

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

A Mystery Story About the AFL-CIO:
The Ghost of the Lonely Refugee

... page 2

THE LABOR LEFT WING IN TUNISIA

... page 3

BEVAN MANEUVERS FOR THE MANTLE

... page 3

THE INDIAN SOCIALIST PARTY SPLIT

... page 4

INDEX TO LABOR ACTION for 1955

... page 6

DECEMBER 26, 1955

FIVE CENTS

SPOT-LIGHT

THE FOREIGN AID MIX-UP: An Answer to Khrushchev?

Too Far on the Road

By its "massive retaliation" against Syrian shooting at Israeli fishermen, the "activist" government of Ben-Gurion confirmed everything we wrote about the provocativeness of its policy. To counter the aggressive designs of the Arab rulers, the Israeli leaders rely on military intimidation. It is a toy-scale replica of U. S. policy vis-a-vis Russia in this respect, with far less chance of having even short-range effect.

What is good, however, is that the Syrian adventure finally brought a sharp reaction within Israeli itself. The prominent Israeli paper *Haaretz* argued that retaliation on such a scale was not justified; for example, it argued that even the Israeli press (let alone the world press) had not given any prominence previously to the Syrian attacks against fishermen which the foray was supposed to avenge.

The N. Y. *Post*, which on such questions usually functions as virtually a mouthpiece of Zionism, also squeezed out an editorial criticism of "the reckless strategy of retaliation" which is "inviting only disaster." Ben-Gurion this time went too far even for these apologists. What is wrong, however, is not that he went too far but that the road itself is one that leads only to disaster and plays into the hands of the worst elements of the Arab feudalities.

Wards or Guinea-Pigs?

An AP dispatch from the Chicago meeting of the Radiological Society reports that, according to Navy Commander Cronkite, radioactive fallout from a U. S. bomb test in the Pacific last year "caused temporary skin eruptions and loss of hair in 90 per cent of some 64 Marshall Island natives . . . some of the atomic burns were deep and became infected." All were cured, he said, however.

The Marshall Islanders are supposed to be wards of the U. S., delivered over to the tender care of Uncle Sam by the UN. Suppose this were being done to 100 per cent American citizens, with white-pink skins, even if all were eventually cured of atomic infections? Or suppose this were being done, even to Marshall Islanders, by barbarous Russian H-bombs . . . ?

Down with

the old year at our
New Year's Eve Party—
Dancing, food, drink, and
a gay, gala time for all.

ISL and YSL
Sat. eve., Dec. 31—9 and on
LABOR ACTION HALL
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

By GORDON HASKELL

Ever since the Stalinists opened up their new political offensive in the Middle East and Southeast Asia, it has become evident to increasingly wide circles that the United States will have to adopt some kind of program of its own to meet it. Reports from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization conference hint at some new emphasis in Secretary of State Dulles' thinking on political strategy for the period ahead. He is said to favor a greater emphasis on political and economic integration for the NATO countries, and has concretely given strong verbal support to the idea of a pooling of their atomic energy resources and production.

Since the utter collapse of American policy in the Indochinese crisis which came right after the fall of Dienbienphu, there has been a swelling chorus on the liberal left for a greater emphasis on economic aid as against programs of purely military containment. Thus, when rumors begin seeping through that Dulles, and what one might loosely call his co-thinkers on foreign policy, are groping around for something with which to meet the Stalinist moves in the Middle East and the Khrushchev-Bulgarian junctet in Southeast Asia, it was quite nat-

ural that people should jump to the assumption that what is proposed is an increase in foreign-aid expenditures.

This assumption led to one of the mix-ups to which we have become accustomed, if not reconciled, since the practical men of business have taken over the administration of the government from the old-style bureaucrats.

There was first an announcement that foreign aid would be doubled during the fiscal year. After a number of congressmen had publicly reacted with strong expressions of disbelief bordering on shock, Washington explained that although the appropriation for foreign aid will have to be doubled during the next session of Congress, no increase in expenditures is planned. It appears that the foreign-aid program has been living off the "fat" of unexpected carry-over balances, and in

order to keep the pipeline full and to permit planning ahead, a much larger appropriation is needed than last year.

All this was another one of those wonderful devices for winning friends and influencing people abroad which have been brought to such a state of pink-skinned perfection by Dulles and his cohorts. The fact that newspapermen and congressmen alike misunderstood the original announcement is perfectly natural, since they were expecting something in the way of a changed policy with which America would seek to counteract the Stalinist post-Geneva push.

It now appears that whatever Dulles & Co. may be thinking about, they are proposing NOTHING new, at least at the present time.

THE SECOND DULLES

The liberals, one may expect, will be bitterly disappointed. They, or at least many of them, have now achieved a state of wisdom in which they at least understand that something more than the rattling of A-bombs is needed if the Stalinists are to be stopped in Asia. Many of them have, one must regretfully say, come to the conclusion that the jingling of dollars in large quantities for eco-

(Continued on page 4)

Brownell Fears New Blow by Cain Against His 'Subversive List' System

By BERNARD CRAMER

The case of the Washington Pension Union, involving the Justice Department's attack on ex-Senator Harry Cain, is of wider significance than the scanty news about the affair make out. In fact, it could possibly turn out to be a sensation.

It involves a real possibility that the notorious Attorney General's "Subversive List" may get a bad blow right in the middle of its solar plexus. And not from a court, this time.

That is why Herbert Brownell, the List's current custodian, intervened in the case this past Tuesday.

Briefly the main facts are as follows. The Washington Pension Union was formed in 1937 to work for larger old-age pensions in the state of Washington, and gained considerable strength; it once had 30,000 members in the state and quite a bit of political leverage. When the witchhunt was institutionalized by the Truman administration, the WPU was put on the Subversive List as a "Communist front."

Of course, quite aside from CP control or influence, thousands of ex-members of this organization were not Stalinists or pro-Stalinists at all, and even if they were, they were being victimized for political ideas and activities.

As our readers know, the Justice Department has never given any organization on its List a chance for a hearing (with the exception of the Independent

Socialist League whose unfinished hearing is currently stalled). But when the witchhunting McCarran Act was passed by Congress, one of the reasons why Truman unsuccessfully vetoed it was the fact that it did provide for hearings of a sort.

The Subversive Activities Control Board set up by this act was supposed to create its own subversive list (separate and apart from the attorney general's) and for the purposes of this list the SACB followed a hearings procedure. So far only the CP and some of its fronts have been listed after hearings. The slowness and cumbersomeness of this more "democratic" kind of witchhunting was one of the reasons why Truman objected to the law—not (as some were led to believe) because of the police-state aspects of the law.

The setting up of the SACB under the McCarran Act, therefore, provided a formal means through which an organization "listed" by the attorney general might possibly get a hearing somewhere, even if not by the attorney general. But of course this did not seem like a very hopeful exception to the well-laid plan of the government to make its "listing" proof against any democratic check.

In the first place, a "listed" organization could not itself take the initiative. If and when the attorney general himself cited an organization to the SACB, thereby asking the SACB to put the organization on the latter's own list, then

the SACB would hold a hearing.

And in the second place, the composition of the SACB seemed such as to make a mockery of the idea that it could possibly act as a "democratic" control on the arbitrary power of the Justice Department. Even when Truman tried to name one and only one semi-liberal to the board, Charles La Follette, his nomination was killed in Congress.

Yet, in spite of these two strikes against democracy, the subversive list is now in serious trouble from this direction, as a result of the accidental conjunction of two developments: (1) The attorney general did cite the Washington Pension Union to the SACB, thus launching a hearing procedure for it. (2) A man named Cain turned maverick.

Harry Cain had been a senator from Washington and a true-blue McCarthyite when, in 1952, he was defeated for reelection, and, in 1953, appointed to the SACB by Eisenhower as a consolation prize. Then in an amazing personal flip-flop, Cain suddenly blossomed out as one

(Turn to last page)

Happy holiday and
best wishes for
the new year . . .
THE EDITORS

A MYSTERY STORY

THE GHOST of THE LONELY REFUGEE

By H. W. BENSON

By common consent, union president, bank president and plain president bar the class struggle from American life. And not a minute too soon—just on the eve of the greatest mobilization of popular power in the history of the United States.

Fifteen million men and women, representing a quarter of the country's population, are now united behind the banner of a single workers' organization, the largest of its type in the world. And more millions are to come. For 25 years, the American labor movement has been in the process of creation; the founding of the AFL-CIO marks its official appearance, a reference date for the beginning of big social and political changes.

And somehow everyone feels impelled to reassure us against the frightening specter of class struggle: first, that there is no class struggle, certainly not in this country; second, that no one wants to have it; third, that no one admits to prosecuting it; fourth, that there's no future for it.

But until the merger was projected, the whole subject was simply ignored. Now merger has its way. Reuther and Meany, who reject the class struggle, accuse the NAM, the Republican Party and extremist employers of stimulating it. Republicans who repudiate it accuse labor and the Democrats of encouraging it. Democrats, who naturally shy away from it, denounce the Republicans for practising it.

Whodunit?

In this world of odd interrelationships, nobody confesses that it was he who sired the illegitimate offspring. The finger of accusation points back and forth.

First there was Eisenhower who initiated the scientific discussion in his remarks to the merger convention. "The class struggle doctrine of Marx," he lectured the delegates, "was the invention of a lonely refugee scribbling in a dark recess of the British Museum. He abhorred and detested the great middle class." In more vernacular terms, David McDonald, Steelworkers' union president, was reported as saying, "Marx was a jerky sort of guy who didn't know the score."

If he was so lonely, if it was so dark, and if he was so "jerky," why use a national telephone hook-up to New York to tell this to 2000 delegates who are busy with important matters?

It was a hundred years ago; the man has been dead for over 70 years. If all the lucubrations of the world's bitter museum-brooders for the past hundred years had to be repudiated anew centennially, there would be little time left for joyful contemporaries and their happy thoughts.

And his "invention"?

In the United States alone, millions of blueprints are filed away in the patent office. One describes a device for fishermen: by a flick of the piscatorial thumb a recumbent angler shoots his lure off into the water and waits in repose until the hooked fish is automatically retrieved. Curiously the president, who must seek the less strenuous forms of sport, pays it no mind. Instead, as the merger takes place, all thoughts turn to the poor lonely refugee and his "invention," the class struggle.

As they forged a mighty instrument of working-class power, George Meany and Walter Reuther were careful to abjure class struggle. "We rejected the doctrines of Marxist class struggle," Reuther told the final CIO convention. "We developed a new labor movement, a

new philosophy, that came out of the richness and the great opportunities of America."

"We believe in the capitalist system," George Meany informed union employers at the convention of the printing industry on October 19, and he concluded: "we find there is complete accord between labor and management as to the system under which we work. We like it, sure."

The Outstretched Hand

When the merger convention adjourned, Meany sauntered over to the convention of the NAM, intending to hold out the hand of friendship to America's employers assembled at their own class organization, founded to fight unionism, a purpose that has guided it in all the twists and turns of 50 years.

Meany proposed a non-aggression pact; to set even the most timid soul at ease, he revealed that in all his years as a labor leader he had never been on strike, called a strike, or organized a picket line.

But not a twinge of sympathy came from these dedicated bosses. The day before, their newly elected president Cola G. Parker had sounded the alarm. The United States, he revealed, "was well on the way to the achievement of a Communist state as blueprinted by Marx." One would be staggered by such a report of victory for the lonely refugee.

But we know Mr. Parker doesn't believe it. It is simply his way of carrying on the class struggle! If the nation is in the thrall of Marxism, what could poor Meany expect? The NAM went on to demand the usual curbs on labor unions.

Some weeks before, Reuther had accused the Perfect Circle Company, like Kohler, of carrying on a class struggle. Now Meany got his dander up. He had come with bon-bons, and was rejected. If you turn us into second-class citizens, he told a television audience, we will go out and form a labor party. At the AFL-CIO convention, he had said, "And we are going to meet those who would destroy our movement and who would turn the clock back. We are going to meet them on the political front if you please."

Solution

All of this raises a perplexing question:

If nobody believes in ghosts, why do they all spend so much time proving that they don't exist?

Answer: the class struggle is no ghost.

Union officials do not "believe" in it but:

- They unite 15 million workers in one trade-union center.
- They hope to use this concentrated power as a battering-ram to break down open-shopism and organize millions more.
- They intend to enter politics as an organized force.
- They press for their own social program on all the issues of the day.
- They want pensions, welfare funds, insurance programs, guaranteed annual wages, shorter hours, higher pay—won by and maintained by the organizations of the working class.
- And if threatened, they retaliate with their own threat to form a labor party.

No wonder the labor movement repudiates the class struggle so vociferously: it practises it so widely.

And that, in short, is why unity becomes the

occasion for all the preachments of class harmony. Union leaders will not admit to themselves that unity is the mobilization of the working class in its struggle against the employers.

As they proceed to organize for the class struggle, they emphasize their peaceful intentions, hoping that the other side will not be alarmed or alerted.

Adlai Stevenson complimented labor for conducting itself as a good citizen and avoiding a narrow class outlook. But he was distressed nonetheless by others:

"... a Republican state chairman has proclaimed that labor leaders are 'Marxist-Socialist bosses who are trying to take this country down a rat-hole.'... This, I repeat, is a distressing and dangerous brand of politics. This is divisive and therefore destructive. ... Must the image of America be further defaced? Is this, indeed, an attempt to stir up class conflict?"

Busy Week

Two days before, Averell Harriman, who by the way has no use for the class struggle in any form, whipped up the delegates against the Republican Party: "Now all of these men I have been talking about know that if labor can be stripped of its political rights, the economic rights of labor can be destroyed as well and that is the motive behind what is going on today."

The class struggle was rearing its ugly head. Leonard Hall, Republican national chairman, who incidentally abhors the class struggle, saw the danger too, but from a different source.

Stevenson, said Hall, talked bunk. "Mr. Stevenson knows that for 25 years the New Deal and Fair Deal spokesmen have waged a class conflict," he continued. "They have attempted to pit class against class, stir up hatred among Americans, and to play off one group of our citizens against another."

All in all, a busy week for the class struggle.

It's all a ludicrous mistake, says A. H. Raskin, labor editor of the New York Times, who has at various times announced the opening of a new era of labor-management harmony. He attributes the massive misunderstanding between Meany and the NAM to the gyrations of a mechanical monster: the teleprompter.

As he sees it, Meany went to the NAM convention brimming over with good-will. But the speech of George Sligh, NAM chairman, "had been prepared in advance without any knowledge that Mr. Meany was going to jettison the familiar list of union complaints against management and confine himself to a plea for peace." The speech, already on tape, came off the teleprompter and Sligh just followed along, a hypnotized Trilby.

Some Abstractions

Republicans blame labor and Democrats; Democrats, the Republicans; labor, the Republicans and irresponsible bosses; the NAM, Marxism. But to Raskin, the real culprit is the teleprompter. We agree to this extent: if not for the machine age, it would never have happened.

The incident of the run-away teleprompter showed, according to Raskin, "that labor and management do most of their fighting and most of their hating over abstract issues, even when experience has shown that they can live peacefully and prosperously together." Why doesn't someone just tell them?

To aid the ministrations of any good-spirited peacemaker we list the following assorted abstractions that ought to be waived aside:

- (1) The attempt to legalize labor political action.
- (2) The fight in Ohio against extending unemployment insurance and the Guaranteed Annual Wage.
- (3) The Westinghouse strike.
- (4) The use of the Taft-Hartley Law to break strikes, decertify unions.
- (6) Organized opposition, legal and illegal, against unions in the South.
- (7) Decisions by the National Labor Relations Board slanting the whole structure against unions.

There are others but this will make a good enough start. It would take too long to list all. We need the time to keep up with all the speeches deploring the non-existent class struggle.

NORTH AFRICA

Labor Left Wing Gains Influence In Tunisian Nationalist Movement

By A. GIACOMETTI

Paris, Dec. 15

Within the last two weeks the conflict inside the Tunisian nationalist movement, between the followers of ex-general secretary Salah Ben Youssef and the Neo-Destour, has sharpened to a critical point.

After the National Congress of the Neo-Destour, which confirmed the expulsion of Salah Ben Youssef, the Tunisian population has increasingly taken sides for one or the other of the two factions. Bloody clashes have occurred; by now, five have been killed on both sides.

The main issue involved in this struggle is the question whether or not the fight for full independence can be carried on within the framework of the Franco-Tunisian Conventions which Ben Youssef opposed. Tied to this question, however, is the choice of methods for solving the pressing economic and social problems of the country: the absorption of the huge mass of unemployed; the privileges of the large French companies and of the French state; agrarian reform.

The pressure of these problems has suddenly accelerated political and social developments. It has released new and conflicting social forces which are crystallizing around Ben Youssef's dissidents and the official Neo-Destour. The features of both movements are emerging more clearly now, as their social base and their policy is shifting, more rapidly than is customary under "normal" circumstances.

These changes appeared most clearly at the recent congress of the Neo-Destour. In a sense, the congress was a triumph for Habib Bourguiba and the Neo-Destour leadership. With an overwhelming majority it approved the Franco-Tunisian Conventions, and the decisions of the Political Bureau since July 1954; and it re-elected Bourguiba to the presidency of the party for another two years. The congress also ratified the expulsion of Salah Ben Youssef.

The former general secretary had been invited to attend the congress and to present his case before the party. He replied by demanding that the congress be postponed for a week, that his faction be recognized and that he be reinstated in the secretariat. The following day, the congress rejected these conditions and ratified his expulsion with only 8 delegates abstaining.

NEW MILITANCY

Yet this confirmation of the party's leadership occurred in a new framework of militancy, which represents a significant change in orientation. Even while the congress was approving the Conventions, Bourguiba was calling in a public speech for the establishment of a Tunisian army—a demand which requires a fundamental revision of the Conventions.

In the eyes of the Neo-Destour, the Conventions are a "living document," and the congress plainly showed its intention to press for their rapid transformation.

On December 9, the French government turned over certain parts of the existing armed forces to the Tunisian government, showing that it could not openly oppose the formation of a Tunisian army.

More significant yet, the congress adopted an economic program which was, in fact, written by the UGTT, the Tunisian trade-union center. This program calls for a revision of the obligations that tie the Tunisian state to several large French companies; for a tax reform and for the beginning of an agrarian reform; nationalization of the land owned by the Moslem church; prohibition of private landowners' turning over more land to the Moslem church; transfer of publicly owned land to rural cooperatives; breaking up of the large estates within the irrigated zones.

The Economic Commission which elaborated this program was headed by the UGTT leader Ahmed Fillali. In the elections to the National Council of the Neo-Destour, he received more votes than any of the other 31 candidates.

Unquestionably, the congress of the Neo-Destour shows an important advance of the UGTT, which becomes the strongest single influence in the party. It is also important to note that the National Council includes, for the first time, two women, as well as one representative of the Jewish colony.

After an intervention by Ahmed Ben Salah, general secretary of the UGTT, the congress adopted a resolution calling for "urgent elections for a Constituent Assembly, which will define the institutions of the country on the basis of a constitutional monarchy, which it exerts through Parliament composed of a single Assembly, elected by universal and direct suffrage and respectful of the separation of legislative, executive and judiciary powers."

Other resolutions at the congress included one which called for the establishment of a Tunisian army, one which congratulated the Moroccan people on its victory and on the return of the sultan, and another which protested against the massacres of French troops in Algeria.

RIGHT WING COALESCES

The increasing power of the UGTT within the Neo-Destour has had interesting repercussions on the fate of Salah Ben Youssef's dissident movement.

Discussing the Neo-Destour's agrarian-reform plans, *Le Monde* observed: "Certain parts of this program will not fail to upset the large landowners, of which a certain number are already rallying to the banners of Salah Ben Youssef." Earlier, the same paper wrote: "Mr. Bourguiba is perhaps called upon to play

the role of the leader of the 'left' as against Mr. Ben Youssef. Extremist on matters of foreign policy, the latter is beginning to rally, on the domestic level, the conservative and traditionalist elements."

The trend is unmistakable: even the clerical reactionaries of the Old-Destour who, incidentally, also oppose the Conventions, have begun to make advances to Salar Ben Youssef.

At first, this development may seem paradoxical, since the large landowners are precisely those who benefit most, on the economic level, from the Franco-Tunisian Conventions, while Salah Ben Youssef appears to be their most radical opponent. However, it becomes more and more evident that the Conventions, in themselves, have ceased to be the main issue, and that the social battleground has shifted.

As in Morocco and Algeria, the struggle against French occupation has put into motion a vast popular movement, which the conservative elements cannot hope to oppose successfully head-on and from their traditional standpoint. The great problem for the routed conservatives is to seek cover in a faction of the nationalist movement. In Morocco, the Democratic Independence Party (PDI) is being used for this purpose, while in Tunisia Salah Ben Youssef is lending himself to the same maneuver.

The main concern of the conservatives is to block the UGTT. Under the present circumstances, this can only be done under the cover of a more radical phraseology. Such phraseology, coupled with the convenient absence of any program, is what Salah Ben Youssef has been providing.

On such a basis, he is rallying around

him the most backward and least politicized elements of the population (especially among the landless, unemployed and desperate peasants); plus the popular strata which are hardest hit by the Conventions in their economic existence (artisans, shopkeepers, merchants); plus the theocratic reactionaries who oppose the Neo-Destour's pressure for a lay state, a constitutional monarchy and the nationalization of church-owned land; plus the large landowners who use all of the above to check the advance of the labor movement and of the progressive elements in the Neo-Destour.

The only element that is still missing from this reactionary coalition is the Stalinists, and it is not unlikely that they will soon make their appearance there.

LANDOWNERS' CHOICE

The landowners have been faced on the one hand with Salah Ben Youssef's opposition to the Conventions—which, in the immediate future, in no way endangers the benefits which they derive from them—and on the other hand with the steady advance of the UGTT. Their choice has been made: they are trading the support of the Conventions for protection against the more immediate danger.

This is not to say that Bourguiba is now a "leader of the left," as *Le Monde* suggests, attempting to exploit the confusion for its own dishonest purposes. He is as far removed from being any such thing as is Ben Youssef. He and the reformist tendencies in the Neo-Destour remain the main hope of the French liberal bourgeoisie, who see in him a "reasonable" partner. The important point is that the Neo-Destour Congress marks for Bourguiba a defeat in victory: a victory for the symbol, but a defeat for the orientation.

In spite of what he says, Salah Ben Youssef cannot advance the cause of the Tunisian people and of Tunisian independence. Neither can Bourguiba. Significant steps in this direction, on the other hand, can be expected from the UGTT (even on Ben Youssef's own ground: the fight against the French privileges and for the economic independence of the country).

LONDON LETTER

As Attlee Goes, Bevan Engages in Maneuvers Over the Succession

By OWEN ROBERTS

London, Dec. 13

During the past week the people of Britain have been treated to the grand spectacle of the Parliamentary Labor Party misbehaving now that schoolmaster Clement Attlee has quit the class which he has kept in order for the last twenty years. Hardly had he left the room when the pupils began squabbling among themselves as to who should occupy the teacher's seat—which still bore the marks of Attlee's posterior.

The first move came from Aneurin Bevan on Thursday evening, the day after Attlee handed in his resignation. In a statement to the press Bevan announced that he was prepared to withdraw his nomination for the vacant leadership in order to allow Herbert Morrison to be returned unopposed if other candidates would do the same.

This announcement, which caused some surprise in certain political circles, was prompted after Bevan had been approached by ten Laborite members of Parliament who had suggested to him that it would be "desirable in the interests of the Labor Party to avoid a contest for the leadership."

The ten who approached Bevan were an ill-assorted bunch. Right-wingers, middle-of-the-roads, Bevanites, ex-left-wingers and one or two who say so little that it is not possible to list their political position with any accuracy.

But, in spite of their widely differing political coloring, their motive was straight-forward; it was to allow right-winger Morrison to walk into the position of leader without challenge. And Bevan, in agreeing to their proposal, was prepared to cooperate in handing over to Morrison the one thing which he now requires to set the seal on his political career.

GAITSKELL STICKS

That the plan was frustrated was due entirely to the refusal of Hugh Gaitskell, the only other candidate, to play ball. In a statement issued an hour after Bevan's, the right-winger Gaitskell made it perfectly clear that he intended to fight for

the leadership, against Morrison or anyone else.

Said Gaitskell: "A number of my colleagues have been good enough to nominate me. They have made it plain to me that they would greatly regret it if I were to withdraw." Gaitskell went on to say that while he had the highest regard for Morrison he thought that the party should have the opportunity to choose its new leader. He therefore proposed to allow his name to stand on the ballot paper.

This action on the part of Bevan—in being prepared to allow right-winger Morrison to become leader—will come as no surprise to those who have followed up the history of the fight for leadership in the columns of *LABOR ACTION*. Some months ago it was reported that there was a section of the Bevanites who were prepared to see Morrison take over in preference to Gaitskell, for the simple reason that Morrison is 67 years old and could not hope to hold the position long enough to make any marked difference in the struggle between right and left.

Gaitskell, on the other hand, is a comparatively young man, only 49. If he were elected leader it is conceivable that he could follow Attlee's example and hold the post for twenty years. Thus a number of those in the Bevanite camp were reported as being in favor of backing Morrison in the knowledge that Bevan would get another chance within the next few years—years in which he might be able to build his following in the party.

Bevan's action proves that he, personally, is also of this opinion; and that he sets so much store by it as a matter of tactic that he is prepared to scuttle with-

out a fight in the hopes of being able to fight, and emerge as victor, at a later date.

But worse is yet to come. It is believed that if Gaitskell is elected leader, as is expected, and Morrison then resigns his post as deputy leader, as is also expected, Bevan will not fight for the post of deputy.

The reasons advanced for this course of probable action by Bevan are varied, ranging from political objection to serving as Gaitskell's Number Two to personal objection toward Gaitskell as a young jumped-up politician. Whatever the reasons one thing is certain—that no hint of Bevan's possible course of action came until after he had tried to do a deal so that Morrison could become leader. This having failed it seems that he is determined not to touch Gaitskell with the proverbial barge-pole.

BEWILDERED

Another rumor circulating is that if Bevan is knocked out in the first ballot for leader, as he probably will be, then he is asking his supporters to switch their votes in the second ballot to Morrison. So it seems that Bevan is determined to throw all his weight behind right-winger Morrison. Stranger things have been known to happen—but not often.

This peculiar situation has thrown many left-wing Laborite MPs into confusion, bewildered many rank-and-file left-wingers, split the Bevanites and taken the Stalinist *Daily Worker* for a ride.

The *Daily Worker*, the day after Bevan's move to let Morrison through, carried a front-page lead story to the effect that Gaitskell had brushed aside a "unity move" and was making a supreme bid for power. The language of the article was such that anyone unacquainted with the situation would have thought, upon reading it, that Morrison was a friend of the left. It said, for instance, that the "extreme right wing were out to destroy Mr. Morrison" and that some MPs were saying of Morrison: "He's

(Continued on page 7)

INDIAN SP SPLIT

Right-Wing Bureaucrats Again Show Their Idea of Democracy

By PHILIP COBEN

We have learned from a couple of sources (including a reference in a recent *New Republic*) that a serious split has taken place in the Praja Socialist Party of India, but thus far we have no details.

The background and general political basis of the right-versus-left struggle in the party has been fairly well covered in our columns; but all we know about the form in which the split finally took place is that a new socialist party has been formed under the leadership of Rammanohar Lohia and Madhu Limaye (supported by the young socialist organization, the SYS).

The leader of the right wing, which remains in control of the Praja Socialist Party, is Asoka Mehta, the general secretary, who (unfortunately and quite undeservedly) has been given a factitious reputation in some American socialist circles as a "theoretician."

The immediate political motive for the split fight was the orientation of the Mehta leadership toward accommodation with Nehru's Congress Party, the country's dominating bourgeois party which uses some socialistic verbiage whenever necessary. However, this in turn was the culmination of a rightward drift in the party which began in 1952 with the support of some of the people who have now broken with Mehta—a drift toward dissociating the party from Marxism and class-struggle ideas, infusing socialism with Gandhianism, embracing land-distribution nostrums, etc.

This rightward movement was given its big impetus in 1952 when the SP leaders were sadly disappointed by their vote-getting ability in the first general election that took place. In something like a panic, they decided to throw their baggage of left phrases overboard in order in future, to ride higher in the electoral swim.

Without much ado, they proceeded to engineer a fusion with a Gandhian group called the KMPP (Kisan Mazdoor Praja Party, led by Kripalani) which had to take a step to the left just to adopt the bare idea of socialism. The SP of course took a big stride to the right. The result, entitled the Praja Socialist Party, steadily moved in the direction set up by the impetus of the merger—rightward, of course.

In 1953 Madhu Limaye already spoke up sharply, in the course of a party discussion, against the party leadership's tendency to dilute the independence of the party politically and organizationally. (See *LA* Dec. 28.) Then this year, when Nehru's party adopted a transparently demagogic program using the phrase "a socialistic pattern of society," Mehta greeted this piece of fakery in terms which set off the basic fight.

BAN ON MINORITY

While we have carried several reports on the political struggle in the PSP, we have not yet publicized another aspect of the PSP's life which is not without interest. This is the bureaucratic and anti-democratic nature of the Mehta leadership of the party.

While politics is always primary, this organizational aspect of the fight is of special concern. Frankly, we think it should be of very special concern to some pacifists we know, who have peculiar notions about this party.

In India, socialist reformism tends to take on a specifically national form, as elsewhere, and in India a national-traditional basis for reformism is at hand in Gandhianism, with its pacifist rhetoric and social-pacifist antagonism to class struggle. The Gandhian-pacifist and Hindu-moral verbiage of Indian socialism has made our own pacifists, sometimes, feel that here is a "good" socialist party as against the "bad" (non-Pacifist and Marxist) socialists who don't go in for this form of obfuscation.

The fact is that the Praja SP has not even been a democratic party in its in-

ternal life. And this came out in the recent fight, as it has before.

For example, after its July 15-22 meeting, the party's National Executive Committee issued a statement on "dissensions" which raised a hue-and-cry about "discipline," meaning discipline against left-wingers who insisted on criticizing the party leadership. After some platitudes about conflicts between "the search for clarity" and "organizational discipline," the NEC declared:

"The identity of the Praja Socialist Party, which has a distinctive policy and program, must not be confused by futile controversies for cooperation with the Congress [Nehru party]. Party members must, therefore, desist from raising controversies on issues such as alliances and electoral adjustments with the Congress Party." (Emphasis added.)

This interdiction against "raising controversies" is given without qualification.

In the July 10 issue of *Janata* (the party official weekly) a right-wing spokesman, Narendra Konkar, directs some blasts against the left-wingers, who had apparently just held a conference in Ghazipur "in defiance of the National Executive's directive."

This paladin of Gandhian socialism writes:

"We have often made a fetish of democracy and internal democracy at that. It has come to mean all things to all people, so much so that some of the members have thought it proper to place before the people whatever passes between any two individual members of the party....

"It is indeed difficult to give a precise definition of internal democracy. But broadly speaking it can be defined as freedom of thought resulting only in honest differences of opinion. It does not, however, concede to any member liberty to discuss through the press his differences with another member...." (Emphasis added.)

In the same issue the right wing makes it clear that any differences which (say) Lohia might have could not possibly be "honest." An article by one Prof. Rajaram Shastri ("Dr. Lohia's Militancy") succeeds in discussing its subject's heresies with a minimum of politics and a maximum of abusive personal vituperation: Lohia's activities are simply "vilification".... "destructive aim".... Lohia uses Hitler's techniques.... "delusions of grandeur".... "dictatorial cravings".... "irresponsible actionism"....

BUREAUCRATIC PATTERN

The behavior of the party leadership toward the youth organization was equally bureaucratic. (See *LA* June 27.) Among other things, they demanded that the young socialist league exclude "intra-party matters" from its own conference!

Janata, of course, in line with the precepts of these "democrats" who love to spout Hindu morality, refused to print the point of view of the minority. Back in 1953, when the critical article by Madhu Limaye was published in *Janata*, an editorial note had made clear that this was being done as an exceptional thing, thus testifying to the general bureaucratic conception of the party leadership with regard to the use of the party press—a common conception in social-democratic circles as in Stalinist ones.

In this connection, too, we must recall the way in which the 1952 merger with the KMPP had been shoved through (see *LA* for Nov. 10, 1952). The procedure was simply hair-raising from the democratic point of view.

A party was liquidated and merged with another party without any possibility of the membership passing on the question either through a membership referendum or a convention called to take that move up, with delegates elected for the purpose. Instead the party body which had the last word was a "General Council" of members appointed by the NEC!

It is our impression that the left-wingers have not always fought against this sort of thing. In any case, we are very anxious to find out more about the new socialist party founded by Lohia and his co-thinkers. It is to be hoped that the momentum of its origin will push it further away from the hopelessly sterile Gandhianized reformism of the Asoka Mehta wing.

Foreign Aid Mix-Up — —

(Continued from page 1)

conomic and technical aid would be a sufficient alternative. Inadequate as this point of view may be, it is not going to be put over on the Dulles clan easily.

Whoever leaked the mistaken story of the alleged new appropriations for foreign aid to the *New York Times* (December 18), also leaked a bit of "background information" on the argument which took place behind the scenes among the various groups of government officials for and against the increase. Although it turns out that the story was mistaken in its most prominent fact (the increase), there is no reason to doubt that there has been an argument in the government about these matters, and that this very fact, which had leaked to the press, led to the confusion on the appropriation-vs.-expenditure question.

According to this version of the story, the group which adamantly insists that military aid must take up the bulk of any expansion of the foreign-aid program centers around Allen W. Dulles, head of the Central Intelligence Agency.

(Incidentally, the CIA is currently planning to erect a single building in Washington to house its central activities. A key to the place this agency is coming to occupy in the American government is the fact that its projected building will be larger than that of any department except for the Pentagon, which houses the central military bureaucracy.)

"As this group within the government views the current problem," writes the *Times* reporter, "economic and financial assistance alone will not stiffen the threatened countries of Asia and the Middle East sufficiently unless accompanied by military equipment."

That needs to be modified a bit. Economic and financial assistance, plus military equipment even on a vast scale, will not "stiffen" these countries sufficiently unless they are accompanied by a policy which has the support of the peoples of the area. The enormous and sufficient example of why this is true was presented in China. Auxiliary ones come from Korea and Indochina.

But Allen W., like his brother John Foster, appears to be incapable of remembering, let alone understanding, what the whole business is about. His big, cheap "success" in "stiffening" Guatemala by military means has misled him about the type of problem which American policy confronts in Asia and the Middle East.

KHRUSHCHEV'S AIMS

Although what the Stalinist leaders are up to in this area is far from clear in detail, its general outlines are unmistakable. They have decided on a political penetration of the area by means of taking sides on every local problem in it, as one of their weapons.

They know that to the vast majority of the peoples in these countries the struggle between the American and Russian power blocs is a distant, dangerous and distasteful imperialist fight. Local and regional problems are far more likely to involve their sympathies and active loyalties than the more distant and grandiose ones of the global struggle.

The Stalinist rulers have neither the means nor the position from which to try to play the role of arbiter in the local struggles, and to gain the arbiter's power over all the contestants. Their first problem is to get a real toe-hold in the Middle East and Southeast Asia. One way to do it is to join the side least firmly lined up with the American bloc on every local issue, and to appear as the loyal, principled and sympathetic supporter of "their" side in such struggles.

That they will antagonize the rulers of the "other" side by such a process goes without saying. But these rulers are already pretty much in the American pocket anyway, they figure. It is just as likely that they can be won over in the long run by pressure as by wooing, specially if a Stalinist movement can be built inside that country to add to the pressure.

In the meantime, advantageous trade and other relations can be established with the governments on "their" side, the local struggles can be kept burning, and with the Dulles brothers on deck to lend a hand, it can be expected that eventually something more rather than less favorable for the Stalinists will develop out of the whole situation.

Thus, the Khrushchev-Bulganin junket through Southeast Asia has presented the amazing and probably unprecedented spectacle of the top rulers of one country visiting a series of self-proclaimed neutral governments, and using every formal occasion at their disposal not only to denounce their world imperialist rivals, but to take vehement and explicit sides on regional international problems on which neither their opinion nor their support had been solicited by any of the contending parties.

Unheard-of crudity? Lack of any feeling for diplomatic form or propriety? Perhaps, perhaps. Nevertheless, there can be no doubt that whatever their hosts may have thought of the matter (and we have no reason to doubt that the Indian officials, for instance, were quite upset about it), they got their message across to the hundreds of millions of Indians and others in the area in a way which could hardly be topped for effectiveness.

The peoples of Southeast Asia heard a different tune than the one they had become accustomed to from across the Pacific, with its emphasis on preserving the status quo, massive retaliation, support for colonialism, and the like.

WHAT'S TO GAIN?

How much will the Stalinist actually gain out of their new political venture? It is impossible to even guess at the present time. The economic deals they have made could help or hurt them in the long run, depending on how capable they are of delivering on their promises.

Since their efforts at snuggling up to Nehru will be accompanied by the inevitable Stalinist popular-front politics imposed on the Indian Communist Party, they run the risk, also, of weakening or even destroying this organization as an effective instrument of theirs in Indian politics. (The Indian CP has been badly split in the past over the imposition of a "support Nehru" popular-front-style policy.)

Little is known as yet about the reaction of the socialist organizations in the area visited by Khrushchev and Bulganin. The Burmese, to be sure, went far beyond the formalities required to get the commercial treaty which is all it appears they got. Since the Indian socialist movement recently split, our sources of information on their policy and activity have been very meager.

Whatever the Stalinists may gain, it is clear that the American program is going to gain precious little. First, it may turn out to represent no significant increase in cash outlay at all. Even if it does, the bulk of it will go not to activities which could strengthen the democratic, progressive and hence anti-Stalinist forces, but to armaments. And even the rest will be practically useless.

For the government's policy of "stiffening" these areas is really no policy at all. Arms, however modern, are useless or worse in the hands of people who have no interest in the victory of the side on which they are fighting. And they cannot gain such an interest unless the social system has first been revamped to the point at which the mass of the people have a stake in victory.



LABOR ACTION

December 26, 1955 Vol. 19, No. 52

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, 1879.—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

SPLIT

a bottle with us at our
New Year's Eve Party—
Refreshment: liquid, solid,
and spiritual
LABOR ACTION HALL
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

Read and subscribe to
THE NEW INTERNATIONAL
The Marxist review for serious
students of social issues.

50 cents

\$2 a year

UMT Inching Up Despite Strong Opposition

By MAX MARTIN

The military and the political leaders of the Republican and Democratic Parties have adopted a strategy of "piecemeal advances" toward their objectives of instituting universal military training (UMT) and further militarizing society. This should occasion no surprise, given the continued existence of a strong tradition of anti-militarism in the United States.

As the press reported at the time, most senators and congressmen would have been willing to vote this past year for an outright UMT program, but were deterred from doing so by resistance in the rear, the opposition of the "constituents back home."

And so instead the Pentagon and administration proposed, and Congress adopted, a Ready Reserve program, one which "merely" took a long step in that direction.

The opposition of the American people toward UMT and militarism, in general, which forces the government to advance toward its UMT goal at a trotting pace rather than a full gallop, is a cause for rejoicing. The plans of the pro-militarism forces to counter this opposition by advancing from position to position, in lieu of mounting an offensive all along the front, are a danger, however, for they have already succeeded in outmaneuvering and out-flanking the traditional hostility of broad sections of the American people to militarism.

Too many of those who would battle vigorously against a direct UMT proposal are taken in by the seeming reasonableness of the step-by-step proposals and offer only token opposition to them, or worse yet, accept them. As a result, one fortress after another of those traditionally in the hands of civilian society has fallen and the military has established strong offensive positions from which to thrust further.

The Ready Reserve program package adopted last year set up a complex military establishment. The two-year draft was extended and a feature added to it whereby draftees have to serve an additional three years in the active reserve, following their release from the armed forces.

At the same time a voluntary UMT program was set up, in which those choosing it are exempt from the draft, but instead spend six months in military training, after which they are obligated to remain in the Reserve for 7½ years. Penalties were introduced for missing one of the weekly drills or the summer encampment. (See *Challenge* for December 19, for story on what happened to one youth in the California National Guard who missed a drill.)

CREEPING MILITARISM

At the time we characterized this program as a half-way house toward UMT, and predicted that the military would not remain content with it but would ask for more. And sure enough, although the Ready Reserve program has only been in operation for a short time, the Pentagon has already sent out feelers for making changes in the program.

As it now stands, the Reserve set-up is a voluntary one. To be sure, the alternative of being drafted into the army for two years and then forced to spend another three in the reserve is a strong pressure directing young men into the Reserve program, but no one can be drafted into it.

It is precisely in regard to this feature that the army wants to introduce changes. According to reports which have appeared in the daily press, the Pentagon is planning to ask Congress next January to amend the act so as to allow it to draft men into this program, thus giving it the power to decide who shall be enrolled in the two-year draft into the armed forces and who in the Reserve. The army also intends to ask for the power to draft men into the National Guard, and other militarism-strengthening features.

The military insists that it requires this power to cope with the low enroll-

ment into the Reserve establishment. As of October 1 only 497 youths, aged 17 to 18½, had signed up with Reserve units throughout the country for the six-months training program.

The quota for the first class under the new program had been 5000, with plans calling for the enrollment of 8,300 men per month beginning next January. This would produce 100,000 men for the program during the course of the next year, and it would be followed by stepping the program up until it included the enlistment of 250,000 men a year, the maximum authorized by the draft.

The low response to enlistment calls by the military, itself another gratifying indication of how strong anti-militaristic sentiment is, will make the compulsory feature necessary, argue army officials, unless the trend is reversed and the rate of volunteering goes up to levels expected by the army.

The army explained the smallness of the figures by claims that it had not been publicizing the program widely and by pointing to the "low draft calls" during the past few months. Since draft quotas each month are low ones, many young people have a "wait and see" attitude. As can be seen, the army recognizes quite well that the threat of being drafted can act as a stimulus channeling young men into the Reserve program.

The army has announced that it intends to increase its monthly draft calls from 10,000 to 20,000. This, along with wider publicity, it claims, may solve the problem. And if it doesn't, well, there's always Congress in January.

These steps are being taken, according to some critics of the Pentagon, in order to answer those who contend that the army hasn't tried hard enough to get men for the program on a voluntary basis and that it is deliberately keeping enlistments down so as to have an arguing point next year when it asks for a

compulsory program. We have no way of knowing whether these charges are true or not, but that isn't what interests us at the moment.

In either case, whether its increased draft call is based on a genuine desire to get young men flocking to the "voluntary" program, or whether it doesn't want them to do so in order to obtain a "compulsory" amendment to the law from Congress, but has to make a show of trying to get voluntary enlistments, it is an outrage that young men should be drafted into the armed forces when even the army doesn't claim that it is doing so to meet military "needs," but rather for an entirely different purpose, one having to do with the military's desire for a UMT establishment.

That there have been no outcries against this outrage is another indication of the success of the military in outmaneuvering those who oppose its efforts to institute UMT.

Furthermore, the danger that the army will have its way with the next Congress in regard to making its Reserve training program a compulsory one will remain, even if "voluntary" enrollment does increase to the level called for by army plans. The military will merely have to find other arguments for it, and Congress may be in the mood to grant the Pentagon's demands.

ATTACK HIGH SCHOOLS

Together with these maneuvers, the army has been engaged in war games in another area. While colleges have increasingly been encroached upon by the army via ROTC, the nation's secondary schools have until recently been left alone. Now, however, the army is engaged in testing a "pilot" project in selected schools of Michigan, a project designed to sell militarism to high school students.

The program, for which current army

plans project a nation-wide operation next year, consists of injecting military propaganda into such courses as social studies, science, mathematics and physical education. Tenth-grade students receive, as part of their general curriculum, a one-week unit on "You and the Draft." Eleventh-grade students have a week of the American History course devoted to this subject, in which they are taught "Why We Need Armed Forces" and "Why I Should Be Willing to Serve."

In addition, eight sessions of the physical education course is devoted to the military's needs. For the twelfth grade, it is the same, except that more time is spent on it. Time is spent on such topics as: choice of military service available; vocational and educational opportunities in the military services; services available to men in the armed forces, etc.—all designed to make military life look appealing to young men.

The textbook used in this program, "The Armed Forces and Your Life Plans," assumes that military conscription is a natural part of one's life and bristles with implications that education and the schools have to be integrated into the military program. At one point, it advises the high school students to take courses which will be helpful to them in the army, for example.

Inch of terrain by inch of terrain, militarism in American life advances. Only a determined opposition over each foot of ground can prevent the imposition of the Garrison State.

An index to the Challenge is included in the general index in this issue.

Young Laborites' Troubles in Britain

As Challenge reported on Nov. 14, the last conference of the British Labor Party decided on the dissolution of the Labor League of Youth (LLOY), the youth work to be carried on through youth sections of the local (constituency) Labor Party branches.

The following is part of a letter received from a British friend which presents some facts and opinions concerning this change. Although written as cursory comments in a letter, and not as an article, we think it is of sufficient interest to warrant publication.—ED.

London, Nov. 27

... First, the League has been dying for years. I last week heard someone remark that the Executive didn't kill the League, nor even bury it; all it did was to pronounce a formal burial service over a long decomposed corpse. That just about sums it up. At the last three annual conferences of the London Labor Party I have personally held forth from the rostrum on the question of the continuous decline in the numbers of LLOYers in London and Middlesex as revealed in the E. C. report.

To pinpoint the reasons for this decline is hard; it is a combination of factors.

First, the young people in Britain are reacting from the war and post-war years of hardship. They are now materially better off than they have been for some time. They have therefore tended to shy away from all forms of political activity. When they have taken part in political activity it has usually been with the Tories because, in their minds, the Labor Party is associated with restriction and controls; whereas the Tories have emblazoned on their banner the slogan "Set the People Free." As yet the youngsters have still to find out that this slogan is a 100 per cent phony. But re-

cent Tory actions have probably speeded this realization.

Secondly, the party has never paid a great deal of interest to the League since it cracked up before the war when the Stalinists succeeded in getting in and eventually causing a split in which the largest proportion of the League leaders went over to the YCL. Since that time the party leadership has shown little interest and has mainly concerned itself with keeping a tight rein on the activities of the League.

The decision to wind up the League does not mean an end to the youth work in the party. In place of a separate League there are now to be youth sections of local parties. This system has operated in some parties for many years—my own being one of them.

Every local constituency party is made up of wards, affiliated trade unions, co-operative guilds and women's sections. To these will now be added youth sections. All of these organs of a constituency party elect delegates to the general council, which is the governing body of the constituency party; from the general council an executive committee is elected which manages the day-to-day conduct of the party. The executive is made up of representatives from each interest of the general council; some from the wards, others from the trade unions, co-op guilds, women's and youth sections. All members, irrespective of which organization they represent, have equal rights.

In my own local party the youth section, like the League's, dies out with a monotonous regularity every two or three years and then is reborn a year later. This is due to a variety of factors—marriage, call-up, studies, etc. By and large our local youth section has always been associated with the left grouping and its delegates to the general council and members on the executive have always

lined up with the left.

On the whole the arrangement has worked fairly well, although it varies from area to area.

The decision to form youth sections as national policy may have political motives, in that the right wing hope it will be easier to keep a check on the younger people. But in practice I cannot see this working out. If it follows the pattern of my own local experience it will have just the opposite effect in that it throws the young people into a closer relationship with the more experienced left-wingers in the party.

I should also mention that the party rules have always been that any person over the age of sixteen can become a full party member and need only join a LLOY or youth section if they so desire. I know several young people who are in their 'teens and have never worked in the youth organizations but at the same time have played a prominent role in the party itself.

The winding up of the League will not affect the National Association of Labor Student Organizations, which is quite an independent organization for students of any age. When at London University I was a member of NALSO although I couldn't have joined the LLOY because of my age; I was then twenty-eight and the upper age limit of the LLOY was twenty-six. NALSO members often take a big part in the activities of their local parties in addition to their work in the colleges; they do so as ordinary party members.

I do not think that the disbanding of the League will alter the relationship of the Labor youth with the International Union of Socialist Youth—and here again I think that you will find NALSO is represented on IUSY as a separate organization and therefore will continue its work with IUSY....

INDEX TO LABOR ACTION FOR 1955

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

To avoid repetitive cross-references, here is a list of the headings under which you will find entries dealing with the general subject of

- WAR**
- FOREIGN POLICY**
- INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS**
- EISENHWR ADMIN, FOREIGN POLICY** for government acts and policy.
- FOREIGN POLICY, U. S.** for other discussion of foreign policy.
- SPAIN, PUERTO RICO, ALGERIA, and other foreign geog heads** for U. S. policy toward, and relations with, other countries and its colonies.
- WAR POLICY** for discussion of socialist policy.
- COLD WAR** for U. S.-Russian diplomatic struggle, Geneva Conferences, etc.
- See also **UNITED NATIONS; NORTH ATL TREATY ORG; ATOMIC BOMB; MILITARISM.**

ACADEMIC FREEDOM—See also Civil Liberties—Anyone seen Hook? 3-21.1. Ac fr on atheist teacher 3-21.6. Ac fr on home front 1-24.5. CCNY membership-list regu 2-28.5. Attack on UCLA Bruin 3-14.5. Chi campus vs Broyles bills 3-21.5. NY Bd of Ed stoolpigeon rule 3-28.5. Govt withdraws ROTC loyalty oath 5-16.6; L 5-30.4; oppo to new oath at Cal 6-6.5; issue is compul ROTC 6-6.5; Berkeley modifies oath 9-26.5; but oppo flares 10-10.5. Stand up against witchhunt! 10-3, 3-C.

AFL-CIO MERGER—Unity & Reuther 2-14.2. Merger 2-21.1. Realignment in merged federation 3-14.2. New unity constitution 5-23.4. Leaders fear unity? 9-5.2. Merger can be starting-pt of surge forward 12-5.1; Haunted by the class struggle 12-12.2. History was made; Labor party in spotlight; Sidelights 12-19.1. Ghost of the lonely refugee 12-26.2.

AFRICA—See also indiv countries; Bandung—Wright's book (BR) 3-28.7. Guinea-pigs 7-25.3. 'Look' squints at Africa 11-14.3; L 12-5.4.

ALGERIA—Algerian at FO congr 1-10.3. Fierce repression 1-17.3. US aid to Fr, training paratroopers 5-2.1; US in Algeria 10-31.2; 11-7.1. New Indochina? 5-23.2. Appeal to Fr workers 9-19.7. Vote in UN 10-3.1; test of free world 10-10.1. Fr-Alg war: Against whole nation; Alg liberation army 10-17.6-7. Rosa Luxemburg on Fr imper in Alg 11-21.7. Resistance in France (see under France).

AMER COM FOR CULTURAL FREEDOM—Sin of Diana Trilling 5-30.6. Matters of Russ legislation only 11-28.2.

AMERICANS FOR DEM ACTION—See also Liberalism; Student Movement (for SDA)—Liberals need fighting program

3-21.1; report on conv 4-11.1. Newton's first law 8-15.1. SDA conv & ADA 7-18.5.

ANTI-SEMITISM—In Ladejinsky case 1-10.2.

ARABS—See also under Israel for Israeli-Arab rel; Middle East—Military 'socialism' in Near East 6-6.6.

ARGENTINA—Why Peron's power cracked 6-27.1. State Dept & Peron 7-11.4. Pattern of revolt 7-25.3. Disc: nature of Peronism & socialist policy 8-22.6; 9-26.7. Unity vs Peron 9-12.4. Still faces civ war 9-19.2. Peron falls 9-26.1; Myth of workers' support 10-10.1; Class forces behind fall 11-14.6. Lonardi regime attacks unions 11-21.3. Aramburu hits labor; SP stand 12-5.4.

ASIA—See indiv countries; Bandung; SEATO; Eishnwr Adm Foreign Pol.

ASIAN SOCIALIST CONFERENCE—Cool to Second Int'l 4-25.3. Proposal on Isr-Egypt clash 12-19.6.

ATOMIC BOMB & ENERGY—See also Civil Defense—H-bomb weather? 1-31.4. Accusation 2-21.1. Brit plans for A-power 2-28.2. H-bomb politics 3-28.1. Geneva atom confer 8-29.1.

AUSTRALIA—Catholic ruckus in LP 3-28.4; L 6-20.4.

AUSTRIA—Russ-Austrian treaty 4-25.1.

AUTOMATION—Marx & automation 4-18.2. Autom & its conseq 5-30.8. Disc in Brit 7-11.3; Shop stewards' program 10-10.3. Automation squared 7-11.4.

AUTO WORKERS—See also Labor Problems—Econ shadows over indus; GAW plan 1-10.1. UAW on Lupa case 1-24.2. Reuther, on 3rd party 1-31.2. Studebaker bubble bursts 2-7.2. Squeeze on auto co's 3-14.2. Big 2 to talk on GAW 3-21.2. UAW conv; Rallying center 3-28.1; Issues facing 3-28.2; Trends at conv 4-18.6. Deal with UE? 3-28.3. GAW demand 4-25.2. Negotiations in low gear 5-23.2. Ford counterplan a dud 6-6.1-2. Ford settlement 6-13.1; GM & Ford yielded to threat 6-20.1; Ranks' reaction cool 6-20.1; 6-27.7; Trouble ahead 6-27.7; Steel gains follow 7-11.1; Discontent due to work conditions 7-11.2; UAW explains 7-18.2; L & disc 8-1.4. Kohler strike 7-18.2; 9-26.2. Tough-guy Chrysler 8-8.2; Tries to set clock back 8-22.2; Victory at Chrysler 9-12.2. UAW settlements & era of labor peace? 9-12.2. War in Indiana, Perfect Circle 10-17.1. This era of 'labor peace' 10-17.2. Dual-union revolt by skilled 11-7.1. GAW hit by defeat of Ohio law 11-14.2; 11-21.2; 11-26.2. UAW faces problems 11-21.2.

BANDUNG CONFERENCE—US policy in a trap 2-28.1. Symbol of change 4-25.3. What Stalinists got 5-2.1.

BASEBALL—Maj leag players' union 7-11.8.

BECK, DAVE—See Labor Problems.

BEVAN—See Britain.

BOLIVIA—Lechin's 'workers congr' 1-10.7. 'Imitation rev' in blind alley 1-24.2. Rightist offensive 5-16.7. L that Militant didn't print 7-25.4. New danger from below 9-5.4. Crisis over student strikes 10-24.3.

BOOK REVIEWS—Abrahams: Mine Boy 9-12.3. Ainley: In Order to Die 8-1.4. Am Friends Serv Com: Speak Truth to Power 5-30.7. De Beauvoir: Les Mandarins 6-6.7; L 8-15.4. Ekwensi: People of the City 8-1.4. Fiedler: End to Innocence 11-14.7. Guerin: Au Service des Colonisés 9-12.6. Halasz: Capt Dreyfus 10-10.7. Hartz: Liberal Tradition in Amer 8-22.7. Hoffer: Passionate State of Mind 10-24.4. Joll: Second Int'l 12-12.4. Kempton: Part of Our Time 5-23.7. Larowe: Shape-Up & Hiring Hall 12-19.4. Ruark: Something of Value 5-16.7. Schanck: Permanent Rev in Science 1-17.4. Tutuola: Palm-Wine Drunkard 8-1.4. Wright: Black Power 3-28.7.

BONIN ISLANDS—Protest US evacuation 11-28.2.

BRAZIL—Quadros wants presidency 3-21.6. Political deals 5-16.3. Reactionary coup in SP 5-23.3. Quadros petering out 6-13.4. Presidential election: 3 hats in ring 7-18.3. SP backs Tavora 8-1.3. Army threatens 9-5.4. Threat of military coup 10-3.3. Kubitschek victory: Getulismo winning out 10-24.7; repercussions 10-31.4. Preventive coup 11-28.3.

BRITAIN—See also its colonies, Malaya, Cyprus, etc.—Strike looms on natlized RRs 1-3.4; 1-10.2; 1-17.2; 1-24.2. Tories yield on RR strike 6-20.3; Strike victory 6-27.2. The year ahead 1-17.2. Little man challenges monopoly; atheist radio talk 1-24.2. Glimpse of GDH Cole 1-31.5; L 3-7.4; L 6-13.4; Cole & socialist unity 5-2.6. Church & state 1-31.5; Church-state tie-up under attack 11-28.6. Who'll succeed Deakin? 2-14.3. Fumbling color issue 2-14.3. Young socialists *2-14.5. Bevan on capitalism's future 2-21.4. Formosa issue in LP 2-21.4. Plan A-power stations 2-28.2. Setback for coexistence mood 2-28.3. Bevanites busy among miners 3-7.3. Eden woos Mid-East 3-7.3. Student movement marks time *3-7.5. London elec; Tory financial manipulations 3-14.3. Move to expel Bevan 3-21.3; Attlee yielded 3-21.7; Bevan scores in 1st round 3-28.4; beats expulsion 4-11.3. H-bomb politics 3-28.1. Respects to Churchill 3-11.1; politics without Churchill 4-11.3; Churchill's souvenirs 4-18.3. BLP fight & coming election 4-25.2. Hot elec fight looms 5-16.2; Tories bank on Bevanite bogey 5-23.3; On eve of elec 5-30.3; Election results: a suspicious analysis 6-6.1; Labor's casualties 6-6.3. Pushing LP to right; Problem of strikes 6-13.3. Old boys going 6-20.3. Bevan kicks off 6-27.2. Attention to automation 7-11.3; Stewards' program 10-10.3. As LP returns to normal 7-18.3. Eden's family tree 7-18.4. BLP faces challenge of program 7-25.2. Africans as guinea-pigs 7-25.3. Dig, die, disperse 8-8.3. Prepare for BLP confer 8-15.3. CP & BLP left 8-22.3. LW fight at TUC congr 9-19.3. Rein workers' anger 9-26.4. Three party conferences 10-3.2. Bevan's challenge 10-17.3. Movie monopolist Rank 10-

HOW TO USE THIS INDEX

The number following each entry gives the date and page number of the issue. Thus:
11-7,6=Nov. 7, page 6.
11-7,1,6=Nov 7, page 1 & 6.

*Entries marked with an asterisk are from the *Young Socialist Challenge* section (for which, see below).
The fullest listing is by SUBJECT. Names and personalities mentioned in articles are usually not listed separately.

Entries relating to foreign countries or places are always listed under the foreign geog headings, and not necessarily under any other subject heading.

Trade-union articles are listed under the name of the occupation, e.g., Auto Workers, Longshoremen, and under Labor Problems.

Entries are separated by periods; but successive related entries are separated by semi-colons. In some cases, related entries are grouped under boldface subheadings.

ABBREVIATIONS

- L—Letter to the editor.
- BR—Book review.
- Disc—Discussion.

INDEX TO "CHALLENGE"

*Articles in the *Young Socialist Challenge* section are included in the general index; but they are distinguished by an asterisk.

Note that when the *Challenge* consists of 4 pages, its pages are numbered 1-C, 2-C, etc.

The bulk of *Challenge* articles will be found under the following subject headings: ACADEMIC FREEDOM; EDUCATION; MILITARISM; SOCIALIST YOUTH (INT'L); STUDENT MOVEMENT; YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE; YOUTH PROBLEMS.

General political articles will be found under subject headings, etc.

LABOR ACTION has been indexed since 1949. Bound volumes available up to 1954, at \$3 for recent years. Write for other prices.

(Continued on next page)

Figures on French Labor's Divisions

By A. GIACOMETTI

Paris, Dec. 8

The recent Social Security elections provide a good vantage-point to see how the French working class divides up among the rival trade-union centers. Before displaying the statistics, we have to explain what these elections are.

Shortly after the end of the war, the French government established an imposing social-security system, providing insurance for sickness, maternity, accidents, death and old age. These benefits are important supplements of otherwise low wages.

Sickness and accident benefits amount to 80 per cent of the basic wage; a family with two children receives an allowance of \$30 monthly, a family with three children receives a little less than \$50; in addition, at the birth of every child the family receives a bonus of \$90-100.

The total budget of the system was 1000 billion francs in 1954 (about \$2.7 billion). The payments amount to 35 per cent of the basic wage in each case: the employer paying 29 per cent and the worker 6 per cent.

The system is a "welfare state" institution that arose out of the reformist phase of the Liberation, along with the nationalization of coal, aircraft and some of the auto plants, such as Renault. Its purpose was to "transform the social structure of the country" by a "redistribution of income in the mass of the population which, if successful, should have mitigated the differences in living conditions between classes and social groups."

In keeping with this spirit of reform, the administration of the system was turned over to representatives elected by the insured. The purpose of these elec-

tions, which take place every five years, was to maintain a closer contact between the insured and their needs, on the one hand, and the administration of the huge system on the other. Also it was calculated to stimulate popular participation in the administration of the system, thereby taking a step toward the "social democracy" which the Resistance movement hoped to establish.

Since the Liberation, the social climate has changed considerably for the worse, and the reformist features of the social-security system were the first to be pushed into the background. The elections to the administration boards, however, remain an important part of the system.

Three-quarters of the representatives on the boards of the social-security system proper are elected by the workers, one-fourth by the employers. On the boards administering family allowances, one-half of the representatives are elected by the workers, one-fourth by the employers, and one-fourth by the self-employed (artisans, shopkeepers, etc.).

The latest elections took place on November 17. There have been two previous elections, one in 1947 and the other in 1950. In every election, all trade-union organizations and various political groups put up candidates. For this reason the elections have become a good test of the relative strength of the trade unions and of the geographical distribution of their membership.

The elections are fought on programs aiming to improve or reform the social-security system. However, these programs should be considered more as general statements of principle, since the elected administrators have very little power to change the legislative regula-

tions which rule the operation of the system.

This year the following organizations put up candidates: CGT (largest trade-union center, CP-dominated), CFTC (Catholic), Force Ouvriere (SP-influenced and right-wing), CAT ("autonomous," i.e., independent revolutionary unions), the two tendencies of the "independent" CGSI (fascist and Gaullist), the Mutualists (close to the SP) and the Family Associations (Catholics of all shades), plus a scattering of insignificant "others."

Here are the results, in per cent, for the workers' representatives; in France as a whole, on the Social Security boards:

	1950	1955
CGT	43.6	43.0
CFTC	21.3	20.9
F.O.	15.1	16.2
Mutual	11.1	10.4
Family Ass.	5.2	2.8
Others	3.7	6.7

For the Family Allowance Boards, the results were similar.

In the Paris region the total vote was 1,717,109 and the distribution was as follows: CGT 44.9 per cent; CFTC 13.9; FO 9.4; CAT 1.7; CGSI (both tendencies) 4.1; Mutualists 12; Family Ass. 6.4.

SLIGHT CHANGE

Several categories, covered by special arrangements, did not take part in the vote: the workers of the nationalized industries (railroads, coal mines), the workers employed by the state (communications, public services, administration, teachers, etc.) and the students. If they had taken part in the vote, the miners

and the railwaymen would have strengthened the CGT. In the elections for the miners' social-security boards of October 29, the CGT won 111 seats out of 192; of the remainder, 39 went to FO, 37 to CFTC, and 5 to others. On the other hand, the vote of the civil servants, teachers, etc., would have strengthened FO and the Mutualists and, in some cases, the CAT. Thirty per cent of the voters abstained, about as many as in 1950.

On the whole, the elections do not show significant changes. The slight loss of the CGT and the CFTC is not important. The slight gain of FO took place mostly in Southwestern France and in the Paris region (60,000 votes), for reasons which are not clear. Jacques Collen, of France-Observateur, suggests that many anti-Stalinists who were still in the habit of voting for the CFTC two years after FO split from the CGT, now switched their votes to FO. For what it's worth, this is one man's opinion.

Geographically, the situation remains also unchanged: the CGT maintained its strongholds in the North, in the Paris region and in the mountain areas of Central and Southeastern France. CFTC also maintained its position in the East, in the Catholic West (Brittany and Vendée) and in Central France. FO's strength is rather equally distributed, with a slight predominance in Southwestern France and in Corsica.

In terms of votes here, the CFTC gained 11,000, the CGT 7000 and FO 2000. This advance of the CFTC is no doubt the fruit of its militant attitude during this summer's strikes, and it will strengthen the "Reconstruction" left wing which leads the organization in this region.

