

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

What Policy for Labor in 1956?

... page 2

Ballots and Bullets in Mississippi

... page 3

A Solution for Indochina?

... page 5

Brazil: Army Threatens New Coup

... page 4

SEPTEMBER 5, 1955

FIVE CENTS

The Moroccan Struggle for Freedom

While French Repression Continues the People Fight for Self-Determination

By ANDRE GIACOMETTI

PARIS, Aug. 25—The recent outbursts of violence in Morocco and in Algeria, in particular the massacres of Oued-Zem, are events which are certain to have important political consequences in France and in North Africa. They are the very type of incident that the most reactionary wing of French colonialism has been waiting for to force the hand of the government; to officialize the war it has been waging in Algeria, and to extend it to Morocco.

They will be widely used to whip up collective hysteria and to support the claim of the repression-mongers that they are defending Western civilization against the onslaught of barbarism—already Oued-Zem has been called a "new Oradour," at a time when the French army is creating Oradours* by the dozens all over Algeria. Soustelle, the liberal governor of Algeria, has stated that "international opinion should know that Algeria is faced with an explosion of barbarism which threatens equally all its inhabitants and its future." Grandval, the liberal Resident-General in Morocco stated that "Oued-Zem entitles him to carry out the repression with the greatest energy." International support comes from the Portuguese press, which speaks of a "horrible manifestation of the lowest instincts," from Lord Beaverbrook's *Daily Express*, which cries that the "Moroccan rebels are no better than Mau-Mau" and should be mercilessly suppressed, and from the Democratic representative from New York, Emmanuel Celler, who recently stated that "if the Istiqlal took power, its first object would be to attack the air bases because it hates the United States."

[*Oradour was a small village in France which was wiped out, and its total population either killed or taken as hostages by the Nazi occupation troops as a reprisal against French partisan action during World War II.—Ed.]

Need Solidarity of Labor

A wholesale, bloody repression of the North African peoples is in the making, to be followed by a full-scale war that could set back the nationalist and working-class movement for years. At this crucial time, when the people of North Africa needs more than ever the solidarity of the international labor movement, and in particular of the American labor movement, it is necessary to recall the facts that have led to the present crisis and to analyze the social forces involved.

The present situation has a number of peculiar aspects. The most striking among them has been the total impotence of the Paris government, which has seemed condemned from the outset to carry out policies made by others. According to a document recently published by *L'Express*, Bidault himself initially opposed the deposition of the sultan Ben Youssef in 1953 but, put before the accomplished fact by the Generals Juin, Guillaume, etc., he endorsed the de-

INTRODUCTION

We are devoting a large portion of this week's LABOR ACTION to the crisis in Morocco. To our knowledge, André Giacometti's article is by far the most complete account of the struggle which has appeared in America so far, as well as of the background of French and North African social, political and economic relations which alone makes intelligible what has been going on.

As we go to press, dispatches from France indicate that after a bitter struggle in the French cabinet, an accord has been reached which has some resemblance to the proposals first submitted by Resident General Gilbert Grandval at the beginning of August (see Giacometti's article for details).

In order to appease colonialist sentiment, Grandval himself is to be replaced by General Pierre Georges Boyer de Latour, now Resident General in Tunisia. The French puppet, Sultan Sidi Mohammed ben Moulay Arafa is to be replaced by a process to be worked out by the Central Government Council of Morocco. Sultan Sidi Mohammed ben Youssef is to be transferred from his exile on Madagascar to France sometime in October. The formation of a representative Moroccan government is again postponed "pending further negotiations."

There is no way of knowing whether the compromise thus announced will get sufficient support from the aroused people of Morocco to prevent further large-scale fighting. Though it is reported that the right-wing ministers in the cabinet considered themselves "bludgeoned" into accepting this deal, there is little reason to believe that the colonialists have suffered a decisive defeat in French politics, and hence that it signalizes a period of reforms and concessions sweeping enough to satisfy the nationalist leaders.

position and all its consequences. More recently, the Resident-General Lacoste, a docile tool in the hands of the Casablanca politicians, refused to carry out his government's instructions enjoining him to proceed with reforms.

This governmental impotence has made it seem that events are being determined by a disastrous fatality rather than by the conscious intervention of governments or authorities, even when their consequences had been foreseen and predicted long in advance. However, the paralysis of the government becomes clear when it is realized that the North African situation is not only determined by the general

struggle of the Arab peoples against the French bourgeoisie, but also by a struggle of two factions within the French bourgeoisie, which was illustrated most dramatically by the assassination of Lemaigre-Dubreuil last June.

In North Africa, as in France, the French bourgeoisie has proved unable to develop a leadership representing its general interests. In France, its "executive committee" is paralyzed by the struggle between the liberal forces around Mendès-France and Mitterand, and the coalition of various reactionary interests whose spokesmen are people like René Mayer, Laniel, Martinaud-Déplat, and General Juin. The symbol and personification of the deadlock between these forces is Edgar Faure. From France, this struggle extends into North Africa, and prevents the elaboration of any coherent government policy. As the *Depêche du Midi* wrote on August 12, "the various Moroccan tendencies" differentiated themselves more sharply as they were finding support among the various French tendencies. The day there will be but one unanimous tendency in France, solution will become easier in Morocco." The deputy Schmittlein from Belfort, one of the most reactionary members of Parliament, put it even more clearly when he said: "It cannot be that the outcome of the rivalry between two financial groups should be the end of France!"

Racketeer on a Grand Scale

In France-Observateur, Claude Bourdet has given a detailed analysis of the antagonistic forces within the class that owns the country, in this case Morocco.

On the die-hard colonialist side there are the French and Moroccan supporters of the "colonialist lobby" in Paris, in particular His Excellency Si Thami el Glaoui, the pasha of Marrakesh. This man, whom Ansel Talbert of the *New York Herald Tribune* once called a "pro-Western Berber chief", is a racketeer on a grand scale, who has carved out an economic empire for himself by a combination of fraud and violence. A great deal has been written already about his unsavory past and his numerous rackets. It is only necessary to mention here his buying monopoly on green olives in the whole of southern Morocco and the state of virtual slavery of "his" peasants. Another of his rackets is prostitution and white slave traffic, which he monopolizes with a few associates. A report on this aspect of the Glaoui's activities has recently been made to the Movement for Colonial Freedom. It states in part:

"Enormous economic interests command the North African prostitution racket, and these interests are closely linked to very influential local politicians and to powerful native chiefs. The French government will be unable to act against prostitution in North Africa, nor to take action against the suppliers, as long as it supports the Glaoui. . .

(Continued on page 6)

LABOR'S SCOPE

Conflicting Statements Show Labor's Political Policy for '56 Still Uncertain

By BEN HALL

On July 20, the Department of Justice brought an indictment against the UAW for alleged violation of the Taft-Hartley Act, charging that the union used its radio programs to promote the candidacy of Democrats. This, claims the department, violates the law against union financial contributions to candidates for federal office. The UAW intends to meet the issue head on, maintaining that any curb on its right to present its views to the public is unconstitutional.

According to the New York Times, "The Justice Department is scarcely overconfident about winning its case." But even if it loses, as it probably will, its indictment is a clear proof that the drive against labor's political rights, a national danger, finds supporters in the very summits of the Republican Party, in the administration itself. This fact might not be very newsworthy but it brings to mind a curious "Report on Congress" by Walter Reuther, CIO president.

"The 84th Congress, to its credit, did not engage in the 'cold war' with the executive branch which President Eisenhower had predicted during the 1954 election campaign." In this offhand manner, Reuther endorses the political tactics of the conservative Democrats now in control of the party in Congress, whose basic line is to obliterate any distinction between them and Eisenhower. Reuther goes on to criticize the president, as Democratic leaders do not. Apparently he wants to express his resentment against Republicans without offending conservative Democrats. His report doesn't even bother to mention, much less criticize, the reactionary wing of the Democratic Party which once was never spared.

The indictment against the UAW prepared by the administration, raises a simple question: why not a bit of verbal "war" against the Eisenhower regime?

Elsewhere, the unions are not quite as diffident. Back in May, the Oil Workers wrote: "We see by the newspapers that Paul Butler, new chairman of the Democratic National Committee wants

to open the arms of the party to the return of Gov. Allan Shivers of Texas, the man who ratted on the party in 1952. . . . This is a mighty shabby way for Butler to treat the hundreds of thousands of loyal Democrats in Texas who fought hard for the national Democratic party in 1952. . . . This so-called harmony in top Democratic party circles is becoming unprincipled hypocrisy and is getting a shade too nauseating to swallow. It is something for organized labor to think about in considering 1956 endorsements."

IN SUPPORT OF FEPC

And in a statement in support of FEPC, the UAW Fair Employment Practices Committee said: "In the name of 'party unity' liberal Democrats did not raise the question of adopting new rules, including a new rule 22 on the opening day of the 84th Congress. Senator Herbert H. Lehman made a statement the following day, January 6, 1955, renewing his pledge to continue the fight for majority rule. On February 1, 1955, Senator Humphrey and other senators introduced a bundle of 8 bills with the hope and prayer, expressed by Humphrey, that one or two might be passed. But with the acceptance of Rule 22 for this session, it seemed likely that any Senate action on such bills would be by arrangement with the anti-civil rights Southern wing of the Democratic Party. This appears to amount to a veto (by threat of a filibuster) levelled in advance against FEPC that is difficult but not impossible to over-ride."

In Reuther's report, the submissive role of the liberal Democrats in the fight over rule 22 is glossed over as follows: "The civil rights record of the Congress is totally blank."

While the official Democrats continue to treat Eisenhower with diffidence and self-effacing respect, the CIO gets ready for the 1956 elections. Jack Kroll, Director of the CIO Political Action Committee, abandoned customary etiquette before the Woodworkers Union convention and spoke of plain facts. "The Eisenhower administration," he said, "is the most corrupt administration this

country has had since the Harding regime and—if it is allowed to continue in office—will result in the complete domination of our government by Wall Street."

On former Air Secretary Talbott: he "got kicked out because he got caught with his hand in the till. But for every Talbott that's kicked out there are today in Washington hundreds of corporation executives, acting in some governmental capacity, whose primary concern is with the profit side of their company's ledgers . . . these appointments are made by the president. He is the one who must bear the responsibility for them."

On the Salk vaccine fiasco: "President Eisenhower's secretary of not-too-much-Health, Education, and Welfare, was afraid that some private drug manufacturer would be offended if the government took steps to protect the health and welfare of the people. Under the leave-it-to-business doctrine of the Eisenhower administration the government did not take steps to insure an adequate supply; did not take steps to prevent black-marketing, did not even take the necessary steps to insure the purity of the vaccine. Who knows how many of the children now in iron lungs and hospital beds could have been spared if it had not been for the Salk vaccine mess. Even one is too many to be sacrificed on the altar of leave-it-to-business. But mostly it's a matter of money—a matter of millions."

Is this the prototype of CIO political speeches to come? Meanwhile, the official Democratic party in Congress continues to fling rose petals.

AFL Leaders Fear Unity?

Unnamed officials of AFL craft unions are reported to be very unhappy over prospects for merger with the CIO but they are reluctant to express opposition to the merger in public. What they are afraid of is expressed in a recent issue of *Union News*, published by the CIO Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers Union. An editorial on August 15, says:

of exceptional significance. The Smith Act and the precedents set under it are still the most vicious legal attack on civil liberties. Since under the Smith Act people can be convicted of "conspiracy to teach" their political views, regardless of whether or not the government can establish any imminent danger that they plan to act on them in an illegal fashion, the door is open to the broadest legal and administrative attack on civil liberties in the history of the country.

The long history of convictions under this act, starting with the leaders and militants of the Teamsters Union in Minneapolis and the Socialist Workers Party in 1941, and extending through several layers of the Stalinist leadership, and the fact that the Supreme Court has upheld the constitutionality of the Smith Act, gives little reason to hope that Donovan and his clients will prevail in this action. On the other hand, the changed political atmosphere in the country and the world could possibly lead to a reversal of the court. Stranger things than this have often happened in the annals of the law.

Even if, at the moment, it may be too much to expect the Supreme Court to reverse itself on the constitutionality of the Smith Act, it is entirely within the realm of possibility that the court may start demanding some kind of more rigorous proof by the government of personal participation in the "conspiracy" by individual defendants. This would at least begin to limit the scope of the dragnet the government has been spreading under the protection of the vicious Smith Act.

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.

"... a new responsibility will be placed on labor's shoulders. After the merger, the greater part of America's organized working people will be affiliated in a single brotherhood. Each international union, each local union, and to a certain extent each member therefore will be judged by the reputation of AFL and CIO as a whole. That means that it will be more than ever important and necessary that all segments of organized labor be kept clean, honest and progressive.

The very fact that labor will be more united, larger and stronger, means that organized labor is going to have to be even cleaner and more responsible than before. There must be no room in the AFL and CIO for racketeers, shakedown artists, professional dues collectors, fat-cats, goons or political racketeers like communists. The proposed constitution of AFL and CIO says just that, but it takes more than just words in a document to make a principle become a fact. It takes vigilance and action. . . . We serve notice to all the phonies—the sweetheart contract signers, the fat-cats, the goons, the commies, the shake-down artists—that we aren't going to get along with them worth a damn if they try to move into the merged AFL and CIO alongside us."

(Lumping communists together with racketeers is an evasion of the essentially political character of the fight against Stalinism. But the warning to racketeers is clear enough.—B.H.)

Is Congress' Mood Law?

A minority of the National Labor Relations Board has come up with a doctrine, so far not applied, that could open the door to union wrecking by whim and imagination. The case was a 3-2 decision in favor of the Teamsters Union.

An NLRB examiner found the Portland, Oregon, division of the Teamsters Union guilty of unfair labor practices. It appears, from facts that the Board majority does not seem to contest, that the union carried on an extreme campaign to prevent its own office employees from organizing into the AFL Office Employees Union. Union officials even tried to intimidate witnesses from testifying before the hearings. Unions should be the first to defend the right to organized; but no one can be as bitter as a union bureaucrat challenged by subordinates; he will often tolerate only defenseless flunkies on his office staff.

But the Board majority dismissed the complaint against the Teamsters Union under an NLRB rule against taking cases involving non-profit organizations. Although we learn a little more about the type of unionism practiced by the Teamsters officials, that is not the most significant aspect of the case.

The dissenting Board minority, which opposed dismissal of the charges, commented: "It is unrealistic, in any case, to believe that Congress which, animated by a desire to make the Wagner Act a two-way street, adopted an elaborate code of restrictions upon labor unions, could have intended to strike down in whole or in part the only limitations in the Wagner Act upon labor union conduct. Such a view not only takes language out of context but ignores the mood of Congress in passing the Taft-Hartley Act."

A minority would base its action on the "mood of Congress". An obliging NLRB, in this view, need only know that the mood of Congress was for anti-labor legislation; dozens of cases could be settled against unions out of hand. Congress need not be specific; it need not put into actual legal language provisions that would provoke or enrage labor. The same result could be achieved coldly by NLRB interpretation of its mood.

This might sound extreme. But such procedures are already tacitly accepted in one sphere of national life. The "mood" of Congress is anti-"subversive". And so, without the annoying necessity of waiting for laws, private and public officials act in a hundred ways to eliminate dissenters from jobs, from politics, from ordinary civil rights. It took the NLRB minority to put this idea into actual words.

These days, such a minority can easily become a majority.

Calif. Bar Ass'n Urges Lawyers Defend Stalinists

The State Bar of California declared yesterday that lawyers should not be reluctant to represent clients in cases involving charges of Communism or other unpopular causes.

At the same time, Augustin Donovan, prominent Oakland attorney and vice president of the State Bar, announced he was representing without compensation two men involved in such a case.

The one-two punch at lawyers who fear public disapproval was backed by an American Bar Association statement promising its support for any lawyer "against criticism or attack in connection with such representation."

Donovan's announcement said he was representing Al Richmond and Philip M. Connelly, two editors of the Daily People's World who were convicted in 1952 on Smith Act charges, in a petition before the U. S. Supreme Court.

His 26-page petition asked the high court to upset the conviction of the two men on the ground that neither the Constitution nor the Smith Act permits jailing of Communists or any other persons for "no more than taking part in lawful and peaceful aspects of an organization's activity."

"Petitioners were shown to be members of the Communist Party," the petition said. "This in itself cannot be a basis for criminal prosecution. . . ."

"No direct showing was made that petitioners ever advocated violence or agreed to organize others for the purpose of so advocating."

Donovan said his purpose in taking the case without fee was two-fold. First was his interest in implementing the State Bar's resolution. Second, was "the critical importance of the case itself to the preservation of the guarantees to be found in the First Amendment to the Constitution."

Of himself, Donovan said: "A product of the University of Santa Clara and the loved by many others."

Stanford Law School, and a member of a family with centuries of uninterrupted Catholic faith, my belief in the integrity of the principle announced in the State Bar resolution should be quite obvious.

"This case," he declared, "is of major magnitude to every American citizen whether he is conscious of it or not. There is only one American way of life and that always has been and must continue to be the constitutional way."

Attached to Donovan's statement was a biography listing his membership in a long list of legal, educational, religious and civic organizations.

The resolution passed by the State Bar's Board of Governors declared it was designed to "reaffirm a lawyer's right to undertake the defense of unpopular causes."

"The attention of the Board of Governors has been called to the fact that a number of lawyers who might otherwise be willing to accept representation of defendants in Smith Act or similarly unpopular causes, are declining . . . because of the fear of economic consequences and personal stigma," the board's statement said.

The board then approved a declaration of principles adopted by the Conference of State Bar Delegates which asserted the lawyer's right to defend any client without having to share the client's reputation.

San Francisco Chronicle
Aug. 13, 1955

The plea to lawyers to take as clients Stalinists and adherents of "other unpopular causes," is reminiscent of the plea in the Yugoslav press a couple of years ago to lawyers to "really defend" their clients regardless of the kind of charges lodged against them. Perhaps there has been a sufficient change in the political atmosphere so that Augustin Donovan's excellent example will be followed. Donovan's attack on the Smith Act is

ON THE JIM CROW FRONT Lynch Murder of Lamar Smith Brings Demand for Federal Action

BALLOTS AND BULLETS IN MISSISSIPPI VOTE

By SCOTT ARDEN

As if to prove that the lynch-murder of Rev. Lee (see LABOR ACTION of June 6) was not the work of an isolated fanatic, Mississippi's racists took another life last week.

Lamar Smith, a Negro, was shot down in broad daylight on the lawn of the Lincoln County Court House. A crowd of approximately fifty people watched while three white men openly committed the murder.

Smith's offense was that he believed Negroes should have the right to vote—and that he did something about this belief.

Taking advantage a local "absentee ballot" provision (instituted some years back for the convenience of rural white voters), Smith had been obtaining large numbers of the ballots for Negroes who wished to vote.

The "absentee" feature made it possible for such Negroes to vote without risking their lives at the pollings places. Unfortunately however, someone had to take the risk of publicly procuring the ballots, and Smith was the man who took that risk.

The motivation for the lynch-murder was clearly pointed up by the fact that it took place on August 16, only three days before the state Democratic primary, which in Mississippi, as in most Southern states, is the real election.

As in the death of Rev. Lee in Belzoni just a few months ago, the local sheriff,

Bob Case, found "nothing special" about the murder. Lincoln County District Attorney E. C. Barlow, however, surprised everyone up to the governor by deciding to raise a little hell. (The fact that his decision may have been based on personal political considerations is irrelevant.)

Barlow leveled charges of neglect of duty at Sheriff Case who reportedly just stood and watched one of the racist gunmen walk away from the scene of the killing "with blood all over him."

Barlow then blasted the governor, a man named White, for refusing to grant his request for state highway patrol aid in the investigation after Case stated that he was not able to turn up "a single wit-

ness" although at least 50 saw the murder.

He went on to announce that he has witnesses and that he believes that he can convict the murder trio who were finally arrested, due to his efforts.

The three were charged with murder by a lily-white coroner's jury and have been released under bail of \$20,000 each. The ability of the three, none of whom is particularly well off, to dig up a total of \$60,000 in a couple of hours raises an interesting side question . . . which perhaps only the local Citizens Council can answer.

The NAACP has urged the U. S. Department of Justice to investigate the case on civil rights grounds and more than 300 residents of the county signed a petition asking the governor for National Guard protection at the polls. Already, other Negroes have received anonymous letters informing them that if they vote they will be killed.

Though all indications are that the governor will veto the National Guard proposal, the Justice Department is, theoretically at least, already involved.

The Chicago Defender reports that the department announced last week that it was conducting a "preliminary investigation" into the gubernatorial election in Mississippi to see if there "was evidence" that state and local authorities had intimidated Negroes who tried to vote.

This announcement was in response to a letter from Congressman Charles

Diggs Jr., of Michigan. Diggs pointed to public and semi-public pronouncements by local officials the accuracy of which the Justice Department's lads can easily establish.

In Bolivar County, for example, voters in the all-Negro town of Mound Bayou were bluntly informed that their ballots would not be counted. In other areas various Democratic Party wheels were reported in the press to have openly ordered election officials to "turn over any Negro ballots" to them.

The Michigan congressman, in his appeal to Attorney General Brownell, stated that for "black American citizens in the state of Mississippi where no white man respects their rights" federal intervention is the only solution.

While we would have to qualify our agreement with Diggs on this, which we'll get to a little further on, we do agree that if Brownell really put some of his boys at work in the mud of Mississippi, they wouldn't have to dig very far.

Clear cases of violation of the 14th Amendment (guaranteeing the right to vote) are all the government needs, in theory, to step in. Brownell has such cases by the bucketful, sprinkled with the blood of at least two Negroes openly murdered for standing up for their democratic rights.

"EVIDENCE" NOT PROBLEM

The point, of course, is that "evidence" is not the real problem and never has been. Our difference with Diggs is that he seems to believe that a federal government based on either the Republican or Democratic Party can be relied on to intervene effectively in defense of the rights of minority group citizens.

You don't have to be a socialist to know that this is so much hog-wash. With the growth of Negro voting strength both parties have partially cleaned house but despite concessions and improvements both continue to sing the only song they know, "gradualism." And the new Negro leadership, whatever other mistakes it may make, is tone-deaf when it comes to this particular tune.

They know that the Republicans, hoping to make deeper inroads into the tight Democratic Party control of the South, aren't about to have one of their attorney generals make himself outstandingly unpopular in Dixie. They also know that the Democrats don't dare risk a split with the powerful Dixiecrat section of their party, and this fact is perhaps clearer now than at any time in the past.

The new Negro leadership is groping for a solution, and though it probably won't happen tomorrow they can find only one—a Labor Party. Only a party organized for and by the working men and women of America can form a government which could be counted on to consistently defend democratic rights and freedoms. And nowhere is the need for a Labor Party more pressing than in the South.

But to get back to Mississippi and the present government. The Justice Department has already fumbled the ball in its bungling of the Lee lynch-murder investigation. Brownell's boys have been "investigating" for several months now and despite their vaunted "efficiency" haven't managed to find a single Anglo-Saxon in the wood pile, to re-coin a phrase.

Even those who don't go along with us on the question of a Labor Party have to admit that on the basis of past and present performance a Justice Department based on either of the present major parties cannot be depended on when it comes to the job of defending civil rights.

Georgia Backs Water

The Georgia Board of Education has rescinded its ruling (which we reported last week) which would have meant discharge for any teacher in the state who has belonged to or supported the NAACP or any other organization favoring integration of the public schools.

The board's hasty retreat was made on the advice, the Afro-American reports, of Georgia's Attorney General Cook, who interestingly enough happens to be the person responsible for thinking up the ruling in the first place.

Cook's cold feet were not explained publicly but the militant response of Georgia's Negro citizens and the clear determination of the NAACP to drag the obviously unconstitutional ruling into court without delay were probably the major contributing factors.

INDIA

Crisis Wracks Praja Socialist Party

By G. K. H.

Although full details are still lacking, it has now become clear that a major struggle has broken out in the Praja Socialist Party of India, which is reaching split proportions.

The July 10 issue of *Janata*, official organ of the PSP, is full of items which, although they do not give a clear picture of the struggle, or of the issues and the size of the factions, reveal how intense and

far-reaching the fight has become.

The National Executive of the PSP has been compelled to suspend the Executive Committee for the province of Uttar Pradesh, and appoint a new one. The UP Executive's chairman, Gopal Narain Saxena, has been "suspended from primary membership" in the party for one year.

Resolutions from the Ajmere District and from the Bihar Executive Committee are printed endorsing

the National Executive's action in this matter. The former resolution calls on "Dr. Lohia to keep the promise of cooperation" with the rest of the leadership, while the latter states that "The Executive profoundly regrets the irresponsible and unfounded allegations calculated to spread confusion made by Dr. Lohia through speeches and press conferences during his recent tours in this State and elsewhere. The Executive requests the National Executive to take disciplinary action against Dr. Lohia without any further delay, in order to save the party and the Socialist movement in the country."

The reference here is to Dr. Rammanohar Lohia, the chairman of the PSP's foreign relations commission, and one of the top theoreticians and leaders of the party. Things have reached the point at which a Professor Rajaram Shastri, writing in the public organ of the party, can say that "Hitler never worried about facts. He called all those who differed with him Jews and is the technique adopted by Dr. Lohia. In fact, he is suffering from delusions of grandeur and persecution at the same time. This is always the case with one who thinks too much of himself, and is impelled by dictatorial cravings."

[We do not think that Professor Shastri really means that Lohia calls "all those who differ with him" Jews," but the fact that the editors permit this kind of thing to slip through illustrates the heat of the political atmosphere.—G. K. H.]

Of course, Comrade Lohia's faction does not have the same access to *Janata* for polemical purposes, and his adherents write in the most polite and round-about way.

Labor Action will seek to give its readers the full story of the struggle in the Indian PSP in the near future. This is one of the strongest socialist parties in Asia, and developments there are of the utmost importance and interest to socialists all over the world.

father had indoctrinated him with ideas or opinions about Communism.

If these reports are true, it appears that Branzovich defied attempts by the Air Force to get him to inform on his father's political views or activities. One must deduce that he insisted on the Air Force presenting charges against him rather than against his father as a basis for any action it might want to take. If this deduction is correct, Branzovich deserves credit for a courageous personal and political stand. His courage should be an example to others. Further, it gives the action of the Secretary of the Air Force in clearing him extraordinary importance.

Opportunity for Youth

Story in the *Times* says Russian students are very anxious to have pen pals abroad. Now's the time, kiddies, to get yourself a Soviet pen pal and start building your FBI dossier while you're still young.

Theodore Kagan
New York Post
August 15

Read the
NEW INTERNATIONAL
America's leading Marxist review

Branzovich Cleared by Air Force

One of the rash of cases of "guilt by parenthood" which have come up in the armed forces recently was resolved in favor of the "accused" when Secretary of the Air Force Donald A. Quarles cleared Airman 3/c Stephen Branzovich of charges that he was a security risk because his father was suspected of being a Stalinist.

The significance of this action by Quarles lies not only in the fact that, after personally reviewing the case he ordered Branzovich's re-instatement in the Reserve even before the latter had gone through with a hearing. The real point here is that this is one of the few recent cases which have received public attention in which it appears that the victim has not denied the political associations charged against his father, or the fact that he has "maintained a close continuing association with him."

According to press stories, at an interview on January 7, 1954 at Keesler Air Force Base, Miss., Branzovich refused to answer questions on whether he had ever attended any meetings with his father. Other refusals at the interview, according to the Air Force, were on whether his father was sympathetic to the Communist Party, whether his father outspokenly favored Communism, and whether his

BOLIVIA Paz Estenssoro Amnesties Falangists, Arrests Stalinists, POR Militants

New Danger from Below Menaces Regime

By JUAN REY

SANTIAGO, Aug. 20 — The Nationalist government of Paz Estenssoro has arrested several hundred fascist militants of the Falange Socialista Boliviana, accusing them of subversive activity.

After the political destruction of the old political parties, the Francoist Falange Socialista remained as the only opposition organization capable of fighting the government and making a "revolution" in the high Peruvian manner, i.e., a palace revolution. In this case it appears that the government did not fear a falangist "revolution" so much as the united front of all opposition parties signed in Santiago de Chile, according to which the Falange has obtained the support of the old "democratic" bourgeois parties.

DESTROY UNITED OPPOSITION

In order to destroy this united opposition front, the government has subjected the arrested falangists to physical and moral pressures, and obtained from them an "open letter" addressed to the leader of the Falange, Unzaga de la Vega, who lives in Rio de Janeiro. This letter demanded of him "a national pacification," collaboration with the Nationalist regime, and a common front with the government against the "Rosca" (the mine owners and their political adherents). The letter condemns the activity of Unzaga de la Vega and his "collaboration with the Rosca." It was preceded by another political declaration, by the "vice-leader" of the Falange, Gustavo Stumpf, who came back to Bolivia from Peru and was arrested, in which he and other "leaders" reject the "revolutionary pact" of the opposition in Santiago, announce their rupture with the opposition parties, and declare for collaboration with the government under the Nationalist banner.

After having signed these declarations, more than 300 "Falangists" were also released from prison and the government decreed an amnesty. In this way the Nationalist regime seeks to annihilate the oppositionist agreement of Santiago politically, and to destroy the rest of the opposition. Even if Gustavo Stumpf signed this capitulation under torture, as was certainly the case with his other friends, their declarations have brought about a broad demoralization among the adherents and militants of the Falange, and have isolated the bourgeois opposition even further from the masses.

On the other hand, the government has ordered the arrest of *Partida Obrera Revolucionaria* (Trotskyists) and Communist Party militants, accusing them of conspiracy. This is very significant: the liberation of the Francoist Falangists and the "united front" along with them, which is paralleled by the arrest of the left militants who are offering their support to the regime against the right.

This policy of Paz Estenssoro is due not only to the growing strength of the right, and the pressure of the State Department of the United States, but also corresponds to the potential danger of a new opposition from below. Because of the growing crisis, the galloping inflation and the fall of the real value of sal-

aries and wages, a spontaneous opposition among the middle class and the workers is growing; and any organized political force can be very dangerous in such a situation, specially if it has a leftist program.

Thus, despite the fact that the POR is incapable of independent action because of its support to the "National Revolution," and the CP is backing the government "against imperialism," the government fears the "danger from the left," because it would be easier for the left than for the destroyed rightist parties to express the spontaneous opposition of the masses.

But on its left flank, the government has at its disposal a better instrument than prisons. It controls the workers through the COB (the union federation) and the workers' organizations of the

MNR (government party). The ex-minister, and now the general secretary of the COB, Juan Lechin, backs the nationalist regime "from below" in order to "preserve the workers' conquests of the national revolution against the right." In spite of his differences with the right wing of the government, Lechin backs it firmly in its attack against the left, accusing the Stalinists of collaborating with the right in the hanging of Colonel Villarroel in 1946. Lechin is now organizing a "university revolution," the aim of which is to destroy the Stalinist influence in the universities. In Oruro, there is a University Council in which Lechin's "workers' and peasants' delegates" sit together with professors and student representatives.

In this way, Lechin, the "supreme leader" of the workers has been transformed into the strongest factor for

stagnation; the big stabilizer of the nationalist regime; the lightning-rod of the workers' opposition. Because the "left" is incapable of breaking this road-block, and freeing the workers from the nationalist influence, the political situation cannot develop to a higher stage, and the regime is searching for collaboration on the right. While Paz Estenssoro and Siles are freeing "Falangists" and arresting leftists, Lechin demands support to the government from the famished workers. Perhaps the State Department is right to give the little assistance of \$5,000,000 every three months to the government to preserve it from collapse, because this alms is saving the "national revolution" from death, and is also a prime factor in the political stagnation of the country.

This low price is proof of the misery of the "national revolution."

BRAZIL Stalinists Back Vargas' Party in Idecisive Pre-Election Situation as Army Threatens "Extra-Legal Solutions"

By J. R.

SANTIAGO, Aug. 20—The victory of Adhemar de Barros' party in the municipal elections in the State of San Paulo, and the taking over of the municipal administration by his adherent, Lino de Mattos, was a smashing defeat for Janio Quadros in his capacity as governor of the State, as well as for his policy of political passivity in the national electoral struggle. It was further a striking demonstration of the fragility of the "pro-Janist" movement, and of its decomposition. Janio's friends, Porfirio de Paz and Emilio Carlos, are now backing the candidacy of Juscelino Kubitschek for the presidency.

After his electoral victory in San Paulo, Adhemar de Barros, thus encouraged, presented his candidacy for the presidency of Brazil. If he should win the election, the situation of Janio Quadros as governor of San Paulo could become very difficult, as he had formerly defeated Adhemar in a campaign the chief slogan of which was "against the thieves."

AGAINST THE THIEVES

Thus Janio can no longer keep up the position of political abstention which he had assumed, so he has decided to resign the governorship temporarily, and join in the present political fight "against the thieves," that is, against Adhemar de Barros, as the latter's victory represents a danger to Janio's political career. He has now become head of the political campaign on behalf of General Juarez Tavora for the presidency. He has announced that Kubitschek and Barros will suffer a "disastrous" political defeat in the campaign.

But such an outcome of the elections is not nearly as certain as Janio proclaims it to be. Kubitschek is backed by the political camp formerly behind Vargas, and quite possibly by a majority of the voters. In any case, he has behind him two major parties, the PSD (Social democracy, founded by Dutra) and the PTB (Partido Trabalhista Brasileiro) founded by Vargas. On the other hand, Barros' PSP (Social Progressive Party) represents a part of the "populist" camp, namely the dregs of the Vargas camp.

The candidacy of General Juarez Tavora does not have the support of the worker and peasant masses, in spite of the support given it by the Socialist Party, because the majority of workers and peasants in Brazil voted for Vargas. The coalition of the PSB (Socialists), PDC (Christian Democrats), PL (Liberals) and UDN (Democratic Union) cannot guarantee Juarez a majority of the votes, because all of them are minority parties in Brazil.

BOURGEOIS CAMP

Even if the support of the UDN for Juarez signifies that he has the backing of an important block of voters, it could also be a danger for him, as the UDN is considered the stronghold of the right. Despite its social and "reformist" program, the adherence of the socialists has resulted only in the formation of a liberal bourgeois camp, and not one of the workers and peasants, or of a "populist left." The PSB (Socialists) is not a workers' party; it has no popularity among the masses, and cannot confer a socialist or populist character on the

coalition in the elections, not to speak of a socialist or "left" program.

Thus, the policy of the PSB has ended up in a united front with the rightist UDN. The "Janist" "movement of March" has been dissolved, and the popular "prophet" Janio Quadros is now scarcely more than an agitator for General Juarez Tavora, together with the rightist UDN.

The pre-electoral situation is so indecisive and uncertain, that the generals who were responsible for Vargas' overthrow in August of the past year have manifested their dissatisfaction with the development of the situation to the point that they have threatened "extra-legal solutions," if the "democratic forces" prove incapable of assuring the stability of the democratic regime. General Canrobert Pereira, who issued this warning, actually in the name of the Armed Forces, proclaimed the inevitability of the "extra-legal solution" in the event of an electoral victory by the pro-Getulist forces.

In this way the leaders of the "August movement" (overthrow of Vargas) have announced that they are firmly determined to defend the status quo, even if Kubitschek or Barros should win the elections.

Since Kubitschek counts on the finan-

cial support of the inflationist bourgeoisie, and, perhaps, with a majority of the Vargas voters (who were a majority of the electorate last time), political developments in this country may be maturing toward a serious internal crisis.

The Communist Party of Brazil is backing the candidacy of Kubitschek-Goulart, and is accusing General Juarez Tavora of fascism and pro-imperialism in spite of the fact that he deposed the hangman of the Stalinists, Getulio Vargas. This collaboration of Stalinism with Getulism in Brazil and Peronism in Argentina is significant. In Rio de Janeiro and Buenos Aires, as in Moscow, the Communist Party is the servant of totalitarian reaction, covered with a "Marxist" phraseology. On the other hand, the opportunist policy of the PSB (Socialists) has led it into the blind alley of collaboration with the right. The policy of revolutionary socialism, if it existed in Brazil, would be to present its own, third, socialist alternative under its own socialist banner.

But today the conscious working class forces will support the totalitarian Getulist camp under the leadership of the Stalinists, since the Socialist Party is in a block with the UDN.

Today no independent policy of the working class, or of revolutionary socialism exists in Brazil.

CHILE

Govt. Workers' Strike Spreads

The Chilean government faces a major crisis. This was made clear when the government ordered 5000 troops into Santiago, the capital, declared it an "emergency zone," and ordered an additional 10,000 soldiers to stand by to support the original detachment. The southern province of Concepcion was declared an "emergency zone" several days ago.

The government is confronted with a strike wave which embraces a number of government departments as well as sectors of industry. A strike of bank clerks on August 26 added the workers in the banks to the ranks of strikers already out in the government's Internal Revenue Section, Treasury, Controller's Bureau, and Customs and Port Authority. Similar movements have broken out, or threaten to break out in many industries, including shipping, transportation and the railroads.

Although the Central Federation of Workers Unions has not officially called out the strikers, the government accuses it of "encouraging" them. In a statement issued on August 27, the government declared that "illegal social conflict is affecting normal development of national activities, but measures

have been adopted to maintain order." Over 100 strike leaders had been arrested by that time, though the leaders of the Central Federation of Workers Unions were still at liberty. Clotario Blest, president of the Federation, declared that any move to arrest Federation leaders would immediately provoke a general strike throughout the country.

On August 29, according to the *New York Times*, "heavily armed police arrested about 1000 health and welfare strikers" in raids on strike meetings. The Central Labor Federation countered by calling for a "mobilization" of its 1,000,000 members in support of the demand for the immediate release of the strikers.

At a special session of the Chamber of Deputies, called by opponents of President Carlos Ibanez del Campo, Conservative supporters of the regime voted down a motion of censure. The Chamber voted, however, to protest to the Supreme Court against police refusal to allow deputies to talk to arrested strikers.



LABOR ACTION

September 5, 1955 Vol. 19, No. 36

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

Editor: HAL DRAPER

Associate Editors:

GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL

Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

Young Socialist CHALLENGE

September 5, 1955

Edited and Published by the YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE

FIVE CENTS

A Progressive Solution for Indochina?

By EDWARD HILL

Over a year ago the partition of Indochina was accomplished at Geneva. Since then, there have been sporadic reports from that country—of uprisings on the part of the police and the religious sects in the South, of the relations between the French and Viet Minh in the North—but little in the way of a detailed analysis of what has been going on. Joseph Buttinger, former leader of the Austrian Revolutionary Socialists, reported on his impressions in a special supplement to the *New Leader*, but by far and large the American press has ignored the Indochina situation or confined itself to a vague uneasiness about the elections which, according to the Geneva settlement, are to take place next year.

The Summer issue of the *Pacific Spectator* has broken this silence with a fairly long special supplement by Ellen J. Hammer, the author of *The Struggle for Indochina*. Although she does not discuss the popular uprisings of this year, Miss Hammer's piece is a fascinating document, both in terms of her analysis of how the Geneva accord came into existence and as to what has happened since. Her point of view would seem to be that of a pro-American liberal, yet her conclusions are cold comfort to American liberalism.

Miss Hammer begins her discussion of the events leading up to Geneva with this statement: "This was an awkward time for American policy-makers; they were forced to recognize the unpalatable fact that practically all of the assumptions underlying United States policy in Indochina were simply not true." These assumptions were: that the French were interested in the freedom of the Vietnamese people; that the Bao Dai regime had substantial popular support; that the French military position was growing stronger and stronger. All of these premises, according to Miss Hammer, were untrue. She writes, "The only freedom that most Vietnamese wanted was not from Communism, about which they knew little and understood less, but from France. . . ."

IMPOSSIBLE POSITION

As a result of this impossible position, it was inevitable that Geneva would recognize the fact of Viet Minh power. This it did through a partition of the country, theoretically for a limited period of time, with the guarantee of elections in 1956. Since then both the North and South have had a period of over a year to demonstrate the nature of their regimes. It is in her analysis of the facts of this development that Miss Hammer raises some of the interesting questions which have been absent from the American press.

JOIN THE YSL!

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

Send me more information about the Young Socialist League.

I want to join the YSL.

(NAME—PLEASE PRINT)

(ADDRESS)

(CITY)

(STATE)

(SCHOOL IF ANY)

First, there has been the development of the Viet Minh state in the North. The pattern which Miss Hammer describes is a familiar one: totalitarianization of political life, an attempt at industrialization, land reform but with a contradictory, though tentative, policy of collectivization. The structure which emerges is quite similar to that of Chinese Stalinism. Probably the most central problem which the Viet Minh has faced is agrarian, although it has also been faced with major difficulties in the area of industrial production.

The agrarian problem was neatly summarized by Nguyen Than Vinh, who was head of the Viet Minh economic and financial services in the South before Geneva. He wrote of land reform: "It leads to over-fragmentation of property and to a very definite decrease in output. However, we have been obliged to stick to it because our entire political action among the peasants is based upon the right of each to individual property. We would have risked losing their support had we stopped breaking up land holdings." Since Geneva, this contradiction has plagued the Viet Minh in the North.

At the same time, the Viet Minh faced the tremendous problem of attempting to develop the industrial plant of the North. At first, Ho Chi Minh tried to strike a deal with the French. Security, freedom from discrimination, and even profits, were promised to French capital. On the part of the French government, there was a certain willingness to accept these arguments. Jean Sainteny, who had negotiated with the Viet Minh in 1945 and 1946 and who has some popularity with them, was dispatched to discuss the question of French business in the North. In December, 1954, Sainteny signed an accord with the Viet Minh for the protection of French economic interests north of the seventeenth parallel.

OBJECTIONS RAISED

Objections were raised to this policy within the French camp. The military regarded it as highly dubious. The businessmen themselves were suspicious. As a result, French capital did not plunge in to negotiate individual agreements with the Viet Minh—a procedure set up under the Sainteny accord—and many businesses began to withdraw South or to make an outright sale to the Viet Minh. The biggest deal of the latter type was made by the big French coal-mining company, the Chorbonnages du Tonkin.

According to Miss Hammer, the Viet Minh have used totalitarian techniques in their attempts to solve both the agrarian and the industrial problem. She writes, "In Hanoi, for example, they set up a vast system of cells in which every one of the twelve members was made responsible for each of the eleven others. . . . The surveillance of every individual was linked with official encouragement of informers, and intensive political 'education' by means of constant political meetings and the highly organized press and radio which operated as an arm of the government." Moreover, Miss Hammer finds considerable evidence in the testimony of refugees that forced labor is extensively used by the Viet Minh on projects such as railroad building.

All of this has a familiar ring. The problems which the Viet Minh face are typical of many Asian countries; the solutions which it is putting forth are typical of Stalinism. The people who rallied to the Viet Minh in order to destroy the imperialism and exploitation of the French now finds themselves under the rule of native exploiters and of political totalitarianism.

It is rather in Miss Hammer's discussion of the Diem Government in the South that material unfamiliar to the readers of the American press is found. The entire section is entitled "Paralysis in the South." It is Miss Hammer's general thesis that Diem is a mandarin without popular support of the people, incapable of the primary task of forging national unity. True, Diem has to come to grips with contradictory forces, even anachronisms like the religious sects, yet, in Miss Hammer's view, he has not made even the first step in the direction of securing popular support for his government.

This is how Miss Hammer characterizes the basic problem which Diem faced: "The Vietnamese had to be rallied and inspired to the greatest effort they had made in their lives, to save themselves by working together . . . without unity, and the vision and courage of Vietnamese leaders necessary to achieve it, there would be no future for any non-Communist government in southern Vietnam." Unfortunately, Miss Hammer nowhere indicates what kind of a movement would be capable of leading the people toward unity—and what effect this would have on the relationships of the governments of the Western Camp to Vietnam. For clearly, the task which she demands be fulfilled before South Vietnam can survive is a revolutionary one.

What she does do is to demonstrate clearly and decisively how Diem has failed to even begin working toward a real solution of the problem. At the very outset, one encounters his Catholicism. He "turned openly to the Catholic minority in the south for the support which the Confucianist and Buddhist majority was slow to give. The public reacted bitterly to this sectarian policy." Miss Hammer then quotes extensively from Graham Greene, the Catholic writer, who made a similar analysis of this point in the *New Republic*.

NO SUPPORT AMONG PEOPLE

In addition to his Catholic orientation in the South, Diem further compromised himself by relying on Northern Catholic refugees for the creation of a militia. By doing this, he not only sharpened religious antagonisms, but regional antagonisms as well. Given this popular dissatisfaction with a leader who had little support among the people and who seemed bent on creating even more difficulties for himself, other elements in the country began to stir politically. "To the superficial observer," writes Miss Hammer, "it seemed to increase the impression of general anarchy. This, however, was something quite different, not a further evidence of disunity but rather the stirring of important sectors of the population. . . . They were disappointed and disturbed by the failure of the Diem government to rally the people around it, but they lacked an assembly and political parties, the right to hold meetings freely and to have a free press. . . ."

It was this feeling which resulted in various manifestations of discontent with the government. Unfortunately, Miss Hammer does not treat of the Revolutionary Committees which came into existence. (She had evidently written most of her report prior to those events.) In her one cryptic reference to them, she notes "One faction (of the anti-Diem movement), which favored making use of Diem before discarding him, was active in establishing a Revolutionary Committee which, though nominally declaring in support of Diem and demanding the deposition of Bao Dai . . . was actually a potential competitor with the Prime Minister for power. Trinh Minh The, the most dynamic member of the committee, was killed under mysterious

circumstances during the fighting in Saigon."

In this general situation, what has been the policy of the American government? In November, 1954, when General J. Lawton Collins arrived in Indochina as Special Envoy with the rank of Ambassador, he said, "I have come to Viet Nam to bring every possible aid to the government of Diem and to his government only. It is the legal government in Viet Nam, and the aid which the United States will lend it ought to permit the government to save the country." Miss Hammer comments on this, ". . . it gave to the Diem Government a blank check, bolstering the latter's already dangerous indifference to public opinion."

WHAT POLICY FOR U.S.?

But what policy could the American government, with its present aims and orientation, have taken? This, I think, is where Miss Hammer's analysis falls down. Committed as she is to the American camp in the cold war, no matter how critically, she does not develop the absolute necessity for an intransigent, anti-imperialist independence on the part of any successful Indochinese popular movement. Indeed, she nowhere indicates that she is aware that the "tasks" which she feels must be fulfilled are revolutionary in nature and require a revolutionary movement. Unfortunately we do not have her actual assessment of the revolutionary movement which did come into being.

Nevertheless, the article in the *Pacific Spectator* is extremely valuable to a socialist analysis of the situation in Indochina. For one thing, it indicates that the broad "national front" under which the Stalinists masqueraded is fast becoming a typical Stalinist "movement." No doubt precise information is lacking, but all of Miss Hammer's data and generalizations support that thesis that the Viet Minh is attempting to solve the very real problems which it faces with totalitarian, Stalinist methods.

On the other hand, the capitalist camp is faced with its inability to even find a government which will unify the South. The French negotiate with the Viet Minh to protect investments. The Americans support the Diem Government which has proved itself incapable of achieving popular support—and indeed must be incapable of this task as long as it is tied to America.

Between these two imperialist forces are the people of Viet Nam. They have given evidence already that they possess a revolutionary determination to achieve independence and political freedom. In the North, this sentiment was tragically channeled into the Viet Minh. In the South, as the appearance of the Revolutionary Committees indicate, perhaps there is, even now, still time. If there is, the movement which can make use of this time will be independent and opposed to both of the camps which seek to betray Indochina.

THE AIM OF THE YSL

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

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

—From the Constitution of the YSL

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

THE "DEFENDERS OF CIVILIZATION" IN MOROCCO

'Even if We Killed Thousands'—

The horror of North Africa is suggested in what an anonymous French official in Casablanca told a reporter: "In Algeria," he said, "we are at home. We can announce it when we destroy villages. Even if we killed thousands of Algerians that would be our business and none of the United Nations' business. In Morocco even if we did the same things—and mind you I am not saying we are—we could never admit it officially." Algeria is considered part of France while Morocco is a French protectorate. The screams of the dying can be heard well from both places.

Theodore Kagan
in the New York Post
August 24

(Continued from page 1)

"Specifically, the Glaoui takes a tax of 100 frs. (0.25) per day on each of the 6,000 prostitutes that live under his jurisdiction. Moreover, the Pasha is the cornerstone of an international association which exploits the de luxe brothel "Le Sphinx" in Fedala, of which he is the principal shareholder. The report goes on to say that a "true migration of the army of vice has occurred from Paris and Marseille to Algiers, Oran, Casablanca and Marrakesh. At the same time, white slave traffic through the Mediterranean has taken hitherto unequalled proportions."

This "industry" shows perhaps more clearly than any other single aspect the real nature of the "defenders of civilization" in Morocco. More important, however, as a source of power for the Glaoui and his friends, is his relation to the Omnium Nord-Africain, a powerful mining company, supported by the Bank of Paris, which acquired most of its concessions with the help of the Glaoui. According to Moroccan law (and to French law) the mineral resources of the country are automatically state property. In order to get hold of the mines, the Glaoui had to have a fictitious "Berber law" invented, which enabled him to force the Berber tribes of the region to concede the mining rights he then passed on to the Omnium in exchange for a participation of 20% of the shares.

The collaboration between the Omnium and its protector has continued ever since. In 1944, Jean Epinat, the founder of the Omnium, was saved from a long prison sentence as a collaborator only by the personal intervention of the Glaoui with de Gaulle. Since 1951, the Glaoui has supported the Omnium against the attempts of another large mining company, the Penarroya, to muscle in; that conflict was solved in 1953 by a compromise agreement between the two companies. The political consequences of the compromise were considerable: in the course of the struggle the Penarroya had enlisted the support of the Sharifian government, that is, of the sultan Ben Youssef; in exchange, Claude Bourdet suggests, it may be due to the support of the Penarroya that Ben Youssef had not been deposed as early as 1951. However, the agreement of the Penarroya with the Omnium seemed to indicate that the only big business group that supported the sultan was no longer interested in doing so, and opened the way for the deposition of the sultan in the summer of 1953.

Procurers and Assassins

This combination of business interests has naturally its representatives in the Administration authorities in Morocco and in Parliament in France. Corrupt politicians like Martinaud-Déplat, generals like Juin and Guillaumé, owe their careers to the coalition's support; large sections of the Independents, Radicals, Gaullists and MRP are paid by its money; the former chief of police in Morocco, Boniface, who continues to wield considerable power, is tied to these business interests, and the Mas newspaper chain supports its policies.

Not content with owning the country's administration, and in particular the police, the Glaoui and his friends imported a gang of

pimps and assassins, headed by one Jo Renucci, to keep the opposition in line. Jo Renucci has a history as a civil servant: in 1945 he was hired by the Marseille police to eliminate the deserters from the US Army who had organized a black market ring in the Marseille region and were competing too efficiently with the police-supported racketeers. Today Jo Renucci and his gang are the organizers of "counter-terrorism" in Morocco, with the help of other criminal elements, former and present fascists, policemen, unemployed officers, Indo-China veterans, etc.

Within the French bourgeoisie, this "classical" coalition of businessmen, politicians, and gangsters has met with opposition. Also supported by business interests, but far weaker than its reactionary counterpart, the liberal bourgeoisie has been led by men like Walter, the owner of Maroc-Presse, Clostermann, a Gaullist deputy, Reitzer, an industrialist, and Lemaigre-Dubreuil, former royalist, "enlighten-

THE ISTAQLAL PARTY SAYS:

THE SULTAN MUST BE FREE!

According to sources close to the Istaqlal party in New York, the removal of ben Arafa in no way satisfies their demands. They stand on the proposition that only a genuine Moroccan government can make a lasting settlement with the French, and that no such government can be formed without the approval of the legitimate sultan of the country, ben Youssef. They maintain, further, that the sultan's approval can only be given freely if he is in a position to confer with the political leaders of his country.

The Istaqlal leadership is willing to wait till October for the sultan's arrival in France, though they feel that this is a concession which may not be popular among their people. In the meantime, however, they will refuse to participate in any "government" cooked up by the French in Morocco.

The insistence of the nationalist leadership of Morocco on the sultan's authority is not based primarily on monarchist conceptions, though they affirm that the vast majority of the Moroccan people want a monarchical government at the present time. What the nationalist leaders insist upon is that the sultan represents the principle of Moroccan national independence; that his removal by the French was an illegal and arbitrary imperialist act; and that the question of the future form of Moroccan government whether it be republican or monarchist, is a matter for the Moroccans themselves to decide completely free of French interference.

ed colonialist" and former editor of Maroc-Presse. With the Moroccan nationalists of all shades, these men were the No. 1 target of Jo Renucci's "counter-terrorist" gangs. All of them have narrowly escaped attempts on their lives, without any kind of police investigation being made or any sanction being taken against the would-be killers. Only when Lemaigre-Dubreuil was finally shot down, on June 11, the Paris government reacted. The gang had gone too far.

The assassination of Lemaigre-Dubreuil closed a period of uneasy stagnation that had lasted since late 1954. Events were set once again in motion: for a while, the liberal bourgeoisie seemed to take the initiative, only to be bogged down, delayed and finally paralyzed by its reactionary allies in Parliament.

On June 20 Resident-General Lacoste was recalled and replaced by Grandval, a representative of "enlightened colonialism" or, as *Le Monde* put it, the "Resident-General of the last chance." With him, he brought vague promises, a "new style" à la Mendès-France, and the basic premises of the same reactionary policy that had been followed before: "(1) loyalty to our Moroccan friends (i.e., the Glaoui); (2) intangibility of the French presence in Morocco; (3) strengthening of Franco-Moroccan friendship." However, he also took limited action:

on July 12, sentences against 77 nationalist and trade-union leaders were lifted, and 9 top-level civil servants, known to be particularly linked to the colonialist extremists, were given the sack. Grandval rallied the support of the moderate nationalists. He was expected to replace the puppet sultan Ben Arafa by a Regency Council, and to prepare a solution on the Tunisian model.

Then, on July 14, a bomb exploded on a Casablanca square killing 6 Europeans and wounding 30. Minutes later well-organized lynching mobs of Europeans overran the European city, and practically kept it under control until July 16. The police refused to intervene, and Grandval managed to re-establish order only by calling in the Army and turning the city over to military rule. It is interesting to see who made up the demonstrating crowds. Hints were given to the press (and eagerly picked up by the *Herald Tribune*) that the mobs were composed in many cases of Spanish republican or Stalinist refugees. Nothing could be more grotesque. The organizers of the riots are well known: they are the same clique of gangsters and policemen which organized "counter-terrorist" activities. The bulk of the demonstrators, however, came from a popular district in Casablanca predominantly inhabited by poor Europeans. They were predominantly young people: the European lumpenproletariat of Casablanca, those elements that feel most directly threatened in their status by the social rise of the Moroccan working-class, the "poor white trash" of Morocco—at the same time fanatically racist, an easy prey for manipulation.

From the 14th to the 17th of July, the official statistics show 63 dead, 100 wounded, mostly Moroccans. The real figures are probably twice as high.

On July 20, Dr. Causse, a prominent leader of "counter-terrorist" circles was deported from Morocco, while Si Bekkai, an independent nationalist leader, returned from exile.

Myth of El Glaoui's Power

In the following days, Grandval undertook an information trip through the major cities in Morocco, and was met everywhere by demonstrations in favor of the deposed sultan Ben Youssef. On July 21, there were demonstrations in Marrakesh, the stronghold of the Glaoui, puncturing two myths at the same time: the one about the Glaoui's absolute power and the one about the "loyalty" of the Berber population. On July 25, there were demonstrations in Meknes, on July 31, there were again demonstrations and incidents in Marrakesh and in Moulay-Idriss.

A few observations are in order also concerning the Moroccan demonstrations. The striking fact about them, excepting a few isolated instances, is the discipline and restraint of the crowds, even in the face of provocation and utmost brutality from the police (like shooting into the crowd without warning). In Tunisia,

(Continued on page 7)

Forty to One for Oppressors

In Algeria—classed as part of Overseas France and ruled by a French Governor General—the French have outlawed Nationalist movements and suppressed them vigorously. Working underground, the Nationalists, over the past three years, have fashioned a crude army of liberation comprising about 2,500 men based in the Aures Mountains. To hold them down, France last spring detached a division from the NATO Command, raising its troop commitment in Algeria to over 100,000.

N. Y. Times, August 28

One hundred thousand soldiers with modern weapons to keep down a "crude army" of 2,500. That is a classic proportion when what is actually involved is the attempt to hold down a whole people which wants to be free of foreign rule.

AFTER AMPLE WARNING—THE STORM BREAKS

(Continued from page 6)

nothing had demonstrated better the strength and the popularity of the Neo-Destour Party than the efficiency of the party's organization in keeping public order on Bourguiba's return—for all intents and purposes it had taken the city of Tunis over from the French police and was doing its job more effectively. A similar demonstration of power occurred on a smaller scale during Grandval's visits, when order was kept by a "barely clandestine" order service, or when the crowd, which had demonstrated in the morning, marched in absolute silence in the afternoon, burying its dead.

This is only one aspect of the great restraint the nationalist parties have shown throughout. On July 22, for instance, one of the more traditionalist leaders of the Istiqlal Party, Allal el Fassi, spoke over Radio Cairo and said: "... the hopes raised by the nomination of Mr. Grandval should not be abandoned under the pressure of disorders." Partial reforms will be accepted, he said, "as long as they do not commit the future of the country."

Another significant fact about the demonstrations, which was noted by all witnesses, was the extremely high participation of youth and of women of all ages. The latter are doubly oppressed as Moroccans and as women, exploited under indescribable conditions, as in the sardine canning industry, humiliated as servants of racist European mistresses, sent by force into the Glaoui's brothels, always condemned to the hardest and dirtiest jobs. In his essay "Marrakech," written in 1939, George Orwell describes the old women he saw, "bent double like inverted capital L's," "accepting their status as beasts of burden," with "poor old earth-colored bodies, bodies reduced to bones and leathery skin, bent double under the crushing weight." These days are past. The daughters of these women are rebelling with a violence that comes as a surprise only to the most hide-bound, racist minds.

Nationalists Present Demands

On July 28, the nationalist parties (Istiqlal and Democratic Independence Party) presented their minimum demands to Grandval: (1) return of the former sultan Ben Youssef; (2) formation of a representative Moroccan government; (3) abolition of the protectorate treaty and its replacement with a treaty of alliance. At this point there could be no doubt in anybody's mind about the seriousness of the nationalists' demands, about the urgency of opening negotiations on this basis, and about the fact that such negotiations represented the last chance for peaceful settlement. Nothing could be done, in any event, toward a solution without first eliminating the puppet sultan Ben Arafa, tool and symbol of French colonialism and of the Glaoui's clique. This conclusion was so obvious, that it became the main burden of Grandval's proposals to the government, after he had completed his information junket in early August: Ben Arafa had to be replaced by a temporary Regency Council.

Yet this elementary preliminary measure was immediately defeated by the right-wing politicians in France. On August 8, Grandval was met in southern France by three ministers who asked him to "moderate" his proposals. On August 11, Grandval unsuccessfully defended his proposals before the government's "Coordination Committee on North Africa." The right-wing ministers, on whom the government is dependent for its majority, rejected Grandval's plan. Instead, the government empowered Grandval to "ask Ben Arafa to form a representative government." Caught between the risk of unleashing bloody disorders in Morocco and the risk of losing its majority in Parliament, Faure hesitated only an instant—and preserved his majority.

Yet, the government had received ample warning. On July 30, the president of the Moroccan Chamber of Agriculture in Casablanca emphatically warned the government against the "propaganda which seeks to mislead public opinion by saying that the people of the countryside do not carefully follow what occurs in the rest of Morocco, that they disapprove of their brothers in the cities, and that

Paris police seized all copies of today's Communist *Humanite* because of offenses "likely to damage the integrity of the national territory." Stories about what the French are doing to the Arabs in North Africa are assumed to constitute the damage.

New York Post, August 24

they are ready to rebel if the dynastic question is raised (i.e., if Ben Arafa is deposed). This is absolutely wrong and ridiculous, all the more since two thirds of the city population is composed of recent immigrants from the countryside."

Memorandum to Parliament

On August 11, a number of liberal French organizations in Morocco, among them the Socialist Party, submitted a detailed memorandum to the Parliament in Paris, asserting the imperative need to solve the dynastic question before going any further, warning of the radicalization of the Moroccan masses, "among whom anarchist tendencies are beginning to appear" in opposition with the nationalist parties, and pointing out that even the traditionally backward and tribal countryside was on the brink of rebellion. In conclusion, the memorandum stated: "Hesitation at this point would only increase the present agitation and might bring about, within the next days, disorders of catastrophic proportions, which would certainly have profound repercussions on French political life, and might force the government to look for much more radical solutions than the compromise formulas it is considering at the present time."

On August 12, four "caids" (leaders) of the Zaian berber tribes in southern Morocco sent a telegram to Edgar Faure and Grandval formally disapproving of the Glaoui's policies and stating in part: "Neither in the past, nor at the present time has the pasha of Marrakesh been recognized as the leader of all Berbers. These are part of a whole: the Moroccan people. To deny this evidence is to create new disillusion."

The U.S. Press Shows Its Imperialist Colors

After condemning the French for "gambling with the lives of their own people and of the native people in Morocco" and stating that after the clashes in Morocco "there is now little doubt that the French will finally offer the concessions they could have offered long ago," the *New York Times* (August 23) goes on to say that "the heart of the problem remains dynastic." It refers to the "evil machinations of the North African Liberation Committee" operating from Cairo, and accuses them of broadcasting "inflammatory propaganda to Tunisia, Algeria and Morocco."

[According to Istiqlal sources in New York, the "North African Liberation Committee" was formed in Cairo under the leadership of Abd El Krim some five years ago, but soon broke up due to differences between the old rebel leader and the representatives of the nationalist parties currently operating in Morocco, Algeria and Tunisia.]

Although the representatives of these movements in Cairo still confer and seek to coordinate their activities, their role is primarily a diplomatic one. The nationalist movement is not led "from abroad," but by leaders still active in North Africa.]

The *Times* editorial concludes: "The Algerian problem is quite different from the Moroccan. Algeria is an administrative part of Metropolitan France, but it is true that the Moslem people, who are in a vast majority, do not have equal political, economic and social rights with the French residents. To raise the level of the Algerian to the French standard is obviously a long-range problem and it is hard to see what the French can do now except to make it clear to the Moslems that this is the goal.

By August 15, only the most reactionary sections in the French population and their Paris supporters were left to support Ben Arafa and the Glaoui. But, on August 15, Grandval returned from Paris with the incredible mission to ask Ben Arafa to form a representative government. In his briefcase he carried a list of personalities the French government would like to see included in this government: they included nationalists, independents, conservatives, the Glaoui's friends.

Coming at this point, such proposals could only be considered as a provocation. The Istiqlal and the Democratic Independence Party immediately rejected the proposal and refused to participate in any government formed by Ben Arafa. The other personalities also refused one after the other; by August 18, Ben Arafa was left alone with a dwindling handful of supporters and with the Glaoui's friends. His counter-proposal to the French government was to create a government composed of his supporters alone. At the same time, a few all too docile caids asked the government to be notified if Ben Youssef is to be returned to the throne "in order to be able to sign the right petitions in time."

These were the last days before August 20, the day Ben Youssef was deposed in 1953. Perfectly conscious of the danger, the government had shipped troops to Morocco from Indochina, from Algeria, from France. The nationalist parties kept issuing appeals to the population to keep calm. Yet the storm broke loose, and broke loose where it was least expected: among the Berber tribes in the mountains.

The facts are known: elements from the Zaian and Ouled-Aissa tribes descended on several European settlements, in particular Oued-Zem, and brutally massacred 47 European men, women and children.

By a cruel irony, these are the very tribes about which official propaganda had maintained a fiction of "loyalty" ("they make good soldiers and servants"), of Berber particularism, of antagonism against the cities. These are also the tribes that traditionally provide the bulk of the Moroccan troops of the French army. For decades the colonial regime main-

(Turn to last page)

"Meanwhile, the first requisite is to restore order, which the French are doing. After the bloodletting of the week-end, both Morocco and Algeria should be reconciled to a period of relative peace. This will give France a chance—it may be a last chance—to find some acceptable solution."

This is typical imperialist colonialesque. The French are chided for going "too slow" with their reforms, with no mention of the fact that these "reforms," or more accurately, promises of reforms have only been wrung from them by the determined struggle of the peoples of North Africa.

Next, the "heart of the problem remains dynastic." True, the *Times* makes it clear that there is no longer much support of any kind in Morocco for the French puppet sultan. But this way of putting it obscures the fact that the "dynastic" struggle is simply the *form* taken of the demand for an end to French rule in Morocco.

Next, "Algeria is an administrative part of Metropolitan France." That makes it impossible for the French, as the *Times* sees it, to do anything about granting full democratic rights to the Algerians (including the right of self-determination) except to "make it clear to them" than it is the objective of French imperialism to "raise them to the French standard," whatever that may mean.

Let us try that one on for size in a couple of other situations. Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia, have been made "an administrative part of Russia." Hence... their claim to independence is null and void. Hitler once made Austria, Bohemia and Moravia "administrative parts of the Greater Ger-

(Turn to last page)

FACTORS FOR A "TUNISIAN POLICY" IN MOROCCO

(Continued from page 7)

tained them in a medieval state of obscurantist ignorance. No school system was developed among them, all organizing attempts of the nationalist parties were repressed with particular viciousness, their "patriarchal simplicity" and their "warrior-like qualities" were extolled when they fought the wars of French imperialism with the utmost savagery. All this is now coming home to roost. The "loyal Berber tribes" have turned against their masters, who are for the first time looking into the face of the medieval barbarism they did so much to perpetuate.

The political responsibilities for this outbreak have not yet been clearly established. The level of political consciousness is as low as can be expected among these tribes, and they are an easy prey for religious fanaticism or for provocation from the outside. However, there is no doubt that the nationalist movement is in no way involved—this is not even questioned by the colonialist circles. The nationalist parties had committed themselves to preventing any attempted violence on the 20th, and they succeeded wherever they were present. A few isolated incidents occurred in Casablanca. Yet, on the 21st, 30,000 people marched in complete silence in a funeral demonstration organized by the Istiqlal and the Democratic Independence Party. In the mountain regions of south-eastern Morocco, on the other hand, the nationalist cadres have long ago been decimated. A nationalist leader gave the following statement to a correspondent of *Le Monde*: "... In the mountains, we were conscious of being disarmed. We had said so before, and we stressed particularly the risks that were being run in the Oued-Zem and Khenifra regions, where our cadres had been decimated by the repression. How could we have maintained our contacts without them?"

Nevertheless these massacres, which are the fruit of a long policy of racism and exploitation, are going to be used as a pretext by the extremist colonialist wing for wholesale repres-

PACIFICATION IN MOROCCO

All the regions in which the recent fighting took place in Morocco and Algeria have been declared "insecurity zones" by the French, and are barred to all representatives of the press. There is a complete blackout of news from these areas. Only the imagination, backed by many years of experience with the methods of French colonialism, can fill in the full story of French "pacification" of these areas at the present time.

Officially, there are thirteen divisions, or 130-150 thousand French troops in Algeria and Morocco. The French government has called up an additional 50,000 reservists, most of whom will probably reach North Africa shortly. An additional 60,000 soldiers whose term of military service is about to expire have been notified that they will be retained in the army.

The French have used no Moroccan troops in the recent fighting and "pacification" actions. The Moroccan soldiers have been used solely to guard some sections after French troops have "cleaned them out."

The French have used units of the Foreign Legion in some of the hottest sectors. The Foreign Legion is now composed overwhelmingly of Germans. A large number of these got their training in dealing with "inferior peoples" in Hitler's SS divisions.

According to Moroccan sources, the stories which appeared in the American press to the effect that between ten and sixty thousand "armed rebels" of the Berber tribes had surrendered is a poor joke. What the French actually did was to round up the total populations of these tribes, among whom perhaps a few dozen old-fashioned hunting pieces could be found.

sion against the nationalist movement. The interests that stand behind the Glaoui, Juin, Boniface and the others are preparing to use the blind, unreasoning fear of the European population to "kill 50,000, like in Madagascar, so we'll have peace for ten years." In Algeria, they are already succeeding; a merciless, racist war of annihilation is under way against the Algerian population: according to the latest reports, 5000 "rebels" were killed in 48 hours, while ten days ago the maximum membership of the resistance movement was estimated at 3000.

Unbridgeable River of Blood

The aim of the colonialists is to silence their own liberal opposition by creating an unbridgeable river of blood between the European and the Arab population, to break the back of the nationalist movement in the process and, in the long run, to turn North Africa into a solid power base from which they could import a reactionary dictatorship into France. Their plan is favored by the fact that the nationalist movement, especially in Morocco, has just emerged from illegality and can ill afford an actual war. It lacks experienced cadres, especially in the more backward strata of the population, and could lose some influence to religious fanatics and to Stalinist elements.

Yet there are also factors which are likely to defeat the colonialist plan and to push the gov-

ernment toward applying a "Tunisian policy." One of them is the pressure of liberal and radical opinion internationally, particularly from the Asian and Arab peoples. The importance of strengthening this pressure in the days to come need not be stressed here. Another factor is that the government cannot either afford another large-scale colonial war. To wage such a war, it would have to mobilize large sections of the French population, and it would face serious resistance if it attempted to do so. Military operations over a period of time would also cause a massive exodus of the European population from North Africa, especially among the farmers; this would weaken the colonialist claims and disorganize the economy of the countries involved. Lastly, the nationalist movement is no longer what it was in 1945. Especially in Algeria, it is better organized, and it has assimilated the lessons of the French resistance movement and of the Indochinese war. It is supported by practically the entire population: the French army is going to have to face not an unorganized crowd, as in 1945, or rebellious tribesmen, but a revolutionary people in arms.

At this time, the outcome is still hanging in the balance. Much will depend on whether the French labor movement will realize in time what another colonial war would mean in social and political terms, and will initiate a general political struggle, joining its own demands to those of the North African nationalist organizations.

U.S. Press Shows Colors — —

(Continued from page 7)

man Reich." True, the Slavic inhabitants of the last two provinces did not enjoy the same "economic and social rights" with the residents of those areas who belonged to the "master race" (none of them had any political rights). We wonder what the *Times* had to say about that "administrative" arrangement.

The final paragraph, however, takes the cake. First, order must be restored, and the French, thank God, are doing it. "After the bloodletting of the weekend, both Morocco and Algeria should be reconciled to a period of relative peace..."

The Berbers, it would appear, should be satisfied after the massacres they performed in a number of French settlements. The French, we infer, should be content with the ten-for-one (or whatever the actual proportion may be) massacres they have perpetrated in retaliation. Just how the punitive expeditions of several French divisions plus the atrocities committed by the French-armed and protected gangsters are supposed to "reconcile" Morocco and Algeria to a period of relative peace, only the genteel imperialists of the *Times* can guess.

The editorial in the *Times* quoted above was followed by another one on August 30, hailing the proposals worked out by the French cabinet. The editorial concludes:

"New problems will be created, for Morocco is a backward and feudal nation, and the French residents have properties and rights and a civilizing mission in Morocco that cannot all be left to the uncertainties of Moroccan nationalism."

No comment needed.

The Liberal as Imperialist

Following right on the heels of the *Times* comes Max Lerner, columnist for the liberal *New York Post*. Since the editors of this paper have not yet seen fit to write an editorial on the Moroccan events, Lerner's column (August 28) must be taken as more or less representing their point of view.

After a brief but gruesome description of the massacre at Oued-Zem, Lerner writes:

"The savagery of it is like nothing else in the contemporary world except perhaps in the fighting between the Mau Mau and the British. The French reprisals, we may be sure, were ruthless. After that will come other Moroccan massacres, followed by other reprisals."

"American opinion leans pretty heavily toward the Moroccan side and against the French. . . . I have little sympathy with the easy baiting of the French. They have behaved stupidly, but their position in Morocco is little different from the British in Malaya. The only difference is that the French are slower than the British to learn the terrible lesson of colonial history. . . ."

"The French are learning too slowly and too late. But I wonder how much it would help world peace and humanity if the French really got out and if Morocco were left to the struggle between the moderate nationalist leaders and the fanatics who organized the episode at Oued Zem."

"I think the moral of the week-end massacres is that nationalism by itself is never so sacred as to justify sustained barbarism, and it is never enough. Once it is loosed it takes the greatest discipline to keep it from going berserk. The nationalist leaders of Morocco need

time to learn, and they need the practice of considerable self-government before they do. This is even truer of the more untamed tribesmen of Algeria.

"But if American leadership and opinion are to play a role, surely we should exert as much pressure to restrain the barbarism of the Moroccans and the Algerians as to build fires under the French."

There you have it. Americans should "exert as much pressure to restrain the barbarism of Moroccans and Algerians as to build fires under the French." That is the impartial liberal view, which looks above the bloody strife to the true interests of humanity. How is "American leadership and opinion" to "restrain the barbarism" of the Moroccan and Algerian struggle for independence against the French, whose only crime is not that they oppress these countries under the heel of colonial rule, but that they "behave stupidly" and "learn too little and too late?" Lerner gives us the key in the closing paragraph of his article. "Instead of committing ourselves to one side or the other our task is to support the more moderate Moroccan and Algerian nationalist leaders and the more liberal Frenchmen, and to put pressure on the fanatics in both camps."

Of course, there is a slight difficulty in this: the more as well as the less moderate Moroccan and Algerian nationalist leaders are mostly in jail or exile. No French government, of any hue, has proposed to give the nationalists what they want in Algeria and Morocco: autonomy leading to independence in the near future. Once Lerner has rejected this idea, as he appears to in his "I wonder how much it would help . . . if the French really got out . . ." paragraph, he is hardly likely to be considered "impartial" by even the most moderate fighters for Moroccan and Algerian independence.

It is all double-talk, and imperialist, white supremacist double-talk at that. The truth of the matter is simply this. The sands of French rule in North Africa are running out. As they run, they turn blood-red not because of some general French "stupidity," but because the colonialist section of the French capitalist class has too much power to make an "enlightened" liberation of North Africa possible. Of course, socialists are for the rise of enlightened socialist and democratic opinion in France to the point at which the imperialists could be crushed politically, and an amicable agreement between equals be reached with the nationalist leaders of the North African peoples on the termination of French rule in North Africa and the future relations between this area and France.

As André Giacometti points out at the end of his article, much will depend on the reaction of the French labor movement to the crisis in North Africa. If the French workers rise to their historic responsibilities, they should receive the full support of "American leadership and opinion," to use Lerner's phrase. But this would not be support for "more liberal Frenchmen," but American backing of Frenchmen who support the North African struggle for freedom.

In the meantime, French imperialism is reaping the fruit of the "barbarism" they have maintained and fostered among the Berber tribes, and the hatred it has earned for itself among the rest of the population. In the circumstances, there can be no doubt about where the sympathy and support of every socialist, and every consistent democrat should lie. That is with the demand of the nationalists of Algeria and Morocco for self-rule, for full democratic rights, and with the struggle the French have forced on them to win this demand.