

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

France:  
**THE SHOPKEEPERS' REVOLT**

... page 6

Britain:  
**Bevan Beats the Expulsion Drive**

... page 3

Morocco:  
**Free Trade Unions vs. the French**

... page 2

APRIL 11, 1955

FIVE CENTS

SPOT-  
LIGHT

## Formosa War Scare Boomerangs, Resistance to Asia Policy Grows

By GORDON HASKELL

There is one virtue, and one virtue only in the position into which the Eisenhower administration has blundered this country in the Formosa Straits. By following the whole logic of its Asia policy to the point of utter absurdity on the tiny islands of Quemoy and Matsu, it has aroused wide sections of public opinion to an unprecedented degree of understanding of the danger and futility of its policy, and to a beginning of opposition to it.

Ever since World War II the basic line of American policy has been to seek "stability" in Asia by supporting the reactionary colonial and native regimes against the tide of national and social revolution. To the Stalinist ability to exploit the revolutionary strivings of the peoples of the area, the United States has sought to oppose financial and military aid to these regimes, and when this proved insufficient, to jump into the breach with its own armed forces.

Thus: the war in Korea; the guarantee of Chiang Kai-shek's regime in Formosa by the Seventh Fleet; the attempt to "draw a line" in Southeast Asia through the SEATO Pact; and finally, the utter absurdity of the "maybe" policy on Matsu and Quemoy.

Up to this point, the bulk of the American public has been dragged along, with more or less enthusiasm or reluctance, to accept the policies first of Truman and then of Eisenhower.

The most liberal wing of the Democratic Party has gone along through every twist and turn of the policy, while calling for additions to it along the lines of more "Point Four" aid.

The right wing of the Republicans has been demanding a tough, "preventive war" policy, and continue to receive

strong support from an important group of top admirals and generals. The majority of Democrats and Republicans have simply followed their leaders, apparently without thought or question.

The Democrats, including leaders of their ADA wing, had a chance to fight the Quemoy-Matsu dead-end before the administration got itself committed to it. They were warned against the "mutual defense" treaty with Chiang in a memorandum prepared by former Democratic State Department officials. A draft of the resolution giving Eisenhower a free hand in the Formosa Strait was submitted to them for consideration before it was made public. It is reported that Senator Humphrey raised objections to the draft at a private meeting of the Democratic members of the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee, but eventually went along with his colleagues on support of the resolution.

Now, when the danger as well as the absurdity of the "stand" on Quemoy-Matsu has become fully apparent, a

group of Democratic senators headed by Morse and Lehman are attempting to get the Senate to reverse itself on the free hand given the president. But when the policy which has led to this wobbly "stand" was up for debate, their uneasiness about it was silenced by Senator George's famous question: "What is your alternative?"

### CRUMBLING DOCTRINE

They could not answer the question then, and they really cannot answer it now. A progressive alternative to Stalinism in Asia can only be support for the national and social revolution on a thoroughgoing democratic basis. Its first condition is ending support to the foreign and domestic forces of reaction which are seeking to block that revolution. That means an end to support of Rhee and Chiang, the police regime in Thailand, British rule in Malaya, and the rest.

There is also another alternative. That is capitulation to Stalinism.

And as time drags on, it becomes increasingly clear that American policy in the area is so untenable that its supporters are forced either into the camp of the Knowland war party, or if they draw back from the brutal logic of that position and are incapable of grasping the revolutionary logic of the democratic position, they end up willy-nilly as capitulators.

A few months ago, it was almost a sacred tenet of liberal and Democratic doctrine that this government cannot recognize the Stalinist government of China or favor its admission to the United Nations. The governments of Chiang and Rhee were sturdy democracies which must be defended against Stalinism at all cost. Any failure to defend them would convince the rest of Asia that they have no choice but to swing into the Stalinist camp.

Today, this doctrine is crumbling all around us.

Voices have been raised in the highest councils of the labor movement for a normalization of relations with China, and some procedure which would permit the people of Formosa to decide their own destiny without interference from Chiang.

### ON THE HOOK

It has gradually begun to sink in that the last thing the peoples of Asia want is to be defended by the United States in the way in which South Korea was defended; that the government's policy is isolating this country from its allies in Europe as well as from the peoples of Asia.

The Eisenhower administration is itself in a state of confusion and uncertainty. Conflicting statements come from the highest sources in Washington weekly. Officials who until yesterday were insisting that what must be done is to "draw a line" for Stalinist expansion, and proclaim to the world clearly and positively that if they cross this line war will be the result, are now seeking to justify the "keep them guessing" policy on Quemoy and Matsu.

The government, having impaled itself firmly on the Stalinist hook in the Formosa Strait, is now casting desperately about for some way to get off. That is the meaning of the sudden desire for a

### We Pay Our Respects

Winston Churchill's retirement as prime minister has evoked the expected sentimentality from all quarters, while the political obituaries brim over with fulsome laudation. His chief claim to fame was his leadership of Britain during the Second World War, and, as it happens, our special issue last week on Yalta and the Second World War provides as fitting an epitaph for him as we could write now.

For those who burble over with nonsense about his love of freedom, there is the record of his frenetic effort to hang on to every inch of colonial territory where British imperialism had any slaves left.

For those who drool with admiration for his stature as democratic statesman, there is his own record in his own words of his determination to control Greece even at the cost of deliberate massacres of unarmed men, women and children in Athens.

For those who chatter about his titanic statesmanship, there is the record of his cynical, callous and crude deal with Stalin swapping Greece for East Europe—all of the adjectives beginning with "c" being his own characterization of what happened.

For those who like to remember that he was an early opponent of appeasement of Nazism (because of its threat to Britain), there is his proud boast that he admired Mussolini and his public statement that if he had been an Italian he would have been with the Fascist leader.

For those who dotingly describe him as a man of great principle, there is the

(Continued on page 6)

## ADA: Two Steps Forward, One Back Stand on Political Role and Civil-Liberties Vote Show Gain

By PAT PARKS

Highlighting the Eighth National Convention of Americans for Democratic Action was an emotion-packed fight on academic freedom, an announcement of a new line on the Democratic Party, and a serious warning to the United States government over possible defense of Quemoy and Matsu which could lead to an H-bomb holocaust.

Although the delegates participated in little discussion on or off the floor regarding the political policy draft, they gave tacit consent to a sharp change of emphasis; termed by new National Chairman Joseph Rauh a "get tough policy" with the Democratic Party, initiated by the ADA leadership.

Until now, ADA has played the role of meek critic to the Democrats, while continually giving public support to them in the press and at election time, despite reactionary control by Jim Crow and anti-civil libertarian and labor elements.

ADA has always pointed to liberal senators like Humphrey, Douglas, Lehman and Morse, rationalizing defense of the Democrats by listing these distin-

guished names as the white hope for eventual liberal control.

However, largely due to the capitulation by Humphrey and Morse on the filibuster issue and the former's responsibility for the worst witchhunt measure to date—the Communist Control Act—ADA has been forced to react with vigorous condemnation of the present Democratic line on "party unity." It correctly points out that the false unity theme is an excuse for compromise by the so-called liberals with the reactionaries over very basic democratic issues in the name of clever politics.

### TALK "PRINCIPLE"

It is encouraging to socialists, and to others who have called on ADA to make some serious demands on the Democratic Party to translate its pretty language on labor and civil rights into some meaningful concrete political program, that ADA should say in its policy statement that "the most practical politics ADA can practice today is the policy of principle."

While we would like, but do not neces-

sarily expect, liberals to thoroughly analyze why the Democratic Party has been unable to translate most of the ADA platform into reality, we urge them to push the policy of playing an independent political role, which means severe criticism and refusal to accept Democrats on their previous easy terms.

Such a push is necessary for ADA now. From a longer-range view, socialists feel that the hopes for the Democratic Party which are held by militant liberals will not and cannot be realized no matter how hard they try to reform the party; but certainly it is only by a principled independent stand that the ADA will be taken seriously by anyone, including the Democrats, and will have their greatest immediate impact.

We think consistent adherence to principled independence will lead liberals to a break with the old parties and to a third-party alliance with labor. This, of course, is far beyond the intention embodied in the new ADA orientation.

Yet it is of special significance that the ADA leadership has finally remem-

(Turn to last page)

NEXT WEEK IN L. A.

Report on the  
UAW Convention

# MOROCCO **Free Moroccan Labor Federation Is Formed in Teeth of French Colonialism**

By A. GIACOMETTI

PARIS, Mar. 29—In a previous issue we reported on the creation of the "Organizing Committee for Free Trade-Unionism" in Morocco. A week ago, the Moroccan trade-unionists of this committee announced that in a congress held in Casablanca on March 20, it was decided to turn the committee into a new, independent trade-union federation, the Union Marocaine du Travail, which will affiliate to the ICFTU.

Twenty-two regional committees were represented at the founding congress, which also elected an administrative commission and a bureau. Mahjoub Ben Sedik was elected secretary-general and Taieb Bouazza vice-secretary.

This initiative has put the French administration before an accomplished fact at a time when it was not even prepared to grant Moroccans the official right to join European trade-unions. The Moroccan workers have thus solved the trade-union question on their own, in direct defiance of the colonialists' law and against a common front of administration officials and Stalinist trade-union leaders.

They have solved it, for it is doubtful that the administration is in a position to suppress the new federation. Even though the next day the Resident-General issued a release to the press stating that the creation of the UMT is "not compatible with existing legislation," this probably only means that the administration will have to quickly adapt the legislation to the existing facts.

From the outset, the UMT has based itself on the traditions of internationalism and solidarity that characterized the labor movement at its best. In an appeal to the Moroccan working class, the founding congress proclaimed:

"...the Moroccan Federation of Labor will only be complete when it unites within itself all the workers in Morocco, differing in their beliefs, nationalities and races, but united in an equal attachment to justice and freedom.

"The Congress calls upon all workers in Morocco to liberate themselves from certain vicious and outdated prejudices, products of an antiquated regime, and to unite in the ranks of the Moroccan Federation of Labor to conduct an energetic struggle for the right to work, for the suppression of unemployment, for decent salaries, for collective contracts, for social security, for a just distribution of wealth, for the respect of human rights and for a democratic regime.

"The Congress takes notice with pride and satisfaction of the support given to Moroccan trade-unionism by French and international trade-union organizations, in particular by the powerful ICFTU."

## F. O. SLANDERER

This statement, a powerful monument to the maturity of Moroccan labor, contrasts painfully with another statement that Robert Bothereau, secretary-general of Force Ouvrière, the French trade-union federation, made at a luncheon of the Anglo-American press. Commenting on the founding of the UMT, Bothereau said:

"If trade-union rights do not yet exist in Morocco, the fault does not lie with France. The Sultan always opposed it in order to preserve the feudal structure of his country. As in Tunisia, the new Moroccan federation is a product of nationalism. Certainly the Moroccans should be given trade-union rights, but it is regrettable that the new federation is autonomous, and therefore nationalist. Its leaders have been formed in the ranks of the Communist-influenced CGT. They do not have the democratic traditions of the Tunisian trade-unionists of the UGTT."

In this short statement, there is not one sentence that does not contain a lie or a misrepresentation.

The responsibility for the illegality of Moroccan trade-unionism even at this late date does lie with France, since all legislation concerning such matters is submitted by the Resident-General to the Sultan, who is then merely asked to sign. It is not known that the Resident-General ever submitted a decree legalizing Moroccan trade-unions. As to the Sultan, he came out in favor of full trade-union rights for Moroccans, in the clearest and strongest fashion, as early as 1949.

Bothereau says that the UMT is a product of nationalism, as if this was something reprehensible. In fact, it is the product of the legitimate insistence of the Moroccan people to determine their own destinies, and of the determi-

nation of the Moroccan workers to build unions of their own choice. In comparison with FO or, for that matter with the CGT, the "nationalist" unions distinguish themselves favorably by their absence of chauvinist prejudice in any form.

If they are not affiliated to FO, the reason is that the Moroccan section of FO, which is composed of French civil-servants and is not even supported by the Moroccan Federation of the French SP, has steadfastly refused to organize Moroccan workers or to support their demands. It has opposed on every occasion their efforts to win trade-union rights. When defeated in union elections, the FO leadership systematically tried to have the elections invalidated on the grounds that the Moroccan workers had no trade-union rights and therefore should not have voted.

## SOME HISTORY

All this aside from open strike-breaking, such as happened in the Casablanca harbor strike in 1952: in December 1952 the FO white-collar workers of the harbor (400 out of 5000) decided to go on strike. As they represented little

strength, their strike fell flat. So the leaders of FO asked the unorganized Moroccan workers of the port to join their strike, which the latter agreed to. By common agreement, a joint list of demands was drawn up (that is, a number of demands of the Moroccan workers were added to those of FO) and the strike became general. As the authorities refused to meet Moroccan delegates, the FO delegates were asked to conduct negotiations for both parties. Having obtained satisfaction for its own demands, FO then ordered its members to return to work, without further considering the demands of the unorganized Moroccan workers.

In the light of such facts, which are not exceptional, Bothereau's innuendo about the Moroccan trade-unionists being "undemocratic" appears as the crassest kind of cynicism.

The Moroccan trade-unionists were "formed in the ranks of the Communist-influenced CGT" because no other union would take them. They were able to assert themselves within the CGT only after bitter struggles with the Stalinist leadership. It is in the course of these struggles that they established their democratic traditions, just as the founders of the UGTT did when Tunisian labor was Stalinist-led, and as FO would have to do if it were compelled to stay in the CGT by government decree.

Fortunately the Moroccan workers can well afford to ignore Bothereau. He and his crowd are a problem that remains to be solved by the French working class, and in particular by the advanced elements of FO in France.

## SHACHTMAN TOUR

# Bay Area and Los Angeles Put Shachtman Thru Active Schedule

BERKELEY, Mar. 29 — Max Shachtman, ISL chairman, spoke at two public meetings in the Bay Area while here on his current national tour, and both were quite successful.

The first, held at the YMCA's Stiles Hall yesterday afternoon, was sponsored by the Student Civil Liberties Union. Comrade Shachtman spoke on "The Subversive List and Civil Liberties" to an interested audience of about 30. He cited the lack of any clear legal procedure for the ISL to get off the "list" since placed on it in 1947, and then detailed the extended areas in which the "list" has been used since its origin under the Truman regime for the ostensible purpose of regulating government employment.

He concluded that the "list" was one of the cornerstones of the current drive against civil liberties, and that it must be invalidated as the prelude to any real successes in the struggle for civil liberties of a fundamental nature. In this regard the ISL's many cases against the list — including Shachtman's current passport case — were of much greater general importance than their mere ISL internal significance. Shachtman concluded with an appeal to SCLU for financial aid, in line with its civil-libertarian purposes, when the ISL's cases reached the point where such aid would be called for.

In the opinion of several SCLU officers present at Shachtman's talk, this meeting and the audience response to it marked a high point in SCLU's meetings this semester. The *Daily Californian* reported the meeting fairly extensively, but unfortunately in a rather narrow vein that didn't capture the full flavor of Shachtman's many attacks on the list.

The second meeting at which Shachtman spoke was tonight at Finnish Brotherhood Hall on the subject of "Peace Through Co-Existence?" under the auspices of the Young Socialist League and the Independent Socialist League. Despite a rainy night, the incidence of mid-terms at Cal, and the hall's distance from campus, the meeting attracted a goodly and enthusiastic audience, both politically and financially.

Comrade Shachtman began with a discussion of the crucial importance of a united and independent Germany for the re-establishment of a viable Europe, and the opposition of both the U. S. and Russia to this aim. He made a detailed review of Russia's internal situation through various periods, disclosing how Russia both at home and in the satellites

has been in a perpetual crisis. He proceeded to show how the ideas of "peaceful coexistence" arise, and to analyze the foreign policies of both imperialist camps. He showed how a free election on Formosa would neutralize China's threat to the peace, while "unleashing" Chiang back to the U. S., following his "unleashing" from the Tachen Islands.

Following his presentation Shachtman answered audience questions on current ISL attitudes toward civil liberties for fascists, election policy, and independence for backward countries.

## In Los Angeles

LOS ANGELES, Apr. 3—The Southern California section of Max Shachtman's national tour has been showing fine results. A responsive audience of over 50 heard the ISL national chairman speak on "Europe and Coexistence" at the Case Hotel in downtown Los Angeles on March 25. The following evening a well-attended social affair took place.

In both cases one of the principal reasons for the excellent showing during Comrade Shachtman's visit has been the support and work of the Young Socialist League unit, plus the relations developed recently between the ISL branch and a group which has recently been expelled from the Socialist Workers Party. (A letter from this group, received too late for inclusion in this issue, will be published in *LABOR ACTION* next week.—Ed.)

Prior to Shachtman's arrival on tour, the ISL branch and this former-SWP group has arranged a series of joint discussions to talk over political differences. The first meeting in this series was devoted to the subject, "Is Russia a Workers' State?" The second of these talks was centered around the question of the role played by political-democratic criteria in making a Marxist evaluation of the Russian state. Comrade Shachtman was able to attend and participate in this discussion, and his contribution was one of the high points of his visit here.

The total effect of these discussions has been great upon all who attended. In too few places, too seldom, have real political differences been discussed at length in a democratic and friendly atmosphere. These discussions, the public meeting and the social created the basis for the series of informal meetings and discussions with Comrade Shachtman and the few days that he spent here were utilized to the full.

## ISL FUND DRIVE

# Strike a Blow For Socialism!

By L. G. SMITH

On April 5, after seven full weeks of the fund drive, we have raised \$6022.75. If we are to make the drive in full, this means that an additional \$4000 must be raised by May 1, in the next 25 days.

From all reports, the going has been rough. Friends of the ISL and *LABOR ACTION* who in the past have given generously and with little urging have shown a greater reluctance to contribute this year, or to contribute as much as in the past. Others, while making as big a relative sacrifice as in the past, have found their contributions decreased by a change in their circumstances.

The pressures of the reactionary drive in the country, while they have diminished in recent months, have left a political-psychological mark on some people which expresses itself in a reluctance to continue to support the cause of socialism in the same way they used to support it.

Such are the difficulties confronted by the comrades who have been collecting money for the drive. We want to make it clear that we in the National Office understand them. Since we stand between the members and friends who contribute and the creditors who must be paid, it may appear at times that we plead for and even demand money without too much understanding of how hard it is to raise it.

Every reader of *LABOR ACTION*, however, must also understand that unless we make this fund drive in full the weekly appearance of our paper will be in direct, imminent danger. That is why we are justified in applying the maximum pressure for the collection of every possible penny. That is why no one who understands the importance of the paper, particularly in these times of reaction, is justified in cutting down his contribution, however hard it may be for him to make it.

## OUR MIRACLE

The regular appearance of *LABOR ACTION* in these times is a continuing miracle. But as with all seeming miracles, it has a material base. It is made possible by the fact that the liberating ideas of socialism can command the loyalty and willingness to sacrifice of people whose consciousness has been illuminated by them, even in a country like ours where they are under the insidious pressures of a continuing war-based prosperity as well as under the direct attack of all sections of bourgeois opinion.

These pressures and this attack have failed to drown the voice of independent socialism in America. They cannot and will not be permitted to succeed now, at a moment when every politically sensitive person can detect the beginnings of a favorable shift in the political atmosphere. This can be asserted because we are confident that however tough the going may be, the members of the ISL, the new recruits to socialism of the YSL, and the readers of *LABOR ACTION* in general will come through.

Don't strain our confidence (and that of our creditors) to the utmost by waiting till the last day of the last week of the drive. Send in your contribution now. And make it bigger than you had planned.

## FUND DRIVE BOX SCORE

Branch	Quota	Paid	%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$10,050</b>	<b>\$6022.75</b>	<b>59.9</b>
St. Louis	25	56.25	221
Streator	25	25	100
Cleveland	150	125	83.3
Nat'l Office	1,500	1110	74
Chicago	2,000	1449	72.4
Reading	50	35	70
Pittsburgh	125	85	68
N. Y. City	3,800	2420.50	63.6
Detroit	200	115	57.5
Los Angeles	450	215	47.5
Philadelphia	250	114	45.6
Seattle	150	60	40
Akron	50	20	40
Bay Area	500	140	29
Newark	400	48	12
Buffalo	250	0	0
Indiana	75	0	0
Oregon	50	0	0

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

# LONDON LETTER **BLP Right Wing Forced to Retreat** **Bevan Beats Expulsion Drive**

By OWEN ROBERTS

LONDON, Mar. 24—At the moment Bevan still remains within the Labor Party—but only just. Yesterday the National Executive Committee of the party sat for over three hours considering the report which it had received from the Parliamentary Party on the withdrawal of the Whip from Bevan after the row in the House of Commons during the defense debate. The 28 members of the NEC had to decide whether to expel Bevan from the party entirely or to take no further action against him.

The eventual outcome was a temporary expedient which fails to resolve the issue one way or the other. By 14 votes to 13 the NEC decided to set up a special subcommittee which will interview Bevan "with a view to seeking assurances as to his future conduct as a member of the party." This special committee will then report back to the NEC on March 30, when the final decision will be made.

The subcommittee consists of eight members and its composition is extremely interesting.

It consists of Attlee, the leader of the Parliamentary Party; Edith Summerskill, who has been a prime mover against Bevan; Percy Knight, of the National Union of Seamen and the mover

of the resolution at the 1953 Party Conference which secured the back-door entry of Morrison to the NEC after his defeat in the party elections the previous year; Hugh Gaitskell, the brains behind the right wing and the man who defeated Bevan in the elections for party treasurer last year; James Griffiths, a middle-of-the-roader who has kept his mouth tightly shut for many years on internal party disputes; Jack Cooper, of the General and Municipal Workers' Union which has consistently opposed the left wing; James Haworth a member of the Transport Salaried Staff Association and an adherent of Moral Rearmament; plus the only Bevanite on the committee, Barbara Castle.

Thus Bevan will have to state his position before a committee which is largely composed of people whose mere names are sufficient to cause the blood pressure

of any left-winger to rise way beyond its normal level.

Exactly what assurances Bevan is expected to give are not specified by the NEC and it is precisely this point which is most important. It may well be that, in an endeavor to end the business without burning their fingers any further, the right wing will be content with a mere assurance from Bevan that he will not make an attack on the party leadership in the House of Commons at any time in the future—for the right wing are tending to channel the whole issue into one of personalities.

But on the other hand they may seek an assurance from Bevan that he will, in the future, remain rigidly upon the official party line and will refrain from advancing any policies which conflict with those of the right wing. For Bevan to give an undertaking of this character would be an entirely different matter and would represent a major victory for the right wing and a prelude to a general clamping down on left-wing opinion within the party.

## BEVANITES FIGHTING

Therefore a great deal depends upon the type of questions which Bevan is asked and, more important, the answers which he gives. Should he fail to take a firm stand on his right to advance alternative policies to the right wing it will mean that the Bevanites have weakened at the crucial moment and are prepared to do everything to retain Bevan within the party—even at the expense of creating a precedent which can be used against any member of the left wing on future occasions.

If the line taken in recent weeks by the Bevanite journal *Tribune* can be taken as a yardstick then it is to be expected that Bevan will stick firmly to his guns and insist upon the right of any and every party member—for that is what the issue now means—to advance left-wing ideas within the party.

In its issue of March 18, *Tribune* hit out at the right wing and insisted that the present conflict had nothing to do with personalities but rested upon policies. It said that the present situation was the "right-wing showdown," and placed this in thick black headlines for all to see at a glance. It said that the fight in the party was now on to achieve a socialist policy and that the revolt within the movement would be stronger than ever—the machinations of the right wing only serving as a spur to those socialists who believed that the British Labor movement could be the instrument for building a new society.

These are fine fighting words which the rank-and-file left wing is prepared to back up with deeds—and with hope that Nye Bevan is prepared to do likewise when he faces the inquisitors of the NEC next week.

## Text of Statement Submitted by Bevan

LONDON, Mar. 31—The Special Subcommittee of the Labor Party NEC which was named to meet with Aneurin Bevan interviewed the left-wing leader on March 29 "with a view to seeking assurances as to his future conduct as a member of the party." At this interview Bevan submitted the following statement:

"Throughout this controversy it has

EVERY WEEK—

**Young Socialist CHALLENGE** appears as a section in all regular issues of *Labor Action*.

Published, and independently edited, by the Young Socialist League,

it is the only socialist youth weekly in the country.

Don't miss it!

## Temperature of British Politics Due to Rise with Churchill Out

By OWEN ROBERTS

LONDON, Mar. 24—In an article to *LA* from London, datelined January 4, the prophecy was made that life in Britain would not be dull during the coming year. Events of the past week have amply justified that statement. For the past few days the British press and public have been discussing politics and practically ignoring all other subjects; a strange phenomena but one to be expected when there is every likelihood of the prime minister retiring, a general election being held, and one of the prominent members of the Labor Party under expulsion charges.

Rumors of an impending general election have been current for some months now, but during the past few days they have taken on a conformity which indicates that there has been a leakage of information from circles in the know. On Sunday practically every newspaper carried an identical story which forecasted two things—that Winston Churchill would shortly be resigning and that a general election would be held soon after.

The story has it that Churchill will announce his decision to relinquish his position as prime minister soon after April 4, this being the date on which it has been arranged that the Queen and the Duke of Edinburgh will have dinner at the official residence of the prime minister—10 Downing Street. It is expected that Anthony Eden, at present foreign secretary, will take over the reins as prime minister. Eden has always been tipped as Churchill's personal choice as successor and has for many years been Churchill's righthand man.

## ECONOMIC THREAT

In mid-April the Budget is to be presented to Parliament and, should Churchill have resigned prior to this, it is expected that shortly after the Parliamentary procedure in connection with the Budget has been carried out Eden will send the country to the polls, hoping to return a Tory government with a greatly increased majority.

Apart from any internal machinations which may be going on within the Tory

party at this moment there are other factors which seem to indicate that an early election would be to the advantage of the Tories. Recent months have seen the economic position of Britain in the sphere of world trade steadily worsening—which will ultimately have grave repercussions on the internal economy. The terms of trade, which have been the headache of all British governments since the war, have shown a definite tendency to be turning against the British economy. Should this tendency continue to develop the country will face a situation like that which it faced in 1951 and which caused Attlee to throw in the towel for the Labor government.

So far this situation is apparent only to those who follow economic affairs and, apart from the recent juggling with the bank rate and hire-purchase agreements, has created little impression upon the average man in the street. But the politicians are acutely aware of what may happen during the next few months.

This is made abundantly clear by an article which appeared on February 19, in the *Economist*, a weekly journal of the British capitalist class, when it discussed the matter in its leading article. After reviewing the economic aspects of the situation, the *Economist* then proceeded, for the benefit of the Tory party, to draw certain political conclusions.

## EXPECT ELECTION

It stated that the economy of the country has already deteriorated to a stage at which this Parliament should go out—that the Tories should force a general election before it deteriorates even further. Should this not be done, warned the *Economist*, the situation is likely to get worse until it reaches a point which makes defeat for the Tories almost a certainty.

By taking this advice the Tories will obviously save themselves a great deal of trouble and a corresponding amount of worry. Theoretically the present government could remain in office until October 1956, when its five-year term of office is up, but if to hang on for another year means increasing the risk of defeat then there is no doubt what the Tories will decide to do.

They are further influenced toward an early election by the present internal troubles of the Labor Party in connection with the exclusion of Bevan from the Parliamentary Labor Party and his threatened expulsion from the party altogether. This matter has not yet been finally settled and there is little question that the Tories are watching its outcome with as much interest as are the members of the Labor Party itself. To throw the Labor Party into an election campaign just at the moment when it is experiencing one of the biggest internal battles in its history would be an extremely good tactical move from the Tory point of view.

## CORRECTION

In last week's special pamphlet-issue on Yalta, a typographical error in one quotation inserted a "not" which of course changed the meaning of the passage. On page 8, first column, fifth paragraph beginning "After Yalta," the quotation from Leahy should read: "... I did think it was possible to give to a reorganized Polish government an external appearance of independence."

## Steelworkers' Ranks Pressing for New Demands on Bosses

By EMIL MODIC

PITTSBURGH, Apr. 2—Although national attention is on negotiations between the UAW and the auto makers, the United Steelworkers are also preparing to reopen wage talks with the steel industry. The present contract with the basic steel producers runs until next year, but can be reopened for wages only.

Nevertheless the negotiations this year will be of interest for several reasons. Whatever the Steelworkers get will be automatically compared with the gains in auto. Also, with an opposition candidate running against McDonald's candidate for the vacant vice-presidency of the union, McDonald will be under pressure to win as much as possible in the forthcoming negotiations.

In recent weeks, and especially at the Pennsylvania State CIO convention of several weeks ago, McDonald has given indications of a more militant outlook than has previously characterized his administration. Observers generally link this to the appearance of an opposition.

In addition, there is evidence of pressure from the ranks for solutions to the growing problems of the rank and file. Chief of these is layoffs, which have been especially heavy in the steel industry in the past period. It is not generally known, but automation in the steel industry has been extremely extensive in recent years, with the inevitable results for the labor force.

The thinking of the ranks on this problem is reflected by the recent action of the Homestead Local of U. S. Steel. That local, Local 1397, is proposing to the Wage Policy Committee of the union that the international demand a 32-hour week in the coming negotiations.

Technically, the demand probably cannot be brought up under the wage-reopener, but it will be interesting to see the response to the Local 1397 demand. If the demand is not actually made on the companies this year, it is almost certain to come up next year when the contract expires.

been stated that no differences of policy are involved. Even if there were there seem no good reason why they should not be resolved within the party, without personal recrimination and in a way that would leave the essential unity of the party unimpaired. In a great party such as ours there must always be argument about how to apply the principles of Socialism to a particular situation. The essence of democracy in a political party is to enable the argument to proceed while at the same time maintaining the effectiveness of the party in action. It is not always easy to achieve this, but we must always strive for it and I shall do my best to make it possible.

"The charge is that in what I have done and also in the way I have done it I have created difficulties for Mr. Attlee and caused him embarrassment in his position as the Leader of the Party. This was certainly never my intention. But if my action or speech could lend themselves to the interpretation that such was my motive, then I am sincerely sorry and I apologize to Mr. Attlee for any pain I may have caused him.

"I ask for nothing more than the opportunity to serve our party under his leadership. In doing so I claim no more privileges than, and accept all the obligations shared by, other members of the party."

## NEC BACKS DOWN

After discussion of the Special Subcommittee's report, on March 30, the National Executive Committee approved the following resolution:

"That the National Executive Committee, having considered the report of the Parliamentary Party on the withdrawal of the whip from Mr. Aneurin Bevan,

"(a) is satisfied that the decision of the Parliamentary Labor Party, to withdraw the Whip from Mr. Bevan was fully justified;

"(b) whilst noting the assurances given by Mr. Bevan in his statement to the Special Subcommittee of the Executive on 29 March 1955, warns that it will take drastic action against future violations of party discipline;

"(c) express the hope that all sections of the Movement will now unite in a determined endeavor to secure the return of a Labor government at the General Election."

## PRO AND CON: DISCUSSION

# Perspectives for the Khrushchev Regime

## Rudzienski Looks to Army Men's Take-Over

By A. RUDZIENSKI

The victory of the old Stalinist guard in Russia is very dubious and temporary. It is, of course, difficult to judge how long the Khrushchev faction will be able to remain in power, because of insufficient knowledge of the internal situation in the upper layer of the Russian bureaucracy. The victory of the "hard" Khrushchev over the "soft" Malenkov is an attempt to overcome the new difficulties and problems by means of the old Stalinist methods, the effort to suppress the new, spontaneous activity of the masses with old methods of pressure, exploitation and terror. But today the position of the ruling group is weaker than in the time of Stalin, not only because the masses are more active, but because the lower layers of the bureaucracy want more food, more clothes, more "butter" and more freedom for themselves. But since the Stalinist party has lost its authority over the masses, it will be very difficult to govern with the old methods of terror, as in the "good old days" of Stalin.

The program of the development of heavy industry at the cost of the masses will not arouse their enthusiasm, and the same is true of the program of new expansion in Asia. The days of enthusiastic faith in "building socialism in one country" are over. The Khrushchev faction's emphasis on the development of heavy industry could signify a policy of preparation for a war for the expansion of Soviet "socialism." But it knows that war would be a catastrophe for the bureaucratic regime in Russia. Thus the talk about the military power of the Soviets produces a policy of bluff because the bureaucracy fears violent changes in the world structure and prefers the status quo and a slow expansion, controlled by itself. Hence, the international policy of Khrushchev, and with it the main body of the internal program, is suspended in the air and can only end in bankruptcy.

The bureaucracy want coexistence with the "American imperialists," of course at a low price, especially after the defeats of Russian policy in France and Germany. After the treaty of Paris and its support by the Bonn parliament, panic prevailed in Moscow. The "hard" faction profited by it to finish off Malenkov, and now the Kremlin wants to make a "deal" directly with Washington and to establish a new relationship by a new "friendly" partitioning of the world. This is the aim of the invitation of American agricultural specialists to Russia, and to this end Molotov will eventually be sacrificed since he belongs to the "old guard" of the party, now hated by the widest masses in Russia.

### KREMLIN'S POLICY

An eventual understanding between Moscow and Washington could signify a new division of spheres of influence in Asia, but only at the expense of Great Britain. The ideological preparation for the deal consisted of the public statements by two intellectual servants of the Kremlin, the atom scientist Pontecorvo and the Russian Ilya Ehrenburg, both of whom violently denounced Churchill and Great Britain.

At a previous conference in Warsaw there had been talk about the neutralization of Germany and the eventual withdrawal of Soviet troops from East Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Hungary. Of course, this was a bluff directed against the Paris Agreement, but under favorable conditions it could constitute the price paid by the Kremlin for a renewal of "friendship." The Russians have great respect for the Germans, and an American-German pact can force the Kremlin into big concessions.

To be sure, the Kremlin cannot exercise absolute control over its Chinese ally, any more than it can over the nationalist movements in Asia. The Formosa problem, for example, is a powder-

keg which could explode against the will of both the Kremlin and the White House.

But in any case, the Kremlin's policy is at this moment in favor of the status quo, and is ready for concessions and direct dealing with Washington. This means that the entire program of the "hard" Khrushchev group is left hanging in mid-air, without any immediate fruit. Therefore it will be resisted by the people, because only in the case of an immediate war danger could the masses be capable of new sacrifices, obeying patriotic impulses.

If the Kremlin now offers Washington a new direct deal at the cost of Great Britain and its own ally China, the Russian people will understand the new policy of the Khrushchev group to be the old Stalinist demagoguery, which will require new sacrifices from the people. Therefore this policy will meet with even more resistance from the masses, the position of the new bosses will grow weaker and weaker, and the prestige of the party will sink. The liquidation of Molotov would be only the beginning of this process, which will end only with the downfall of Khrushchev himself and probably of the entire party regime.

### STALINIST TWILIGHT

We are getting nearer and nearer to the twilight of Stalinism first in Russia and then everywhere else, because the party no longer has anything to offer the masses other than new sacrifices and harder work, less bread and less clothes and less liberty, in exchange for the discredited phantom of "socialism in one country." Therefore the government of the party is obsolete in Russia, and it must be replaced by another political force: the only force which saved itself from the terror, the army; the only force which has not been compromised by the crimes of the regime but which shines with glory reflected from the Russian victories over Nazism in the saving of "mother Russia."

While the party government has nothing to offer the people, an army government can offer very much:

(1) To the bureaucracy—enrichment and a bourgeois living standard, with more civil guarantees and more liberties than now. The bureaucracy wants to use the class positions it has won and enjoy life.

(2) To the peasants—an army government can offer more privately owned land, more of a free market, more liberty and more chance for self-enrichment.

(3) To the workers—higher wages, less hard work, more bread, clothes and liberty.

All these concessions do not require any change in the base of the economic régime in Russia; they require only a change in the party régime, i.e., a new coup d'état in the Kremlin. To be sure, the party always has controlled the army and the army "marshals," but after Stalin's death the secret police does not have the same power it used to have, and the army's role was decisive in the downfall of Malenkov as of Beria because the army is the only political force in the country left after the extermination of all other political forces by Stalin.

The establishment of a new army régime would not necessarily signify a new war danger; on the contrary it could inaugurate a new period of coexistence and a new partition of influence at the cost of weaker partners. Economically and socially there would be a continuation of the same regime in Russia, but with a new political face, one that would be softer and more "liberal" (to use a word which is so inadequate to describe Russian relations). From the socialist's standpoint, an army régime in Russia would not signify a "capitalist restoration," because this restoration was brought about by Stalin—in the peculiar form of "state capitalism" or "bureaucratic capitalism" (or, if you wish, "bureaucratic collectivism" as a synonym of these terms). The new post-Khrushchev régime could realize the "soft" program of Malenkov and open the period of "armed peace."

This could also signify the emancipation of the working class from the "Russian spell," that is, the rebuilding of the independent working-class movement in the whole world and in Russia also, to open the way for a new evolution or revolution toward socialism.

All these phenomena permit the judgment that the days of Stalinism are over, and with it the days of the post-revolution counterrevolution in Russia.

## Comment: Illusions on Stalinist Liberalization

Judging by his letter in LA for March 7 as well as the last part of his discussion above, Comrade Rudzienski is looking forward to the replacement of the Stalinist party regime in Russia by a military dictatorship which would basically loosen up the present totalitarian structure, and permit greater liberty; and to this auspicious change he ascribes the consequences mentioned in his last paragraphs, namely, the rebuilding of world socialism.

Unfortunately we think this expectation (which, in various forms, has been common since the death of Stalin) is founded upon an illusion and can lead only to misinterpretation of what is going on in Russia.

Naturally this would have to be discussed at length if it is to be discussed adequately; but here we merely want to note the opinion and make a comment on Comrade Rudzienski's special mode of arriving at this popular conclusion. Otherwise, we refer reader to the type of analysis which was given by Comrade Stein's excellent "From Malenkov to Khrushchev" in LA for Feb. 21 (compare, for example, Rudzienski's remarks on the secret police).

### ARMY AND PARTY

As it looks to us, one of the main things wrong with Comrade Rudzienski's approach is his counterposition of the army to the Stalinist party as an independent political force within the Russian structure, in somewhat the same way as the army has often been able to act as an independent political force within capitalist societies; for he regards Russian Stalinism as a peculiar form of capitalist society.

But the institution which under Stalinism is called the "party" (not to be confused with anything of the same name outside of the Stalinist system) is not a mere excrescence on Stalinist society, to be excised by a coup d'état or palace revolution. It, or something which plays just its rôle, is fundamental to Stalinist society, which is not integrated by the laws of the capitalist market but has to be held together by other social means. In the totalitarian-"planned" society of Stalinism, the "party" is that institution which performs the rôle which under capitalism is classically performed by the "blind laws of the market."

Such at least is our approach since we analyze Stalinism as a new exploiting system which is different from and antagonistic to the old exploiting system of capitalism.

From this point of view there is plenty of room to discuss possible increased influence within the regime for the military, or greater dependence on military figures by the regime, etc., but none to counterpose the army to the party. If the Zhukovs were to take over the Moscow régime within the framework of the present system, that would merely signify the replacement of one set of party leaders by a new set of leaders who take over the party. The fact that the origin of this new set of party leaders may be in the military would be a very interesting fact, but it would not resemble Comrade Rudzienski's perspective in which a new political structure (a military dic-

tatorship more nearly resembling previous capitalist ones) would replace the present uniquely Stalinist political structure whose keystone is the institution of the party.

Now, has there been any indication whatsoever in Russia that the army is capable of being counterposed to the party, in the Rudzienski sense? None at all, in our opinion. What indication of this does Rudzienski cite? None that we can see.

He argues that the party has nothing more to offer the masses, and lists a program of liberalization and concessions which the army would offer. For others, like Deutscher, such a program is the one which they expect from a liberalized party leadership. At this point, Comrade Rudzienski's difference is that he rejects the possibility of any party leadership realizing this program; it must be the army.

### FROM THE TOP?

But why not the party, if it is a matter of life-and-death of the regime, as Rudzienski insists? In his present piece, he merely asserts this point, but in his March 7 letter, he answered: "this policy [is] very dangerous to the Stalinist régime, because it would end up with the collapse of party domination as well as revision in economic and international policy, the 'taboos' of Stalinism up to now."

But if the army put such a program through, will it also not end up with the collapse of their domination? Why, of course, Comrade Rudzienski argues; that is why he looks forward to it, and links it up with the revival of world socialism. Then...?

Certainly, in every authoritarian régime, a relaxation or lessening is dangerous, and may be fatal, because it stimulates revolution from below. This is a point which we have often made. But this is exactly one reason why the totalitarian political structure of Stalinism is fundamental to it, and not an excrescence which can be lopped off by army leaders without changing the system.

We would trace Comrade Rudzienski's difficulty back to his conception that Russia is capitalist, though a peculiar capitalism, and his further view that the retransformation of Russia back to a less peculiar capitalism by the army would therefore be no basic change... We suspect that it is therefore that he can start thinking about processes of basic "liberalization" and democratization in this régime from the top (the army in this case) while Deutscher dreams of it as coming from the top via the party itself. Rudzienski rejects the Deutscher version, but has no defense against it, for his own view seems to run right into the same stream.—Ed.

## Stresses Role of Revolutionary Workers

To the Editor:

The letter of A. Rudzienski in the March 7 issue of LABOR ACTION is an excellent example of the contradictions to which an impressionistic approach to an important social problem can lead. Some of Comrade Rudzienski's expressions are in fact quite meaningless. He speaks of the Russian nation as having been "annihilated" (and not only annihilated but also "exhausted, tired, disillusioned" to boot!) Not only does this apply to the victims, according to Rudzienski, but to the victors (i.e., the bureaucracy) as well. Comrade Rudzienski was apparently searching for the very harshest expression he could use, and came up with one so harsh that it has lost all meaning.

Quite unexpectedly, Rudzienski, mortal enemy of Stalinism, arrives at the identical political prognosis first put forth by Deutscher, the apologist for Stalinism. Both expect the self-reform of the bureaucratic régime. The theoretical basis for this belief is a purely mechanical "materialism": the material foundation on which Stalinist totalitarianism was built is eaten away—therefore Stalinist totalitarianism will automatically disappear.

Objective conditions do govern the rise and fall of social and political systems, but not automatically or smoothly. Otherwise history would be filled with peace and reform rather than with violence and revolution. There has never existed a social or political régime which voluntarily left the scene with the disappearance of its objective foundation; and there is no reason to suppose that the Stalinist régime will act differently. The Stalinist bureaucracy will have to be overthrown by a revolution.

Rudzienski, like Deutscher, fails to see the force that can overthrow the rule of the bureaucracy. "All possible enemies,"

(Continued on page 7)



# LABOR ACTION

April 11, 1955 Vol. 19, No. 15

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

Editor: HAL DRAPER

Associate Editors:

GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL

Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

## YOU'RE INVITED

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

# Young Socialist CHALLENGE

April 11, 1955

Published by the YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE

FIVE CENTS

**YSL FUND DRIVE**

## We're Ahead at This Post, but The Pace Has to Be Kept Up

By MAX MARTIN and DON HARRIS

**Fund Drive Directors**

The 1955 Fund Drive of the Young Socialist League got off to a good early start. Receipts of the first three weeks, the point at which this report is being written, place the League ahead of schedule.

As of this moment we have received a total of \$422, or 26.4 per cent of the \$1600 goal which the YSL has set itself. Had the receipts of these three weeks been on schedule, we would have had only \$345 or a little less than 22 per cent of the total at this point.

Needless to say, we are very gratified at the showing so far. At the same time, it is necessary to point out that any feeling of cockiness on the part of YSL members and friends is premature. The results of the first weeks of the drive show that the YSL is making serious efforts to fulfill and oversubscribe its quota, but there is still a long pull ahead. Continued intensity in these efforts is essential during the rest of the drive. Keeping it at this pace, and only keeping it at this pace, will enable the YSL to raise the \$1600 quota and, as we are certain can be done, to raise more than that.

In distributing the honors for the showing so far, we accord the heartiest accolades to the Los Angeles YSL. Our friends there have sent in close to two-thirds of their quota. The National Action Committee lowered the quota of the Los Angeles unit from \$150 to \$100, at its request. Because of local conditions, the comrades there felt that \$150 was beyond their circumstances. From the way Los Angeles is going, however, we are certain that they will not only surpass their quota but also the original quota of \$150.

The reduction of the Los Angeles quota does not involve a lowering of the total goal. On the contrary, the total has risen from the original quota of \$1550 recommended by the NAC. The reduction in one area was more than offset by the acceptance of a \$50 quota by our new Cleveland Area unit and by the increase in quota of \$50 which the New York unit adopted.

Both Chicago (which had also raised its own quota) and New York are doing quite well in the drive. Our friends in the Windy City write us that they are certain they will go above the \$400 pledged. New York will have a harder time of it, considering its large quota, but can certainly achieve its goal.

Pittsburgh, Berkeley and "At Large" are represented with payments during the first three weeks, although these are below what they should be at this point.

How about it, friends? You surely are not going to let Chicago and New York stay ahead of you?

Cleveland and Seattle have not yet sent any money in. We are sure that this situation will have been remedied by the time of the next Fund Drive report.

The "At Large" and N. O. category hasn't done too well so far. And that's where you, Challenge readers, come into the picture. We have to depend upon friends and sympathizers of the YSL and readers of the Young Socialist Challenge to help us exist. The appearance of Challenge depends upon our having the money for it. So why not send that check or money order today? Make checks payable to Max Martin and send them to YSL, 3rd Floor, 114 West 14 Street, New York City.

**WHAT'S THE SCORE ?**

	Quota	Paid In	%
Total .....	\$1600	\$422	26.4
Los Angeles .....	100	65	65.0
Chicago .....	400	142	35.6
New York .....	700	179	25.6
Pittsburgh .....	75	10	13.3
Berkeley .....	100	12	12.0
At Large & N.O. ....	150	14	9.3
Cleveland Area .....	50	0	0.0
Seattle .....	25	0	0.0

### BERKELEY YSL PRINTS ORWELL ON BURNHAM

The Berkeley Unit of the Young Socialist League has just published George Orwell's essay, "James Burnham and the Managerial Revolution" in pamphlet form. The Orwell piece, published in England in 1946 and generally unavailable since then, is an outstanding analysis of the ideas of Burnham. Orwell traces the development of Burnham's views and demonstrates the attraction which political power, no matter how reactionary or totalitarian, has for Burnham and other intellectuals of his type.

In an attractive format, and with an interesting foreword by James Robertson of the Berkeley YSL, this pamphlet sells for 15 cents. The first printing of the pamphlet has already been sold out and the unit is considering a second printing. Whether or not one is issued will depend upon the number of advance orders. Orders for individual copies and bundles should be sent to YSL, 3rd Floor, 114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y. The rates for bundles of 10 or more is 12 cents per copy.

### LETTER-BOX

To the Editor:

In order to clear up some confusion among friends and sympathizers of the Berkeley unit of the YSL, I would like to state publicly, and in heavy print, that the Berkeley unit of the YSL will defend the civil liberties of non-violent fascists. Apparently it was not clear that when we opposed the government's "juridical violence" against non-violent fascists, and when we denied our own justification in attacking non-violent fascists, that we were actually defending the civil liberties of non-violent fascists.

Yes, we do defend the civil liberties of non-violent fascists! We also are for strong political opposition to such groups, including picket lines and other means of calling attention to the dangerous symptomatic importance of such groups.

Jack WALKER  
for the Berkeley YSL

## A New Kind of Community Youth Group Forms in N.Y.

By PAULA LEVINE

NEW YORK, Mar. 30—A Community Brotherhood Conference was held on March 27 at the Lenox Hill Neighborhood Association. The conference brought together over 100 young adults representing youth agencies and young adult groups throughout the city—including B'nai B'rith, Senior League of the 92nd Street YWCA, Educational Alliance, Young Democrats, NAACP youth, and the Young Socialist League.

The composition of the conference broke down roughly into two major groups: those representing community-service organizations whose role is primarily social with a tradition of "service," and those whose role is either political or social action. Into the first category fall such organizations as B'nai B'rith and the Senior League of the YWCA; into the other come NAACP and the YSL. While all are oriented toward action in areas of discrimination, there is likely to be different views over establishing what such areas are, and more important on how to cope with them.

In addition, while all participants were concerned and well-meaning people, there was a grave lack of political insight among some. On the question of establishing a continuing council, for instance, there was no consideration given to the nature of member organizations other than an "interest" in the problems of discrimination. This obviously leaves the way open for any of a variety of Stalinist groups. Also, as is often the case with "service" organizations, there was no clear realization of the limitations imposed upon the organization both by its composition and its role in the community in relationship to already established anti-discriminatory groups.

### NEW COUNCIL

The conference was an outgrowth of the United States Assembly of Youth held in 1953. For more than a year, young people from this group have worked to establish a conference which would "discuss some of the problems of discrimination in housing, employment, education, recreational facilities and the problem of juvenile delinquency" as well as "to provide an opportunity for an exchange of ideas with a view toward coordinated effort on the part of these organizations in order to strengthen and publicize their existing programs."

These goals were met, both in the conference proper and in the later plenary session which gave birth to a new and continuing council. During the plenary session it was agreed that New York needed a "permanent city-wide coordinating body set up by participating organizations, which could serve as a means of exchanging ideas... and carrying out jointly the common interests of the organizations." Motions were initiated and a Young Adult Coordinating Council is in the making.

ated and a Young Adult Coordinating Council is in the making.

In such a setting, we might have expected a somewhat less than cordial attitude toward the YSL. On the contrary, YSLers were welcomed as participants to the conference as well as in the Continuing Council, which will meet again in three weeks.

There were several key ideas brought out both by speakers and in the panels sandwiched between the speakers.

(1) New York City and the youth of New York will, in the rapidly approaching future, have to deal with a new kind of population shift. As more and more middle-income families leave Manhattan for the suburbs, the island is becoming an example in extremes, containing industry, a limited number of high-income apartments, and massive slum areas—some already degenerated beyond the point of human habitation and others now being built in the form of low income, national-origin segregated projects.

### ARENA FOR WORK

(2) The "Puerto Rican problem," so much in the minds of New Yorkers, must be approached in the light of a revolution occurring around the world: the determination of the colored peoples of the world to control their own destinies as well as the need of the Spanish-speaking peoples of this country to share in the wealth and power of the nation and participate in its labor force without being discriminated against.

(3) Refusal to hire or the firing of individuals because of their political or social beliefs is a form of discrimination projecting blatantly from this city, known throughout the country for its progressive action in anti-discriminatory measures in other areas.

Of note also is the role played in the conference by the labor movement. Among the resource people on the employment panel was a member of the ILGWU. Similarly, the general membership, particularly representing such agencies as the Educational Alliance, contained many rank-and-file members of the same union, in addition to students and young professionals.

Thus, we have in this new Young Adult Council an arena of activity open to all who wish to deal democratically with the problems facing the New York community, in which we can act in conjunction with progressive segments of other groups toward a common goal—the end of discrimination against all groups.

### New York Symposium

#### PACIFISM AND SOCIALISM—ARE THEY COMPATIBLE?

Speakers:

- ROBERT GILMORE  
Amer. Friends Service Committee
- MICHAEL HARRINGTON  
Young Socialist League
- GORDON HASKELL  
Independent Socialist League
- BAYARD RUSTIN  
War Resisters League

FRIDAY EVE.—APR. 15—8:30

At Gilmore's,  
45 St. Marks Pl., N. Y. C.

Sponsored by the 4 organizations represented.

### Berkeley YSL Class

#### REVIEWS AND DISCUSSIONS OF OUTSTANDING SOCIALIST BOOKS

#### SUNDAY EVENINGS AT 6

- Apr. 3—George Orwell: Homage to Catalonia.
- Apr. 10—Joseph Scholmer: Vorkuta.
- Apr. 17—Lenin: The State and Revolution.
- Apr. 24—Trotsky: Stalinism and Bolshevism. Their Morals and Ours.

At Berkeley YSL headquarters  
Rm. 31, 2161 Shattuck Ave.

## POUJADE AS FASCIST PORTENT

# THE SHOPKEEPERS' REVOLT IN FRANCE

By A. GIACOMETTI

PARIS, Mar. 20—For some time now France has been the preserve of reactionary interests who have been preying on the national wealth, undisturbed by an effective independent labor movement and unhampered by intelligent concern for self-preservation which might have imposed limitations on their greed.

The fruitless attempt of the Mendès-France government to instill into these groups "responsible behavior," such as one finds in highly organized monopolies, only further provoked their fury. Their scavenging expeditions underline at the same time the decadence of the bourgeois state and the weakness of the labor movement.

The latest of such scavenging expeditions has the advantage of seeming to express legitimate grievances. It is the now famous "shopkeeper's revolt" led by Pierre Poujade.

As is known, the "mouvement Poujade" originated in the "underdeveloped" rural departments of central France, which also were the scenes of farmers' demonstrations in September 1953.

The center and southwest of France is a poor country and likely to become poorer. It has no mineral wealth. Its small industry and its agriculture are not adapted to the requirements of modern production and marketing. Technical progress does not bring wealth, as it does in more industrialized regions, but only ruins the artisan; modernization of retailing does not increase over-all sales but threatens the shopkeeper with bankruptcy.

Neither is this situation likely to change unless the whole economy of the region is reorganized. The population is declining rapidly as impoverished farmers move to the cities: the department of Lot, for instance, where Poujade's agitation began, had 240,000 inhabitants in 1900, 157,000 in 1938 and was down to 147,000 in 1953.

Under such circumstances, it has become very difficult for small shopkeepers to make a living. In order to do so, they have to resort to all kinds of makeshift expedients, such as cumulating businesses (the barber also sells newspapers, etc.); cultivating a plot of land; keeping rabbits or chickens; working 12-hour days and more; viciously exploiting themselves, their families and their hired help.

Their life is complicated even more by an extremely cumbersome and intricate taxation system, which includes 9 different taxes and favors big corporations over small business.

### AGITATOR

In 1953 the latent crisis of small business in the area became acute: the official promise of a price drop caused the customers to withhold their purchases. At the same time (August 1953) the tax administration of Lot notified about 50 businessmen in two small towns, Aynac and St. Céré, of impending control by taxation officials.

The city council of St. Céré asked its head, Pierre Poujade, to take care of the matter, which he did by organizing resistance and running the tax collectors out of town.

A few words are in order about the man. He is a bookseller and paperdealer in St. Céré. He is fortyish, heavy-set, good-looking, a successful public speaker in a slangy way, with a slight Southern accent. Before the war, he was a member of Doriot's fascist PPF. During the war he was active in the Resistance movement. After the war, he joined the Gaullist RPF and was elected to the St. Céré city council on a Radical ticket.

One tangible outcome of the St. Céré incident and of others that rapidly followed was the creation, first of the "St.

Céré Committee," then within a few weeks of the "Union de Défense des Commerçants et des Artisans" (UDCA).

The CP, which had become very interested in this movement of grassroots rebellion, supported it from the beginning and gave it a hand in setting up the organization.

Poujade became the president of the new organization. From the beginning he organized it on a dictatorial basis, choosing his aides on the basis of unconditional personal loyalty, disposing of the organization's funds in a high-handed and uncontrolled fashion, generally allowing no influence but his own to make itself felt, thereby greatly frustrating the Stalinists who still continue to support him.

### RAPID GROWTH

For a year or so, the movement remained confined to central France. Then, at the end of 1954 it began to spread rapidly to other departments, multiplying incidents, interfering with tax controls, frustrating tax auctions, molesting tax collectors. Whereas in June 1954 the organization was confined to 8 departments in central France, it was able to set up branches in 30 departments by October 1954, and in 72 out of France's 89 departments in February 1955.

This rapid spread shows that the problems of small business are not confined to central France. It shows even more that the movement is now being supported by more prosperous merchants and businessmen. These "new followers" have successfully evaded taxes for years and are in no way dependent on the UDCA to keep them in business, but they see in the concessions it may win a way to enlarge their profits.

Wherever the movement has spread to, it has organized a tax strike which has been largely successful. The strike affects a tax called the "tiers provisionnel," which is only one of the numerous taxes small businessmen have to pay. Nevertheless, in February the strike was 70 per cent effective in 5 departments, more than 50 per cent effective in 8 departments, and more than 30 per cent effective in 5 others. On a national scale, this has meant a decrease of 3-4 per cent in the total revenue of the state from taxes.

In its provincial meetings, the UDCA succeeds in attracting an audience of several thousand people (50-100,000 in Paris), a performance no other organization could hope to match at the present time. Its membership is being evaluated at between 400,000 and 800,000, all paying yearly dues of about \$3. Its weekly, *L'Union*, has a press-run of 600,000.

What is the movement's program? In the main, it demands: the abolition of the "Dorey amendment," which provides for legal sanctions against all those who interfere with tax controls; a total amnesty of offenses connected with taxation; the suppression of all tax controls until new taxation laws are passed; equal taxation of small business and "big business" (i.e., chain-stores, co-ops, self-service stores, etc.).

### POLITICAL THEMES

But these demands no longer constitute the main burden of the movement's propaganda. Since several weeks ago the themes of its agitation have been political.

It has been putting pressure on the parliamentarians, who have been placed before the alternative of satisfying its demands or not being re-elected. The importance of this sort of blackmail in a pre-election period can be measured by its success. The spectacle of the intimidated and cringing right-wing deputies in the fiscal debate of March 19, proposing and withdrawing motions at Poujade's beckoning, has probably undermined whatever faith some people still may have had in the parliamentary system.

In his numerous public speeches, Poujade has never failed to introduce vague political themes, usually directed against the Mendès-France government, often reviving the mythology of fascism. His speeches yield pearls such as these: "Our fathers, who drank wine, were able to win Verdun, and Mendès wasn't there . . ."; "Mr. Ulver, who has been dropped into the Ministry of Industry, is a one-generation Frenchman, and his parents were picking their fleas on the Danube . . ."

Who is responsible for the small businessman's plight? "The vultures." Who are the vultures? "The big bosses, the semi-big bosses and those around the big bosses." Also the foreigners and the naturalized, the civil servants "who paralyze the state," the intellectuals, the technicians, and the unions: "the labor bosses, who dine with the ministers . . ."

But "thanks to us, France has found herself for good, we are the last chance of the nation." What do we want? "Purity, clarity, sincerity and honesty." "All united, toward a radiant future . . . rebuild France among Frenchmen . . . pure, honest, loyal, faithful . . ."

### BIG BUSINESS ALLIES

While it has been spreading, the UDCA has met a number of organizations on its path. Most of these have either been depleted by it or have swung into line behind it. This has been the case for many other professional organizations of large and small businessmen, and for farmers' organizations such as Dorgerès' reactionary Syndicat Agricole de Défense Paysanne, which has linked recent farmers' demonstrations in the North to the general agitation of Poujade's followers.

The UDCA has also allied itself to the powerful alcohol and sugar-beet growers' lobby, which has forced the state to buy 25 million dollars' worth of excess alcohol production yearly, for which there is no use whatever besides poisoning the population of the African colonies.

On the parliamentary level, the UDCA has met ready endorsement by the Right (Independents, Peasants, Gaullists), ambiguity from Radicals and MRP, and hostility from the SP. The CP's position has been equivocal throughout.

After fully supporting the movement in its beginnings with the hope of turning it into a grass-roots "front," the CP soon found that Poujade's organizational methods were as totalitarian as its own, and that the UDCA was more difficult to infiltrate than had been assumed. Yet the CP has refused to oppose the movement, in the hope of capturing the mass of angry shopkeepers eventually. In its propaganda, the CP has adapted itself to the demagogical slogans of the movement: for the "little man" against the "big bosses," etc.

### LABOR HOSTILE

Reactions from the labor movement have been hesitant and late, but generally hostile. FO, CFTC and CGC (white collar and technicians' union) have come out against Poujade, and have raised strong protest with the government for allowing itself to be intimidated by the UDCA.

The attitude of the unions reflects resentment against the businessmen, small and large, who have been evading taxes for years while salaried workers are

taxed on their pay-check and have to pay taxes in full. It also reflects a defense reaction against a movement which shows all the hallmarks of potential fascism, and may become a battering ram for the Right. Finally, the unions are defending the tax collectors who are affiliated to them, and who are being made the scapegoats in a situation for which they are not responsible.

The secretary general of the CGC does not see "why there should be two categories of Frenchmen, one whose revenue is known, and another who can avail itself of special privileges."

Richard of FO put it this way: "If Parliament decided that a tax strike is sufficient to obtain satisfaction, the salaried workers may well follow this detestable example when the next installment of the 'tiers provisionnel' is due. We also asked the government to order the publication of tax rolls, as is done in the U. S. and in the Scandinavian countries. If no decision should come forth on the matter, we shall invite the tax-collectors' union to collectively violate professional secrecy."

He further proposed a boycott of all "Poujadist" enterprises by organized labor. The Federal Bureau of FO in turn denounced the "fascist conceptions of this movement, which uses an unfair taxation system as a pretext for spreading agitation throughout the country."

As to the CFTC, it expressed its "disgust with the spinelessness of certain parliamentarians" before the UDCA and considers a protest strike to "enforce fiscal equality between all categories of tax-payers."

The CGT's position has been more ambiguous, aligned as it is on the CP's policy. Avoiding a direct attack on the UDCA, it "understands perfectly that businessmen, artisans and industrialists should express their own dissatisfaction," but cannot admit "that this dissatisfaction should be channeled against the civil servants . . . the co-ops . . . and the advantages of social security to which the workers are attached."

### FASCIST POTENTIAL

Thus the line-up so far. Born out of the very real grievances of a doomed social category, the "mouvement Poujade" is rapidly becoming one more lobby for reactionary business interests. As such, it is bound to find its main enemy in the labor movement.

What distinguishes it from other lobbies is its authoritarian, "dynamic," mass-movement character. On the wider social level the UDCA may thus reconstitute the basis for a potential fascist movement which disappeared from French politics with the collapse of the RPF. On the electoral level, it may likewise reconstitute a grass-roots organization for the Right, especially in southern France where the right-wing parties have been generally weak and where the RPF, even at the height of its success, was unable to make significant inroads.

Whether it will go any further in influencing French politics than the RPF did, is difficult to foretell. The coming elections will be its first political test.

## SPOTLIGHT

Continued from page 1

easily found fact that few English politicians have turned their party coats inside out twice, as has Churchill, without any principled reason known to man, woman or beast in either the Liberal or Tory parties, each of which he quit once when convenient.

Churchill's stature as statesman is inextricably linked with the fierceness of his fanaticism as a loyal imperialist, dedicated to empire. No other man living represents so personally the last efforts of capitalism to keep its colonial domination fixed on the lesser peoples of the world; no other man living so personifies the crimes of imperialism and the well-merited hatred and suspicion of the colonial and ex-colonial world against Western capitalism.

For this very reason, no other man living so personifies the forces which have opened so much of the world to Stalinist demagogic infiltration; for the appeal of totalitarian Stalinism is not based on its own beauties but on its militant opposition to the status quo for which the Churchills stand.

The capitalist world is dying of Churchillism, rotting with it, gangrening in its outer limbs for the poison which still fills all its veins, and gutted within by the corrosion of the whole system. Please excuse us if we do not raise our hat to the retiring symbol of a whole civilization's dead-end.

PRO & CON DISCUSSION

Marxist Policy and Social-Patriotism

Stresses Role —

Support the Chinese Stalinists in War?

Comrade Shane's reply came in a good deal oversize; we decided, however, to print it as is, on request, in spite of our usual space restriction; but in two parts. The shorter part follows, dealing with war policy on China. The second part, next week, discusses the nature of "state capitalism" in Stalinist China.—Ed.

To the Editor:

In my letter to LA (Feb. 28), I put forward the position in a war whose stake was the offshore islands. The editorial reply characterized this view as "social-patriotic." It defended that characterization by this question: "When, and how, has he discovered the right of a revolutionary Marxist to support war by one capitalist power against another capitalist power, in this era of ours, in the context of an imperialist world struggle?"

It is unnecessary to recapitulate the long list of such wars (and wars by semi-feudal and even slaveholding regimes as well) that revolutionary Marxists have supported, including two last year (Guatemala and Costa Rica). It is sufficient to examine but one instance—the war of Chiang Kai-shek's China against Japanese imperialism, between 1937 and 1941.

Wasn't that a war of "one capitalist power against another"? (The semi-feudal character of the Chiang Kai-shek regime, against which Japanese imperialism was clearly "progressive" as the fate of Formosa attests, reinforces this point.) Didn't it take place "in this era of ours"? Wasn't it "in the context of an imperialist world struggle" (that between Anglo-American imperialism and German-Japanese imperialism)? In fact, hadn't the Chiang Kai-shek regime already been, for over ten years, an obedient servant of Anglo-American imperialism?

In view of these facts, one may be led to wonder "when and how" every revolutionary Marxist, including those now in the ISL, "discovered the right" to support that war.

The answer, of course, is found in the basic Leninist position on war in the imperialist epoch: that revolutionary socialists under no circumstances support imperialist war, but that they continue to support wars of national defense, provided that such wars are not component parts of larger imperialist wars.

The then Workers Party applied this position quite correctly when it switched from a "defensist" to a "defeatist" position on China's military struggle after Pearl Harbor. But today, in the case of China, the editors of LABOR ACTION have abandoned this Marxist position in favor of refusal to support a war of any capitalist power in the present era (which is already over 40 years old). What has changed between 1937 and the present? The Chinese revolution and the replacement of Japan by America as the aggressive imperialist threat to China—changes which make the defense of China more, not less, urgent.

The position of LABOR ACTION on the offshore-islands war, "no support to either side," is a completely abstract one as presented in the reply to my letter. To justify the refusal of revolutionary socialists to defend China against U. S. imperialism and its agent Chiang, it is necessary to demonstrate that the struggle of China is imperialist in nature. That can only be done by a concrete analysis of the actual war. Is China seeking as a war aim to dominate and exploit foreign countries and peoples? Is China acting as an instrument of an imperialist power? Unless at least one of these questions can be answered in the affirmative, the actual war that China is now carrying on cannot be considered to be imperialist.

The facts as to the real character of the war aims are therefore of prime im-

portance. On this point I need merely repeat the argument I advanced in my previous letter, which the editorial reply was unable even to attempt to contravene:

"These islands are indisputably Chinese territory; in the hands of Chiang they represent a base of military operations against the mainland and of naval blockade action against China's normal foreign trade. Their conquest by China would clearly be an act of defense alone."

As to the question whether China is an instrument of Russian imperialism, can there be any dispute? Today even the American capitalist press is forced to admit the fact of Chinese independence, to recognize the existence of a Chinese-Russian alliance.

Do these views constitute a "completely social-patriotic rationale," as the editorial reply claimed? "Social-patriotism" means to justify an imperialist war as a war of "national defense." To defend the victim of imperialist aggression by one's own government, when its struggle is in fact one of national defense, has far less in common with social-patriotism than does refusal to defend such a country. (Defense of China in no way implies cessation of struggle against the Mao regime. The main aspects of revolutionary socialist criticism of the Chinese Stalinists were indicated by the letter of Barnes, in LA Feb. 7, which began this discussion.)... SHANE

REPLY

ABC of Social-Patriotism

Comrade Shane is working deeper and deeper into the social-patriotic trap which he set for himself when he invented his theory about supporting war by a Stalinist China which is "capitalist."

(1) He spends the first half of his space breaking down an open door—deducing from the word "context" (instead of "component part") nothing less sensational than the news that "the editors of LABOR ACTION have abandoned" something and that they bethought themselves to announce this "abandonment" only in commenting on Shane's letter.

Nobody's abstractly proposing "refusal to support a war of any capitalist power in the present era," etc.

The real CONTEXT of the present war crisis over China is the imperialist antagonism between the capitalist and Stalinist war camps. War between Washington and Peiping would be indeed a "component part" of this larger imperialist-war framework, whose protagonists are primarily the U. S. and Russia.

SLIGHT OMISSION

(2) Does Shane understand this real context; or (to use the phraseology he prefers) does he understand what the Chinese issue is a "component part" of?

No. He writes revealingly: "What has changed between 1937 and the present? The Chinese revolution [this is what he calls the Stalinist victory] and the replacement of Japan by America as the aggressive imperialist threat to China—changes which make the defense of China more, not less, urgent."

Is that all that has changed? The only thing left out of this beautiful formulation of the world context is the fact that, since this "Chinese revolution" of his, this Stalinist China has become a "component part" of one of the rival imperialist war camps which face each other across the world! That's all....

PUPPETS AND ALLIES

(3) Maybe Shane doesn't think so? Unlikely.

True, China is not a puppet of Moscow (Shane says "instrument.") It is only in "alliance" with Moscow—only! Shane even italicizes alliance.... What can he be thinking of?

It is as an ally of Moscow (not as a puppet) that Peiping's role in the war crisis is a "component part" of the world struggle between the imperialist camps.

All Shane has to do is try out his social-patriotic methodology on the other side of the lines. France is no puppet of America; only in alliance with it as a "component part" of the Western capitalist war camp. Franco Spain is certainly no puppet, only in alliance as a "component part"....

In the very midst of war, England will be no puppet or mere "instrument" of American imperialism; and indeed there are anti-war socialists who play around

with conditions under which they will be willing to support this capitalist non-puppet in the context of the imperialist war, although not supporting the U. S. ... just as Shane is playing around with a theory about supporting the Chinese Stalinist partner in war but not the Russian partner.

MARXIST CRITERION

(4) But Shane's social-patriotic approach becomes spelled out when he rests his case on the proposition that since the offshore islands belong to China, we must support this "capitalist" China in any war which breaks out over them. He says "It's struggle is in fact one of national defense" (his italics) obviously because of the fact of ownership.

In case of war breaking out around the powderkeg of the offshore islands, what would the war be about "in fact"?

A Marxist (not a social-patriot) asks the question: What is the politics of which this war is the continuation? If "war is a continuation of politics by other means," from what politics does this particular war flow?

It is in answer to this question—and not in answer to the social-patriotic question posed by Shane—that we can decide whether the war is politically a war of "national defense" in a primary and decisive respect.

In case of war over the offshore islands, are the real war aims of either side decisively based on the secondary question of ownership of these islands?

Since there is no imbecile in the world who will answer yes, we need only point out the Marxist's conclusion (not the social-patriot's): The politics of which such a war is the continuation is the politics of the present-day struggle for the world between the capitalist war camp and the Stalinist war camp.

If it is politically correct to support the Stalinist war camp—e.g., like the "orthodox-Trotskyist" type of Stalinoid—then for a Marxist (not a social-patriot) it is necessary to support Peiping even if IT AND NOT THE U. S. is the formal "aggressor" at the start of the shooting.

But Shane has not pushed himself so far yet, because so far he gives a social-patriotic and not a pro-Stalinist motivation for supporting the Stalinists—just as most pro-West social-patriots give a social-patriotic and not a pro-capitalist motivation for supporting the Western imperialist camp.

CAUTION

(5) A caution against breaking more open doors: The fact of China's ownership of the offshore islands can be used very profitably to demonstrate the reactionary nature of American war policy; we do not propose to ignore this fact, and we don't. But when Shane draws social-patriotic conclusions from it, we have to teach the ABCs of socialist anti-war policy all over again.

WHIFF

(6) We wrote last time that when Shane gets around to dumping this new-spun social-patriotic monstrosity of his, he will have to invent a theory about how his Stalinist "capitalism" is "progressive" if he wants to persist in supporting Stalinism's wars....

Well, his teratological inventive powers are at work: we get a passing whiff of a theory, no doubt in the egg, according to which Japanese imperialism "was clearly 'progressive'" as against the semi-feudal Chiang regime. (If Japanese, why not Stalinist imperialism?) But it is only a whiff—the word "progressive" has saving quotes hedging it in—there is even a possible kernel of truth, albeit misapplied—and we would hate to provoke several pages on a brand-new theory about the progressiveness, or "progressiveness," of Japanese imperialism. Maybe we'd all better forget about it.—Ed.

(Continued from page 4)

he writes, "are annihilated and disarmed." He sees, therefore, only two alternatives: "[The bureaucracy] must give the masses more food, more clothing, more liberty, raising their standard of living, and increasing the production of goods and agricultural products"; or "we must wait for new internal tensions, new political crises, new coup d'états, up until the complete self-annihilation of the Stalinist party."

But the revolutionary force that will overthrow the bureaucracy does nevertheless exist. It has not only not been annihilated but it has grown tremendously in numbers and social weight since the rise of Stalinism. I refer, of course, to the industrial proletariat, which is just as revolutionary in Russia as it is in the capitalist world. Rudzienski obviously does not understand the significance of his own words when he writes that "Khrushchev & Co.... are encountering a hitherto unknown resistance from the masses, the powerful pressure of the masses against the party and the government." There is a serious struggle going on; why else do they need the slave-labor camps? And this struggle is already, as it inevitably must, developing organization and leadership. The bestial repressions play not only a negative but also a positive role in this process, as all past police regimes have learned. In the prisons and slave-labor camps the oppositionists find to their astonishment that they are not alone, that they are part of a nationwide struggle. Thrown together, they have begun to unite in several national organizations, one of which calls itself "Leninist Youth." Out of the struggle, which has already begun, will emerge the Marxist party that will overthrow the rule of the bureaucracy.

Both Rudzienski and Deutscher overlook the inevitable rise and victory of the revolutionary opposition to Stalinism. Stalinism can flourish only in industrial and cultural backwardness. Russian industry has made giant strides forward since the October revolution. This has been, it is true, at the expense of the standard of living of the masses. But the growth in industry has, as always, a profoundly progressive and revolutionary aspect; it carries with it the growth in numbers, power, organization and consciousness of the industrial proletariat, the most revolutionary class that has ever existed, the gravedigger of all oppressive regimes. In the advanced countries of the west industrialization and the creation of an industrial proletariat took place under the social regime of capitalism. Capitalism thus played a great revolutionary role. This could not have occurred in Russia if property had remained in private hands. For proof of this we have but to look at all the other backward areas of the world, which have remained backward under capitalism.

In defending the nationalized economy against the restoration of private property the Stalinist bureaucracy has played a progressive role (this is, of course, only one aspect of its total social role); it has defended the material conditions for the growth of its own gravedigger.

In my opinion the totalitarian rule of the bureaucracy cannot be reformed. It will be overthrown either by the revolutionary Russian proletariat or by the counter-revolutionary foreign bourgeoisie. In the first case the nationalized property will remain, cleansed of the totalitarian oppression. In the second case the oppression will remain and be intensified, "cleansed" of the nationalization of property.

S. R.

We'd like to point out that Comrade S. R.'s next-to-last paragraph can be considered merely ambiguous, but insofar as it suggests the notorious "orthodox-Trotskyist" workers' state theory of Stalinism it only gets in the way of a reply to Rudzienski. However, this is a different argument. ... —Ed.

There's No Angel Around

to finance LABOR ACTION. It has appeared every week since 1940 because it's been backed by the dime and dollars of independent socialists — AND YOUR SUBSCRIPTIONS.

A sub is only \$2 a year—Subscribe now!

Note: Jam-Up in the Mail Box

Because of last week's special pamphlet-issue on Yalta, and a couple of crowded issues before that, we are temporarily suffering from an overproduction on the "Readers Take the Floor" and Discussion sections. A number of letters received recently are still awaiting publication. We ask their writers' patience.—Ed.

THE FIGHT FOR SOCIALISM

by

Max Shachtman

A basic primer on the ideas of Independent Socialism!

\$1.00 Cloth \$2.00

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

# Formosa War Scare

(Continued from page 1)

conference with the Russian Stalinist rulers.

Until yesterday, the demand in the United States for such a conference was pretty much the stock-in-trade of the Stalinoid and neutralist groups. Today it has the endorsement of Senator George, and with the more or less enthusiastic support of the liberal Democrats.

What is hoped for from such a conference? Not an agreement on the unification of Germany: that is certain. It is openly hinted that what is ardently desired is some way of getting the Russians to put pressure on the Chinese to accept the status quo with regard to Formosa, at least for the time being.

No one has yet come out with a statement of what the United States should offer Russia, and eventually China, in return for the service of getting them off the hook.

## ALTERNATIVES

The State Department is obviously reluctant about a "quickie" Big Four conference "at the summit." They would prefer advance discussions in which it would be possible to get some idea of what the Russians would demand in exchange for their "peacemaking" services. After all, the last time Dulles conferred

with them in Berlin he was happy to get away with his shirt, and the Geneva Conference was even more disastrous for American policy.

The point is this: great power conferences can only have "fruitful" results when both sides have something to offer. As the Yalta experience demonstrates, when imperialist governments get together to make a deal, what they offer each other are slices of territory and millions of peoples who do not belong to them, but who do not have the power to defend themselves.

The alternatives for the American government are pretty clear. Either they must follow the logic of their policy in Asia as it is spelled out for them by Knowland, Carney and Radford, or they must continue to yield slices of territory and nations to the Stalinists either through a deal or through the kind of helpless inertia which seized the government during the Indochina crisis.

They have only these two alternatives because they are incapable of grasping the alternative of a democratic foreign policy, which would seize the initiative from the Stalinists by backing the national and social revolution in Asia.

## NEED INITIATIVE

But the American people are not bound by the imperialist considerations

which dictate policy to the government. The interests of the American people, unlike those of the capitalist class and its governmental representatives, are not in conflict with the democratic aspirations of the peoples of Asia. Quite the contrary. They have everything to gain and nothing to lose by supporting these aspirations to the full.

The first step must be an active campaign to expose and resist the Quemoy-Matsu-Formosa policy. Next comes the demand for free, democratic elections in Formosa, South Korea and Indochina to determine the desires of the peoples in those countries with regard to their form of government and national affiliation. Along with these steps must come a demand to end all support for reactionary governments in Asia, and to give economic and political support to the democratic forces in the area.

It would be futile to imagine that either of the major political parties in America is capable of formulating and carrying out such a program. The initiative must come from the labor movement and popular organizations which retain their independence from both parties. And eventually, unless we are to be dragged from one disaster to another, if a progressive issue is to be found from the dead end we have reached in Asia, such a movement will have to organize a political party of its own.

# ADA Takes Steps Forward

(Continued from page 1)

bered to stress that political power is not wielded through retreat from principle but through strength of political conviction. What this will mean in ADA practice is another matter, to be seen.

What could be described as the most dramatic portion of the convention was the floor fight on academic freedom. A large section of the delegates had fully discussed the questions of the Stalinists' fight to teach on a local level before the convention met. This demonstrated some real rank-and-file participation which has been sorely lacking in the past.

Following the recommendation to the plenary session of the same vague statement as last year, an amendment was introduced which clearly defined membership in a totalitarian organization as not grounds for automatic dismissal from a teaching position.

This amendment had gained the support of delegates previous to the floor fight, with differing degrees of emphasis on the question, but united to get ADA on record for a minimum democratic position on academic freedom. A long-winded debate, which was packed with platitudes on both sides, revealed that many delegates were loath to change because of fear of impairing respectability. The vote was so close that it was taken three times and the amendment was defeated by only 131-117.

While the advocates for a principled position on academic freedom were nominally defeated, we must regard this as a big gain as compared with last year, when such a position could not even be pushed to the floor for a vote. What is disturbing is the fact that ADA traditionally held an excellent academic freedom stand until a few years ago, and that it has slipped to the point where one must consider a close defeat on such a basic issue as a type of victory.

## A RETREAT

The remainder of the debate on civil liberties, though limited, was dominated by the section dealing with the sedition laws. In an effort to meet the demand of most delegates for a strong blast at the Communist Control Act, and to simultaneously remain in the eyes of the public as an organization of hard-hitting

anti-Stalinists, the plenary session was given a description of the Communist Party that represents a grave backward step for ADA.

For the first time in ADA's history the Communist Party and Stalinism in general are pictured as almost solely a "conspiracy" of sabotage and espionage without proper recognition of its real force as a political movement and ideology.

That ADA should include in its platform a strong statement opposing the evil totalitarian nature of Stalinism went without question, but by passing the conspiracy statement (by a vote of 2-1) ADA is capitulating to the McCarthy rationale of the witchhunt, and it has extremely dangerous overtones for liberals who must defend the rights of all political groups regardless of hate for their ideas. This analysis of the nature of Stalinism should have precluded any disagreement with the Humphrey Act outlawing the CP. Fortunately, ADA ceased to be logical and consistent at this point and did call for its repeal along with the Smith Act.

In the realm of foreign policy, the convention took a rather hard line against United States intervention in defense of the Quemoy and Matsu islands off the Chinese coast. As in the past, it criticized support of Chiang's corrupt rule on Formosa and his present ambitions of recapturing the Chinese mainland. This convention called for a UN trusteeship and an eventual plebiscite on Formosa.

The delegates failed to attempt at least to spell out in some concrete form a possible democratic solution for the Formosan people which could halt Stalinist imperialism on the one hand and Chiang's reactionary police control on the other. Much of such a failure is due to the liberal dilemma of talking self-determination while actually giving basic support to American imperialism, whether it be aid to Tito, Chiang, or masterminding SEATO.

## SHIFT IN EMPHASIS

The convention expressed a change of attitude on China's admission to the UN, which perhaps reflects something more than the academic question involved. ADA calls for eventual admission of China after the Formosan question has been settled. The change of attitude is marked by a shift in emphasis from a negative to a positive formulation, the single benefit being that the delegates took a step toward more clearly facing reality on this question.

Because of ADA's commitment to the European Defense Community—a commitment guided by its insistence on following the broad outlines of American foreign policy—it was no surprise to anyone present when the delegates reaffirmed their position on German rearmament with some misgivings. However, the doubts expressed had no connection with the reality of the real struggle in Europe, but represented with more emphasis than in previous years the fears of good liberals concerning the rise of neo-Nazi elements to power positions in Adenauer's coalition.

While such fears can be hailed as instinctively democratic sentiments on the parts of good liberals, it conveniently blacks out any attempt to justify the American position in Europe other than the Russian "menace." During the debate over the Paris Treaty, a sense of futility was evident in some speeches—"We've gone this far, we have no choice but to hope for the best." Unfortunately, the ADA can only see surface problems involved with German rearmament and is unable or refuses to dig into the implications of the United States' frantic and bullying methods to get the Paris Treaty ratified.

Two or three issues that never received any serious support by the delegates, but which had been discussed by local segments of ADA, and to a very limited extent on the floor, dealt with fairly recent aspects of United States imperialism and H-bomb rattling.

## CHAPTER PROPOSALS

It was gratifying to hear one of the chapters submit a resolution condemning U. S. intervention in Guatemala, particularly after the long and loud silence by the ADA leadership on this question. The lack of discussion on Guatemala and subsequent rejection of the resolution was based to a great extent on the Max Lerner thesis—the danger of Stalinist control was so imminent and horrendous to U. S. security that it was only the stupidity and bungling of Dulles which raised all sorts of embarrassing questions for U. S. prestige.

As to the H-bomb, one delegation proposed that ADA call on the president to announce that the United States would never be the first to use the H-bomb. Losing by about a 4-1 vote, it reflected a groping awareness by small but significant sections of ADA rank and file that the armaments race, in nuclear weapons especially, has such awesome implications that even an organization that supports the armaments race has to call for limitations on its Frankenstein monster.

Another resolution asking for immediate cessation of H-bomb tests while the government makes an open investigation into the dangers of fallout and other effects was drastically watered down to the point of calling for investigations but not stopping the tests.

While much of what ADA wrote into its platform constitutes repetition of old platitudes and insertion of new ones, the sense of the discussion on a local and national level presents some encouraging signs for the return of the liberal movement to a meaningful place in American politics.

To a very large extent, ADA has the responsibility along with organized labor to offer a clear positive democratic alternative in foreign policy and to wage a broad vigorous fight in defense of civil liberties at home. This year's convention showed a small but nevertheless real tendency of the rank and file in ADA to participate to a greater degree than in the past in making decisions that were, and in many cases still are, left to the leadership.

## The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Get Acquainted!

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

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

.....  
NAME (please print)  
.....  
ADDRESS  
.....  
CITY  
.....  
ZONE STATE

## HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE

## LABOR ACTION

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

- Please enter my subscription:
- 1 year at \$2.  New
  - 6 months at \$1.  Renewal
  - Payment enclosed.  Bill me.

.....  
NAME (please print)  
.....  
ADDRESS  
.....  
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.

19-15

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

RENEW NOW!