

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

NOVEMBER 21, 1955

FIVE CENTS

WHY LABOR LOST IN OHIO

Behind the UAW's Defeat in the Referendum

... page 2

NORTH AFRICA'S TRAVAIL

THE SPLIT IN TUNISIAN NATIONALISM

... page 6

ROSA LUXEMBURG ON ALGERIA

... page 7

Gains Push Dems to Right

By PHILIP COBEN

In the November 8 elections, Democrats made considerable gains in local contests, encouraging them to believe that continuation of the trend will mean victory in the 1956 sweepstakes. From the looks of it, this is going to mean even stronger pressure within the party to continue presenting a conservative face to the people, in accordance with the Lyndon Johnson prescription.

The reasoning would seem to be as follows: Here we Democrats have refused to make any meaningful fight in our party-controlled Congress for any concessions to the labor-liberal left, such as it is, and it hasn't done us any harm, has it? Those people will vote for us, no matter what, because they haven't anybody else to vote for. They're in our pocket. The problem is how to convince the conservative-minded bulk of the voters that there really isn't much difference between us and the Republicans. ...

"Among the Democrats, spokesmen for the liberal wing now are counseling their colleagues to exhibit more, rather than less, harmony with the centrist, or moderate, Democratic Senate leadership. Whether this effort will be effective remains to be seen." (Times, W. S. White, Nov. 12.)

"Centrist," in current Democratic doublespeak, means a Texas-type right-winger, i.e., someone who is in the middle-of-the-road between a Governor Shivers and a Senator Humphrey.

On the other hand, shift your perspective a bit and both of these latter are middle-of-the-roaders too. Shivers is in the middle of the road between Lyndon Johnson and Knowland; and, balancing him on the other side, Humphrey is in the middle of the road between Johnson and the ADA. This system of transmission belts sketches out the present structure of the Democratic Party.

The role of Senator Hubert Humphrey as a transmission belt is well, if unwittingly, described by Southern newspaperman Robert Riggs in a sycophantic article on the man in the current *New Republic*, "A Man with Southern Connections." His point, with value signs reversed, is essentially the one we made about Adlai Stevenson's role in LA for Oct. 24. In fact, the idea is also to boost Humphrey as Stevenson's running mate on the ground that he plays the same part: "third man" between the reactionaries who run the party and the liberals who like to vote for it.

Humphrey, according to this glowing account, is "the man from whom Lyndon Johnson seeks guidance on liberal issues." (Is that how Johnson has been so successful in keeping the Democratic liberals in line?) Humphrey is "the man about whom Walter George speaks so warmly." This Humphrey "has not retreated one inch from the liberal side while establishing a beachhead among the Southern conservatives." (Is that

(Continued on page 4)

Geneva Flop Leaves State Dep't Groping For a New Policy

By GORDON HASKELL

The Geneva conference of the foreign ministers has gone into history as a failure. Although nothing was agreed upon at this conference, as at many another deadlocked and futile conference down through the years of the cold war, the failure of this one had something special about it.

For this was supposed to be the "acid test" of the "Geneva spirit"—the time for words to be transformed into deeds; the occasion for realistic and tough-minded bargaining among the representatives of great powers which have decided to live together in peace, and need only work out the practical details to make that possible.

As we go to press, it appears that the conference has been completely and hopelessly deadlocked to the point that even the relatively minor matters of international cultural exchanges have been found utterly non-negotiable.

The determination of John Foster Dulles to maintain an air of optimism,

come what may, was finally frozen to a grimace on his face, and at the end it seems that the poor man was plunged into such a pit of despair that he was stubbornly reluctant to agree to setting a date for another conference of foreign ministers.

Just what it was that hardened the Stalinists' position in the middle of the Geneva conference it is probably impossible for anyone outside the closest Kremlin circles to say.

What seems pretty clear is that when Molotov first came to the conference, he had been instructed to assume a vague,

(Turn to last page)

FANTASTIC FICTION FROM FOGGY-BOTTOM

THE 50c PHONOGRAPH, & OTHER STORIES

By HAL DRAPER

We now have a Fifty Cent Phonograph, which is so cheap, so rugged, so simple that it "Can Be Air-Dropped With Messages for Red-Ruled People," as the press announced with some jubilation on Nov. 11, which used to be Armistice Day.

RCA has developed it, and David Sarnoff showed it the other day to journalists. "A fascinating new weapon for the propaganda war," said the *Times* lead. Manufacture it in millions, drop it like leaflets behind the Iron Curtain, and we have solved the problem of how to reach those enslaved people with America's Message.

The reports on Sarnoff's Little Giant Curtain-Piercer did not bother to say whether RCA's laboratory had also worked out for sure what the Message is.

There is, at any rate, a good deal of uncertainty about it. "Blow to Influence of U. S. Is Seen in Wake of Geneva," headlines the *Times* as we write this on Tuesday, with James Reston doing the celebration. It seems that U. S. influence is deteriorating in Southeast Asia and the Middle East, the acute spots; the Western position is "serious" in Germany; therefore the State Department's "reliance on military solutions" in these areas is being questioned; etc.

Now, the Fifty Cent Phonograph is not intended for these areas, which don't need it. The Message of the U. S. has been sent through these lands with expensive hi-fi equipment, amplified with

dollars, tuned in by the ruling governments themselves as like as not. Perhaps there was something wrong with the Message.

Never mind: the American way is to solve first problems first. First comes the gadget.

THE CITRUS CRISIS

The Fifty Cent Phonograph is that which was foretold. Last year John Scott's book *Political Warfare* summarized U. S. wisdom on the subject of how to counter the Stalinists' success in winning the minds of men. Here is a passage:

"Other novel means [besides old-hat things like leaflets] can be devised to carry the written word. Sky-writing has been tried, with indifferent success. . . . When Soviet purchasing agents recently tried to buy large quantities of surplus butter from the U. S., it might have been sold in slogan-decorated containers. While many U. S. companies meter-stamp their mail with advertising promotion, the U. S. Post Office has so far not found it possible

to work political slogans or comments into the cancellation stamps on letters going to the Soviet area. The restraint of private exporters has so far prevented the stamping of slogans on citrus fruits exported to the USSR."

The author of this profound book wants slogans for lemons, instead of vice versa. His penetrating study has been out for months now, and yet the eyewash is still on the inside of the grapefruit, not on the outside. Is it any wonder America is losing the cold war?

But then nothing much came, either, from the suggestion once made by President Eisenhower himself, that Arthur Godfrey be put on the Voice of America beaming directly to Moscow. It was a fine opportunity lost for Godfrey to fire Khrushchev, with two weeks severance pay.

But just as John Foster Dulles comes disconsolately home from Geneva ("it has been even more of a failure than they gave the impression it might be and the repercussions are beginning to be heard"—Reston) alone comes Sarnoff's rugged, cheap and simple phonograph to make sure that the Message's repercussions can be heard anywhere.

SOME DULLES DISCS OF THE WEEK

But what shall the Message be? The gadget is ready; all scientific problems

solved; the willing wax waiting to be grooved. . . .

• Make a record of the State Department's triumph in political warfare (reported in the *Times* the same day as the Fifty Cent Phonograph) as it welched on invitations to Russian seed experts to visit this country. They can't come, said Washington, because we have no reciprocal group ready to go over there.

"State Department aides frankly admitted that the Russians had grabbed the ball on the 'cultural exchange' field, apparently because they knew just what they wanted whereas U. S. policy was still in a state of fluctuation."

This makes things puzzling. Has General Sarnoff's laboratory learned yet how to gadgeteer a record that will play a fluctuating policy in a loud, clear tone? With oscillating frequency perhaps?

In any case, since this country is being so carefully protected from being overrun with Russian hybrid seed specialists, perhaps it is the Russians that will have to start manufacturing the gadget to pierce the Iowa Corn Curtain with recorded lectures on Michurin-Lysenkoism.

• Make a record, for example, of Dulles' confab with Dictator Franco, in which they assured each other of their "frankness, cordiality and reciprocal understanding, according to the friendship that unites both countries," according to the communiqué issued.

(Continued on page 4)

Why Labor Lost the Ohio Battle

By BETTY PERKINS

Cleveland, Nov. 14

By a vote of 3 to 2, Ohio voters on November 8 turned down a CIO-sponsored unemployment compensation referendum after an extremely bitter campaign.

The initiative and referendum laws on the books of many states are rarely used, and almost never employed by the labor movement. This particular campaign, although unsuccessful, opens up new avenues of labor political action for the future.

The proposed law increased the minimum from \$10 to \$15 and the maximum from \$33 to \$50 weekly, increasing dependency allowance to \$9 for three or more children, for a period of 39 instead of 26 weeks. Delaying and protesting action of employers was made more difficult.

Also included was the very important proviso that supplemental and Guaranteed Annual Wage payments would be allowed by Ohio law, which now deducts such payments from the total benefits or disallows them altogether.

Ohio workers under the 1955 law took a 62 per cent cut in their standards of living, as against the 45 per cent cut set up by the original law of 1939. In addition, Ohio employers pay only half the national average premium per \$100 of payroll. Stringent administration of the law means that 47 per cent of the claims are disallowed (against 24 per cent national average) and the average length of claim is less than two weeks! Workers must be in good health, actively seeking work, and reporting weekly to the employment office.

VICIOUS CAMPAIGN

The CIO-sponsored bill was kept in committee by the rural-dominated state legislature, which passed a completely inadequate bill of its own allowing a weekly increase of a measly \$3. Thus the CIO was forced to go to the referendum.

The CIO was joined by the AFL, the United Mine Workers, the railroad

brotherhoods, and individuals organized as the Committee to Protect Standards of Living. The employers, infuriated by labor's independent stand, poured money and personnel into the "Ohio Information Committee," openly backed by the Ohio Chambers of Commerce and the Ohio Association of Manufacturers.

This employer front-group waged an incredibly vicious and slanderous campaign against the measure. They were joined enthusiastically by the capitalist press, which supported their misrepresentations 100 per cent.

Directed especially to rural areas, the employer advertisements, large and frequent, pictured slyly grinning CIO workers disporting on Florida beaches as mail men bring them \$256 monthly tax-free. (This is the absolute maximum figure, which only a few workers with three or more children could receive.) Workers not covered by GAW agreements were pitted against their UAW brethren. Ohio workers were pictured as "loafers, chiselers, and bums."

By and large, the employers tried to avoid discussions and debates (though they participated when forced to) but relied on the tricky wording of their numerous ads. As the campaign neared its close, employer ads appeared on practically every page of local papers and radio spots were omnipresent.

The labor campaign distributed five million pieces of literature and used radio and newspaper space to the limit of its finances.

This was the first such campaign for the labor movement, and naturally mistakes were made, from which much can be learned for the future. First, the bill was too complex, and this frightened the voters and allowed employers to misrepresent it. The portion tying in the GAW also made it possible to try to pit the majority against a small part of the workers.

Secondly and basically, the campaign demonstrated that the union movement as presently constituted is not organized

effectively for political action. Coordination between unions was poor. In many locals the issues were never taken to the rank and file. There was no systematic drive to get out the vote; this was especially necessary since there was no state or national office on the ballot. The blunt truth is that labor needs a daily press and a political party of its own.

SILVER LININGS

The present mood among Ohio union officials is one of discouragement. They feel they tackled too much. As a matter of fact, there are certain optimistic factors:

(1) The vote in the election was extremely light. Although the newspapers trumpeted that many workers voted against the measure, this is not necessarily true. Urban voting was much lighter than rural voting and it is well known that light voting favors the reactionaries. This only underlines that labor needed to get out the vote.

(2) The fact remains that labor received, despite all disadvantages, 38 per cent of the vote. This is no mean achievement, for it must be remembered that Ohio's Democratic governor, Frank Lausche, opposed the measures, calling it "fantastic," and other important leaders of the Democratic Party were silent. The Republicans naturally were opposed. This means that labor got nearly 40 per cent of the votes in opposition to the two old parties.

If labor could bet such a percentage of the vote for a slate of labor candidates, it would be sure of electing many officeholders in a three-way election.

It is of course true that voters could vote for this measure without abandoning their traditional party, a step which would be necessary to vote for labor candidates. On the other hand, a labor party could appeal for votes on a broad program rather than a single issue, could coordinate political action and supply personnel to carry out this action adequately.

ELECTRICAL WORKERS

IUE Strikers Standing Firm

By GERRY McDERMOTT

Pittsburgh, Nov. 13

As this is written, it appears that Westinghouse has been defeated in its attempt to stampede striking workers of the CIO electrical union back to work. After a month of intense back-to-work publicity by the company, the nationwide IUE chain is still solid.

Westinghouse forced the strike, apparently in the belief that they could crack some of the weaker locals of the Westinghouse Conference Board, and thus force the union to settle on company terms. Toward this end the company has been engaged in a publicity campaign unprecedented in the history of modern labor relations in this area.

It has to be seen to be believed. The company published not simply full-page ads but double-page ads. They published the same ad in three or four different parts of the same paper on the same day, and they did so in all the papers. This went on for day after day. In addition, there were radio spots on every station all the time, all of them plugging the company offer.

Despite this fantastically expensive barrage, the company has not cracked a single local. And the rest of the union movement began to help the IUE to answer the corporation with union full-page ads and television and radio appearances. These were paid for by the Steelworkers and by the AFL, and plans were made to step up the campaign.

At this point, the company decided to abandon its strategy and give up the propaganda campaign. It agreed to a program proposed by the federal mediator whereby both sides would stop advertising. Negotiations were switched from tension-ridden Pittsburgh to New York, and both sides agreed to bargain for seven straight days.

It is likely that this will result in a settlement, perhaps before this story is printed. It is known that Westinghouse is in a poor financial and competitive condition at the present, a situation which is being made worse daily by the strike. With the union ranks, if anything more solid than at the beginning of the strike, a union victory seems in the cards at this writing.

UAW Faces Problems on 3 Fronts

By JACK WILSON

Detroit, Nov. 13

Like the chilling winds of November that herald a long and cold winter, events of the past week cast a cloudy gloom over Solidarity House, headquarters of the United Auto Workers.

(1) Labor's enemies ganged up on the UAW and Walter Reuther in the Ohio election, and the daily press was bragging about it, as they did in 1950 when the CIO and AFL campaign to defeat the late Senator Robert Taft fell flat on its face.

(2) In Indiana, the election of a pro-labor mayor at New Castle, seat of the turbulent Perfect Circle strike, was more than offset by the loss of NLRB elections in three of the corporation's nearby plants.

(3) And in money-hungry Detroit, where almost everyone has a fever thinking about how much profit can be made out of the proposed Ford stock sales, the infection spread among the auto workers sufficiently to enable the inimitable Carl Stellato, president of Ford Local 600, to ask that Ford give the UAW members the stock offer the UAW had turned down last summer as a substitute for the modified GAW.

The following special dispatch printed in the Detroit Free Press from Akron, Ohio speaks for itself on what happened in the Buckeye State last week.

"The decisive defeat Ohio voters gave the CIO's layoff-pay plan was a stinging

denunciation in this state of CIO President Walter Reuther.

"The entire campaign against the proposal was planned around an 'anti-Reuther' theme.

"Reuther was pictured as a wild and unstable salesman who was attempting to peddle pie-in-the-sky schemes to Ohio voters.

"The strategy was cleverly designed, properly executed, and excellently financed by the Ohio Chamber of Commerce and the Ohio Manufacturing Association.

"The campaign was calculated to divide the workers and labor chieftains. It was a crusade against an individual described as hungry for power at the expense of Ohio's future economic growth.

"First step was to scare the daylighters out of the rockribbed Democrats who were told Reuther was trying to take over the Democratic Party in Ohio as he had in Detroit.

"Appeals went out to conservative workers who heard the layoff plan would crumble the foundation of the state's economic system.

"Labor bosses heard over and over that Reuther was using the layoff plan to get to the top of the merged AFL-CIO.

"The public in general was told the plan would ruin the state's economic future and stunt its industrial growth and threaten all business."

FOREGONE CONCLUSION?

The conclusion reached by one of business' strategists was this: "The outcome of the campaign confirmed my belief that the most conservative man in American politics is the working man with the steady job, a family and a home. Razzle-dazzle and uncertainties scare him."

To bolster that theory, business analysts point out that in two key industrial

areas of Ohio proposal Four took a shelling.

In Dayton, where 47 per cent of the workers are covered by the layoff plan of the UAW in contracts with General Motors there, the plan was defeated 62,239 to 20,495.

In Cleveland and surrounding Cuyahoga County, where many UAW locals exist, the vote was 224,674 to 168,813.

Parenthetically, there may be enough rulings in other states to save the Guaranteed Annual Wage contracts at Ford and GM, but the problem for the Ohio auto workers remains. Do they get a nickel an hour instead, or what happens to the fund set up for them at Ford and GM?

What is painful to record is that the Ohio results were a foregone conclusion, in spite of the major campaign by labor. For it just didn't make sense that any proposal like the GAW, which is so little understood in the more class-conscious shops of the Detroit area, would serve as a rallying point for a crusade in Ohio.

FORD STOCK RUSH

How true this observation is may be seen in the current problem of the Ford stock sales, not to mention the dissatisfaction among the skilled workers.

Since the news of the forthcoming Ford stock sales has simply filled the newspapers here, and an excitement like a California gold rush has permeated this automotive center, there has been considerable discussion in the shops about buying Ford stock, and about whether the company will give its workers a chance to get some.

Again, the daily press was quick to point out that the GAW plan signified a maximum of \$155 for a worker, while the rejected Ford stock plan would earn him twice that much now. And certainly, if the Ford stock makes the impact on the market that is universally expected, everybody is going to be counting how much they could have made. For Detroit is a city, among other things, where every other old-timer tells you how he missed out on buying stock in the early Ford days, Chrysler days, or something else.

Last week the issue was hot enough for the news to be leaked that the UAW through Ken Bannon, Ford director, had informed the corporation it had no ob-

jection to any plan the company wanted to put into effect to give employees stock. Stellato, of course, jumped the gun for publicity purposes in his demands on the Ford Company.

At the time of the settlement of the Ford negotiations in June, the following exchange between Walter Reuther and John Bugas, vice president of Ford, took place.

Reuther: "You can tell them [the press], John, that the union as a demonstration of its willingness to cooperate with Ford Motor Company has agreed to give the company a letter which will enable the company to handle the stock problem as they see fit."

Later, Henry Ford II announced that the company did have a plan covering its 40,000 salaried employees which it expected to apply when Ford stock was sold.

PREVAILING MOOD

Given the limited direct benefits of the UAW gains this summer, and the pressure of inflation, as well as envy and bitterness at the fabulous profits of the corporation, is it surprising that a campaign to get stock for Ford workers should make headway, and that Stellato is scoring a beat?

The pernicious effects of the Taft-Hartley Law were evident in the Indiana NLRB elections, for scabs were allowed to vote in the three plants. But the fact remains that the decertification petitions began with former UAW members who were dissatisfied, as we pointed out in earlier articles on the Perfect Circle strike situation. And the UAW was unable to win the confidence of the majority of workers in those plants earlier.

How much re-evaluation the UAW leadership makes in the face of these adversities remains to be seen. One thing they know for certain: The increasing number of local strike votes and of wildcats, and the open grumbling at the recent national skilled-trades conference, emphasizes that the dissatisfaction with their lot in this period of super-colossal prosperity for American capitalism is the prevailing mood of the auto workers' rank and file.

C. O. Case Loses

Los Angeles, Nov. 13

The U. S. Supreme Court this week refused to review the conviction of Vern Davidson for draft evasion. Davidson, a socialist conscientious objector, had been appealing his 1953 conviction on the grounds that the Selective Service Act, which exempts only religious objectors, is unconstitutional.

Davidson is a former national secretary of the Young Peoples Socialist League; recently he has been active in the Socialist Party in Berkeley. Last April he polled over 3000 votes as a Socialist candidate for the Berkeley City Council. He is leaving Berkeley this week to surrender to federal officials in Los Angeles and to begin his 3-year sentence.

LONDON LETTER

Tory Budget Spurs Strikes, Militant Demonstrations

By OWEN ROBERTS

LONDON, Nov. 10—The blanket of apathy and inertia which hung over the British working class during the general election six months ago is rapidly disappearing. It is being swept away by the wave of anger generated by the latest Tory attack on the workers' living standards. Chancellor Butler's budget of a fortnight ago has succeeded where Labor election propaganda failed.

The sharpening of class antagonisms which has followed the budget is manifesting itself in all spheres of working-class influence and organization. In the trade unions the pressure is building up for an all-out drive for higher wages and the long period of going-easy on wage demands—in response to government pleas—will surely soon come to an end.

The rank and file of the unions have never taken too kindly to this policy, and quite understandably so. They could see that while workers were asked to ease up on wage demands in order to prevent inflation the boss class was helping itself to a larger slice of the national income in the shape of increased profits and dividends. The rank-and-file trade-unionists have continually exerted pressure upon the union leadership to end this phony truce with the employers.

But now there are indications that many union leaders themselves have decided that the time has come to toss this policy overboard. Few have so far made a public pronouncement to this effect, but it is generally known that many union executive committees are now in the process of reformulating their wage policies. And it is equally well known that many of the right-wing leaders have now shifted their position as a consequence of Tory policies.

PRODDING THE LEADERS

The union rank and file are becoming increasingly militant and, on a number of construction jobs, building sites and dock sides, bodies of workers have staged token strikes against the government's policies.

True, the number of workers involved is small, and true that in many instances the strikes have been led by the Stalinists. But important is the fact that even these relatively small numbers of workers are prepared to take part in what are commonly designated as "political strikes." And since the General Strike of 1926, when the government raised the whole bogey of "political strikes," British workers have shown great reluctance to become involved in strike action which does not have some direct bearing on their particular job.

In local trade-union branches the pressure is also being piled on. Resolutions are streaming into union headquarters from the branches, and they all express great opposition to the Tory budget and urge the leadership to advance fresh wage claims.

This action reinforces the arguments of those trade-union leaders who want to come out in open fight against the employers and the government, and at the same time prods those right-wing leaders who are at the moment wavering before changing course.

HOUSING FIGHT

In the local Labor Parties, too, feelings are now running high and in many areas plans are being laid to launch big blows at the Tories. This is particularly true in relation to housing and rents.

Some 2,750,000 houses in Britain are owned by municipal authorities, and the Tories, who have never liked municipal housing, are at this moment pushing plans through Parliament which will seriously upset municipal housing schemes. The subsidies paid through the central government exchequer for municipal housing are being slashed from 22 pounds to 10 pounds a year on all new houses, and it is intended to abolish such subsidies completely within a few years.

Another feature of the attack on municipal enterprise is the decision of the government that local authorities must cut back their spending and at the same time seek the funds for their projects in the private money market instead of through the Public Works Loans Board, a government body which makes loans

available to local authorities. This means that municipalities will now be in the hands of the private money-lenders when they need funds for housing or similar projects, and they will have to pay higher interest charges as a consequence.

The net effect of these two measures is that rents of tenants in municipally owned houses are going to jump upwards in the very near future. It also means that thousands of people who are now waiting for council houses will not be able to afford them when their turn comes round for rehousing.

MASS RALLIES PROTEST

Local Labor Parties are in many areas preparing to conduct wide agitation campaigns among the tenants on this issue. Already, as a consequence of Tory policies of pushing up interest-rates on loans from the Public Works Loans Board to an all-time high of 5 per cent, some local authorities have decided to put up rents.

And the tenants have reacted violently. In areas where the tenants are organized in some form of local association hundreds of tenants have declared a rent "strike" and refused to pay the increased rent. In many cases there have been law suits and evictions; and—in one or two instances—physical violence.

In Crawley, one of the so-called New Towns which were planned to disperse the population from the densely built-up surroundings of London, tenants are engaged in a mass campaign against rent increases. Last week 3000 people demonstrated in the town and attended huge protest meetings.

Most important of all, the local trade unions have stepped in to back up the tenants. When a demonstration was held last Wednesday morning almost every major industrial enterprise in the town came to a halt as workers downed tools and joined in a protest march. The column of marching workers and tenants stretched for over a mile with people marching five abreast, chanting slogans, singing songs and waving banners.

In the great industrial center of Birmingham the local Labor Party has also swung into action against the Tory plans to smash municipal housing projects. It has decided to launch a campaign which will begin with a big demonstration of protest later this month.

STORMY PASSAGE

In cities, towns and villages all over Britain, Labor Party militants are preparing schemes to organize tenants into a big fighting force against the Tory government. All this is being done on the initiative of local parties. As yet there has been no decision from Party headquarters to launch such a campaign on a national basis.

But, whatever the intentions of party headquarters, there is no doubt that the campaign is growing and will ultimately reach the point where it becomes a national campaign of its own impetus.

Tenants living in the 8,000,000 privately rented houses are also due for a rent increase soon. For the government has announced its intention of amending the Rent Acts which place restrictions on the amount of rent a private landlord may charge. These Rent Acts were begun during the First World War when tenants in Glasgow organized a campaign against landlords who were profiteering from the wartime accommodation shortages. During the past forty years these acts have been added to by successive governments in order to protect tenants. And now the Tories aim to tear down this whole structure of rent restriction.

They will have a tough fight, for the mood of the people is such that, with careful planning and organizing by the Labor Parties in the localities, they will offer considerable opposition.

With nearly eleven million tenants fighting against rent increases and the trade unions fighting for higher wages the government is in for a stormy passage. And every sign points to the fact that rank-and-file Laborites intend to make it as stormy as possible.

DISPATCH FROM DUBLIN

De Valera's Party Trying to Work Up Economic Solutions

By M. M.

Dublin, Oct. 24

As I mentioned in a previous dispatch, De Valera's party has in recent weeks attempted to give itself a facial. Sean Lemass, De Valera's economic expert and former minister of Industry in all previous De Valera governments, at a party meeting in Dublin recently came out with a blueprint discussion document.

Nothing epoch-making emerged. Lemass emphasized that a policy of full employment required a "five year plan" of state investment to prime the pump of private investment, to create 20,000 jobs per year (equal to the rate of emigration). No indication was forthcoming how this massive capital investment program of \$600 million was to be financed. For obvious tactical reasons, he eschewed taxation directly and savings from current revenue.

The unreality of the proposal was that it dealt with industrial development as something distinct and apart from the pivotal element in the Irish economy, which is agriculture. The psychology of peasant proprietorship is the half-submerged economic iceberg that grinds to bits the toughest political craft.

As political strategists, however, Lemass and De Valera are uncannily correct in their assessment of the tempo of political events. The immense personal prestige of De Valera, and the group of former revolutionary nationalists that he gathered around him, has provided in the past a mass following nurtured on nostalgic reminiscences of the best days of the independence struggle. That brand of political hypnosis, however, was never sufficient to retain this popular mass following, and De Valera and his party in government pioneered socialwelfare and pro-working-class legislation to disorient left-swinging workers.

Side by side with this, the party in the government used public moneys to finance, subsidize and generally develop a native industrial capitalism protected by tariffs and import duties. Now the impasse has been reached.

Within the framework of ordinary capitalist investment, no further progress is evident, on account of the migration of capital to the United Kingdom and the sterling area generally, where Irish investors are so "unpatriotic" as

to prefer the economic "stability" of British colonial exploitation to investment at home. Lemass concentrates on this aspect of private investment, as complementary to state accumulation of capital, and indicates a capital-gains tax on earnings invested abroad. But the main aspect is a massive state spending-spree, undertaken to underwrite super-profits for private industrial expansion, while incidentally mopping up some of the unemployed.

This is "enlightened" capitalist economics, and the moth-eaten Labor leaders stand mesmerized by Lemass' fast double-play. Norton, Labor's counterpart of Lemass, has reached the latter's position, but with this difference: Lemass is a bourgeois politician who apprehended it intellectually, while Norton is a perverse representative of the class that is potentially socialist and anti-capitalist who has drifted into that position, if not in ignorant orthodoxy then by corrupt design.

THE TITOIST FOOTBALL

The arrival in this country of Tito's football ambassadors was greeted with a wave of protest by Catholic (Re)Action and the archbishop of Dublin. These argued that, in the light of anti-Catholic persecutions in Yugoslavia, the Football Association of Ireland should not play host to the "statified" Yugoslav footballers.

If so, it is fair to reply, why not extend the protest to cover all the victims of totalitarian repression, political and otherwise? Why stop at Stalinist, or Tito-Stalinist, repression? Why not deed?

Franco (and formerly Peron)?

A Catholic friend of mine remarked with tongue in cheek: "But why indict your religious patrons?" Why not in-

The Football Association held firmly to its decision in spite of active governmental and clerical boycott. The Yugoslavs skated home by four goals to one, watched without incident by at least 20,000 Catholics out of a total of 22,000. The Belgrade representative in London made a hypocritical protest in the *Irish Times* and, calling the pot black, he accused the Catholic Church of "intolerance." Shades of Djilas and Dedijer.

ARGENTINA

Post-Peron Regime Is Attacking Unions

The following dispatch was of course written before this Sunday's overthrow of the Lonardi provisional government.—Ed.

By JUAN REY

Santiago, Nov. 2

Relations between the Lonardi regime in Argentina and the workers are sharpening now.

It was the workers who had permitted the overthrow of the Peron regime and the defeat of the "Beloved Leader" by their political neutrality during the rebellion, the fact that they stayed at home and refused to come out in defense of the regime at the call of the pretorian leaders. A minority of the working class had taken part in the anti-Peronist revolt, in the first place the workers of the Socialist Party and the old free unions.

The neutrality of the main cadres of the workers was quite spontaneous and not an organized political action; but it was the general and solidary attitude of the workers as a class and that is most important.

After the rebellion the workers did not defend the dictatorship nor did they manifest any support to it. The Lonardi government promised to respect all workers' social rights and trade-union independence. The workers waited to see this carried out in deed.

But the Argentine bourgeoisie took this working-class attitude as the sign of its weakness and as an opportunity to inflict a real defeat upon it. If the bourgeoisie seeks to turn the overthrow of Peron to its own profit, then its policy will encounter the spontaneous and organized resistance of the workers.

In this respect we have a very important precedent in the recent history of South America. In Bolivia, after the victorious popular revolution against the Nationalist regime in 1946, the bourgeoisie set out to seize all the results of

the revolution for itself; it set up a regime which for six years persecuted the workers. And so this regime was overthrown by an armed uprising in 1952, with the installation of a new Nationalist regime which nationalized the mines. (We are leaving out of account here the limited nationalist and bourgeois character of this Bolivian revolution, which we have analyzed in *LA* before.)

If the Argentine bourgeoisie make the same mistakes as the Bolivian tin barons—turning their revolution against the workers and solving the crisis at their expense—then the analogy with the Bolivian development may be transformed into living history.

The Lonardi government has, for example, decreed devaluation of the currency, which means an automatic cut in workers' wages. It also ordered the dissolution of the union committees and designated a government overseer to administer the unions pending new, free union elections. But the workers, who had remained peaceful up to this point, looked on this as an attack on their rights and called a general strike.

While it is true that these unions were or had been Peronist-led, still they were the only workers' centers capable of organizing defense of workers' rights and wages. This time the issue was not Peronism but the life and existence of the workers themselves.

The Argentine revolution is entering a new stage of internal class conflicts between the bourgeoisie and the workers, and it is difficult to foresee the outcome.

Read and subscribe to
THE NEW INTERNATIONAL
The Marxist review for serious
students of social issues
50 cents \$2 a year

Subscribe to LABOR ACTION —
\$2 a year does it!

Reading from Left to Right

The Stalinoid Road to Power in America

By EDWARD HILL

The current (November) issue of the *Monthly Review*, the independent Stalinist magazine edited by Sweezy and Huberman, is largely devoted to memorializing Eugene Debs. In an editorial entitled "Debs and the Future of American Socialism," the editors attempt to estimate the perspectives of socialism in the United States because "there is no greater tribute we can pay to Debs than a really serious effort to understand our present situation."

Some 36 pages after this editorial, there is a quotation from the man whose memory occasioned the analysis. It is Debs saying, "The workers can be emancipated only by their own collective will, the power inherent in themselves as a class, and this collective will and conquering power can only be the result of education, enlightenment and self-imposed discipline."

This serves as a fitting introduction to the *Monthly Review* discussion of American socialism, for the editors of the magazine look for American socialism not from the American working class, nor even from the American socialist intellectuals, but from . . . the example of Stalinist Russia!

First, the editors consider the weakness of the American socialist movement, and then go on to analyze the possibility of its becoming a significant factor in society once again: "The crux of the matter, it seems to us, is to demonstrate that socialism is attainable in the United States, that we do not have to rely on a miracle or a disaster to bring it, and that intelligent activity here and now can hasten its coming and help to solve the problems of transition."

One can hardly quarrel with this rejection of the "miracle" approach, "the ones who imagine that the American working class has a basically socialist attitude and will soon throw off its present misleaders and march forward to the socialist goal." This kind of nonsense is reserved to the purveyors of an ostrich-like traditionalism (the SLP, for example) which holds that nothing has happened in the last fifty years, or to those who plight their faith in a mystical conviction that the American working class is getting more socialist, day by day.

SOCIALISM BY EXAMPLE

But *MR's* second rejection is a little ambiguous. The editors write about the "reliance on disaster": "just let there be another world war or another big depression, they say, and socialism will soon revive in the American working class. Then we shall resume our interrupted forward march." In certain ways, one can see this as a rendering of the Socialist Workers Party position (an attitude which some expelled, ultra-left Stalinists recently referred to as the "crucible theory" of history in which the more cataclysmic the catastrophe, the more hope there is) and if it is, one can agree.

But the *MR* editors spell out the position a little more. They postulate a situation in which "there is neither a big war nor a big depression." Is American socialism then doomed, i. e., are the "reliance on disaster" in the right?

This is not the point to argue the substantive question raised in the editorial; my intention is to deal with an analysis of how these independent Stalinists answer the problem. They do find hope for American socialism in the absence of either war or depression. Heretofore, they tell us, socialism came to power in the wake of catastrophe—

"But this is changing under our very eyes. Among one third of the people of the world, socialism is now a going concern, and its performance is being watched with sympathy and hope by growing numbers outside the socialist orbit. Every socialist success makes new converts; every improvement in the quality of life in the socialist countries convinces doubters."

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.

But how does this affect the United States?

"Let us concede that as the most advanced capitalist country we are likely to be the slowest to be impressed by the achievements of socialism. . . But these are not the kind of developments to which any people can remain permanently blind. . . Already our more intelligent heads are beginning to understand, reluctantly and with mixed emotions, that in a peaceful competition of social systems, socialism is the predestined winner. . . Sooner or later, we too will see the truth and draw the necessary conclusions."

To translate: "Socialism" in the above quotations means Stalinist Russia. The "more intelligent heads" who are beginning to understand that "socialism" (Stalinism) is the predestined winner and therefore are supporting it are not specified. Paul Sweezy and Leo Huberman, two candidates for the description, have understood it for a long time. Senator Malone recently came to something near this position, but his conclusion was for America to arm for preventive war. And finally, the process of "seeing the truth" is apparently a euphemism for the class struggle, or at least it occupies the same place in this analysis as the class struggle has traditionally held in socialist theory.

WHERE'S THE WORKING CLASS?

But even more interesting than this Aesopian language (which, of course, is not Aesopian at all, but more or less typical *Monthly Review* socialism) is the absence of an old socialist hero from the entire analysis, i. e., the working class. The lesson about Stalinism which is to be learned by the American people ("and we mean to include all but the special beneficiaries of capitalism") is to come, evidently, in the absence of social movement, class struggle, class-consciousness, and so on.

The editors evidently became conscious of the fact that this could provide the basis of a sectarian criticism: "We shall perhaps be sneeringly told that we are counseling to American socialists a program of all talk and no action. This is nonsense. We are counseling a program of purposeful action. Teaching the truth is not a matter of sitting back and shooting off your mouth."

At the tail-end of the editorial, all of this issues into the possibility that these principles will lead to a labor party "when the time is ripe." But if socialism is to be taught to America by the example of Stalinism, if it is to come in a time of social peace unmarked by depression or war, why the sectarian conclusion, why "a labor-based political party" for the people, i. e., "all but the special beneficiaries of capitalism"? This would seem to hark back to De Leonism, or even back to that old fogey Karl Marx who, unable to foresee the lessons of Stalinism and learn the truth from it, kept on insisting that the self-conscious activity of the vast overwhelming majority, led by the working class, was the road to socialism.

THE STALINIST MIND

The editorial ends with a call to begin implementing its ideas "by studying the life and works of Eugene Victor Debs." All right:

"The class-conscious worker recognizes the necessity of organization, economic and political, and of using every weapon at his command—the strike, the boycott, the ballot and every other—to achieve his emancipation. He, therefore, joins the union of his class and the party of his class and gives his time and energy to the work of educating and lining up his class for the struggle of his class for emancipation." (Debs, same magazine, same issue, 32 pages later.)

The insight which this editorial suggests is not a facetious one. It is that one cannot consciously continually support a bureaucratic, anti-democratic and anti-working-class society like Stalinism as "socialism" and still remain a partisan of democratic socialism in one's own country. The difference between a Sweezy, a theoretician who calls anti-freedom "freedom," and a French or Italian worker who mistakenly sees the Stalinist party as the party of socialism, is incalculable.

The problem here is a particular one for the intellectuals: revise socialism to make Stalinism fit into it in Russia, and you will end by revising it everywhere else. The "unfortunate necessity" which you invoke as an explanation of the totalitarian nature of Stalinist society will become a matter of principle.

50c Phonograph

(Continued from page 1)

• *Make a record of the Times* editorial a couple of days later, headed "Wehrmacht 1955," greeting the establishment of the new Germany army as it reorganized under the Iron Cross, emblem of Prussian militarism.

Here is the Message: "It was an Iron Cross and not a Swastika. . . It is for defense . . . there was no alternative . . . not militaristic . . . might even be a symbol of peace . . . sober and sorrowful last recourse, if freedom cannot otherwise be preserved . . . then all our hopes for Western civilization are vain." (Nov. 14.)

The above is a low-fi reproduction of the editorial it is true, but little more than the static is left out. Drop the rugged, cheap little discs over Poland, the Ukraine, Russia . . . the people will rise. . .

DROP 'EM ON NATCHEZ

• *Make a record of Adlai Stevenson's* speech (the day after Sarnoff's) calling for a UN police force in the Middle East—while at the same time a vicious guerrilla warfare against the Negro people is raging in the Deep South of his own country, and Stevenson says not a word about sending in even the Department of Justice which has a legal right to investigate.

How about a UN police force in Mississippi? Here is a record for Sarnoff's Curtain Crasher:

"MEMPHIS, Tenn., Nov. 11 (AP)—William Faulkner said last night that continued racial segregation was as great a threat to world peace as communism. The novelist, speaking before the Southern Historical Association, called for a 'confederation of the free,' regardless of color, 'if we want a world, or even part of a world, in which individual man can be free.'"

Make a record:

"Dr. Theodore R. M. Howard, Negro physician and crusader for equal rights in his home state of Mississippi, said here yesterday that the U. S. had no right to go to Geneva and propose free elections in Germany as long as there were no such elections in Mississippi."

Obviously these are doctrinaire people. But make a record, General Sarnoff: manufacture your rugged, cheap Fifty Cent Phonograph for the NAACP to drop over Mississippi.

FROM THE U. N. ALBUM

• *Make a record of how the U. S. spokesmen* crawled and squirmed at the UN while refusing to vote for the proposal to investigate the racist Apartheid system in South Africa.

Make a record of the State Department delegate's speeches at the UN in favor of France on the Algerian issue, in favor of Britain on the Cyprus issue—get your Message across to the peoples.

• *Make a record of the welcoming ceremonies* to dictator Castillo Armas of

Demo Gains

(Continued from page 1)

why Humphrey was so mealy-mouthed in, confessing on last week's Meet the Press program that the "loyalty oath" is dead for the Democratic convention?

Humphrey has not been "captured or entrapped by the right wing of the party"—heavens, no—he "has bored from within to give liberals a means of presenting their demands to the leadership." (And of giving the leadership the means to reject those demands, or anyway the few the liberals took courage to make, like Lehman's futile call for a pro-civil-rights fight.)

Proof of the non-entrapment? "Americans for Democratic Action, which he helped found, still approves him."

What a man! Senator George loves him . . . he is "liberal adviser to Johnson" . . . ADA approves of him . . . Strom Thurmond is nice to him . . . he presents the views of Lehman and Wayne Morse . . . bue "he had no trouble with the problem of Communism" . . . truly, truly, this liberal magazine has gone to a lot of trouble to paint Humphrey as a veritable *mädchen für alle*. Just the man to run with Adlai Stevenson, that other principled statesman.

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

Guatemala as he toured the U. S. last week as a paladin of the anti-Communist struggle and United Fruit.

Record the laudatory speech of Mayor Wagner of New York at City Hall, extolling the man as one whose "victory over Communism" in Guatemala "was a victory for us as well." Record the fruity little dictator's speech at the UN as he declaimed his love for democracy and undying affection for his American friends who helped him overthrow the Arbenz government by armed force.

WHO'S HORRIFIED?

• *Make a record of the Pentagon's* approval (Nov. 6) of a report which for the first time took a strongly positive attitude toward the use of germ warfare—also "a complete family of chemical, biological and radiological weapons for 'actual use' if necessary."

Turn up the volume on the passage where it is pointed out that these weapons are directed not only against military personnel but also the "civilian population."

"[The committee] decried the conception that such forms of warfare were 'horrifying in character' and said they had a 'proper place' in military planning."

"The committee particularly urged that the Chemical Corps undertake a public relations campaign to achieve a more candid recognition of the proper place of chemical and biological warfare." The committee was headed by Otto N. Miller, vice president for operations of the Standard Oil Company of California. . . . (Times, Nov. 7.)

The place to drop this rugged, cheap disc is obviously over China.

GLIMPSE OF UTOPIA

Thus the triumphs of American technology and know-how will guarantee victory. What difference will it make if more lands follow the example of China and North Vietnam in plumping for the Stalinist despotism as their lesser evil to capitalist colonialism? What difference will it make if—being forced to choose between the capitalist world whose oppression they know on their backs, and the new Stalinist tyranny whose evils they have still to learn—more peoples are swallowed up by the totalitarian imperialists?

If Stalinist influence and power spreads, why, call out the fleet and drop the Fifty Cent Phonograph, with rugged, cheap discs full of rugged, cheap talk about democracy.

The greater the need, the more phonographs will have to be manufactured, the more discs will be turned out.

Whole new plants will have to be raised to meet the demand.

A whole new industry will be created. It can amount to a whole new capitalist revolution, which will be celebrated by A. A. Berle and Sylvia Porter.

A new era can dawn: the Permanent Phonograph Economy.

RCA will split its stock 57 to 1, and seize the Defense Department from General Motors.

Boom times; no depression; full employment; Stalinism foiled.

The beauty of it is that the records don't have to say anything at all, not even fluctuatingly; in fact, the less they say, the more that have to be manufactured eventually.

It is at this point that the State Department will come into its own.



LABOR
ACTION

November 21, 1955 Vol. 19, No. 47

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

UNIV. OF CALIF. • BERKELEY

SCLU: Disquieting Symptoms

Berkeley, Nov. 6

Challenge (Oct. 31) reported the resolution adopted by the local Student Civil Liberties Union aimed against the Berkeley YSL. At that time YSLers in SCLU had been informed by the vice-president of SCLU that they were not entitled to a copy of the resolution, because it might violate "constitutional procedure." This bureaucratic decision was later reversed by the executive committee of SCLU under pressure from some of its members, and it is now possible to discuss that resolution with the text at hand.

Following is the text of that resolution, originally presented by the Executive Committee and amended by the membership meeting of October 21:

"Resolved:

"That the Student Civil Liberties Union wishes to correct any misconceptions which may arise as a result of an article published in the press of the YSL about the formation and content of SCLU's program. The article in question appeared in *Challenge* on October 3, 1955 under the name of Michael Harrington, and dealt with the fight for civil liberties on American campuses.

"This article may convey erroneous impressions about SCLU. It is stated that 'Members of the Young Socialist League on the California campus have been instrumental in trying to persuade SCLU to adopt the kind of program discussed in this article.' It is a well-known fact that the civil-liberties beliefs of SCLU are derived from the stand taken over the years by the American Civil Liberties Union, an organization with which we have a close cooperating relationship.

"The article by Mr. Harrington fails to show any single point of civil-liberties philosophy that SCLU or ACLU does not now hold and has not held from their inception. The implication that any political group within SCLU has persuaded that organization to take its policy of unalterable support for complete civil liberties for all is utterly and completely false. Thus, we feel that it is self-evident that Mr. Harrington is mistaken in the role he assigns to his colleagues in SCLU.

"Insofar as the article implies in any way that the fight for civil liberties is part of a 'broader struggle,' presumably for socialism, it must be firmly rejected as part of SCLU doctrine, past or present.

"Since Mr. Harrington's article is probably based on a faulty knowledge of our group, we feel that a statement of this sort is a necessity."

SOME FACTS

As originally presented to SCLU by its Executive Committee, the resolution contained a section criticizing the Berkeley YSL on the question of its attitude toward the rights of fascists and asserting that the Berkeley YSL does not stand for their defense. The membership deleted this section, although a large part of the meeting revolved around it.

Two quotes should suffice to make it obvious that the Berkeley YSL did not oppose "full liberty under the law" for fascists:

Challenge, Feb. 7, 1955: "We do not accord the government nor ourselves the right or duty to use juridical or physical violence to restrict minority political groups of all shades in political, non-violent activities."

The *Daily Californian*, March 24, 1955: "The Berkeley YSL defends the legal rights of all fascists to pursue non-violent activities free from legal harassment."

As for the resolution as adopted, first, it is a fact that the original SCLU program in 1952 was drafted by liberals and socialists, including some of the YSLers now present in SCLU. Contrary to the current official rewriting of history, SCLU did not spring from the forehead of ACLU, but it was only after formulating and living up to a full civil-liberties program for several months that

SCLU was later recognized by the local ACLU as a "cooperating" organization.

The creation and persistence of such a non-partisan (neither socialist nor liberal) organization was based upon honest collaboration of its founders, and the avoidance of any spurious attempts to "capture" or alter the purposes of SCLU toward either political direction. Later some Republicans were also active in SCLU.

As a matter of fact SCLU has a much better position than the national ACLU, especially in defending the rights of Stalinists.

Regarding the necessity to view civil liberties as part of a "larger struggle," there was no attempt to inject the political views of any segment of SCLU into its program. It would have been wrong to demand political agreement as the prerequisite for cooperation in the fight to defend the civil liberties of everyone. Naturally individual political views colored the rhetoric adopted in SCLU discussions, but these views were rigidly kept out of SCLU's official statements.

BAD SIGNS

But what is really at stake when a few SCLU members feel it important SCLU business to search for socialist heresies from liberalism or pacifism—such being the real content of the last SCLU meeting?

So far as a reaction to publicity in *Challenge* is concerned, SCLU has every right to dissociate itself therefrom, provided it does no violence to the facts in this dissociation. But while doing likewise for publicity by other groups as well; it should be realized that no democratic exception can be taken by SCLU to other groups reporting on the activities of SCLU or of their members activities in SCLU.

Far more seriously, however, there are indications that this was only a useful pretext for dredging up criticism of the YSL, because YSLers stand as an ideological road-block in SCLU against a less libertarian orientation. Thus we note the discussion among a few SCLU people—including the president—to the effect that perhaps certain reforms in the government security system might be introduced which would make it more acceptable to civil-libertarians. All such "reforms" still contain provisions for a political police and a massive dossier system, but only eliminate "excesses." Or more narrowly the SCLU president's dogged resistance to SCLU's denouncing student loyalty oaths on the ground that in times of social disturbance the government is entitled—at least "constitutionally"—to expel student political dissidents.

There is also a new line of argument for civil liberties "ab constitutione," which means restricting one's concern for liberties to what can be squeezed out of the Constitution by interpretation. No matter whether something is undemocratic or not, the question is, is it constitutional?

In conclusion the Berkeley YSL reiterates its desire to see SCLU flourish as a non-partisan civil-liberties organization. However, whether this is possible rests to no small extent upon the desire of a few people in SCLU to change its character, and the reaction of SCLU's membership to proposals implementing such changes. Should SCLU become a liberal front group as opposed to its present status of a non-partisan association of liberals and socialists, and abandon its earlier principles, this will be a loss for the university community as well as a hollow victory over some socialists in SCLU.

New Issue of 'Anvil' Rings the Bell

The Winter 1956 issue of *Anvil* and *Student Partisan*, student socialist magazine, handsome in its new red-colored heavy-cover format, has just rolled off the press and will shortly go on sale on campuses, in bookstores and at newsstands all over the country.

The new format and the excellence of its articles guarantee this issue a brisk and widespread sale. *Challenge* readers who cannot get their copies through normal channels in their localities can order *Anvil* from its office, 36 East 10 Street, N. Y. C., or from the YSL national office, 114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C. Single copies sell for 25 cents; bundles of 10 or more can be ordered for 20 cents each.

The lead article in this issue, entitled "Be Happy, Go Liberal," was written by Harvey Swados, well-known novelist and literary critic. Swados' piece constitutes an analysis and critique of that new in-

tellectual type, *Liberal McCarthiensis*, which has arisen in recent years in *Partisan Review-Commentary-American Committee for Cultural Freedom* circles. More specifically, Swados subjects *An End To Innocence*, a recently published work of Leslie Fiedler (a prime example of this species), to a searching examination during the course of which Fiedler's flagellating capitulation to McCarthyism is dissected and laid bare.

Abe Stein, writer for *LABOR ACTION* and the *New Internationalist*, contributes an article, "The Religion of Sociology," in which the weakness of academic sociology is analyzed. He convincingly shows that it has failed to develop a coherent and systematic body of theory to explain society.

"Koestler—the Unpolitical Political," by Michael Harrington, national chairman of the YSL, discusses the works of that writer and points out that Koestler's confused thinking about politics and ethics leads him to the adoption of reactionary political positions.

George Rawick, an American historian who has been published in *Dissent* and the *South Atlantic Quarterly*, deals with the views of such historians as Louis Hartz, who assert that America is exempt from class struggle and the growth of a socialist movement, in "The Hartz Mountains of Liberalism." Naomi Tchardjian, who covers African affairs at the United Nations, analyzes America's reactionary role in relation to the struggles of the African peoples for independence.

Tim Wohlforth's article, "Communism in Bobbysox," describes the nature of current Stalinist politics among students and young people; it examines the "popular-front" antics of the Stalinist Labor Youth League. The final article in this issue of *Anvil*, "Germany After Geneva," by H. B. takes up recent developments on the world scene. The issue is rounded out with editorials, several book reviews, a movie review and poetry.

All indications point to a complete sell-out of this issue in a short time, a fact which should surprise no one. The current number of this expression of student socialist, radical, and anti-war opinion is one of the best issues in recent years and will be eagerly received and discussed in political and other circles among students.

Picket French Consulate Protesting Algerian War

Los Angeles, Nov. 13

The continuing French war against Algeria was the object of a demonstration yesterday before the French consulate in Hollywood. The picket line, called by a group of individuals, was participated in by the Young Socialist League, Young Peoples Socialist League (SP), pacifists, and others. Students from at least five California campuses were represented.

Posters carried by the demonstrators called on France to get out of North Africa and attested solidarity with French soldiers who are resisting the war in Algeria. Signs also protested the brutal massacres perpetrated by the French and the use of U. S.-supplied military equipment against the North Africans.

The consulate is located on a residential side-street in the Hollywood Hills' Cadillac belt. For this reason, there were no pedestrians, but many automobiles stopped to find out what was going on. Most of the passers-by seemed seriously interested, but one driver yelled "Why don't you guys go to join Trotsky?"

Photographers were present from one of the national news services; in addition pictures will probably appear in the student newspaper at the California Institute of Technology. The widespread television and newspaper coverage which a YSL demonstration at the consulate received last August was not repeated.

YSL Camp Was A Big Success

The following report of the N. Y. YSL encampment was crowded out of the past few issues of *Challenge* as a result of the press of other material. We apologize to correspondent Mulligan and the New York YSL for the delay.—Ed.

By B. MULLIGAN

New York, Oct. 25

Over fifty comrades and friends of the YSL participated in the highly successful encampment sponsored by the New York unit of the Young Socialist League at Camp Goodwill in Butler, N. J. this past weekend, with 30 present for the entire two-day period.

The campers attended two classes, hiked through the woods, played baseball, enjoyed themselves at a Saturday night social (which featured folk-dancing led by H. and A. Draper) and participated in many other activities. The beautiful Indian Summer weather, which obtained all through the weekend, helped make it an enjoyable affair.

The first educational session, Saturday afternoon, featured Bob Bone, contributor to *Anvil* and *Dissent*, in a discussion of the Negro novel. Bone analyzed the various stages of development of literature written by Negroes and showed how they reflected the developments in the consciousness of the Negro people.

During a session held outdoors in the warm fall sunlight the following afternoon, Max Shachtman, national chairman of the Independent Socialist League, gave a talk on the early days of the American Communist Party. He examined the development of the CP from the Socialist Party until 1928, and explained that despite its sectarian and other mistakes it was a serious revolutionary party which after its first few years began to develop in a healthy direction, until the Stalinist degeneration set in.

All who attended declared the camp to be a delightful experience. The New York YSL is planning to conduct another weekend encampment early next spring.

Young Socialist CHALLENGE

organ of the Young Socialist League, is published as a weekly section of *Labor Action* but is under the sole editorship of the YSL. Opinions expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of the *Challenge* or the YSL.

Habib Bourguiba Vs. Salah ben Youssef

The Split in the Tunisian Nationalists

By A. GIACOMETTI

Paris, Nov. 8

Compared with war-torn Algeria and an unsettled Morocco, Tunisia stands out as an island of peace and, in the official view, as a testing ground for a "French Commonwealth." This view is shared by the moderate nationalist leaders like Habib Bourguiba, who said in a recent speech:

"We have internal autonomy, it is a living reality. Favoritism and humiliations have come to an end. The Tunisian people can govern itself. A homogeneous Tunisian government has been formed; its decisions are no longer censored; it is free to take the decisions that it considers to be necessary for the functioning of the new regime. The city councils are in Tunisian hands, the new mechanism is working and it must be prevented from creaking."

The real situation of the country is far removed from these rosy vistas. In fact, Tunisia has passed from one crisis to another: it no longer has the problems of direct administration by a colonial power nor of colonial warfare, but it has new problems, some of which had existed in a latent form throughout the colonial era.

The first victim of the new stresses and strains has been the representative party of Tunisian nationalism, the Neo-Destour itself. The Franco-Tunisian Conventions in particular have been the issue around which the conflicts in the country and in the party have crystallized, culminating in a split in the Neo-Destour.

The Franco-Tunisian Conventions, which were ratified this summer, are the juridical expression of the new semi-colonial status of the country. They greatly curtailed French domination on the administrative and political levels, but maintained it on the military, and consolidated it on the economic levels.

The Conventions did not turn Tunisia into a sovereign state, nor did they free the Tunisian people from the scourges of colonial exploitation; they merely associated the Tunisian bourgeoisie with the administration of the country.

As such, they were the crowning achievement of the leading reformist tendency of the Neo-Destour, led by the party's president Habib Bourguiba.

RIGHT WING'S PARADOX

Peaceful change, gradualism and moderation have always seemed to this tendency the appropriate way to obtain concessions from colonialist governments. Like the right-wing nationalists (UDMA) in Algeria, Bourguiba and his supporters have spent a great deal of time fighting "extremist" tendencies within the nationalist movement.

The attitude of the Neo-Destour leadership toward the "fellagha" movement (the guerrilla army) was significant in this respect. They were caught in the uncomfortable paradox of being able to follow a conciliatory policy of negotiations only because their demands were backed by the armed resistance of elements who stood for uncompromising struggle against the French government.

The Neo-Destour could neither disavow nor oppose the "fellaghas" because they represented too valuable a bargaining-point against the French government, and because they manifestly enjoyed support from the ranks of the Neo-Destour itself. On the other hand, the guerrilla army represented an uncontrollable political center which was in the process of developing a far more radical line than the Neo-Destour was then willing to follow. It is safe to say that the voluntary disarmament of the "fellaghas" relieved the reformist wing of the Neo-Destour as much as it relieved the French administration.

BOURGEOIS PROGRAM

For reasons such as this, the leadership of the Neo-Destour considered the signing of the Franco-Tunisian Conventions as a great victory. In their view, the path was now open for a gradual,

peaceful evolution toward independence, without mass intervention from below, and without significant changes in the social structure of the country.

This program reflected very accurately the aspirations of the Tunisian bourgeoisie, in particular of the large landowners like Tahar ben Ammar, present head of the government, or Chadly Rhaim, minister of communications and leading member of the Socialist Party.

These landowners have organized Tunisian agriculture on a capitalist basis by extensive mechanization and modernization, while at the same time lowering the living standards of the peasants to the barest subsistence level. The yearly average income of a peasant in Southern Tunisia is approximately \$15. The customs union with France, for instance, benefits the land owners alone, among the Tunisian population, while it hinders the development of a native industry that could absorb the unemployed.

The Franco-Tunisian Conventions therefore fully satisfied only the Tunisian bourgeoisie and the French interests. They are unsatisfactory for all other classes in the population: for the peasants, who are directly threatened by the extension of the great estates; for the agricultural workers, who are employed on these estates at starvation wages; for the industrial workers, who are in constant economic conflict with their employers, both Tunisian and French; for the artisans, who cannot compete with cheap French manufacturers; for the merchants and shopkeepers, to whom the new "austerity" policy of the Tunisian government only means a greater tax burden and a diminution of the purchasing power of their customers.

CRISIS AND CONFLICT

In reality, the ratification of the Franco-Tunisian agreements opened a period of social strife. Moreover, these conflicts were sharpened by an economic crisis.

This crisis has several permanent reasons, of which technological unemployment is the most important: both artisans and peasants become unemployed proletarians as French industry, favored by the customs union, and the industrial agriculture of the large estates, advances. To arrest this evolution, a sweeping agrarian reform would be necessary. The land of the estates would have to be divided up among the peasants; then cooperatives would have to be organized and subsidized to enable the peasants to exploit their land effectively.

However, there is no workable land available except the estates of the bourgeois supporters of the Neo-Destour, or the French-owned estates which cannot be nationalized under the terms of the Conventions. Neither is there capital available to support the development of rural cooperatives unless foreign loans are contracted.

Another permanent factor of crisis is the "overpopulation" or, better, the undercapitalization of the country. For the past twenty-five years, the production of the most important staple, wheat, has increased by a fifth, while the population increase has been 60 per cent; in fact, wheat production per head has diminished by 18 per cent.

These permanent factors were disastrously intensified by a succession of three dry summers and bad harvests, of which this year's was the worst. At the present time, there are 600,000 unemployed in Tunisia (about 18.5 per cent of the total population). Although there are public-works projects, these only support 45,000 workers now.

The government's possibilities in meeting this situation are limited. It cannot touch French enterprises, which are protected by the Conventions; it cannot touch the Tunisian capitalists, who are one of its mainstays; the only thing it can do is to "increase production" and decree a policy of "austerity," i.e., harder work and lower living standards for the working class.

On September 29 Minister of Finance Hedi Nouira described the elements of such a policy in a speech to the French and Tunisian Chambers of Commerce.

"Even with a policy of austerity, we cannot keep the expenses [in the budget] from increasing under the pressure of the increase in population and the imperatives of progress. In the last analysis, we must therefore direct all our efforts to an increase in resources. To develop our agricultural production is one vital and urgent necessity. To favor the development for all, and by all means at our disposal, of a viable industry, is another. For these reasons, our financial policy must be adjusted to our economic policy. The government to which I have the honor of belonging has decided to take every possible measure to hasten the development of the country's resources in order to fight against unemployment and to face social necessities that become more pressing every day."

NEW OPPOSITION

In short, the leadership of the Neo-Destour finds itself in the dangerous position of a nationalist party which has to administer a colonialist economy in the midst of an economic crisis.

Whichever way it turns, it cannot maintain the unity of the party, a coalition of conflicting social classes which common struggle against French rule had kept together for over 20 years.

The first to split in the present situation were those who were hardest hit by the Conventions: the peasants and the independent petty bourgeoisie, leaving the working class and the bourgeoisie in an uneasy alliance.

This radicalism of the independent petty bourgeoisie is nothing new in North African nationalism. Its political complexion may be compared to the traditional wing of the Moroccan Istiqlal, represented by Allal El Fassi, or to the more exclusively nationalist elements in the Algerian underground. It draws its leadership from the Cairo exiles, who have received much support from the Egyptian junta and who, in their propaganda, sometimes lapse into reactionary and chauvinistic overtones.

In Tunisia, the leader of this opposition has been the secretary-general of the Neo-Destour, Salah ben Youssef. Immediately after the ratification of the Franco-Tunisian Conventions, he denounced them as dangerous for the future of the country, and proclaimed his intention to return to Tunisia to "hinder their application." He correctly criticized them as legalizing the most important aspects of French domination. "France has remained the unquestioned master of Tunisia's destinies. . . . From the economic and financial point of view, France is continuing to despoil the country as it did in the past."

BEN YOUSSEF'S LINE

In a recent speech, which is also revealing as to the nature of his appeal, Salah ben Youssef spelled out his immediate program:

"I returned to Tunis to work for the good of the fatherland and for God's religion. Since my return, I publicized a bitter truth which some would keep hidden from the people. If the people approved the Conventions, it would betray the sacred memory of the martyrs who lie buried in all corners of our dear Tunisia.

"I have said, and I repeat, that the Conventions represent a step backward. Yes, it is true, we lived before under a despotic regime which had been imposed upon us by force. But we were free to demand all our rights, to see the Tunisian flag flying over the public adminis-

trations and to constitute an autonomous government.

"This flag now cannot fly outside of our country. Abroad, we are represented by France, which also has the right to raise an army, whatever its size may be. . . . In case of war against our Algerian or Moroccan brothers, France will be able to use the strategic advantages of our country. Was the sacrifice of our basic positions a step forward? It would have been preferable to obtain one instead of ten per cent of our rights and to remain free of all commitments toward France.

"Before Bourguiba, Ben Youssef or Mongi Slim, the people alone have the last word. . . . I have not said that it was necessary to fight the Conventions by force of arms. Is it not possible to organize a congress where all the representatives of the people could express themselves freely to examine the Conventions? A decision taken at such a congress would be binding. I am certain that the people will decide against the Conventions."

RETROGRESSIVE TONE

Salah ben Youssef's denunciations of the Conventions and of the party leadership have been countered by the latter with his expulsion from the party, along with three of his leading supporters. At the same time, the Political Bureau decided to call a congress for November 15.

Salah ben Youssef has called for a boycott of this congress, and has convoked a minority congress for the first weeks in 1956. Since his expulsion, he has traveled through the country, rallying his followers and frequently clashing with the supporters of Bourguiba.

As yet, there is no such thing as a program of Salah ben Youssef's tendency. The only concrete element in its propaganda is the rejection of the Conventions. The propagandistic tone is nevertheless revealing; it shows a withdrawal to exclusively nationalist positions, with a strong emphasis on pan-Islamism, return to traditional customs, religion—perhaps in the hope of conciliating the traditionalists of the Old Destour, who also oppose the Conventions.

Such a withdrawal is an inevitable consequence of the passivity of the French labor movement, which failed to support the North African peoples. Had it intervened, it could have contributed decisively to orient the radical wing of the nationalist movement in a positive way.

But even in the present situation, the future of revolutionary nationalism does not lie in the hands of Salah ben Youssef's followers, but will be determined by the Tunisian labor movement, in particular the UGTT, the trade union federation.

LABOR TAKES A HAND

In the present conflict between Bourguiba and Salah ben Youssef, the UGTT has supported the reformist tendency of the Neo-Destour. However, this alliance has been neither unconditional nor very stable, and the nature of the conflicts between the UGTT and the government shows that it is not likely to be lasting either.

In July, a general strike was narrowly averted as the UGTT and the three small federations (F.O., CFTC and the Stalinist USTT) demanded a general wage raise of 30 per cent. The government countered the demand with completely insignificant proposals, then granted a 10 per cent raise and fringe benefits after a series of industry-wide strikes threatened to disorganize the whole economy.

At the time, Ahmed ben Salah, the secretary-general of the UGTT, made a speech which is as good a statement as any of the UGTT's policy and perspectives. He said, among other things:

"Our federation will not tone down its traditional struggle; . . . it intends to safeguard the right of our country to exercise its sovereignty; it will see to it that the social content of our nationalism does not retreat before any pressure. . . . What we want above all is that the social and economic problems take precedence over all other considerations. We must take rapid action to establish the new institutions and a reign of social justice and political democracy over the country. . . ."

As a warning to the next government, which was to take office in September, Ahmed ben Salah said a few days later:

"If the next government does not establish an action program in agreement with the national organizations [meaning the UGTT] we shall have a free hand, regardless of who the new cabinet and its head may be."

One detects in this speech, as in the

(Turn to last page)

A PAGE FROM THE HISTORY OF COLONIALISM

By Rosa Luxemburg:

HOW FRENCH IMPERIALISM DESPOILED ALGERIA

Today, while the Algerian struggle of national liberation against French colonialism is in the headlines, we take the opportunity to present a classic analysis of the impact of imperialism on subject peoples—Rosa Luxemburg's passage, in her *Accumulation of Capital, on Algeria*, published just before the First World War.

British India and French Algeria are the two case studies in Luxemburg's book of the way in which developing capitalist imperialism inevitably sought to recreate in its own image all economic and social life in the less developed countries it had seized, disrupting the lives of the people on its way.

"Next to tormented British India," begins Rosa Luxemburg, "Algeria under French rule claims pride of place in the annals of capitalist colonization."

First, she explains, when the French conquered Algeria, there still remained among the Arab-Kabyle population ancient social and economic institutions, and in part these still survived at the time Rosa was writing. "Nearly half of the productive land is jointly held by Arab and Kabyle tribes who still keep up the patriarchal customs." Many families still led a nomad life. "The fields of those Arabs who had settled on the land were in most cases the joint property of the clans, and the great Kabyle family associations also lived according to old traditional rules under the patriarchal guidance of their elected heads."

She describes the primitive-communal character of the clans: "not only the fields but all the tools, weapons and monies, all that the members acquire or need for their work, are communal property of the clan. Personal property is confined to one suit of clothing, and in the case of a woman to the dresses and ornaments of her dowry. More valuable attire and jewels, however, are considered common property, and individuals were allowed to use them only if the whole family approved. If the clan was not too numerous, meals were taken at a common table; the women took it in turns to cook, but the eldest were entrusted with the dishing out. If a family circle was too large, the head of the family would each month ration out strictly proportionate quantities of uncooked food to the individual families who then prepared them. . . ."

These social relations were already seriously impaired by Turkish rule, established in the 16th century. By the time of the French conquest, only 12.5 million acres remained the communal property of individual Arab clans.

With this background, Luxemburg analyzes the dynamics of French imperialist rule in the section which we reprint below, somewhat condensed.

With their conquest of Algeria, the French made a great ado about their work of civilization, since the country, having shaken off the Turkish yoke at the beginning of the 18th century, was harboring the pirates who infested the Mediterranean and trafficked in Christian slaves. Spain and the North American Union in particular, themselves at that time slave traders on no mean scale, declared relentless war on this Moslem iniquity.

France, in the very throes of the Great Revolution, proclaimed a crusade against Algerian anarchy. Her subjection of that country was carried through under the slogans of "combating slavery" and "instituting orderly and civilized conditions."

Yet practice was soon to show what was at the bottom of it all. It is common knowledge that in the 40 years following the subjection of Algeria, no European state suffered so many changes in its political system as France. . . . Yet French policy in Algeria remained undeflected by this succession of events; it pursued a single aim from beginning to end; at the fringe of the African desert, it demonstrated plainly that all the political revolutions in 19th century France centered in a single basic interest: the rule of a capitalist bourgeoisie and its institutions of ownership.

"The bill submitted for your consideration," said Deputy Humbert on June 30, 1873, in the session of the French National Assembly as spokesman for the Commission for Regulating Agrarian Conditions in Algeria, "is but the crowning touch to an edifice well-founded on a whole series of ordinances, edicts, laws and decrees of the Senate which together and severally have as the same object: the establishment of private property among the Arabs."

In spite of the ups and downs of internal French politics, French colonial policy persevered for 50 years in its systematic and deliberate efforts to destroy and disrupt communal property. It served two distinct purposes.

The break-up of communal property was primarily intended to smash the social power of the Arab family associations and to quell their stubborn resistance against the French yoke, in the course of which there were innumerable risings so that, in spite of France's military superiority, the country was in a continual state of war.¹

1. "We must lose no time in dissolving the family associations, since they are the lever of all opposition against our rule" (Deputy Didier in the National Assembly of 1851).

Secondly, communal property had to be disrupted in order to gain the economic assets of the conquered country; the Arabs, that is to say, had to be deprived of the land they had owned for a thousand years, so that French capitalists could get it.

DISRUPTING THE COMMUNAL ECONOMY

Once again the fiction we know so well, that under Moslem law all land belongs to the ruler, was brought into play. Just as the English had done in British India, so Louis Philippe's governors in Algeria declared the existence of communal property owned by the clan to be "impossible." This fiction served as an excuse to claim for the state most of the uncultivated areas, and especially the commons, woods and meadows, and to use them for purposes of colonization.

A complete system of settlement developed, the so-called *cantonments* which settled French colonists on the clan land and herded the tribes into a small area. Under the decrees of 1830, 1831, 1840, 1844, 1845 and 1846, these thefts of Arab family land were legalized.

Yet this system of settlement did not actually further colonization; it only bred wild speculation and usury. In most instances the Arabs managed to buy back the land that had been taken from them, although they were thus incurring heavy debts.

French methods of oppressive taxation had the same tendency, in particular the law of June 16, 1851, proclaiming all forests to be state property, which robbed the natives of 6,000,000 acres of pasture and brushwood, and took away the prime essential for animal husbandry.

This spate of laws, ordinances and regulations wrought havoc with the ownership of land in the country. Under the prevailing condition of feverish speculation in land, many natives sold their estates to the French in the hope of ultimately recovering them. Quite often they sold the same plot to two or three buyers at a time, and what is more, it was quite often inalienable family land and did not even belong to them. . . . There followed an infinite number of lawsuits in which the French courts supported on principle all partitions and claims of the buyers.

In these uncertain conditions, speculation, usury and anarchy were rife. But although the introduction of French colonists in large numbers among the Arab population had aimed at securing support for, the French government, this scheme failed miserably.

IN THE NAME OF PROFIT

Thus, under the Second Empire, French policy tried another tack. The government, with its European lack of vision, had stubbornly denied the existence of communal property for 30 years, but it had learned better at last. By a single stroke of the pen, joint family property was officially recognized and condemned to be broken up.

This is the double significance of the decree of the Senate dated April 22, 1864. General Allard declared in the Senate:

"The government does not lose sight of the fact that the general aim of its policy is to weaken the influence of the tribal chieftains and to dissolve the family associations. By this means, it will sweep away the last remnants of feudalism [sic] defended by the opponents of the government bill. . . . The surest method of accelerating the process of dissolving the family associations will be to institute private property and to settle European colonists among the Arab families."²

The law of 1863 created special commissions for cutting up the landed estates, consisting of the chairman, either a brigadier-general or colonel, one *sous-préfet*, one representative of the Arab military authorities and an official bailiff. These natural experts on African economics and social conditions . . . proceeded to their destinations. . . . Ten years' valiant efforts by the commissions yielded the following result: between 1863 and 1873, of 700 hereditary estates, 400 were shared out among the branches of each clan, and the foundations for future inequalities between great landed estates and small allotments were thus laid. . . .

Partition, however, stopped at that point. Arab customs presented insurmountable difficulties to a further division of family land. In spite of colonels and brigadiers, French policy had again failed in its object to create private property for transfer to the French.

FREE HAND FOR EXPLOITATION

But the Third Republic, an undisguised regime of the bourgeoisie, had the courage and the cynicism to go straight for its goal and to attack the problem from the other end, disdaining the preliminaries of the Second Empire. In 1873, the National Assembly worked out a law with the avowed intention immediately to split up the entire estates of all the 700 Arab clans, and forcibly to institute private property in the shortest possible time.

Desperate conditions in the colony were the pretext for this measure. It had taken the great Indian famine of 1866 to awaken the British public to the marvelous exploits of British colonial policy and to call for a par-

2. Since the Great Revolution, of course, it had become the fashion in France to dub all opposition to the government an open or covert defense of feudalism.

liamentary investigation; and similarly, Europe was alarmed at the end of the sixties by the crying needs of Algeria where more than 40 years of French rule culminated in widespread famine and a disastrous mortality rate among the Arabs.

A commission of inquiry was set up to recommend new legislation with which to bless the Arabs: it was unanimously resolved that there was only one life-buoy for them—the institution of private property; that alone could save the Arab from destitution, since he would then always be able to sell or mortgage his land. It was decided therefore that the only means of alleviating the distress of the Arabs, deeply involved in debts as they were because of the French land robberies and oppressive taxation, was to deliver them completely into the hands of the usurers.

This farce was expounded in all seriousness before the National Assembly and was accepted with equal gravity by that worthy body. The "victors" of the Paris Commune flaunted their brazenness.

In the National Assembly, two arguments in particular served to support the new law.

Those in favor of the bill emphasized over and over again that the Arabs themselves urgently desired the introduction of private property. And so they did, or rather the Algerian land speculators and usurers did, since they were vitally interested in "liberating" their victims from the protection of the family ties. As long as Moslem law prevailed in Algeria, hereditary clan and family lands were inalienable, which laid insuperable difficulties in the way of anyone who wished to mortgage his land. The law of 1863 had merely made a breach in these obstacles, and the issue now at stake was their complete abolition so as to give a free hand to the usurers.

TOWARD ECONOMIC RUIN

The second argument was "scientific," part of the same intellectual equipment from which that worthy, James Mill, had drawn for his abstruse conclusions regarding Indian relations of ownership: English classical economics. Thoroughly versed in their masters' teachings, the disciples of Smith and Ricardo impressively declared that private property is indispensable for the prevention of famines in Algeria, for more intensive and better cultivation of the land, since obviously no one would be prepared to invest capital or intensive labor in a piece of land which does not belong to him and whose produce is not his own to enjoy.

But the facts spoke a different language. They proved that the French speculators employed the private property they had created in Algeria for anything but the more intensive and improved cultivation of the soil.

In 1873, 1,000,000 acres were French property. But the capitalist companies, the Algerian and Setif Company which owned 300,000 acres, did not cultivate the land at all but leased it to the natives who tilled it in the traditional manner, nor were 25 per cent of the other French owners engaged in agriculture. It was simply impossible to conjure up capitalist investments and intensive agriculture overnight, just as capitalist conditions in general could not be created out of nothing. They existed only in the imagination of profit-seeking French speculators, and in the benighted doctrinaire visions of their scientific economists.

The essential point, shorn of all pretexts and flourishes which seem to justify the law of 1873, was simply the desire to deprive the Arabs of their land, their livelihood. And although these arguments had worn threadbare and were evidently insincere, this law, which was to put Paid to the Algerian population and their material prosperity, was passed unanimously on July 26, 1873.

But even this master-stroke soon proved a failure. The policy of the Third Republic miscarried because of the difficulties in substituting at one stroke bourgeois private property for the ancient clan communism, just as the policy of the Second Empire had come to grief over the same issue: In 1890, when the law of July 26, 1873, supplemented by a second law on April 28, 1887, had been in force for 17 years, 14,000,000 francs had been spent on dealing with 40,000,000 acres. It was estimated that the process would not be completed before 1950 and would require a further 60,000,000 francs. And still abolition of clan communism, the ultimate purpose, had not been accomplished.

What had really been attained was all too evident: reckless speculation in land, thriving usury and the economic ruin of the natives.

OPEN DOOR FOR CAPITALISTS

Since it had been impossible to institute private property by force, a new experiment was undertaken. The laws of 1873 and 1887 had been condemned by a commission appointed for their revision by the Algerian government in 1890. It was another seven years before the legislators on the Seine made the effort to consider reforms for the ruined country.

The new decree of the Senate refrained in principle from instituting private property by compulsion or administrative measures. The laws of February 2, 1897, and the edict of the governor-general of Algeria (March 3, 1898) both provided chiefly for the introduction of private property following a voluntary application by the prospective purchaser or owner.

But there were clauses to permit a single owner, without the consent of the others, to claim private property; further, such a "voluntary" application can be extorted at any convenient moment if the owner is in debt and the usurer exerts pressure. And so the new law left the doors wide open for French and native capitalists further to disrupt and exploit the hereditary and clan lands.

Of recent years, this mutilation of Algeria which had been going on for eight decades meets with even less opposition, since the Arabs, surrounded as they are by French capital following the subjection of Tunisia (1881) and the recent conquest of Morocco, have been rendered more and more helpless. The latest result of the French regime in Algeria is an Arab exodus into Turkey.

ISL Case Still Stalled by Government

Readers have no doubt been wondering what has happened to the Department of Justice hearing in which the Independent Socialist League is protesting its inclusion on the attorney general's notorious "subversive list."

It may be recalled that the hearing, which is the first of its kind since the "subversive list" was promulgated in 1948, started in Washington around the end of last July. It was recessed after a day and a half when the ISL's attorneys moved to disqualify hearing examiner Edward M. Morrissey for personal bias and prejudice.

The ISL's appeal to disqualify the hearing examiner was refused by Attorney General Herbert Brownell in a letter dated September 2. Upon receipt of this letter, the ISL and its lawyers, Joseph E. Rauh and Isaac N. Groner, were prepared to resume the hearing immediately. The Department of Justice's law-

yers informed them that they would hear from hearing examiner Morrissey as soon as he was ready to resume the hearings.

After waiting a few weeks, the ISL's attorneys wrote Morrissey reminding him that the organizations have been trying to get a hearing for eight years, and urging him to set an early date for a resumption of the hearing. Mr. Morrissey replied on October 4 that he is presently engaged in holding a hearing as examiner for the Subversive Activities Control Board (his regular job), that he has no way of knowing how long that hearing will take, and that he will notify the ISL's attorneys when he is ready to resume the hearing in their case.

There is no way of telling how long the "recess" of the hearing in the ISL's case may last. The constitutional provisions for speedy trials are, it appears, as

foreign to the Department of Justice's conduct of its administrative hearings as are any other provisions, like informing the accused of the nature and cause of accusation, their right to be confronted by the witnesses against them, and other factors which enter into the concept of "due process" and civil liberties.

It is the hope of the Independent Socialist League, its attorneys, and the Workers Defense League which has been seeking to publicize its case and to gather financial and moral support for it, that the hearing will resume in the near future. In the meantime, they are doing everything possible to make the vital importance of this hearing and its consequences widely known. Every person concerned with civil liberties should give what aid he can to the WDL's special committee which has been set up to fight the case, and to the ISL itself.

State Dep't Groping---

(Continued from page 1)

non-committal attitude which would leave the position of his government in doubt. When he came back with his "better baggage" after a weekend recess, it is clear that the line had hardened, and it had been decided in Moscow that it would serve the Stalinists' purposes better to torpedo the conference quickly and decisively than to let it, and the mood under which it had convened, linger on indefinitely.

Once the decision has been made that there was nothing to trade in the imperialist market, it is obvious why the Russian rulers decided to put an end to the discussions at Geneva as quickly as possible.

The capitalist allies were in a position to pose as the advocates of a more democratic and popular course on Germany (unity through democratic elections and freedom to decide the future diplomatic and military relations of the new Germany). Since the Stalinists were in the embarrassing position of having to explain why they will not permit the German people to decide their own future by democratic processes, it was best to get the discussion away from an arena where even men with as dirty imperialist hands as the representatives of French, British and American imperialism could successfully point the finger of scorn at them before the whole world.

With the disintegration of the Geneva conference, it appears that one stage of the thaw in the cold war has definitely come to a close. This was the stage at which a Russian smile seemed enough to melt the hearts and even the brains of the sternest advocates of such grim doctrines as "negotiation from strength" and "massive retaliation."

It was the stage at which the shift in the Stalinist attitudes was so sudden and literally disarming that it appeared to many that there might be no limit to what the Stalinists might be willing to do, or yield, while caught in the throes of this sweet smiling frenzy. It was the period of the first passionate courtship, when the bloom was definitely on the peach. And now it is over.

WHAT NOW?

The question which the State Department must ask itself is simply: what now? As long as wars were being fought or were on the verge of erupting, the policy

of building military strength all over the world, and seeking allies with whom to build it, made at least a superficial kind of sense to most people.

To those millions in this country and abroad who had misgivings and worse about the final outcome of such a policy, its architects in the Pentagon and State Department, and their many-throated chorus of supporters all over the country, could say:

What is your alternative? The Reds are attacking in Korea, they are gaining in Indochina, they have engulfed East Europe and threaten the rest of it. What other language do they understand but force? It is all very well to speak of economic aid and the like, but all that will not prevail unless we have the armed force to defend it. Once we have that force in sufficiently impressive quantity so that we can negotiate from strength, the Russian rulers will see the light and we will be able to make some kind of a favorable deal.

When the Stalinists began to smile, there must have been a brief, soaring moment when the intellectuals assembled in the Pentagon and at the State Department really believed that their scheme would work out. "I'll be hornsogged," they must have said to themselves, like the astounded inventor in the story, "if the old windmill ain't goin' to fly after all!"

The more imaginative of them may even have had daydreams of Molotov on bended knee before Dulles, Pinay and Macmillan, imploring them not to take unsportsmanlike advantage of Russian weakness, and handing them East Germany on a silver platter, not in exchange for some equivalent in a hard bargain, but in the fond (but illusory) hope that such an act of seeming generosity would deter them from sternly demanding that the Stalinists unhand the rest of the loot in peoples and territories they took over in World War II.

As the second Geneva conference drew near, anyone who may have entertained the extravagant kind of dream imagined above must have reduced it to more modest proportions. Geneva, however, demonstrated that the dream, like the American policy which preceded it, was made of the stuff of illusions.

HARD BARGAINER

The stern facts are that although Stalinist Russia is not nearly as strong as she is sometimes imagined to be, and is deeply vulnerable both internally and externally to political attack, her strength relative to that of the capitalist world, now that she too possesses a stockpile of nuclear weapons, is such that she can and will drive a hard bargain when her opponents have something to trade, and will give away nothing just for the pleasure of making happy Dulles and his chief in Washington.

Why should the Stalinists have given up East Germany at this conference? Because they have suddenly been convinced that democracy, or honesty, or generosity is the best policy? But then they would have to give up the whole of East Europe, and their own rule in Russia to boot for the same reasons.

What did the capitalist side have to offer in exchange for such an invaluable prize? Alternatively, what lever did the allies possess which could pry such a prize loose from the Russians? Not very much . . . evidently not enough, in ex-

change, and almost nothing in the way of political leverage.

In the *New York Times* for November 15, James Reston states that high administration sources are "seriously disturbed" at the post-Geneva prospects because they believe that "events are running steadily against the administration's policy in Germany. He adds that there is a "deterioration of United States influence in Southeast Asia and the Middle East," and that it is being said in the embassies of America's allies that "the United States has lost the gamble to arm and unite Germany within the North Atlantic Treaty alliance."

If all these gloomy second-thoughts on the American prospects in the cold-war lull are justified, what new policies are being proposed to replace the old ones which have failed?

(In this article, Reston, who is at the same time head of the *Times* Washington bureau, one of the State Department's favorite unofficial mouthpieces and trial-balloon launching platforms, and an exceptionally intelligent and responsible journalist, writes that "The secretary of state's reliance on military solutions of the problems in Germany, in the Middle East and Southeast Asia are now being questioned by his own associates.")

GOING BACK?

The answer is that no new policies have been proposed by either liberal or conservative spokesmen in America. We leave aside, at this point, the lunatic fringe who have the same solution to all problems of foreign affairs: drop the atom bomb on them now.

The Republicans will in all likelihood be quite content to coast along hoping that nothing serious happens before next November 2 so that they can still claim to be the party of peace. The Democrats, to and through their labor and liberal wings, will find gripes about this or that aspect of the Eisenhower-Dulles policies and procedures, but they have little different to offer themselves.

The Democrats were the architects of the military-containment policy carried through by Dulles. Some of them may long for the days of the Berlin airlift and the Korean war when the enemy could be clearly distinguished, identified, and dealt with by the superior material means America has at her disposal, but it will hardly do for them to seek a return to office by advocating return to the good old days when one might wake up any fine morning fearing that the old home town had been transformed into a gigantic mushroom during the night.

But if a return to the tough policies of the cold war is politically not practicable this year, and a continuation of the present relatively relaxed and flexible but stubbornly unyielding deadlock leads to a gradual deterioration of America's influence all over the world—what then?

As socialists, we have never considered it our responsibility to advise a capitalist State Department on how it should conduct its foreign policy. We are deeply concerned, however, that the labor movement in this country, starting with its most advanced sections in the CIO, come earlier rather than later to recognize the reactionary character of the policy they have been supporting so long.

It is of the greatest importance and urgency that THEY, and not only Dulles's associates, should begin to seek an alternative to the policy which is being shown

Tunisia ---

(Continued from page 6)

speech by Hedi Noura, a sense of urgency, of racing against the clock. The government hurries lest the UGTT conquer too many positions in the new state. The UGTT hurries before the reactionary interests get too entrenched. Both hurry lest the shaky structure of "internal autonomy" collapse under the impact of events in Algeria and Morocco.

Actually, such statements are only weak reflections of the clash of interests that has continuously strained relations between the labor movement and the government. The campaign of the UGTT to find work for the unemployed and to raise the general wage level has conflicted with the government's "austerity" program; its organizing campaign among the agricultural workers has hit the Tunisian bourgeoisie where it hurts most. The recent general strike on the estates of Tahar ben Ammar, against the firing of union organizers and the non-application of social legislation, may be taken as a symbol.

The choice before the UGTT is one which all labor movements in colonial or semi-colonial countries must face sooner or later, and which the Moroccan labor movement in particular will have to face soon.

In the first stages of autonomy, when direct administration has been abolished and the native bourgeoisie has taken responsibilities in government, the working class no longer enters into conflict with foreign interests alone, but also with its own bourgeoisie. The proletarian tendency which has developed in the party of nationalism, then, has to do one of two things: either take over the party, and turn it into a labor party, shedding the party's right wing in the process; or else, leave the party and lay the foundations for a labor party with a socialist program (as in India, in Syria, etc.).

In Tunisia, the UGTT will more and more enter into conflict with the sacrosanct French enterprises, and with those of the Tunisian capitalists. The Franco-Tunisian Conventions will increasingly appear as an obstacle to a progressive social and political development.

Soon the UGTT will have to face its real task: that of formulating an independent program of opposition, that can rally on a progressive basis the working class, the peasants and the elements that are now following Salah ben Youssef. Time is short, for the repression in Algeria is bound to have political repercussions in the Regency.

up so crassly for the failure it is. What is needed is a policy or series of policies which represent the interests of the American people as a whole, and hence of the peoples of all countries rather than of American imperialism and its decaying satellites all over the world.

A DEMOCRATIC PROGRAM

LABOR ACTION has often discussed such a policy under the general heading of "a democratic foreign policy." By this we mean one which bases itself on the democratic needs, aspirations and desires of the peoples on both sides of the Iron Curtain and throughout the colonial and underdeveloped areas of the world; one which, regardless of how this may affect the present ruling classes and imperialist powers, seeks to rally these people to struggle for their own democratic social political and economic rights, and offers them every legitimate aid it can in such struggle; one which seeks neither to cultivate nor buy the friendship of Franco or of Khrushchev, of Chiang Kai-shek or of Mao Tse-tung, but rather, while threatening neither nuclear nor conventional warfare, uses every political agency and means at its command to hold these tyrants up to the scorn, hatred and contempt of the freedom-loving masses of the world, and to support and foster the democratic popular movements which are struggling, with greater or less success, everywhere to free themselves from exploitation and repression.

With such a program, representatives of the American people could face Molotov anywhere, any time, without fear of the consequences. They could look forward either to an extension of the thaw in the cold war, or a return to the period of "tough" political warfare with equal confidence. But the American people will never be represented by spokesmen with such a program as long as the American labor movement continues to be tied firmly to either of the two major parties.

We must liberate ourselves from the political illusions which keep us thus bound before we can help others to liberate themselves from the chains of domestic or imperialistically imposed tyranny.



DULLES: The Smile Is Gone