party seriously affected in the next period, but the party left-wingers could feel that they had had their periodic "victory."

This time, even this did not happen. Perhaps one important reason is the fact that this is the first SP convention to take place after its youth group, the Young People's Socialist League, had walked out. (The YPSL then merged with the Socialist Youth League to form the present Young Socialist League.) The YPSL militants, many of them also party members, used to be a significant portion of the "ginger" elements of the left-wingish sections; and their absence from the SP no doubt has had its effect.

In any case, it is evident that the remaining elements of the old SP who think of themselves as left-wingers were somewhat dismayed by the new atmosphere of the convention.

A PLEA

Toward the end of June a group of SP members in California took the initiative in trying to rally such left-wingers, according to a communication they mailed out to party members in various parts of the country.

It began:

"News of the convention of the Socialist Party has reached you by now. Many of us have been deeply shocked at the failure of the party to take a militant position on civil liberties, by its tendency to support the foreign policy of the Democratic Party, and by a general sense of inertia within the party. Several comrades throughout the country have been so discouraged by this convention that they have resigned their membership."

The signers propose to do something about it. They are: Jerry Blatt, Bill Briggs, Charles Curtis, Ernestine Kettler, Don Mayall, Margaret Phair, and David McReynolds, all active in the California SP.

"This letter is a special plea to all members of the Socialist Party to hold fast!" they write in their circular, which went to about 100 party members. "A

group is already at work establishing contacts with comrades across the country with the intention of presenting a clear-cut socialist position within the party."

They add: "The thinking among those of us in California at the moment leans toward the formation of a Committee for a Socialist Platform to work within the party, aiming at the 1956 convention and acting as an educational and organizational center to bring the party to a reaffirmation of its traditional Socialist integrity."

There is no very concrete indication in this circular as to the political platform these comrades have in mind. They mention that they are "working out now a more definite prospectus for action" to follow, "which will outline in more detail our feelings on foreign and domestic policy, electoral action, party problems, etc."

WANT TO REFORM PARTY

In conclusion they reiterate their party loyalty, "our own deep commitment to the cause of democratic socialism and the Socialist Party, and our determination to carry on and intensify our own efforts to build the membership of the party and give support to the National Office, however much we may disagree with it," although they add, "we shall not let our sense of comradeship stop us from sharp and active opposition to those policies we consider basically non-socialist."

The Socialist Party itself is today a tiny sect, like all other socialist groups in the country, and the remaining left-wingers within the SP are a dwindling band; but what has been the particular difficulty of the SP is not merely its weakness but its characteristic lack of any clearcut political policy. Its psychology (even that of many of its would-be left-wingers) is that of behaving as if "general socialism" were enough to constitute a program nowadays. In this respect SP thinking tends to be a hangover from long-gone days when it could have hopes of becoming or acting as a mass party merely on the basis of propaganda for "production for use instead of profit."

In their desire to "reform" the SP within, that is, try to make it at least the simulacrum of a decently socialist party, the California left-wingers have our sincerest best wishes. It is no gain for the socialist movement as a whole if the once-great Socialist Party falls apart organizationally as well as politically, as it bids fair to do. Only, if the "reform" effort is quite hopeless (as we believe), is the remaining alternative to drop out of the fight for socialism altogether?

World History—Year by Year

The bound volumes of LABOR ACTION

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

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

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

Independent Socialist Press
114 West 14 Street, New York City

Have You Read Labor Action's Pamphlet-Issues?

No. 1—The Principles and Program of Independent Socialism.

No. 2—Independent Socialism and War.

No. 3—The Fair Deal: A Socialist Analysis.

No. 4—Socialism and Democracy.

No. 5—What Is Stalinism?

10 cents each

LONDON LETTER *The End* *Of Rationing in Britain*

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, June 30—July 3 may not go down in history, but it will be a date remembered by all British housewives. For on that date they will throw away the ration books to which they have been slaves for the last 14 years.

On May 9 butter rationing was ended, and July 3 will see the release of meat.

I remember well the opening months of the war, September, October and November 1939, with everyone expecting rationing to be introduced. They knew that this time the government had no intention of leaving it four years as they had in the First World War.

There was first a run on the shops, which were a little reticent to sell certain foods, especially tinned goods. People were heard alleging that their neighbors were "hoarding."

When, however, the months of the "phony war" dragged on, and Chamberlain showed no signs of introducing food rationing, shopkeepers began to be more generous, and consumers began to wonder.

Early in 1940, in accordance with plans made in the '30s, the rationing of meat, sugar, butter and fats was announced. I cannot remember exactly how much the amount allowed was. I believe it was about a half pound meat, a half pound sugar, three ounces of butter, and four ounces of margarine per week. These were certainly the approximate amounts about which rations oscillated during the war.

In an heroic effort to be fair, the government laid down extra rations for invalids, and growing children. Jews and vegetarians were allowed to exchange their bacon rations for extra cheese and margarine.

Starting with these three items, food rationing spread to milk (2-3 pints per week), eggs (1-2 per week), tea (2-4 ounces), tinned goods, dried fruit, cheese, etc. Not long afterwards, the rationing of clothing was introduced, with sufficient coupons to be able to buy a whole suit in about 1½ years.

As a result of these very stringent measures, Britain was able to reduce its food imports from 22,000,000 tons per annum pre-war, to 11,000,000 tons. Six million tons of animal feeding stuffs, 2,000,000 tons of fruit, and 1,000,000 tons of sugar were saved. At the same time, the home production of wheat and potatoes doubled compared with pre-war; vegetable production increased by 45 per cent, sugar beet by 20 per cent and milk consumption by 50 per cent.

EFFICIENT SYSTEM

To counteract the possible effects of inflation with the largest working population in history, income tax went up to 45 per cent on incomes under \$5,600, and 95 per cent on incomes over this amount.

To keep prices down very strict controls were imposed on all essential goods, and the system of "utility" was introduced. This latter system covered clothes and furniture; it guaranteed the quality of factory-made goods, giving a fixed profit margin to manufacturers. It was abolished by the Conservatives in 1952.

To keep the price of food down, the government subsidized nearly all basic foods at a cost of about \$1,100,000,000 per year.

The food rationing system worked

fairly well on the whole. Even if one were wealthy one could not go into a restaurant and gorge on any quantity of food. Meals in restaurants weren't rationed, but they had a price ceiling of five shillings (then, a dollar). There were also set up a large number of government-run, cheap, "British restaurants" at which reasonable meals could be obtained.

Although there was no general differential ration for manual workers, farmers and miners were given extra cheese, and canteens in their district were allocated double the quantity of meat.

In all fairness it must be said that the efficiency of British rationing was mainly due to the fact that a substantial proportion of food consumed was imported. It was at the channels of entry that the Ministry of Food controlled it.

Judicious planning ensured that the standard of health of the people was kept up, and it had never been so good. However, there was an epidemic of one disease which I am afraid has become endemic to this country.

Goods and services were so short that queuing became the scourge of the common man. The English people being placid by nature adhered religiously to the dictum that "when six people or more shall congregate together for the purpose of obtaining some goods or services, this shall constitute a queue."

There was a story about a woman who was walking along the road, and noticed a long queue, which she instinctively joined. After waiting in it about half an hour, she turned round to her neighbor, and said,

"Excuse me, dearie, what is this queue for?"

"Tales of Hoffman, I believe," the other answered.

"Oh well, I suppose we have to eat what we can get, nowadays."

END OF AN ERA

When the war ended, we began to hope for an improvement in our standard of living. However, a world wheat famine in 1946 forced Britain to ration flour and wheat, which was quite unprecedented. It was not until eight years after the end of the war that the clouds of economic depression passed over, and rationing began to be abolished.

Naturally, the greater quantity of consumer goods not only causes greater productivity, by greater incentive, but is in itself produced by that greater productivity. Production today is 6 per cent higher than a year ago.

The price which has had to be paid for greater productivity is greater wage differentials. Prices of most foods have gone up considerably since the Tories came to power—butter by 50 per cent, cheese by 45 per cent, bread by 25 per cent, etc. This increase in price has been more than offset by wage rises for industrial workers.

But the real sufferers are old-age pensioners—still trying to live on \$4½ per week—and salaried employees. Little attempt has been made to aid them economically.

The price rises of food have not only been from retailers. Most of them have been due to decrease and abolition of subsidies from Labor's ceiling of \$1,150,000,000 to \$800,000,000 per annum.

As the prices have risen even before the abolition of rationing, it is not expected that they will climb much higher. Nearly everyone will welcome the end of 14 years of food control, with all the bureaucracy it has involved.

July 3 is the end of an era. The war has produced scars on many of our minds.

We still form queues without thinking; we still feel a bit guilty about dropping in on a friend for tea, as we don't want to use up his rations; we still feel when we go shopping that the customer is always wrong. What is odd is that probably more people have been to India than Brighton, which makes you think. . . .

Reading from Left to Right

HOW FRANCO DISRUPTS THE WESTERN CAMP

DANGEROUS DEAL WITH FRANCO, by Lawrence Fernsworth.—*The Progressive*, July.

In this article a liberal newspaperman argues against the U. S.-Franco pact in terms of expediency: Franco cannot be trusted. He emphasizes, to begin with, that for all Spaniards the military agreement means "We are allies" with the U. S.

"The official U. S. viewpoint holds that the agreement is merely a dollars-for-bases affair. . . . No Spaniard sees it that way—least of all Franco. . . .

"Franco made some remarkable statements in [a recent speech]. For instance: 'I am confident that the presence of a distinguished general at the head of the most powerful nation in the West, with a rectifying responsibility over the destinies of the universe, will succeed in re-establishing an era of peace.' He was certain that 'the fact that the United States and Spain are both governed by generals' provided far greater hope for peace than if civilians were at the head of those governments."

These tender sentiments of friendship from the fascist leader were reciprocated—

"Last year, when the Sixth United States fleet made a courtesy visit to Spain, its commander, Vice-Admiral John H. Cassidy, hailed Franco's Spain as 'a bastion of defense and a vital link in the lifeline of peace and freedom of Europe.' And months later the new ambassador, James C. Dunn, paid a visit to Franco, whereafter he publicly stated: 'Today the friendship and cooperation of Spain and the United States are an important bulwark in defense of our common civilization.'"

Against this developing closeness, Fernsworth argues that Franco is not a reliable ally against Russia:

DOES J. EDGAR HOOVER WALK ON THE WATERS?

Murray Kempton, the N. Y. Post columnist who does not always obey the taboos laid down even for liberals, commits lèse majesté—if not sacrilege—in the following irreverent, impious and undoubtedly subversive discussion of that gilded idol, J. Edgar Hoover. We quote it from his column of July 1.

We may be grateful that some higher deity, if not the Goddess of Truth, was sacred to the McCarthy-Army hearings. All parties, especially in moments of wrath and conflict, swore by J. Edgar Hoover in preference to gods whose immortality is more generally established by the common human consent of centuries.

Roy Cohn said: "J. Edgar Hoover can do no wrong." Joseph Welch certified that he loves, cherishes and reveres J. Edgar Hoover, and was only disturbed by the wild chance that Roy Cohn might be neglecting him.

Everett McKinley Dirksen suggested that, since Frank Carr had once worked for the FBI, he was at least a sub-deity, and close questioning could be a species of profanation of the shrine. Joe McCarthy, a man uncomfortable upon his knees, observed at one point that "J. Edgar Hoover's shoulders must be getting awfully lame from so many people here hanging upon his coattails."

On Tuesday, the name of one Hoover crept into another Washington hearing. He was obviously not Herbert; he seems to have been the director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; but he cannot have been the J. Edgar Hoover certified for 36 recent days as the man who sleepeth not and watches always.

Senator Capehart's committee to investigate the Federal Housing Administration was hearing the record of Clyde Powell, the chief loan officer of the FHA and a Civil Service employee since 1934. Powell has wrapped himself in the Fifth Amendment on matters relating to his functions as a public official.

In 1934, as a routine on his Civil Service form, Powell had been asked whether he had ever been arrested. He had answered "no." Capehart's committee discovered Tuesday that prior to his appointment into the public service, he had actually been arrested eight times on charges ranging downward from grand larceny. He had been convicted of house pilferage, arrested for embezzlement, and picked up for passing bad checks, all in the same year.

"The incidents which Spain has begun building up between itself and France on the question of the Moroccan sultanate, and with Great Britain over Gibraltar, have serious implications for the United States. Not only do they affect the relations between us and two major allies, but they are fraught with menace for Mediterranean peace.

"Franco's growing quarrel with France has all the earmarks of a fascist-style provocation like Mussolini's trumped-up quarrel with Abyssinia. The attempted quarrel with Britain is on the same order. It is plain that Franco's government took the signing of the agreement with the United States as the signal for stepping up the cold war it had previously initiated against France and Britain. . . .

"It has been little noticed that Spain of late has not found much reason for quarreling with Russia and that Communist Russia is not quarreling with Spain. Communist Russia and Fascist Spain will without doubt serve their own interests in their mutual relations, just as Communist Russia did in its relations with Nazi Germany. . . .

"European political observers have noted that since the death of Stalin, the Soviet radio has ceased attacking Franco and that for the first time the same radio has failed to commemorate the anniversary of the ill-fated Spanish Republic. In Madrid Franco continues to tolerate the small Communist Party and to permit it to circulate its 'underground anti-Franco' literature in order to claim to the world that he is fulfilling his chief mission of saving Spain from the Communists. This Communist literature is distributed from the Falange headquarters. It was seen one day by an Associated Press correspondent who inadvertently wandered into the wrong room."

Finding Communists is a difficult matter, it rests on dossiers of associations and the testimony of informants. A loyalty file, as J. Edgar Hoover himself says, is a complex thing, whose weight cannot be finally determined short of semi-judicial processes. But a record of arrests is a simple police business; it needs only a fingerprint check.

But McCarthy yielded to no man in his reverence for this god of his friends and his enemies alike. The name of J. Edgar Hoover is pronounced by him as by everyone with all three initials, the way the name of T. S. Eliot is rolled off by graduate students at meetings of the Modern Language Association.

If anyone says just "Hoover," you may be assured that he is talking about that fellow who lives at the Waldorf Towers and adorns conventions of the Republican Party and used to be only president of the United States.

It was McCarthy's contention that J. Edgar Hoover had been warning the army about the situation at Fort Monmouth (Espionage-Russian) "day after day" for years. The Hon. Karl Mundt did, on the record, observe that "J. Edgar Hoover is mortal like the rest of us" and was not struck dead on the spot, presumably because it was quite clear that Mundt meant to imply only that, while J. Edgar Hoover is otherwise divine, he, like the rest of us, may someday be expected to be gathered unto his fathers.

Yet Clyde Powell sat undisturbed in his job for 20 years. There was the usual statement Tuesday that J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI had warned against him. It appears that they sent their first warning in 1941, seven years after he was hired. He stayed on, and there is some question of whether somebody robbed the Civil Service Commission file of the FBI report on his record. J. Edgar Hoover waited seven more years and then sent another report in 1948. That has disappeared too. This, of course, is the J. Edgar Hoover who "day after day" was warning the army about security risks at Monmouth.

J. Edgar Hoover, just twice in 14 years, reported to his bosses that Clyde Powell had lied about his police record. The first report was seven years after he was hired and the last six years before he was caught. The consensus in the Senate Committee was that only J. Edgar Hoover had done his duty and everyone else had failed in his. J. Edgar Hoover may or may not walk to work on the waters of the Potomac, but certainly nobody in Washington is going to get up early enough to find out if he does.



LABOR ACTION

July 12, 1954

Vol. 18, No. 28

Published weekly by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone: WAtkins 4-4222—Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1874.—Subscriptions: \$2 a year; \$1 for 6 months (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canadian and Foreign).—Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

Editor: HAL DRAPER

Asst. Ed.: GORDON HASKELL,

BEN HALL

Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

The standard biography

KARL MARX

by

Franz Mehring

\$3.50

Labor Action Book Service
114 West 14 Street, New York City

Scientists (and Few Others) Rap Oppenheimer Verdict

By SAM ADAMS

The case of Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer has been concluded with the decision of the Atomic Energy Commission that he be dismissed from government work and refused security clearance. In reaching this decision, the AEC heard testimony for several weeks, listened to a variety of witnesses and read much material. It handed down its decision with an air of genuine impartiality and its presumed objectivity ended a great deal of the criticism of the AEC Personnel Security Board headed by Dr. Gordon Gray, president of the University of North Carolina. The reaction to the Gray board's decision was severe. Dr. Gray and his concurring associate were taken to task for deciding the case upon a totalitarian premise: namely, whether a man who disagrees with a course of action or policy may be found guilty in whatever degree *post facto*, and then be penalized for differing with an opinion or proposed policy, and failing to show proper enthusiasm for a course with which he disagreed. A large section of the press attacked this premise, as did most of the liberal and intellectual world, and of course, the scientists. Most of these believed that the AEC could do little else but reverse the decision of its subcommittee.

DISINGENUOUS

When the AEC, however, handed down its 4-1 decision not to recommend clearance for Oppenheimer, liberal and conservative opinion was taken aback. It had not expected such a decision. When one bears in mind the great public display of respect by liberals for the commission as an objective body that would right the wrong of the board's 2-1 decision, their shock becomes understandable.

Having the advantage of seeing the public reaction to the decision of its subcommittee, the AEC gingerly avoided such pitfalls. It did not, as the Gray Board did, find Oppenheimer a loyal citizen or a discreet one who knew how to keep a secret. It said rather little about this, although one of the commissioners, businessman Thomas E. Murray, in a separate opinion found that he was "disloyal," by using a Pickwickian definition of "disloyal."

The AEC avoided the matter of Oppenheimer's "enthusiasm" as wholly irrelevant, and at least one of the commissioners rebuffed such a criterion, while the commission as a whole stated that "enthusiasm" was not a security requirement.

SMYTH DISSENTS

In relation to Oppenheimer's associations, the commission was far more severe than its board and cited six instances of lack of forthrightness on the scientists' part which was the principle basis for the commission's recommendation.

Dr. Henry D. Smyth, the only scientist on the commission, was the lone dissenter. He issued a courageous opinion against the majority of the board, pointing out that the purpose of the security system was to protect secrets and prevent sabotage. No such charges were made against Oppenheimer, and in Smyth's opinion the commission's decision "is to extend the concept of 'security risk' beyond its legitimate justification and constitutes a dangerous situation."

Only the scientists of the country have maintained their courage and principle in this situation. While the press as a whole has surrendered to the decision of the AEC, one scientific body after another has denounced it and declared its opposition to the security program and

the reign of intellectual terror that occurs under it.

SALVE FOR OPPENHEIMER

The Washington Star, for example, seeking refuge in a decision which it accepts as fairly arrived at, but remaining uncomfortable nevertheless, wrote: "The final judgment against Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer is, in a sense, the American tragedy of 1954. He is a victim of the conspiratorial age in which we live..."

The New York Times reports that one suggestion advanced in Washington, in an effort to counteract the unfavorable reactions to the whole case, is for Congress to recognize Dr. Oppenheimer's great contributions to national security in "some tangible form, such as by voting him a sum of money which he could use to pay the legal costs of his appeal."

"The fact," says the Times reporter, "that such a proposal has been made by an administration official intimately concerned with scientific matters is perhaps a sufficient indication of the Oppenheimer verdict's disturbing effect."

Life magazine, however, is not quite so disturbed. In its characteristically pompous manner of writing on both sides of any question, its current editorial laments so much talk about conformity and then goes on to lament itself. It finds the Oppenheimer case is "one of those hard cases that makes dubious law," but it is not "totalitarian." It all arises, you see, from the confusion between "loyalty and security, a confusion perpetuated by politicians of both parties." After all, "how much regard should one have for that system [security]? That depends on whether you are working for the government or not." And then, since it costs nothing, Life speaks out on the nation's need for the nonconformist. For "his discoveries strengthen our society and his arguments enlarge our grasp of truth."

There is no stopping Life's platitudes, since they got started: "Americans must never measure their own loyalty by conformity to rules. The truest loyalty transcends even the Constitution; for the freedom it exists to serve has a source greater than America, and a greater goal."

THE POST SPUTTERS

But the real facts of life have paid little attention to Life. Any man who would attempt to tell a congressional committee that his "loyalty transcends even the Constitution" would find out soon enough where such copybook maxims would get him.

The AEC decision and its less crude premises (as compared with the Gray board) also seemed to have a shattering effect on the liberal principles of the N. Y. Post.

Right after the publication of the Gray report, the Post had carried a burning editorial denouncing it and its decision. They cogently argued that the real motive for denying clearance to Oppenheimer was only the scientists attitude on the H-bomb program and not any of the other charges mentioned.

Now the AEC, forewarned by public reaction, has merely dropped the "enthusiasm" charge, and the Post is mollified. In an editorial of July 1, which sputters a bit without a sign of flame, the editors crack their spines bending backward to recant. They do not exactly say that they now approve the decision on Oppenheimer—they mention that "two executives of the Post" differed on this—but these two have apparently compromised on the idea that there was a fair case against Oppenheimer and men of good will have got to think and think and think about the implications of it all...

Young Socialist CHALLENGE

Discussion: Conditions for YSL Growth

By OWEN MORSE

The YSL in the six months of its existence has experienced a growth and a level of activity completely out of keeping with what had been the norm for its precursors, the YPSL and SYL, during the past seven years. Much more important than our growth as an organization has been the impact we and our ideas have made on the campus.

In this article, some reasons will be put forward for this that are largely the generalization of observations from some Eastern and Midwest campuses, as well as impressions from rallies and conferences held in the East

We have seen three distinctly different situations on the campus since the end of World War II. Immediately following the peace, the student movement witnessed a blossoming of political ideas and organization due in part to the tremendous influx of GI-bill veterans on the campus, in the general critical climate of optimism about the brave new post-war world. The development of the American Veterans Committee, the first significant socially aware veteran's organization that the U. S. had seen, the boom in the NAACP, etc., and the development of all sorts of local political and semi-political clubs paralleled the post-war offensive of the labor movement.

THE 1948 PERIOD

However, the honeymoon of the "Grand Alliance" with our Great Soviet Ally was not to last forever. The brief period of marital bliss of the first post-war years had already gone sour by the time the 1948 election rolled around. The dew-eyed adulators of the United Nations of the Stalinist student front, American Youth For Democracy, began to make way for the more militant Progressive Party and the YPA. As the Friends of the Soviet Union began to lose members, the campus witnessed the post-war crisis, and with it the political high point of the Stalinists there.

For the honeymoon of the labor movement with the administration in Washington had been sorely strained by Truman during the (second) round of wage increases. Talk of a third party was rife in early 1948, and the lack of enthusiasm on the left for the Democrats was balanced by the nation-wide conviction that this was the year for Tom Dewey. While the Stalinists had suffered defeats throughout the labor movement, and the ADA had risen to challenge its leadership of liberalism, they were almost unchallenged on the campus during the Wallace campaign. It was the complete failure of this campaign that really broke their hold on student life.

SECOND PHASE

This period, of course, also saw the growth of the socialist student organizations, as well as SDA. However, we were everywhere outstripped by the Stalinists. But it was our high point too. We continued to rise during the years '49 and '50 while the Stalinists went down. The major reason for this was the growing disillusionment with Stalinism among the liberal and radical portion of the student body which accompanied the continued failure of the Fair Deal administration to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act or carry through the militant promises of Truman's campaign.

Then the campus entered the second post-war period, the black phase of the witchhunt. The year 1950 saw the junior senator from Wisconsin wave his list on the floor of Congress and the fruition of Truman's loyalty campaign in the popular anti-Communist hysteria. When the wave hit, it found the campus in an enervated state. Ninety per cent of the liberals had "had their fingers burnt." Everyone suddenly became aware that they had endangered their careers in government. The demand for conformity was felt as the just retribution for their sins by large segments of ex-Stalinoid liberals. Thus the response of the student's to this hysteria was not a "natural" one. When judged in the light of the previous five years, the level of resistance was feeble. In a sense, the witchhunt was not

This is a discussion article, expressing the opinion of the writer, for consideration of the League and Challenge readers.—Ed.

merely accepted; it was embraced. The depths of apathy cannot be explained merely by the strength of reaction; there was a distinct anti-political tone on campus. This tone can still be seen on a few of the more "politicalized" campuses, and in the whole crop of graduates from the period.

A LIFT HAS COME

The main point of this article is that an almost self-imposed blanket has existed on the campus during the years '51, '52 and '53, an anti-political blanket which prevented the natural development of radical and non-conformist ideas among young vigorous lower classmen.

This blanket has more or less been lifted with the graduation of the last of the "corrupted" generation. Thus we find ourselves confronted with a comparatively "normal" situation on the campus for the first time since the end of the war. Of course, this is in the framework of a growing reaction throughout the country, and an "aggressive" American foreign policy. The Stalinists were "aggressive" for most of the cold war. The witchhunt is entrenched in a way starkly unthinkable only a few short years ago, and the mass of the student body that accept the status quo accept a much more reactionary "way of life" than before. However, we have finally found that healthy naive response to it among as yet unpolitical young students who say, "Who are you to tell us what to read and who to hear? We can think for ourselves, so why don't you keep your nose out of our business?"

WE CAN GROW

This does not mean that the great mass of students in the U. S. are less apathetic. Probably they are more so if anything, for ours is an apathetic status quo throughout the country. But it does mean that a real militant student movement is possible today, that could really make an impact if a militant liberal student organization (as SDA sadly is not) existed to mobilize it.

We are the only organization in the student field that speaks up boldly for civil liberties in the U. S. today, with the sole exception of the Stalinists. They cannot grow to the extent they did in the past for many reasons. We can. We are. Efforts put forth today will net a much higher return than our recent past would indicate. Where we have been able to put forth the effort, it has already begun to pay off.

Though the witchhunt continues and voices of caution advise from all sides, fresh and vigorous sentiment does exist on the campus. The YSL will continue to grow from and with this sentiment.

This under-size issue of the Challenge is due to the illness of the acting editor. We expect to be back to normal next week.

The YSL's Aim

The Young Socialist League is a democratic socialist organization striving to aid in the basic transformation of this society into one where the means of production and distribution shall be collectively owned and democratically managed. The YSL attempts to make the young workers and students, who form its arena of activity, conscious of the need for organization directed against capitalism and Stalinism.

The YSL rejects the concept that state ownership without democratic controls represents socialism; or that socialism can be achieved without political democracy, or through undemocratic means, or in short in any way other than the conscious active participation of the people themselves in the building of the new social order. The YSL orients toward the working class, as the class which is capable of leading society to the establishment of socialism.

—From the Constitution of the YSL

JOIN THE YSL NOW!

YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, New York

- I want more information about the Young Socialist League.
- I want to join the Young Socialist League.

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY..... ZONE..... STATE.....

SCROLL IN ANY

Get the Challenge every week — by subscribing to Labor Action. A student sub is only \$1 a year!

The Guatemala-U.S. Junta: Will It

By HAL DRAPER

From virtually all sides now, it is being said—entirely truly—that the “big test” before the new Guatemala junta is whether it will carry through seriously the social reforms initiated by the Arbenz regime, and the Arevalo regime before it, since 1944.

That this is the fundamental test of the political nature of the rebellion, is undoubtedly true. But we wonder how many people really have any doubts about the outcome.

If that cloak-and-dagger wonderboy John Peurifoy, who is merely supposed to be U. S. ambassador down there, can twist arms as skillfully and viciously as he had to do in San Salvador when he knocked the heads of Monzon and Castillo Armas together and told them to agree to his scheme for division of the new junta—if Peurifoy can continue to dominate the situation for a while, then the new government may coast along for a while without any overt steps to junk the social-reform program publicly and brazenly. That's at the best.

Or for a while the reform program may simply be crippled here and there, put in cold storage there and here, and otherwise quietly put to sleep without any great fuss, out of consideration of Washington's sensibilities.

If the Guatemalan *finqueros* or United Fruit's henchmen do any loud crowing with delight, Peurifoy seems smart enough to know that he ought to crack their knuckles, in reproof of such unseemly open joy.

So one has no right to predict that on the day after tomorrow Guatemala, under the new junta which is “made in the U. S. A.”, will snap immediately back to its status under José Ubico, the dictator who was overthrown in 1944 and who belonged to United Fruit body and soul—even if such a snapback was still socially possible.

No Mystery

But with such qualifications as to tempo and degree, the social character of the new junta regime is not really a great mystery, and we advise no one to bate his breath while awaiting the outcome.

It should be remembered, first of all, that Castillo Armas, the leader of the rebels, and the main elements around him, *did not fall out with the Arbenz regime*. He went into opposition against Arbenz's predecessor, Arevalo; and it was under Arevalo that the “Guatemalan revolution of 1944” got started. Now, as all readers of the U. S.'s well-kept press know, the Arbenz regime is supposed to have become “Communist-dominated”; but even the same editorialists, speech-makers, columnists and assorted authorities and experts who have been calling Arbenz “Communist-dominated” have not quite applied that label to the preceding government of Arevalo, even though CP influence started growing soon after 1944.

The point is that, even in terms of the present myth about “Communist domination” of Guatemala, Castillo Armas rebelled against the social-reform program and not against “Communist domination”; and he rebelled against the social-reform program even before it was pressed ahead into agrarian reform in a law touching the landholdings of the foreign investors as well as of native landowners.

Naturally Castillo Armas now gives out with the usual kind of doubletalk—not any more clever or more interesting than usual in such cases—about continuing the gains of the revolution; and this deserves no attention whatsoever, except from venal journalists who are paid to do so, or from very stupid ones who don't know any better, or from liberal journalists who write such mush simply to show that they are suspicious of the official claptrap.

Land Reform Dumped

Castillo Armas and his gang are out to turn the clock back; of that there can be no doubt. But he does not control the junta alone: there is also Monzon. Does Monzon represent any kind of counterweight to his colleague's reaction?

There is not the slightest reason to believe this. Monzon represents the extreme right tip

of that wing of the Arbenz government which was willing to tag along with the government instead of fleeing into exile and opposition, but which turned against the government as soon as a gun was shot off. The elements around Monzon can act as a bit of painted makeup on the face of the old hag Reaction which is now taking back the power in Guatemala City; at best their hesitations can slow it up a bit. The only serious force to counter Castillo Armas is that of the U. S., as we have already discussed.

Already, by the time this article is being put into type, there is evident a remarkable absence of embarrassment on the part of the junta about repudiating the reform program:

“The junta's first statement on internal policies was that social advances would be maintained. It was explained, however, that the agrarian reform law had been suspended pending further study of its administration.” (N. Y. Times, July 6.)

For a regime which is on the kind of spot occupied by this junta, this (so soon) is an open declaration that the land reform is dead. There can be little doubt that the United Fruit Company, in one way or the other, will now get back the land whose loss had so infuriated it. It will not be necessary for Washington to collect the bill for United Fruit, since the company's demand was for compensation for this very land; the return of the land will cancel the job for the bill collector.

Concentration Camps

At the same time the new junta, which has been imposed on the Guatemalan people as the democratic alternative to that bad Arbenz regime which had practically become a Russian-satellite-type “people's democracy” (to believe the press)—this new junta has celebrated the reconquest of freedom by instituting concentration camps. So many “Communists” are being arrested that there is no room for them in the jails.

Now we have been told a thousand times by the press that there are only a handful of Communists in Guatemala, who have however infiltrated the high posts of the Arbenz government and controlled it. Where do these thousands of “Communists” come from now?

No mystery. The “Communists” who are being rounded up are made up of anyone who

Every day the course followed by the Guatemala-U. S. junta becomes less of a question-mark. In addition to the measures cited in the accompanying article, on July 7 the press announced that the junta had decreed nothing less than the disfranchisement of three-quarters of the people of Guatemala!

The forms of the measure was a ukase limiting the vote to “literate persons.” Two-thirds of the country's population consists of the Indian peasantry of the provinces, to whom Spanish is a foreign language. It is estimated that 73 per cent of the population is illiterate, and naturally under Guatemalan conditions this means that the peasantry and a portion of the working class have been deprived of political rights.

There is hardly any use any longer for liberals to keep on saying that the “test” of the U. S.'s “sincerity” lies in the future course of the new rulers.

No doubt there will be scurvy attempts at explanation on the ground that, after all, literacy is a requirement for the voting privilege in the U. S., isn't it? To apply this requirement, reasonable in a country where compulsory education has existed for a long time, to a country where education is not only not-compulsory but impossible for the masses, is to apologize for dictatorship. And incidentally, India and many other countries with a low educational level among the masses have shown the practicability of conducting a serious democratic election under such conditions. In any case, the alternative is to make oppression and exploitation inevitable.

We must note also that, while the Arbenz government did not formally suspend the constitution even after the invasion had started (though civil rights were suspended), the new junta has not hesitated to suspend the constitution to all effects and purposes even after the hostilities have ended. “It was said that all existing laws that did not hinder security measures taken by the junta would remain in effect. . . . Monzon, junta president, said yesterday that the new constitution would not be prepared hurriedly.” (N. Y. Times, July 5.)

militantly pushed and fought for the social-reform program, particularly no doubt the land-reform program. To be sure, among these victims are probably genuine Stalinists, but it is safe to say that their bulk consists merely of those nationalists who were most willing to work with the CP as a pro-revolutionary force.

Simultaneously — such are the niceties of democratic conduct—the junta announced that all of its democratic fervor is now enlisted on the side of the U. S. war camp against the Russians. Monzon declared that his government did not want friendly relations with Iron Curtain countries; in his eagerness to please he even added that he didn't want diplomatic relations, but Peurifoy ought to educate him about that before he goes too far.

However, in thus eschewing relations with nasty totalitarian countries, Monzon made clear that he wasn't talking about Yugoslavia; “explaining that he considered her a Western democracy” (Times, July 6). We may recall that when Hitler held hands with the Mikado he decreed that the Japanese were officially Aryan. . . . Monzon also made clear his desire for “friendly relations” with Franco Spain.

In other words Guatemala has passed all the tests for joining the “Democratic Camp,” unlike that Arbenz regime, along with Tifo and Franco.

A Note of Cheer

The result is that the N. Y. Post is downcast. Having decided to plump for the U. S.'s policy of clubbing Guatemala into line, the liberal Post (as our readers may remember) solemnly warned against installing reaction in place of Arbenz. For some reason the State Department and its man Peurifoy did not listen to this advice on how to be a benevolent-type imperialist; hence the Post now deplores, even while it is slightly cheered:

“The rebel victory in Guatemala furnished the free world with a needed note of cheer last week. It was at least a little balance against the bad news from the battlefields of Indochina. . . .”

But this sunny beam of light is immediately darkened for the Post editors (who are liberals), by the new regime's talk of concentration camps. So now they warn the junta against such goings-on, which are unsuitable for men who have just given the free world its only note of cheer in a dog's age.

They warn the junta, but no one could possibly guess *how* without going through a brainwashing and becoming a liberal Post editor himself. Here's the grim warning to Castillo Armas:

“The new rulers of Guatemala don't have to go far to see how wrong they are. The evidence is all around them: Jacobo Arbenz couldn't stay in power for all the strong-arm tactics he borrowed from the Soviet Union. *The people evidently don't want to be ruled that way.*”

This makes it sound as if the Post editors believe that the rebellion was the work of the Guatemalan “people.” As our readers have seen in our columns, they have not previously been that hypocritical. Furthermore, in the very same issue of their paper, their special correspondent in Mexico City wires that—

“Mexicans, and representatives of other foreign governments, do not hesitate to say that the real ruler of Guatemala, at this moment, is Peurifoy.

“Dr. Manuel Rosas, an economist, a voluntary exile from his native Guatemala, said: ‘Any American ambassador would be in this position. Your country controls Guatemala's economic destiny. You buy more than three-fourths of our exports and sell us two-thirds of what we buy. You can starve or bankrupt us at will.’”

So perhaps the Post's dire and awful warning to Castillo Armas will go as unheeded as its strict injunctions to the State Department to beware of fostering reaction in Guatemala.

James Rides Again

Still on the subject of the social program of the new Castillo Armas-Monzon-Peurifoy junta, we can pass on at this point to a journalist of a *other kidney*. Last week we introduced a

Continue the Reform Program?

Mr. Daniel James, former managing editor of the *New Leader*, who, in that eminent organ of "anything-goes-against-Communism," conclusively proved as early as April that the Arbenz regime was "Communist-dominated" by pointing to the fact that Arbenz was making charges about a coming invasion by U. S.-supported rebels. . . .

It has not been reported that D. James has since referred publicly to this feat of political analysis, not even (for example) to demonstrate his credentials for publishing his coming book *Red Beachhead in America: Guatemala*.

However, modest though he is about such past achievements, the same James did grant some tokens of his wisdom to the N. Y. *Herald Tribune*, Sunday before last. (June 28). "Who Are Guatemala's Anti-Reds?" he asks and answers, in an article complaining against the plot to "smear" Castillo Armas as reactionary.

Without the Students

In defense of the Castillo Armas gang, James claims that the rebel colonel is really a "middle-of-the-roader" and "favors the basic social and economic reforms instituted in Guatemala," only he wants to purge these reforms of "their collectivist implications," whatever they are; that his program is "democratic and progressive," only unfortunately his program "has not been pressed with vigor," etc.

The factual basis for his opinion seems to be the fact that the colonel says so. But James also gives another fact. In forming his cabinet (while the fighting was going on), Castillo Armas omitted two elements, which causes James to do a bit of deploring. These happen to be the only two organized social elements of any significance among whom can be found anti-Stalinists who do favor some kind of democratic and progressive program. They are: the students and the anti-CP trade unions.

Castillo Armas' cabinet contained no representatives of these two strata.

The enormity of this omission (from the point of view of these stupidly hypocritical claims about the rebels) can be understood only on the background of the Guatemala scene. To Americans it may seem even absurd to speak of including representatives of the students in the cabinet. Not so in Guatemala (as in so many other colonial and semi-colonial countries).

In this country without a well-formed class structure, dominated socially by its urban middle class, the student body has long been an institutionalized political force. They took the leadership in the 1944 revolution against Ubico according to some accounts, and in every account they certainly played a major role at that time—and since. Open opposition to the Arevalo regime in its later years, and then to the Arbenz regime, also came from the students very notably.

No Labor Reprs

James himself writes, in the course of his deploring: "Young, idealistic and spirited, the students have been in the forefront of the fight against Arbenz and Communism for years. In February, for example, they led a demonstration before the National Palace where they symbolically burned Guatemala's constitution, which they believed Arbenz had rendered worthless. . . . In carrying out such protests, the students have braved shootings and beatings, arrest and exile."

It can be said quite accurately that—aside from United Fruit and the big landowners, who obviously cannot be openly represented in the rebel cabinet, and aside from the army—the students were the best organized political force arrayed against the Arbenz regime. But there was no room for them in the rebel cabinet.

The same goes, to a lesser degree, for the trade-unionists organized in the Union of Free Workers in Exile, which was associated with ORIT, which is the Latin American regional organization of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions. Even from the point of view of sheer demagoguery, it wouldn't have been a bad idea for Castillo Armas to find some well-broken-in "trade-union representative" to

stick on the cabinet, so that people like D. James (for example) could point to him in order to prove how democratic and progressive the rebels are.

If there is any possibility of development of a force in Guatemala opposed to both Stalinism (and even to collaboration with Stalinism) and to American imperialism and its native hangers-on, such a force can be looked to as coming from these two sources, as the most important of all. By freezing out any representative of the students and trade-unionists, Castillo Armas made it quite unnecessarily easy for the stupidest honest observer to know where he stood.

But not for D. James.

Point Four as a Band-Aid

Outside of good-natured advice to Washington to maintain the social-reform program in Guatemala, one of the liberal notes being struck in the present juncture of affairs in Guatemala is the demand that the U. S. make up for its previous neglect of our Latin American brethren by increasing economic aid and technical aid to Guatemala.

Heeding these voices, or perhaps simply because he needed to apply some salve after the rather rough operation performed on the body of Guatemala, Secretary of State Dulles has indeed promised to shell out a bit more liberally for the benefit of the Guatemalans.

The last thing that could enter our mind is to denounce any increase in economic aid* to Guatemala on the ground that it is an obvious bribe. True, a heated imagination could compare the grant of money to some unpleasant things; say, a woman is raped and finds a silver dollar alongside, to allay her indignation; a man dashes into a house in pursuit of an enemy, smashes everything in sight, and leaves some change as damage-money; etc.

Anyway, an increase in U. S. economic aid would, obviously, be welcomed in Guatemala. But there is another side to the Latin American reaction which should not be forgotten,

If Dulles does carry out his promise and throw some hush-money in Guatemala's direction, that will not appease Guatemalan nationalist sentiment by a whit, nor should it, but it will convince Latin Americans about something else—

—That it was the Stalinists who got that money for Guatemala.

Please excuse us, because we're sure all our readers have heard the story by now in one version or another, but we have got to refer to the one about the president of a small country who requested his neighboring state to please lend him their Communist Party because he needed a loan from America.

The circumstances of any increased economic aid to Guatemala are such that the great benefits foreseen by the liberals are sure not to happen. No Guatemalan will be "grateful." The people will consider that the U. S. is leaving a tip, and they will be right.

And as for the notion that a couple of more millions handed over by the rich Northern uncle will change the picture of dire poverty for the masses—that is not even wishful thinking nowadays. Guatemala needs a social revolution, and a handout cannot even scratch the surface.

But one of the few foreign-policy ideas that the liberals have latched onto, as a sort of shibboleth, is the Point Four idea; and in or out of season the Point Four idea is hailed out as a "solution." So the liberals watch with equanimity and even a "note of cheer" as the Guatemalan revolution is stabbed to death, and then prove how humanitarian they are by advocating Point Four bandaging.

The Anti-Trust Gag

The U. S. government has sought to Air-Wick the stink caused by the Guatemalan affair by rushing through an anti-trust suit against United Fruit. We are willing to be convinced that it is in earnest, but the news so far is little evidence.

There is no possible dispute about the fact that this announcement was made for its propaganda effect. The United Fruit Company's hurt rejoinder to the government's statement made clear that the anti-trust action had been dragging along for some time, and that it was brought to a head suddenly, virtually in 24 hours.

The announcement itself has had whatever propaganda effect it deserves; the real question that remains is whether the government intends to put the screws on the banana monopoly or not.

Now it happens that, apart from any suspected tender-

ness for United Fruit, the Eisenhower administration has been building up quite a record for itself with regard to anti-trust policy under Brownell. It is such a record that the people would be saving money if the Anti-Trust Division were closed up tomorrow. Even under Fair Deal chiefs who had fervent intentions of checking the monopolistic corporations, the Anti-Trust Division has been one of the more futile agencies of the government. Under Brownell and Eisenhower, the Anti-Trust Division has been a joke. It became a menace only in order to persecute the Louisiana unionists whose organization was busted on grounds of "monopoly."

When this administration suddenly announces, therefore—still swinging the bloody club from the assault on Guatemala—that United Fruit is going to be prosecuted as a monopoly, even the less cynical among us have a right to be amused.

However, this is as good a point as any to add a caution which we had intended to mention in previous articles, and which ought to be borne in mind in order to avoid a simplistic soapbox notion of the relations between the U. S. government and the United Fruit Company.

While it has been necessary to emphasize the role of United Fruit in the Guatemala mess, it would be entirely exaggerated to think that this Boston company, big as it is, dictates U. S. foreign policy in its bailiwick. Things aren't as simple as that, no doubt, though it may be impossible to guess the actual forms of the relation.

The State Department is (we can admit quite freely) not at all anxious to come automatically to the defense of United Fruit's interests; and there is therefore a real measure of justice in the thesis that Washington's role in Guatemala was not simply determined by its bill-collecting function. But we should also remember that, in its Central American empire, United Fruit has always acted, and tries to act, just like a sovereign government; and one of the aims of the United Fruit's general staff, when its interests are under attack, is to make sure that the State Department is put in the position where it has to defend it, or thinks it has to defend it.

Thus the theory may be correct that the groundwork for intervention in Guatemala, and the whole buildup of the rebel forces, was engineered by operatives of the Central Intelligence Agency, as an autonomous CIA project. There have been precedents. And that hypothesis does not even require the idea that it was the Washington center of the CIA (Allan Dulles) that initiated it.

A Speculation

It is easy to speculate from here on: It is a well-known policy of the Washington bureaucrats to rely on cooperation with U. S. interests abroad; given the enormous semi-governmental role that United Fruit has always played in Central America, it is easy to see that CIA agents would be instructed to work closely with the company; in Guatemala, the company has its own aims and its own uses for the CIA. . . . Reports are sent back, a climate of semi-official propaganda is created, government agencies are more and more committed through the bureaucratic channels. . . . In reaction to the Arbenz government, seeing what is going on, leans even more heavily on its most reliable anti-American allies, the Stalinists; this is used to scare Washington further. . . . The situation is jacked up by clever machinations from within and without, until the U. S. seems committed publicly, and then it is committed. . . . The shipment of arms to Guatemala from Czechoslovakia comes along and is presented to Washington as (a) a real danger, and/or (b) a good opportunity for "teaching the Reds a lesson." . . . The rebel forces, with or without the agreement of their CIA mentors, decide to take advantage of the favorable climate of Washington interest to launch an armed attack. The U. S. is confronted with an accomplished fact; from its representatives in Guatemala, from everyone whom United Fruit can reach, from the CIA operatives involved; it is told, "Maybe we wouldn't have wanted this to break in this way, at this time, but the die is cast, and we've got to choose sides. . . ."

This piece of sheer speculation is presented only as an attempt to concretize what can be meant by a less simplistic version of the relations between United Fruit and the tops of the State Department themselves. There was no inevitability (from the "nature of imperialism") that the State Department had to intervene in Guatemala in this crude way; for it has been a long time since American imperialism has been so crude and heavy-handed in its efforts to keep its Latin American backyard under control; in short, so stupid.

As LABOR ACTION had occasion to observe in another connection recently, no one should underestimate the power of sheer stupidity in determining the day-to-day policy of this State Department and this administration. The main lesson is not any soapbox moral like a claim that the U. S. is tied to United Fruit and cannot take a slap at that company if that becomes necessary.

The main lesson is that—whether in a crude way as in Guatemala, or in a more clever way as in the case of U. S. control over Bolivia—U. S. imperialism is the enemy of the Latin American people's aspirations to full national sovereignty and economic freedom and development; this imperialism is the reverse of a democratic foreign policy such as can really offer an alternative to the Stalinist totalitarian world menace; and it is this imperialism which tends to manure the soil in which Stalinist influence grows.

Knowland's Threat — —

(Continued from page 1)

sideration, Formosa is less important than the alliance in Western Europe.

It is a well-known fact that at this coming session of the General Assembly a serious attempt will be made to oust the Chiang Formosa regime and seat Peiping in the UN. While the outcome is certainly in doubt, no matter which way it goes it can have far-reaching effects inside the Western camp's alliance.

If Peiping is seated, the consequences will be felt most sharply on the domestic American political scene, as Senator Knowland has already given notice. And if the U. S. is able to bludgeon enough Latin American delegations into line to prevent a two-thirds majority from being formed, then the effect on the Western alliance will be the greatest. It would be safe to guess that a new wave of anti-Americanism will follow what will be interpreted as the U. S.'s determination to go on with the cold war at the expense of a chance to work out a formula for peaceful coexistence.

CHURCHILL PRESSES

For a while it appeared that all that the U. S. diplomats at the UN, led by that "Man of Distinction" Henry Cabot Lodge, would have to do is to delicately balance between opposing the admission of the Chinese Stalinists for home consumption, and the all-out opposition that would keep the Stalinists out and alienate the allies. Senator Knowland and the right wing of American politics have made it clear that they are not going to go along with this gentlemen's agreement.

The visit of Prime Minister Churchill, while touching off the Knowland outburst, also almost conclusively demonstrated the paralysis of U. S. foreign policy. In place

after place debacle followed disaster: the Berlin conference, the Geneva conference, the failure of the European Defense Community, the rout in Indochina, added to the U. S.-manufactured revolution in Guatemala.

The near-involvement of American troops in the Indochinese war, so shortly after the end of the Korean adventure, raised new fear over a Third World War. When Churchill came to the United States he was looking around for some formula to call a halt to the cold war and to "coexist" with Stalinism. The widespread popularity of this sentiment especially in Europe is not hard to understand. It is Churchill, the old imperialist himself, who emphasized that in the event of another world war England would be the "bullseye" of the first Russian hydrogen-bomb attacks. And this applies to all of Western Europe.

GOP IN A HOLE

What was proposed was a "Locarno-type" treaty with the Russians and with the Chinese Stalinists. What else would be involved in the deal is only to be left to the imagination, and no doubt the worst can be expected from Churchill.

But from the point of view of the Republican Party the very idea of a Locarno-type treaty, with all that it implies of guaranteeing frontiers of the existing states, becomes anathema.

In the 1952 elections the Republican Party beat the Democrats over the head with the "containment policy" which they claim was responsible, among other things, for the loss of China. "Liberation" was to be the policy of the new Republican administration. How it would be possible to reconcile the accusations of loss of China, the promise of "liberation" and the signing of a Locarno-type treaty would be too much even for the hucksters employed by the Eisenhower administration.

Senator Knowland's threat to resign is a reflection of this conflict with the Western allies, but not evidence that the Eisenhower administration gave a second thought to the Churchill proposal. Knowland is not going to let go of one of the old issues from the 1952 presidential campaign which, it is hoped, can be warmed over again at least through the 1956 elections. This is not merely the policy of the so-called Neanderthal wing of the party, but the Republican strategy. This is to be seen also in the recent speeches by Vice-President Richard Nixon raising the devil-theory of the loss of China.

Of course Knowland's threats reflect no policy of any kind, even less than those of Dulles. They reflect a kind of frustration in face of the recent success of Stalinism, most particularly in Indochina. The job of Dulles is to walk the tightrope between the growing reactionary trend in American politics and the need to maintain a series of world-wide military alliances.

It is not that the Knowlands reject the idea of allies. They are in the process of writing off some allies, notably the West European ones whom they regard as questionable in case of a showdown. The allies they look to are Chiang, Rhee and the Thailand regimes in Asia. From the military point of view these reactionary regimes appear to be the most reliable. They make their choice, carrying to its logical conclusion the U. S.'s entire emphasis on building a foreign policy around a series of military alliances.

The momentum built up by this right wing is based on the failures of Truman-Acheson and Eisenhower-Dulles foreign policy. The economic and political policies urged by Democratic Party and liberals are part of these failures. No wonder it is hard to see how they can expect to offer any real resistance to this reactionary drift.

The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

BRAZIL

New Assault on Workers' Standard of Living — —

Vargas Fakery Stirs General-Strike Threat

By BRASILEIRO

RIO DE JANEIRO, July 1—The economic crisis in Brazil has been deepening, manifesting itself not only in price rises and continuous inflation but also in the political life of the country.

While Brazil is the most important country of South America, political life here is even more backward and formless than in the smaller Latin American republics. All political life here is subordinated to the needs of primitive capitalist accumulation, and its formlessness corresponds to the initial stages which industrial capitalism has arrived at.

In terms of such stages, Brazil is perhaps at the point where the U. S. was a century ago, or in the first period of capitalist development in England—but, of course, without having gone through the preceding English bourgeois revolution or the U. S. war of independence.

Capitalist development is proceeding in the country without any background of political tradition and previous economic formations as in Europe. This is indeed the reason for the amorphousness and instability of its political life. In addition, the country's class structure is very weak, and the native bourgeoisie is working under the control of European capitalists and managers and under the powerful influence of U. S. capital. As for the Brazilian

people, particularly the Brazilian working class, it is their exploitation which is the source of the primitive accumulation, for the surprofit of European and U. S. investments.

For the most part, the Brazilian workers do not intervene directly in political life; they are not the subject but the object of "national policy."

The main political struggle that is going on is between the right-wing "democratic" opposition and the government camp headed by President Vargas.

All interest at the moment is centered on the presidential elections. As dispatches from Rio to LABOR ACTION have reported before, the president decreed a minimum-wage law for the workers, as a means of regaining the support of the workers and the people generally, as against the conservative bourgeois opposition, in order to win the coming election. But in truth the minimum-wage law helps nobody, certainly not the workers. The fact is that in the big cities like Rio or Sao Paulo no one can live on 1800 Crs., nor in the provinces on 1200 Crs.; the actual minimum for a modest existence is 5000 Crs.

REAL WAGES FALL

Apart from its political aims the minimum-wage law has served only as a pretext for giving industry a price rise of 30 to 50 per cent, without any corresponding rise in wages, so that in sum the workers have been on the losing end of the "generosity" shown by ex-dictator Vargas, to the extent of losing up to 50 per cent of real wages.

As if this were not a sufficient mockery of the workers' demands, the Supreme Court has suspended the presidential law as unconstitutional, so that the bourgeoisie has pocketed the benefits of this operation but has held up the implementation of the president's "workers' policy." [On July 5, the court finally voted to uphold the law.—Ed.]

The right opposition attacks the government and accuses the president of planning a coup d'état; a move for impeachment failed to get a majority in the Congress; but the political scrap is only a smokescreen for the cynical robbery of the working people.

The other political factor is the army, which now is the arbiter between the rightist opposition and the president. The military demanded the dismissal of Goulart, the ex-minister of labor, as a "communist," and Vargas yielded to their pressure. But the president has also insisted on his position as constitutional chief of the army and has counterattacked against the influence in the army exercised by the right-wing "democrats."

All of these political maneuvers are possible in a country without a revolutionary tradition, without any political tradition to speak of, where "God is a Brazilian" and is arranging everything for the good of Brazil, where the proletariat is politically apathetic and too passive to defend their own economic and political interests. The corrupted leaders of the trade unions are also incapable of defending the interests of the workers.

THREATEN STRIKE

In spite of this situation with all of its difficulties, the fakery of the minimum-wage affair has so stirred the resentment of the workers that the trade unions are considering the possibility of a general strike, under the pressure of the working masses. It seems that even though social and political consciousness is asleep, the stomach cannot sleep...

A general strike could indeed be the only answer to the bourgeoisie and the sole weapon of the workers against the capitalist offensive on their living standards and against the demagoguery of the government. A general strike could put an end to the political maneuvers of the corrupt politicians and army heads, to the political comedy which stages a mock "struggle" at the expense of the workers. It could lift national politics to a higher level, and, as in other countries, transform it into a struggle of definite and modern political parties representing antagonistic social classes.

But this is a long way off in this country, where the bourgeoisie still has so easy a life.

Get Acquainted!

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

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

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

The Handy Way to Subscribe!

LABOR ACTION

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

Please enter my subscription:

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

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

SUBSCRIBERS — ATTENTION!

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

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

1 8 - 2 8

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

RENEW NOW!