

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

FEBRUARY 4, 1952

FIVE CENTS

THE REVOLT AGAINST IMPERIALISM
FROM GIBRALTAR TO SUEZ

... pages 1, 5, 6, 7, 8

The Story Behind Tunisia's Fight
Arab Socialist-Third Camp Conference
Churchill Bids U. S. Invade Egypt
The Strange Case of Libya

The Circus Comes to Detroit— Un-Americans to 'Probe' UAW

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT, Jan. 27 — The oldest diversion in history for the unemployed is bread and circuses.

Detroit soon is going to have its circus, billed in advance as the most sensational hearing of the year. Advance publicity has been excellent: top headlines in major newspapers here, speeches by congressional figure. It ought to be good.

The circus is going to be produced by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. And it is considered such a major event that the full committee will conduct the hearings.

The hearings are scheduled for any week now, sometime in February at the latest.

It is expected that target No. 1 will be Ford Local 600. However, there is every reason to believe that the congressional committee has bigger game in mind. It is the United Auto Workers (CIO) and

its political allies in the Democratic Party, Governor Williams and Senator Blair Moody. The technique will be Senator McCarthy's vicious methods.

That the union movement is worried is shown by the story carried in the January 17 issue of the *Michigan CIO News*.

The story is headlined, "Red Probers To Take Swipe at Auto Union." It says: "Predictions are that the un-American activities committee will use the investigations largely for publicity purposes. This is made clear by this week when the entire committee decided to participate in the Detroit hearings. The usual procedure is for a subcommittee to handle such a quiz."

"The probe may also be used to take a swipe at labor unions, especially the UAW-CIO. Committee members have been telling the press that they are convinced that a large-scale infiltration of Communists is going on in the UAW plants."

(Continued on page 2)

Uprising in Tunisia: The Fight Has Just Begun

By HAL DRAPER

In the French North African colony of Tunisia, a series of planned peaceful demonstrations organized by the nationalist movement was pushed toward the verge of an unlooked-for national-revolutionary insurrection when the French administration reacted with the most brutal colonialist repression yet seen in the post-war world outside of the Russian sphere.

The Tunisian events since January 19, seen in the background of the French record in the country as well as of the whole Middle Eastern situation, offers one of the clearest pictures of the face of post-war imperialism: its grasping desires as well as its limitations, its inter-imperialist rivalries, and the specific way in which U. S. imperialism is involved in the situation.

This is so not because the Tunisian people are the most exploited and oppressed people of the Middle East or the colonial world—far from it. It is so, for one thing, because here there was an almost total absence of the post-war excuses and pretexts which the imperialists have been using for maintaining their slipping centers of control in the face of revolt in Asia and Africa.

None of the following pretexts, made familiar to Americans by the demagogic agitation of the U. S. press in connection with other situations in the Middle East and Asia, has the slightest color of truth with regard to Tunisia—even as pretexts:

(1) They are backward, not ready for independence, without political experience in self-government. (2) The "Communists" will move into control if the controlling power moves out. (3) There are strategic installations (like the Suez Canal) which must be kept in the hands of Atlantic Pact powers at all costs. (4) The native ruling class merely uses its anti-imperialist agitation to distract the masses from their economic misery. (5) The people are anti-West or "neutralist," and therefore not "reliable allies" from the point of view of Washington, Paris or London.

There is no reason to believe that the leaders of the Neo-Destour Party (New Constitution Party), headed by Habib Bourguiba and Salah Ben Youssef, which enjoys overwhelming support from all classes of Tunisians, had organized for or expected anything but peaceful demonstrations. This view is supported not only by the press reports, and not only by the character of the Neo-Destour movement, but also by objectives set for the demonstrations. This was frankly pressure to back up the request of a Tunisian delegation to the UN that the world body put the question of Tunisian independence on its agenda.

French Provocation

Outside of a French claim of a "Communist-led" riot at the naval arsenal city of Ferryville on Thursday, the main violence was unleashed when the regime of French Resident-General Hautecloque moved before dawn (in approved police-style fashion) to seize Bourguiba and five other leaders and rush them out of the capital, Tunis, by air, to the Algerian border. No charges were laid against them. In fact, it was not an "arrest," said the French, but a "measure of removal." The official French announcement, with refreshing candor or naïveté, simply charged them with "systematic agitation."

It was also clear that Hautecloque was putting a well-known colonialist gambit into play: they hoped that by removing Bourguiba from the scene, leadership of his movement would fall to three members of the Destourian political bureau whom they left unmolested in Tunis; and/or that the Bey, the native ruler, could then be pressured into repudiating the activities of the Destour leadership. Neither trick worked.

(Sole comic relief was afforded by a straight-faced announcement from the French Residency that its moves were solely concerned with "protecting the Bey" in accordance with treaty obligations. In juridical fiction, this is the legal basis of the French "protectorate.")

This "calculated risk" of the French, on the contrary, touched off the landslide.

A general strike broke out, probably directly called by the Tunisian General Workers Union, which is affiliated with the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions. All shops in the Arab quarters of the cities closed down tight. Union leaders asserted that activities in the European quarters also were suspended. Later food stores were permitted to open daily between 4 and 7 p.m. The general strike lasted solidly until called to a temporary halt on January 28, ten days later.

(Continued on page 5)

Taft, Hoover Sound Off For Republican Old Guard

By MARY BELL

It is twenty-four years since the Republican Party has sent a president to the White House. It appears foredoomed to being a minority party, even after having served up two "internationalist" candidates in the past two presidential elections. The backers of the Eisenhower candidacy stake a rejuvenation of the GOP on the leadership of a military hero who represents bipartisan foreign policy. Meanwhile, the Old Guard wing of the Republicans, represented most typically by Senator Taft, campaigns more militantly than ever. In the latter category we dismiss for the moment the Young Foggy Stassen, currently fumbling with a "revised gold standard" as a possible plank in his 1952 platform.

In any assessment of the chances of the Republican Old Guard an examination of its program is in order. Two recent addresses of its prominent spokesmen, the elder statesman who sets the key, and the political bridesmaid, "Mr. Republican," establish the issues.

ECONOMY ARGUMENT

Herbert Hoover's views, aired over CBS on January 27, are more sober, dignified and abstract than those of Senator Taft, but the latter's shift and adapt with the exigencies of the politician who is actively campaigning for office and required to make cam-

paign promises. Essentially the two agree.

The overriding election issue between right-wing Republicans and Democrats is the war. Hoover singles out for emphasis the "overstrain" of the economy as a result of the huge federal allocations for military expenditures and laments over the reduction in living standards occasioned by tax pressures and rabid inflation.

The argument for economy and

relief from high taxation undoubtedly has appeal, chiefly among businessmen. Not so among labor, for the criticism of high governmental spending is coupled with the expressed fear that this might lead to "creeping socialism," which, in the Republican vocabulary, is identical with Fair Deal welfareism and social security, the British Labor Party experiment and Russian Stalinism.

(Continued on page 2)

GRIMMEST JOKE OF THE YEAR

Francis Biddle was the author on the "Author Meets the Critics" program January 17 over the Dumont Television network. There he answered a question we have asked more than once.

Biddle, who is now chairman of Americans for Democratic Action, has a new book out, *Fear of Freedom*. In it he castigates the Smith Act, government methods in the current witchhunts and the loyalty oaths. It is filled with excellent civil-liberties doctrine, even if it avoids a merited condemnation of the Truman administration's over-all policies on democratic rights.

But Biddle, a former attorney general under Roosevelt, was the man in charge when the FIRST prosecution under the Smith Act took place during the war, directed against the Minneapolis defendants of the Socialist Workers Party and the Teamsters Union, and substantially based on "evidence" of dangerous thoughts.

On the TV program, Biddle was put on the spot by Leo Cherne, who asked why, since he now denounces the Smith Act, he saw fit to prosecute the Minneapolis defendants. His reply is the grimmest joke of the year.

He explained: "That was simply to test the constitutionality of the act; we wanted to get the Supreme Court's ruling on it as to its legality."

Circus to Detroit--

(Continued from page 1)

The story concludes by pointing out: "The UAW constitution contains a provision which bars Communists and supporters of totalitarian ideologies from holding elective office in the union."

The jitters shown around Detroit over these forthcoming hearings come from the fact that it is very unlikely that any city outside of New York has as many ex-Stalinists and ex-socialists as the auto center. What a field day the committee may have with these frightened souls who have but one prayer, that their "youthful indiscretions" may have long been forgotten.

What the committee will not investigate is the root causes of the unemployment situation which is bound to be used and exploited by the Stalinists.

Nor is it likely to investigate the proposal of President Truman's "Task Force" on auto unemployment, which shocked this city last week. It led to a bitter Detroit Free Press editorial blasting the totalitarianism involved in the idea.

The committee proposed nothing less than dispersing Detroit's labor force, by compulsory methods if necessary, whereupon the Free Press said, "Shades of Stalin!"

WDL Hits Scab Prison Labor

(WDL Release)

In awarding contracts for shoes and blankets to Federal Prison Industries Inc., the Army "is in effect supporting a system of forced labor similar to that existing in Russia and its satellites."

So stated Rowland Watts, National Secretary of the Workers Defense League in a letter to President Truman written after the Boston Post pointed out that a government contract for 200,000 pairs of military shoes had been awarded to the Federal Penitentiary in Leavenworth, Kansas, "while many New England shoe workers are either working only part-time or are unemployed."

Watts' letter says: "Federal prisoners are forced to work. If they refuse, they are thrown into solitary confinement. In view of the fact that all but industrial jobs in prison are unpaid, some prisoners choose these jobs in order to send a little money to their families. But what they can send is indeed very little since they are paid approximately one-sixth of prevailing wage scales on the outside.

Detroit, Jan. 27—The first reaction of Briggs workers to the order of Emil Mazey, director of the UAW Briggs department, that they call off their "wildcat" strike against speedup, was to shut down five other Briggs plants. It took another 24 hours to quiet things down, by calling a special Briggs membership meeting for Sunday to take a regular strike vote. The issue is an admitted speedup which grievance procedure has not been able to settle, as was to be expected.

Many Briggs union officials, all of them supporters of Mazey, were quite embarrassed by the action of the international union. The speedup issue at Briggs is a very hot potato, and elections are only five months off now.

In a circular letter sent out by the National Office of the ISL, it said: "Between the 1951 Fund Drive and this one, we have held our national convention and organized one nation-wide tour; we have maintained our press under the most incredible difficulties; our leading staff stays on the job under conditions that few would undertake. Inflation hits the organization even harder than individuals because we cannot know exactly what our income will be,

Taft, Hoover Speeches --

(Continued from page 1)

In an effort to provide for a reduction of the military expenditures, Hoover calls for a kind of military nationalism and isolationism, a Western Hemisphere "defense wall" based upon a joint air-sea force of the United States and Britain, with little reliance upon ground forces. He hopes that Eisenhower succeeds in getting the NATO countries to underwrite their own military defense, rather than leaving the burden to the U. S. And he voices skepticism because of the shortcomings in this regard and the failure of France and Germany, for instance, to meet their timetable in providing the necessary number of divisions. He also takes a crack at England's reluctance to join an all-European army: "Britannia would be a friend but would not marry Mr. Europe."

Hoover, like MacArthur, must be prepared to risk all-out war, rather than the smaller Korean war, through his advocacy of its extension across Chinese borders.

The essential nationalism of the Hoover position is again revealed in his view of the relations of the U. S. to the UN. They "must not be allowed to dominate the internal sovereignty of our government," he declaims. Hoover sees reality upside down.

Senator Taft is meanwhile busy collecting a grab-bag of political supporters, including the backers of McCarthy, MacArthur and the Dixiecrats, claiming for benefit of the latter that the Republican Party is the real party of States' Rights (read: White Supremacy).

HOOVER'S GIBRALTAR

In his recent policy speech before the Women's National Republican Club at the Waldorf in New York City, he referred to the "unnecessary Truman war." He makes cogent points against the administration's agreements at Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam, when the Republicans were not even consulted in the division of spheres of influence with the Russians in the course of World War II. He scores a bigger one in relation to the Korean war, when Truman "completely failed to consult Congress itself." But neither he nor Truman can make the point that the people itself are never consulted on major questions of strategy and war itself.

There are a few kernels of truth in the former president's statements. And there is a certain, if demagogic, attractive power, in the arguments against further high spending for military preparations because they are draining our economy. Hoover's view is a toning down of the isolationism of the past, but it is in the reference to "this final Gibraltar of freedom," the Western hemisphere.

Hoover supports, as does Taft, MacArthur's position on Korea, and would seem to attempt to revive the "Great Debate" of last year over foreign policy. The United States lost the victory in Korea, he believes, because it vetoed the MacArthur plan to bomb "the Chinese air sanctuary in Manchuria," and to use the troops of Chiang Kai-shek. Herein is revealed the essential demagoguery of the present of being against the war and of great concern for the victimization of American soldiers.

Hoover's cosmology, an invasion by Russia is not to be feared; nationalism (Yugoslavia) and the threat of atomic warfare will prevent that. His advisers tell him that "Russian ground armies could have overrun Western Europe in a two-month campaign any time in the past five years and can no doubt do it during several years to come." The "war psychosis" is greatest, he maintains, in Washington.

AFTER MACARTHUR

Taft, who customarily votes for trimming down military appropriations, reveals himself, like Hoover, a peculiar kind of "anti-war" advocate. He says of Korea, "We have only proved that we perhaps may punish a small aggressor but that we cannot punish or even prevent a large aggressor." The latter reference is to the stalemate established by the intervention of the Chinese in the war.

Or: MacArthur was removed because "he wanted to win the war in Korea and the administration did not want to win that war in Korea or protect Formosa." Further: "MacArthur's policies of bombing and blockading and the use of Nationalist troops would have resulted in the consolidation of Korea and the setting up of a

since it is difficult to rely upon irregular payments which come in from branches."

And so our appeal is made once more to the ISL, its branches, its friends and sympathizers to help the organization and its press to carry on for another year, and respond to the appeal of this Fund Drive.

We disclose no state secrets when we tell our readers that our debts are large and that we rely upon the Fund Drive to see us through the year.

If you will glance at the quotas set for branches, you will note that the Socialist Youth League has already responded to our appeal by voluntarily taking a quota of \$1500. This is three times the quota the SYL had in 1951. Last year they went over the top and they promise to do the same this year.

New York and Chicago top the quotas and we expect them to reach 100 per cent as they did in 1951. Other branches were given reasonable quotas and we know by past performances that they will do more than their bit.

We are calling on our readers and friends to join in the drive

and help the ISL and the press which they support as readers. Although the drive begins officially on February 15, we want the drive to get a running start with this announcement, so that by February 15 we can report that an excellent beginning has been made.

The quotas for branches appear below:

Akron	\$ 75
Baltimore	25
Boston	50
Buffalo	650
Chicago	1800
Cleveland	200
Detroit	750
Los Angeles	600
New York	4000
Newark	300
Philadelphia	300
Pittsburgh	150
Reading	75
St. Louis	50
Oakland	500
Seattle	300
Streator	25
Youngstown	100
Indiana	100
Oregon	50
Socialist Youth League	1500
General	1000
TOTAL	\$12,500

inextricably with the problems of the world and locked in world rivalry with Stalinism.

As against the Democrats' program for the salvation of Western capitalism, that of the Republican right wing remains far inferior. It would run the risk of isolation without insuring against, perhaps provoking the threat of war, whereas the Democrats seek a bloc of countries to share the struggle against Stalinism, and that despite the cries of the Republicans, under the undisputed hegemony of the U. S.

So far as labor is concerned, with the exception of a few cave-dwellers, this wing of the Republicans has no attractive force, nor can it be expected to engender any. This remains true even though the Fair Deal trimmings of the administration program have been whittled to the point where even the Republicans have little room for criticism. Whatever political combinations or recombinations the liberal and labor movement may make, it will not go in the direction of the Taft and Hoover elements of the Republican Party.

HOW THE AMA DOCTORS THE VOTES

The American Medical Association's political activities have been severely criticized in an article in a magazine for people who run hospitals.

Wrote Editor R. M. Cunningham, Jr., of *The Modern Hospital* in the magazine's December issue: "Few people would question the doctor's right, as citizen, to express himself politically. . . .

"But some doctors and their friends do question whether it is right to use the county medical society, presumably a scientific and educational organization, for political purposes; and whether the sacred patient-physician relationship should be subverted to political ends. . . . and whether the doctor should lend himself to political statements of questionable truth. . . ."

In discussing ads used by the AMA in the New York campaign the magazine said:

"The . . . radio announcements . . . provide a neat example of the medical profession using the patient medicine, or snake doctor, sales technic."

Subscribe to
LABOR ACTION

Polish Workers Protest Famine Policy of Regime

By A. RUDZIENSKI

For the first time in the modern history of the country, famine threatens the Polish peoples, as a result of Russian exploitation and the Kremlin's imposed policy of war and rearmament. There is an absolute lack of meat in Poland, even for workers and state officials, even through supply cards. Long queues at the state stores wait through the night for meat and other food articles. In November members of trade unions received only a half kilogram of meat per week, and retired workers got only half a kilogram of bones and a quarter kilogram of "kasha."

Hunger is so serious that it threatens the labor "norms" in the factories, since the workers grumble over the lack of food. At a factory meeting in Wroclaw (the power factory), first the working women and then all the workers protested to the party "activists" who were demanding higher production norms. The women threw their meat cards on the table before the chairman of the meeting and cried, "Give us food to eat first, and then demand hard work!" The other workers backed up the women, and the Stalinist activists had to end the meeting without obtaining agreement to higher norms.

A similar meeting took place in the shipyard of the port of Gdynia, at a rally of the Stalinist party. Workers, members of the party, threw their party cards before the chairman as a protest against the

inadequate food supply combined with simultaneous demands for greater production. One voice shouted from the hall: "Where's the meat and grain?" Others: "Where is the fish?"—"Don't fatten the Russian swine!"—"Give us food!"

On the coast there is a chronic food-supply crisis—lack of meat and fish—in spite of rich fishing. The people believe that the lack of fish is due to its exportation to Russia and Czechoslovakia.

A SPECTER HAUNTS

Prices in Poland are very high. With the official rate fixed at 4 zlotys to a dollar, a kilogram of meat costs between 11 to 20 zlotys; a kilogram of butter, 32-43; of ham, 22-24; of carp, 14; of tea, 250 zlotys. One suit costs 1500-1800 zlotys and a woman's dress 400-500; a pair of shoes, 500-1000.

And all this while the monthly wages are 450-500 zlotys on the average.

The Kremlin wants to lower the standard of living to the Russian level. The workers protest not only at the factory and party meetings but, in addition (as Polish news sources abroad report) in the last period there have been strikes in Lodz and Silesia because of the food situation. Many workers were arrested by the police but the strikes broke out anyway, since the people are driven to desperation.

The ferment of discontent is so great that it menaces the fulfillment of the six-year plan. The

crisis is caused by the war and rearmament policy personally imposed by Stalin on Warsaw's Minister of Industry Mine. The low prices for agricultural products which are fixed by the government reduce the peasant's production of grain and meat, and the government collects the reserves for the army. Thus the regime stands before the dilemma: relaxation of the tempo of industrialization and rearmament or acceleration of collectivization. The latter could provoke a major crisis in Poland and lead to tremendous resistance, even civil war.

Stalin certainly remembers his own peasant policy in Russia: forced collectivization, famine on the countryside, and the death of 5-6 million peasants. A similar policy in Poland could be a catastrophe for the Stalinist regime, even before the outbreak of a third world war.

Therefore Minister Minc is still opposed to forced collectivization and the government cannot bring itself to decide on a frontal assault against the peasants. Stalin is frightened by the specter of the Ukrainian famine in Poland and still more by the specter of Polish underground resistance. Russian industrialization policy (i.e., military preparations and war policy) in Poland develops in this dilemma between the needs of Moscow's imperialism and its fear of a Polish uprising—particularly, peasant resistance backed by the working class.

THE FIGHT FOR DEMOCRACY on the HOME FRONT

Recording a Few Victories

By MEL HACKER

Last year on February 19, the Hecht Company, one of the largest department stores in Washington, D. C. ran a full-page advertisement stressing the need for equal treatment for all Americans, timed to coincide with Brotherhood Week. Soon after the ad appeared, a small delegation of Negro and white citizens in the nation's capital called on Hecht Company officials to ask them to practise what they preached, at the lunch counter in the store where only white shoppers were permitted to eat.

When the store continued to refuse luncheon service to Negroes, Committee for the Enforcement of D. C. Anti-Discrimination Laws, along with about 100 civic, labor and church groups in the city, instituted a boycott against the store. On July 20 the boycott was reinforced by picket lines which marched in front of the store three times a week, calling customers' attention to Hecht's segregation policy.

After six months of picketing, the organization finally won. Last week, the Hecht Company changed its policy. Mrs. Mary Church Terrell, an outstanding Negro educator, held an interracial luncheon party at the store. She announced that the committee will continue its efforts to persuade downtown eating places to serve everyone. The committee has succeeded in ending segregation at more than 40 downtown restaurants and department and dime-store lunch counters.

SEGREGATION AT ALL COSTS

Gov. James F. Byrnes this month called on the South Carolina legislature to submit to the people of the state at the next general election a resolution repealing the

state constitutional provisions for a public-school system. This recommendation was made because of the anti-segregation case now pending in the United States Supreme Court.

That suit, which originated in Clarendon County, resulted in a 2-to-1 lower-court decision upholding the state's right to segregate but requiring immediate steps to equalize facilities. The governor has stated that that state would abandon the public-school system if segregation were abolished by federal courts. The schools would then presumably be turned over to private groups.

In Tennessee, a maneuver permitting one Negro into the hitherto all-white University of Tennessee has pulled a test case of the state's segregation laws from the United States Supreme Court. The closing of this case has given Tennessee a "breathing space" to continue its construction of "equal but separate facilities" for Negroes. The Negro A. and I. College of Nashville has been raised to university status and the Meharry Medical College, a private Negro institution, is being supported by state funds. The charge that was to have been tested before the court was that segregation itself meant inequality for Negroes.

The increasing militancy of Negro and civil-rights groups in contesting segregation through picket lines and the courts is threatening the vested interests of the Southern bourgeois. They would eliminate public schools, spend sizable amounts of desperately needed school money to build a fiction of "equal facilities" for the Negroes. They threaten bloodshed if segregation is abolished and thus encourage the Klan and its warped racists to commit acts of violence against Negroes and other minority groups in the South, as shown by the recent murders of Negro civil-

rights militants in Florida and Louisiana.

CATCHING A BIG ONE

The militant struggle against race-biased eviction by the omnipotent Metropolitan Life Insurance Company in its Stuyvesant Town project was won this month in New York City. Disposes notices were given to 39 tenants for their activity in the anti-racial-discrimination campaign at Stuyvesant Town, which included inviting Negro families as weekend and "permanent guests" in the apartments. The intervention of labor and civil-rights groups and that of City Council President Halley, after Mayor Impellitteri had refused to intervene, resulted in this civil-rights victory.

However Stuyvesant Town, which benefits from reduced city taxes, still discriminates against Negroes in the rental of its apartments and should be the target for future campaigns.

INDIAN SUMMER

The struggle of Indian tribes supported by the legal profession, against regulations that would have allowed the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to impose disciplinary restrictions on lawyers representing Indian tribes, was won last week. Oscar L. Chapman, secretary of the interior, announced the abandonment of these regulations.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

can help you build your own Labor and Socialist Library.
SEND FOR OUR FREE BOOK LIST.
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

Source Material for An Unwritten Article on— GOVERNMENT CORRUPTION AND BIG BUSINESS

In Congress, any informed observer nowadays can show you rows of senators whose votes are controlled when the chips are down by the banks, the local utilities, the mining and mineral interests, and other big-business groupings which play big parts in state politics.

There is even a soft-drink company which has a senator. What has always gone on in a small way has now become common; and this has produced the general lowering of standards typified by the Senate's bland refusal to be shocked by such episodes as the Lustron Corporation's \$10,000 payment to Sen. McCarthy of Wisconsin (for writing a pamphlet on housing).

—Washington columnist Joseph Alsop, in the N. Y. Herald Tribune, Dec.

REWARDS FOR BUSINESSMEN

That ethical standards of the same type [as Congressman May's] prevail in the land beyond the Capitol can be seen in the record of business crime; in fact, it is likely that far less drastic punishment would have been meted out to May had he been a corporation officer. Consider, for example, the case of the nine cable-manufacturing concerns which, in February 1943, were found guilty of conspiracy to fix prices on U. S. navy orders for \$50,000,000 worth of cable. Were not these companies, which included General Electric, American Steel and Wire and Phelps-Dodge Copper Products, at least as guilty as May of hampering the speedy prosecution of the war? Like May, they were entrusted with public responsibility; at the time, these firms dominated the Wire and Cable Industry Advisory Committee in the War Production Board, Copper Division. Like May, "they did not consider themselves guilty," although the evidence against them was such that they pleaded *nolo contendere*. Not one officer of these companies went ahead to warn a prison bench for former Representative May, however, since, for business crime, the punishment usually consists of the payment of a relatively small fine.

Further, had May been a businessman instead of a congressman, he might even have been rewarded with additional honors. Thus the New York Central appointed A. B. Dick Jr. a director after a federal court fined him \$5,000 on each of three counts, as well as A. B. Dick Company, for conspiring to fix prices and monopolize the stencil-duplicating industry. . . . The government's bill of particulars in June 1947 charged that the Dick Company conducted a sabotage school in Chicago where employees were instructed in methods of sabotaging, under the guise of repairing, the duplicating machines of rival firms or their own machines of users of competitive stencils and supplies. . . .

—Congress: Corruption and Compromise, by H. H. Wilson. Rinehart & Co., N. Y.

THE DAISY CHAINS

A Senate investigating committee headed by Senator Blair Moody (Dem., Mich.) is disclosing some unsavory "black markets" which cost the American people far more than the much-publicized milk costs. Daily newspapers pay little attention to Moody's probe, however, because it reveals skulduggery in business, not in the government.

First, the Moody committee disclosed a fantastic black market in nickel, a vital war material. Among those who bought nickel in this black market, the committee found, were such giant and "respectable" corporations as Westinghouse.

This week, the committee dug into the steel black market, and found a "daisy chain" which led to the Indianapolis plant of Chevrolet, a branch of General Motors. . . . Moody declared that the steel shortage is largely caused by "daisy chain" operators who buy up steel and keep it off the market until they can get their unearned profit."

—Labor, railroad unions' weekly, Dec. 1.

TRUMAN'S RIGHT AND LEFT

Readers of *The Progressive* doubtless remember the bitter fight over the Kerr bill two years ago. Senator Robert Kerr, Oklahoma Democrat and millionaire oil and gas magnate, had proposed to wipe out federal regulation of natural gas producers. The bill passed through Congress, but it was vetoed by President Truman. The Chief Executive's right hand, however, soon performed an act which destroyed all the gain his left had achieved. He appointed Wallgren chairman of the Federal Power Commission and Wallgren's first major official act was to "enact" the Kerr bill by administrative ruling and thus reverse the result of the president's veto.

Wallgren's ruling came in the famous Phillips Petroleum Company case. Phillips, owner of 14 trillion feet of gas reserves, was in effect told to charge any price it wanted. The Wallgren ruling opened the gate to overcharging consumers to a tune which, one member of the commission estimated, might be "hundreds of millions of dollars"—or certainly somewhat more than the ham-&-hardware take of the "fixit" politicians on whom the press has been lavishing its attention. —*The Progressive* (monthly magazine), December.

PARASITE PRICES

Some shockingly shady doings, involving both business and government, were revealed at Detroit this week by a House investigating committee, headed by Congressman Porter Hardy, Jr. (Dem., Va.). The committee is probing purchase of automobile and truck "spare parts" by the Army's Detroit Tank Arsenal. Here are some highlights of the latest disclosures:

1. Big automobile and parts manufacturers—such as Chrysler, Studebaker, and Auto-lite—either refused to sell parts direct to the Army, or purposely "bid" prices so high that they obviously could not be accepted. Why? So the Army would have to buy the parts from "middlemen," who performed no useful function, but got profits "as high as 400 per cent." These "parasite profits," as Hardy called them, added up to the huge sum of \$305 million in just the comparatively few examples dug up by the committee. How much do such business "parasites" cost the taxpayers, if the full facts were known?
2. The committee prepared a six-page list of parts, showing that the Army has already bought, at "parasite" prices, enough of them to fill the Army's needs for periods as long as 104 years. Flabbergasting as this is, it is nothing new. Hardy recalled that the same sort of thing was exposed by the Senate "Truman Committee" during the Second World War. —*Labor*, Dec. 15.

The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

INTERESTED?

Get acquainted with the Independent Socialist League—

114 W. 14th Street
New York 11, N. Y.

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

I want to join the ISL.

Name
Address
City Zone
State Tel.

MARXISM FOR TODAY

THE CLASS WILL NOW TAKE AN EXAM

By PHILIP COBEN

The comments in last week's column, introducing "Marxism for Today," suggest the following test for readers. We've assembled some choice quotations from "authorities." Take it as an exam for yourself, or try it out on the other fellow.

Each of the following quotes is of the same type and around the same subject, Marx's theory of value. One and all, they reveal that the particular critic does not understand the first thing about the Marxist economics he is "refuting." (This in distinction from anti-Marxist arguments which may be invalid in our opinion but at least show that the critic knows something about the subject!) Most of these bluffers are from standard textbooks in economics by professors.

(1) "In my youth I tried to read Marx, but when I read that labor determines value and price, and that therefore the lazier the worker the more valuable his product, I stopped then and there forever."—George Santayana.

(2) "The labor theory of value is untenable; value is not created by labor nor do goods exchange in proportion to the amount of labor embodied in them; if you spent ten millions of dollars building a chimney five miles high, its value would not be ten millions. Who except Santa Claus, wants a chimney five miles high?"—C. R. Fay, *Elements of Economics*.

(3) "The socialists are wrong in regarding trade as robbery."—A. T. Hadley, *Economics*. (Prof. Hadley is president of Yale.)

(4) "Marx claimed that practically all wealth has been created by the laborers alone, and that all persons other than laborers are parasites."—T. R. Williamson, *Introduction to Economics*.

(5) "The base of Marx's system of economics is the labor theory of value. Normally and in the long run, he says, goods are exchanged for each other in ratios which measure the relative amounts of labor power incorporated in them. . . . The law of wages is a corollary of this law of value. Labor, like other goods, sells at a price equal to its cost of production. . . . This is the 'iron law,' or subsistence cost theory, of wages."—Fairchild, Furniss, and Buck: *Elementary Economics*, vol. 2.

(6) "Ricardo, Marx and you [Scott Nearing] carefully ignore the different kinds of labor. Labor is to you, as I think Marx says, 'a homogeneous mass.' An hour spent in the labor of discovering radium, an hour spent in hop-picking, an hour spent in muddling a business, an hour spent in putting one straight, are all the same."—Edwin Cannan (Emer. Prof., U. of London), *An Economist's Protest*.

(7) "The labor theory of value says, briefly, that the value of everything that is produced depends, or, rather, should depend, on the amount of labor necessary to produce it. Value to the labor theorist means exchange value—price, we call it. Thus, if a pair of shoes takes in its production two hours of labor, and a hat takes only one hour, then the shoes should have twice the value of the hat, and if they do not, there is something wrong with our system."—A. L. Faubel, *Principles of Economics*.

(8) "Remember, and this is all important, the Communist jibes at and denounces Wall Street and the Mellons and the Morgans as 'capitalists,' but by 'capitalist' the Communist . . . means as well the corner grocer, the laborer who owns his own home, the farmer who employs a helper, etc. Against these as well as the millionaire, 'violence' will be used to strip them of their property, 'if they resist.'"—Raymond T. Feeley, S.J., *Communism and Morals*.

(9) "If profits come from surplus value taken from the worker in the last hours of his toil, it should follow that the most profitable enterprises would be those employing the most workers. We find, on the contrary, that labor-saving machinery increases profits. A completely mechanized factory—like certain new brickyards employing only one man as watchman—still yields profits, greater profits, in fact, than those earned by hand labor."—Jacques Barzun, *Darwin, Marx, Wagner*.

(10) "It is not certain why Marx used the surplus-value doctrine, as he might easily have employed sound reasons to show why employers exercise an unfair advantage over laborers. He may have done it because of muddled thinking, or he may have done it for purposes of propaganda, since it is certain that the doctrine makes the exploitation seem peculiarly offensive. . . ."

"Marx actually chose to argue first, that the exchange value of commodities are determined by the comparative amounts of labor used in producing them; second, that the costs are depressed below the exchange value because employers hold the wages of labor down to the subsistence level, taking the 'surplus' for themselves. But exchange values are not determined by costs alone; nor are costs solely a matter of labor costs, nor are wages held down to the subsistence level."—Bruce Winton Knight, *Economic Principles in Practice*.

The condign punishment for flunking the above exam is to sign up for the very next class in elementary Marxism.

LABOR ACTION
Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 16, No. 5 February 4, 1952

Published weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York City 11, N. Y. Send all communications to general editorial and business offices of LABOR ACTION at that address. Telephone: WATKINS 4-4222.

Subscription rate: \$2.00 a year; \$1.00 for six months. (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canada and Foreign.) 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.

Editor: HAL DRAPER
Assistant Editors: MARY BELL, GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL
Business Manager: L. G. SMITH Asst. Business Mgr.: SAM FELIX

Opinions and policies expressed in the course of signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

U.S. Weighs Churchill Bid to Invade Egypt

By LARRY O'CONNOR

The clash between the nationalist aspirations of Egypt and the determination of the Western powers to maintain their military position in the Middle East at all costs has reached a critical stage.

This crisis has been in the making ever since the Egyptian government denounced the Anglo-Egyptian treaty last October. Since that time the British troops in the Suez Canal Zone have maintained their position by sheer military force in the face of a rising wave of guerrilla warfare. This reached its most bloody point when some 1,500 British troops with tanks fought a pitched battle against about 1,000 Egyptian auxiliary police in Ismailia in the course of which 41 of the latter were killed and many were wounded.

The reaction of the Egyptian people was to stage a day-long riot in Cairo during which they attacked and burned all foreign institutions which they could reach. The government had lost control of the situation, and in an attempt to regain it, King Farouk dismissed Premier Mustafa Nahas Pasha, leader of the majority

Wafd party, and replaced him with Aly Maher Pasha, an "independent" politician. His first major political act, according to a Reuters dispatch from Cairo, was to close the headquarters of the Socialist Party of Egypt.

As we go to press he is ruling under a state of siege, with the capital of Egypt packed with troops seeking to "maintain order."

Speculation is rife as to whether the United States will join Britain in the military occupation of Egyptian territory at the invitation of Winston Churchill. Washington columnist Robert S. Allen wrote in the *New York Post* for January 28 that a "token force" of 6,000 U. S. marines are being held in readiness "within a few hours of the Canal Zone," and their landing is being held up only pending "the solution of certain key political problems."

One of these problems is the fact that the United Nations is currently debating the definition of the term "aggressor" and a landing of the marines at this particular moment "might run afoul of UN terminology—and thus play into the hands of the Russian and Arab extremists propaganda." It seems that they will have to dig up another word to describe the invasion of one country by the troops of another. "Pacification" would be a bit shopworn.

WOOING TURKEY
The other problem is that the State Department would like to get other nations to take on themselves part of the hatred which is bound to be aroused by open American aggression by joining in the invasion. They are particularly anxious to get Turkey involved. As the Turks are a Moslem nation, like the Egyptians, and are also a Middle Eastern power, it is thought that the presence of Turkish troops might

make the presence of U. S. marines less objectionable. But the Turks are understandably reluctant to compromise themselves in the interest of the British and American governments.

As far as the internal situation in Egypt is concerned, the picture is far from clear. The news reports describe the rioting on the 28th as if it were the action of a mob without any political objectives, simply seeking to lash out blindly at all symbols of foreign power in the country, including business establishments, hotels and the like. Yet the broadcast of Nahas Pasha just before he was deposed, as well as the immediate attack on the Socialist Party by his successor, give basis to a speculation that something more was involved.

NAHAS SPEECH
"Traitors seized the opportunity," said Nahas in his address to the nation, "of your condemnation of British aggression, infiltrated your ranks, committed horrible crimes, attacking and looting and setting fire to shops and houses, thus touching off a wave of disorders which gives the enemies of the country an opportunity to persist in their aggression."

"To remedy this exceptionally serious situation, which almost threatened the nation's existence, martial law was proclaimed temporarily so the government can crush this organized revolution and restore peace."

It is quite possible, of course, that all that is involved was a loss of control by the leaders of the Wafd Party over their own followers, some of whom have been urging all measures, including war, to get the British out of the Canal Zone. The small and corrupt Egyptian ruling class, which has traditionally been quite willing to "collaborate" with foreign imperialist interests when

Bare Knuckles

The Hungarian Stalinist press urges the factory managers to take off the velvet glove and show the bare knuckles in order to speed up the workers. On October 15 last, Ernő Gerő, minister of state, declared to a National Foundry Conference:

"As regards quality, we are lagging even farther behind. It must be openly admitted that, as far as leadership is concerned, there are still many shortcomings. . . . Some of the worker-managers are more like works committee secretaries than real managers and industrial commanders. . . . They should remember that they are masters of the workshop and should direct it instead of indulging in agitation and persuasion. . . ."

"The old generation of technicians and the old technical intelligentsia fulfill their tasks honorably. But some of them, posted by the state to a command, negotiate and argued like diplomats instead of giving orders. . . . What are they afraid of? The Party and the State have confidence in them. . . . If some of the workers become angry with them, the Government, the State and the Party will stand behind them."

Vice-Premier Rakosi, at a miners' conference on October 21: "We have not yet dealt with the problem of work discipline with the gravity it deserves. . . . Up to now our comrades and party officials, in the mines and outside them, have only tackled it reluctantly and with kid gloves. They were afraid of becoming unpopular if they raised the problem of undisciplined workers who disturb production. . . . This problem is one of the cancers of our coal production."

The failure to solve the "key political problems" mentioned by Robert S. Allen may of itself deter the American government from taking such a fatal step. But it would be foolish to rely on their judgment in the matter, or to hope that somehow the whole struggle in Egypt will settle itself. Every trade union, every democratic organization should raise its voice now, before it is too late: Keep Americans troops out of Egypt!

London Letter The Polish Emigres In Great Britain

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, Jan. 24—There is a large Polish emigré population in Britain as a result of the Second World War. Their situation here and the tendencies in their ranks are tied up with the fluctuations of the cold war.

A perusal of the mass of memoirs, histories and apologies which have appeared since the war makes it quite clear that there was a difference of opinion between the Western Allies and Russia on the "second front" proposal. Britain wanted to press an invasion through the Balkans while Stalin desired an attack on the German flank in France. With Roosevelt's support, Stalin's view was accepted. If it had not been, the Iron Curtain might have been a few hundred miles farther east, and Poland might be a social-democracy.

But history did not frame it that way. The Western Allies attacked through France, while Stalin created a Polish army out of the estimated one and a quarter million deportees he had taken to Russia; with General Anders in command they went through Iran, Palestine and finally wound up in Italy.

When peace came in 1945, many of these Poles returned to their home country, although the fate of General Bor-Komorowski and his Home Army should have warned them. The Russians soon began to sweep them out of the way, after accepting Mikolajczyk and other "London" Poles in exchange for recognition of the "Lublin" (Stalinist) government.

Over 100,000 Poles decided not to return to their country but remain in England, having already been labeled fascists and other ignominious names. Many more emigrated to the United States.

WARSAW FOILED
At first life here was difficult for them, partly because of natural English xenophobia and partly because of the anomalous position of their government-in-exile in London.

In 1947, however, the British government undertook responsibility for them and formed the Polish Resettlement Corps. It told them that they could become naturalized British citizens, that they would be entitled to veterans' privileges, and that they would not be extradited to Poland. Since then they have to some extent become integrated into the community; many are at British universities. At not infrequent intervals, various members of the Polish embassy and trade missions have broken away and applied for asylum here; this was made easier by the fact that

Tunisia: Fight Just Begun

(Continued from page 1)

Together with the Neo-Destour leaders, the French also announced the arrest of "Communists" and "Communist leaders."

There is no doubt that, as Bourguiba announced, this was simply a maneuver to smear the nationalist movement. (The U. S. press has not carried the name of a single "Communist" arrested, assuming that Hauteclouque really found some CPers to arrest, nor have any dispatches from Tunisia said a word about any claimed strength or influence for Tunisian Stalinists. Russian propaganda batteries went into operation, of course, to weep crocodile tears over the attacks on the Tunisian people, thereby affording the Western press an opportunity to point with alarm. *Izvestia*, putting the needle on the record, trumpeted the tommyrot that the uprisings were due to the Tunisians' resentment against American military bases. The *N. Y. Times* played its end of the comedy by warning gravely against "chaos or communism.")

Monday saw the spread of the fighting further into the country: in Nabeul; at Hammamet, where barricades were set up, and elsewhere. In Tunis helmeted police fired into a march of 150 Tunisians led by a dozen robed and veiled women, chanting "Bourguiba, Bourguiba, Bourguiba!" Reporters observed police with broken rifle butts. Arrests of Nationalists ran up into the hundreds. Serge Moati, socialist member of the Tunisian Grand Council, was arrested when he protested against the treatment of demonstrators but was later released.

JETS AND GRENADES

On Tuesday, in sections of Tunisia, the people went over to the offensive on a large scale. The important city of Sousse was taken by the nationalists from the French in an hours-long battle, apparently with small arms and grenades. Civil war spread the next day to Makine. But it was Thursday when the civil war "began to assume the appearance of an insurrection in some parts of the country."

At Teboulba the people attacked a column of Mobile Guards and sailors "as they moved toward the village to insure safety of one of the few Europeans living in the area." (In view of the composition of the French colonial population, it would be inter-

esting to know who was the "one" European for whom the column was mobilized.) At the holy city of Kairouan, a battle with the police took place. At Kelibia, according to reports, there was a grenade attack on a police post.

It was at Kelibia that the French threw jet planes into the fray—sweeping them over the crowd "as though they would strafe." (Please note: only 10 days before, General Juin, recently put in charge of France's Indochina war after his career as the French hangman in Morocco, complained in Washington that "We do not have a single jet plane in that part of the world [Indo-China]," adding that this was one of the problems he had discussed with General Bradley. Far be it for us to advise the French imperialists on how to dispose of their jet-plane resources, but apparently they had them available—for Tunisia.)

MOBILIZING FOR WAR

Testifying to Paris' fear of the spread of the insurrectionary flames through the country, the French government announced measures adequate to handling a small war: the troops in Tunisia were to be doubled, from 20,000 to 40,000; it decided to rush armored troops, as well as infantry, Mobile Guards in half-tracks, three battalions of paratroopers, one battalion of shock troops, a squadron of Spahis and one of Guards.

This was the high point. After continuous pressure, the Bey, although refusing to issue an appeal for "calm" and "order," permitted his name to be used by Hauteclouque in his own appeal. Another factor, of course, was the

French preparations for full-scale warfare. The rising tide abated.

At the same time, the new Faure government in Paris put out a bid for new negotiations on a vague basis. With transparent doubletalk, Faure regretted that the Tunisians had "misunderstood" the French rejection of their proposals last December and offered to talk some more. Vain and fruitless talks with the French for near two years had sent, of course, exactly what had sent the Tunisians with their appeal to the UN; and it is doubtful whether the Neo-Destour forces are optimistic about a change of heart in Paris.

FAURE GETS LULL

Quite likely is it that the main point of strength for Faure's offer is the fact that he had succeeded in convincing the French Socialist Party (without whose support his cabinet cannot last) to give him an extension of credit on the Tunisian question. Although the French SP (one of the most right-wing in Western Europe) has never been noted for its anti-imperialist zeal, it is on record for Tunisian independence as a "goal," and during the fighting adopted a resolution condemning the government's repressive measures. French Tunisian policy is more than its leaders can stomach with goodwill. Chief advocates of a blood-and-guts suppression of the Tunisian nationalists are De Gaulist elements.

There is a lull, but Bourguiba has warned that it will soon end unless substantial concessions toward autonomy are granted; otherwise "the next three or four days will bring new outbursts of popular discontent." Meanwhile (Jan. 29) the French police are still rounding up nationalists; and a one-day strike is set for February 1.

The Story Behind Tunisia's

By HAL DRAPER

Some general references to the background of the Tunisian development toward civil war are made in the front-page article in this issue. As mentioned there, an outstanding feature of this background is the relatively mild and moderate character of the Tunisian movement up to now.

Even the forcible conquest of Tunisia by French imperialism back in 1881 took place relatively "peaceably"—that is, without major resistance to the French aggression on the part of the Bey. The French marched their troops in from Algeria and set up their "protectorate" by the treaties of 1881 and 1883. No treaty or other agreement has ever given them the right to direct administration of Tunisia as a colony; ostensibly they are in Tunisia to "protect the Bey's sovereignty."

Since they have, however, run the country in fact for 70 years, it is even surprising that this bit of *curiosita* took on live importance last December, as it did, in an episode which testifies to either the stupidity or desperation of the colonialists.

Tunisia was, then, comparatively quiet up to the end of the Second World War. What stimulated it then was, of course, the wave of national-independence revolt in Asia. What they saw were the Asian nations utilizing the wartime and post-war difficulties of the Western imperialists to gain their own freedom; and this is what has impressed them, in spite of highly moral warnings from their masters and masters' allies against rocking the boat in the face of the Russian threat.

The Asian nations which achieved independence—in the fashion which that paladin of international ethics, the New York Times, denounces as "immoral"—are now respected states. Nothing succeeds like success. And the North Africans want to do the same thing. The Tunisians have been most gingerly about it.

There had been an Old-Destour Party in Tunisia but it was based on longings for outlived conditions, and disappeared. The present movement, the Neo-Destour Party (New Constitution Party—the "neo" refers to the party, not the constitution), grew up in the climate of modern nationalism.

The Neo-Destour Party did not have its present strength in 1938, when its president, Habib Bourguiba, was jailed after a riot in Sousse, and held in Marseilles. The French officials say that Bourguiba, liberated from

prison by the Germans, negotiated with the Nazis, but they have never made this charge officially and it is not unreasonable to presume that they can't prove it.

The new ferment began virtually the day American forces took Tunisia in May 1943. At that time General Giraud dethroned Bey Mohammed Moncef, at the charge of collaboration with the Nazis; we note that a responsible magazine like *Newsweek*, referring to the incident, describes it as a frameup. In any case, the Bey died in exile in 1948 to become something of a national martyr.

The "Moderate" Tunisians

"Since May 12, 1943, the day American forces liberated Tunisia, tens of thousands of North Africans have been killed, hundreds of thousands imprisoned and millions terrorized. On May 8, 1945, which was also V-E Day, France used American lend-lease planes and tanks to kill an estimated 40,000 Algerians. In North Africa it remains as much as a man's life is worth to express an opinion in favor of independence in any of the three countries. Yet France is our partner in the Atlantic pact and other efforts to protect democracy!"—*Christian Century*, Sept. 6, 1950, editorial.

In 1946 a congress of all Tunisian parties (except the Stalinists) took place and adopted a program setting full autonomy as the aim—virtual independence, though the leaders say that France can run foreign policy. They started long-drawn-out negotiations with the French.

The moderate character of the movement, emphasized even by the U. S. press, is manifested in both its political program and leadership. There are, as far as accounts show, no radical social demands such as appear, for example, in the program of the Moroccan Istiqlal. Bourguiba himself is an "able lawyer," the Neo-Destour secretary-general, Salah Ben Youssef is also an "able lawyer," and the pro-Destour native premier, Sidi Mohammed Chenik, is a businessman—no doubt an "able" one. The urban population of Tunisia is a large one for North Africa: one third of the population lives in cities and small market towns; there is no tribal structure, no entrenched native feudalism, and the important urban middle class gives the lead to the countryside.

The most varied observers agree on the non-combative nature of the Tunisian tradition. (One, Nina Epton, writing in the London *Spectator* after a year ago, remarks that "the Destour and their leader are the most reason-

able and statesmanlike people that the French have to deal with. The Tunisians are not a sanguinary people; the Arabs even say 'The Tunisian is a woman.'")

They have kept aloof from ties with the Arab League. "Relations between Tunisia's more than 3 million Moslems and 100,000 Jews have been traditionally good. Even when the war in Palestine strained feeling throughout the Arab world, leaders of both communities here appealed to their respective groups to refrain from incidents, and the advice in general was heeded," says *Times* correspondent Robert Doty.

The Neo-Destour Party's relations with the organized trade-union movement, led by Farhat Hached, are close. It claims 20,000 active members, 300-500,000 adherents, and the sympathetic support of virtually the entire native population, and there is no reason to doubt this in any important respect. When U. S. editorialists fling out the word "extremists" with regard to these people, they are merely obeying a reflex action—a Pavlov dog slavering when confronted with opponents of imperialism.

Got Concessions

The Tunisians' famed moderation did not get them very far.

The French were willing to talk, and that is just what they did to repletion, until strikes in Tunisia accumulated to prod their conversational powers. It was not until 1950 that the Tunisians gained their first substantial concessions. According to Professor Charles-André Julien of the Sorbonne, writing in *Foreign Affairs* (April 1951), their break came when the French Socialist Party approved a resolution which had been voted by the Socialist Federation of Tunisia in December 1949. The resolution set independence as the goal and demanded a definite time-schedule for passing through various transitional stages toward the goal, since Paris kept talking about the necessity of "stages." Since the SP was a government party in France, its action brought the Tunisian question to the fore. There ensued a period which made it look as if the French tiger was preparing to change a spot or two.

For the Destour, Bourguiba declared willingness to agree to a plan looking toward independence by stages, on condition that the French Resident-General and the Bey agree on the nature and duration of the stages. Only a few days ago Bourguiba reiterated this position. (Harsh people may know how to characterize the statement in the N. Y. Times' lead editorial for January 21 that "Unfortunately, the Neo-Destour . . . have blocked a gradual and orderly progress toward independence by making extreme demands, such as an all-Tunisian Parliament and ministry.")

And so in 1950 an agreement was made by which the natives got an equal number of ministers in the Council of State, though not real power over the country. The Kaak cabinet which had been imposed by the French was replaced by the present Chenik cabinet. An agreement was struck in which the French conceded independence as the goal, and the Tunisians conceded the process of "stages" as the means. The Neo-Destour Party went so far as to authorize its secretary-general, Salah Ben Youssef, to enter the cabinet as minister of justice—even though, ironically, Destour was still officially under a decree of dissolution. Bourguiba himself did not take a post but concurred. The prospects looked more rosy.

Bourguiba Abroad

Whatever intentions there were behind the agreement were torpedoed very soon. Behind the turn were, naturally, first of all the French interests battenning on North Africa. Main spokesman was the same General Juin who is now at the head of the French forces in Indo-China and was then the French Resident-General (gaullester) in Morocco. Juin raised the cry of the Atlantic Pact and military security. The job in France was done by the Radical Party leadership and other right-wing elements.

Resident-General Perillier in Tunisia made the turn. His administration told the Tunisian ministers in humiliating terms that there was no question about French supremacy. The hated Kaak was appointed to the French UN delegation. On October 7 Perillier announced, in the well-known formula of imperialism, that the country had to turn its attention to "economic and social reconstruction" and forget about politics—that is, independence. A police massacre in November in Enfidaville rocked the country.

In February 1951 the French offered another concession, which was taken, but it did not change the course of events. The premier would be allowed to preside over the Council of State, instead of the Resident-General's man, but the Resident-General still had to approve any law before it could receive the Bey's seal. More Tunisian functionaries were permitted on lower levels of government. Above all, what still remained in the hands of Perillier was control over the budget and finances. And in the event of an "emergency" the French were authorized to supersede the council of ministers with their own special high committee—this last just to make sure.

From this point, the events of 1951 leading up to the present January days followed in order. Clashes with the police increased. An especially serious one occurred in May when groups of students fought the gendarmes, with dozens injured. The French politicians began to get worried about "unrest."

In September Bourguiba went on an international tour to get support against the French. He went to London, where he appeared on two BBC broadcasts, much to the anger of the French. From Britain, he proceeded to the United States, formally to attend the San Francisco convention of the AFL as a fraternal

Fight for National Freedom

delegate. (He did, and made a pitch for Tunisian independence.)

Bourguiba's sponsor for his American trip was the AFL's European representative, Irving Brown, who got his U. S. visa for him after some difficulty. (The French government officials here expressed "puzzlement" over the AFL's interest in him.) Worse yet, on September 12, the Voice of America itself put Bourguiba on the air for a broadcast, in which he spoke for the freedom of Moslem nations now under foreign domination. Although he did not mention France specifically, it seems, he made up for the omission over the air by issuing a supplementary statement after the broadcast. (The French officials in Paris expressed exasperation about this excessive hospitality.) Bourguiba also told the press that Brown had arranged for him to meet the "proper" people in Washington.

In October, Bourguiba submitted an appeal ("manifesto") for Tunisian independence to the United Nations. Meanwhile negotiations with the French went on, with Premier Chenik in Paris. By December (two months ago) the Tunisians decided, in their moderate fashion, that matters were at an impasse: the French were merely offering a mixed commission of French and Tunisians to "study" the question. Warning of "grave civil disturbances" ahead they decided to ask the UN to intervene. The question was presented there on December 13 through the intermediary of Arab delegates.

The reply of the UN was to reject the overtures of the hopeful moderates, with U. S. delegate Ernest A. Gross strongly supporting France's dodge that a discussion of Tunisia would poison the atmosphere (no less). The Pakistan delegate warned Gross that if blood flowed in North Africa, he, Gross, would be responsible.

Insult to Injury

The same month, Resident-General Perillier was fired by Paris. Later, the N. Y. Times' Robert Doty explained this change as follows: The big French colonialist interests in North Africa demanded his head, presumably because he was not "strong" enough—i.e., brutal enough; the Paris cabinet needed every vote controlled by "the colonialists in the Assembly."

Doty then adds: "M. Schuman's letter of December 15, asserting that Europeans could not be excluded from political participation in Tunisia, was regarded as a victory for their view, won on the eve of crucial debates on the Schuman Plan for a coal-steel merger." (Jan. 27.) Which means, in Doty's reading, that Schuman capitulated to the specific North African colonialist interests on a hard Tunisian policy in order to buy votes for the Schuman Plan.

To the Tunisians, therefore, Hautecloque's arrival in Tunis to replace Perillier (even Perillier) was the arrival of the hatchetman of their most immediate and bitterest enemies.

The Schuman letter of December 15, referred to by Doty, was a final reply to the Tunisians' demands. It not only rejected them but also, to add insult to injury, included the passage mentioned which specifically asserted for the first time the right of the French to participate in the internal political affairs of Tunisia. (As we noted at the beginning of this article, this is what the French had been doing; but they were now, so to speak, throwing it into the Tunisians' faces.) It is this point which Premier Faure, after the struggle just ended, has referred to as being a "misunderstanding."

Bourguiba's reply was an announcement that he would convoke a Neo-Destour congress to plan action: general strike, boycott of French institutions and officials, street demonstrations and an appeal to the UN. It was accompanied by an angry reference to the independence of Libya. [See article on Libya elsewhere in this issue—Ed.]

Spurned by UN

The Tunisians presented their appeal (signed by Chenik and presented by Ben Youssef) to the Security Council—and this time got a contemptuous kick in the face from that body for the preservation of peace, democracy, freedom and human decency. The UN officials turned their appeal over to—France! The ground was that since Tunisia was not independent it was "represented" in the UN by the French delegation. . . . It happened that the current president of the council, by rotation, was Chauvel of France; but on January 20, when the Tunisians also presented a protest on French actions in Tunisia, Trygve Lie likewise referred the note to the French delegation, rather than the Security Council. On January 24, when Arab delegates protested the bloodshed in Tunisia, General Assembly President Neruo, also, politely relayed their opinions—to the French delegation.

On the same day, January 14, that the UN acted on the Tunisian appeal, a battle broke out between several thousand trade-union members and ex-servicemen outside the Tunis courthouse as Abdel Aziz el Mestiri, a trade-union leader, was being tried for participating in a banned demonstration.

From this point, as our news story records, the Tunisian people decided—at least in action—that a reputation for moderation was an excellent thing but that independence was dearer.

What is at stake for France and the other powers of the Western bloc in Tunisia and North Africa (the two cannot easily be separated)?

The strategic importance of the area for the cold and hot war with Russia is, of course, loudly advertised

Two days before he gave the French administration in Tunisia the green light for its assault on the nationalists, Edouard Faure, upon being approved as new premier by the Chamber of Deputies, orated that "the enemies of freedom win points only because there are countries in the world where poverty and misery are so great that freedom does not count." The Chamber applauded.

by the West itself, mainly to justify its continued domination: it is the crossroads of the Eastern Hemisphere, the meeting-place of three continents, the southern flank of Europe, etc., as well as a "fabulous oil pool" with half of the world's known oil reserves if we throw in Iran. Testifying on January 15 in favor of the admission of Greece and Turkey to the Atlantic Pact, General Bradley remarked that the present southeastern flank of the European forces has to be "anchored in the central Mediterranean" at present; integration of Greece and Turkey with Eisenhower's army "would eliminate this unfavorable situation," he said. (The Senate Foreign Relations Committee thereupon set something of a record in deciding so important a matter with such speed.)

But it is France that has the highest stakes there, naturally. Its colonialists control half to two-thirds of Tunisian agriculture, 90 per cent of Tunisian industry, and the overwhelming majority (if not virtually all) of Tunisian commerce. Here are the interests controlling the Assembly votes to which Schuman bowed; here are the interests who "own" the French Residency in Tunis; here are the interests from whom is sprung a General Juin, who was born and raised among the French North African representatives of the White Man's Burden.

The French imperialists, like others, like to claim that they have put more money into Tunisia than they have taken out. They can prove it with figures—because the putting in was done by the French government and paid for by the taxpayers while the taking out was done by the French investors, enterprisers and businessmen.

The following claim may be an exaggeration, but it is made by an editorial in the *Christian Century*: "The iron curtain of French policy has kept the world in ignorance of the real situation in North Africa. These Mediterranean possessions are infinitely more important to France than are Indo-China and all of its other Pacific holdings. The real goal of French colonial policy is to keep French North Africa at any cost. . . ." (Sept. 6, 1950.)

If anything, the economic importance of North Africa to France has increased since the war.

"At present, French North Africa is experiencing a boom. These dependent territories offer some advantages to Frenchmen which today are lacking in France itself. The coal shortage is not so noticeable in this sunny climate, taxes are lower, prospective profits are higher, and threats of invasion are fewer," says Demaree Bess, an editor of the *Saturday Evening Post* in its issue of June 18, 1949 ("We're Invading North Africa Again").

"Limitless Field for Investment"

But what has given French capitalism its biggest fresh interest in the economic stakes of North Africa has been the Marshall Plan. *Business Week* (Aug. 5, 1950) presents a picture which will help to explain French fury and brutality with elements ("moderate" or no) which seek to interfere with its operations. *Business Weeks* summary: "Since war's end, France, aided by ECA money, has been pouring capital into development of its African empire. Now it's beginning to pay off! Its story:

"ECA's economic invasion of French Africa is rolling along in high gear . . . total Marshall Plan spending there [comes] to more than \$60 million. . . ."

"The French hope for big things to come from their vast African territories."

"Private businessmen and the French government have been doing the work hand in hand. In Morocco, for example, 471 new joint-stock companies were set up during the first nine months of last year. That represents an investment of some 12 billion francs (\$35 million). The money went into food industries, tanneries, cement and brick plants, textile mills. Already, 230 of the new concerns have boosted their invested capital."

"The government has been encouraging investment at every turn. . . ."

"ECA money comes into the picture whenever one of the new companies—or a big public works development—needs U. S. equipment. . . ."

"Northern Africa—more industrialized than the rest of French Africa—is a beehive of activity. Prospecting teams . . . are scouring the Sahara for copper, manganese, iron ore, phosphates, lead, and of course water. Existing mines are busily modernizing their facilities. And there's a full-scale oil hunt on. More than \$1 million worth of U. S. drilling and testing equipment has recently been made available for the search."

"North Africa's cement industry is expanding by leaps and bounds. Algeria and Morocco are becoming nearly self-sufficient in cement. Tunisia should be able to start exporting it this year in considerable quantities. All told, \$689,000 of ECA funds have gone into North African cement. Lend-lease and interim aid worth more than \$2 million got the cement industry started several years ago. . . ."

"The French are thinking about the day when ECA aid will begin to peter out, and private investment will have to take the place of intergovernmental credits. In the past few months, the French African Committee of the International Chamber of Commerce has been beating the

drum for more international understanding of France's work in Africa, so that capitalists the world over will see the limitless field for investment there."

The Tunisians have an understanding of this too, but it is not a sympathetic one.

But France's troubles do not stem only from the inconvenient insistence of the native North Africans on running their own lands. Its suspicions of its own Atlantic Pact partners are rarely publicized, but they are deep. And who will say that it suffers from a persecution complex when it suspects that the United States and Britain, particularly the former, would not be sorry to upset its imperial monopoly in this "limitless field for investment" if it could be done without (a) breaking the more important united front of the bloc against Russia, and (b) encouraging native resistance to all imperialism?

The French were put out by Libyan independence; they wanted a slice, at the least. But that would have been extra. What specially infuriates them and their pockets are machinations aimed at their present holdings. On March 8 of last year, the leading Paris newspaper *Le Monde* lifted a curtain on rankling French feelings in a blast by Edouard Sablier. Sablier openly charged that U. S. emissaries in North Africa were encouraging Arab nationalism there against the interests of France. The Voice of America, he complained, "constantly broadcasts violently anti-French messages from Azam Pasha and other philanthropists of the Arab League"; that Jefferson Caffery, U. S. ambassador to Cairo, had advocated material aid to newspapermen friendly to the United States; that Irving Brown, the AFL's European representative, had "expressed threats against the French administration"; that American diplomats in the area "spend whole nights receiving nationalist agitators to whom they give advice and moral encouragement if not material support."

How many of the specific accusations are true is anyone's argument, but the French think they know what the U. S. wants. When Bourguiba was in the U. S. seeing the "proper" people in Washington, the Quai d'Orsay was not under the impression that said "proper" people had a humanitarian interest in Tunisians; its grumbles were open.

Its fears of the British are similar. When Bourguiba was in London, and directly inspired by his visit there, the same *Le Monde* printed a series of editorials alleging that Britain was trying to oust France from the Mediterranean and had stationed officials trained in anti-French techniques in Libya. The attack was taken up by some other newspapers and even some politicians, although government circles maintained a discreet silence.

What the U. S. Wants

What the U. S. would like to see in North Africa is quite clear, but Washington would be overjoyed if a course of action to achieve the clear objectives were equally clear. Actually it has a delicate and complicated path to tread, which would require clever maneuvering at the best—and (a) American foreign-policy tactics have not been noted for their brilliance, and (b) the situation is not the best, what with the over-all importance of the basic cold-war alliance with France to keep in the foreground.

The optimum situation for the American brand of imperialism is: France out of monopolistic control, an open door for all the wealthiest and economically strongest rival, the U. S., has the biggest foot to get into the door, all under a safe though nominally independent government under proper controls and safeguards. For something approaching this optimum situation, see the story in these pages on Libya.

But in a situation like that presented by the suddenly immoderate Tunisians (or Moroccans, or Algerians, or Egyptians), the U. S. must not antagonize its ally nor open the sluiceways to the kind of nationalist elements which it calls "extremist"—that is, those who actually want independence, of all things. As the N. Y. Times summarizes it for the State Department: "The State Department has only one course open to it, but it is a difficult one to follow; it must not openly dispute French policy, for all the world and the enemy to see, but it must at the same time exert all reasonable pressure on France to modify, to modernize its attitudes toward the new expressions of nationalism in North Africa." (Jan. 27.)

Therefore: the U. S. goes along with France while pressuring it to keep the animals quiet. Its organs yell to the people of the Middle East: "Peace and quiet, law and order, unity against the Russians!" But as long as the people are quiet, the French thumb their nose at pressure to loosen their imperialist grasp. And when the people start to move, even getting out of hand from moderate leaders, and the French do become more susceptible to pressure, the U. S. equally becomes concerned about the "extremism" of the elements who seek to replace their French rival.

As the latest *Times* editorial pronouncement on the Middle East says:

"We cannot simply sit back and say: 'Egypt and Iran are British headaches; Tunisia and Morocco are problems for the French to worry about.' The bells are tolling for us as well."

They are indeed. The bells are tolling in the Middle East for the whole of the imperialist world, for all of its inter-imperialist rivalries, including the United States' aims at inheriting the older established empires.

The people of the Middle East simultaneously also face the next problem, highlighted by the conference of socialist and radical parties of the Arab world whose program is described elsewhere [see page 8—Ed.]. That is to keep the revolution now going on continuous, from the ouster of the foreign exploiters to the ouster of the corrupt and reactionary native ruling classes who fester in the seats of power in countries like Egypt and Iran.

The Strange Case of Libya

Not the least of the events which infuriated the Tunisian people (as well as the rest of North Africa) was the granting of independence to Libya, its neighbor, through the UN about a month ago. This is no paradox, nor was it due to cantankerous envy.

It convinced the Arab world that the big Western powers are the sheerest hypocrites in their talk about "just" claims to independence, and that what they want are docile satellites.

The UN decided back in 1949 that Libya was to become independent, after a strenuous tug-of-war and maneuvers among the powers. Libya was a former Italian colony, and of course return to Italy was out of the question.

Libya was "the least likely candidate for independence along the whole North African coast" (the characterization is that of N. Y. Times correspondent Clifton Daniels, Dec. 30). In other words, it measured up to not a single criterion for independence ever set out by the UN or colonial powers—except, of course, the fundamental right of a people to control its own destinies, a concept which is given lip service by the colonialists only in holiday declarations of "principle."

It is one of the most backward of countries. UN experts rank it as the poorest country in the world, according to one AP dispatch. It is mostly desert (90,000 camels and only 70,000 cattle). Something like 90 per cent of the people are illiterate. Only 32,000 Libyan children go to school. The average income is estimated at \$35 a year.

"Libya is not even a geographical expression," remarked the Manchester *Guardian* a few days before independence was formalized. Compared with Morocco, Tunisia and Algeria, there has been no very powerful mass independence movement in the country—it gained its independence "almost without a struggle," said Daniels. The extent to which this is so is due, of course, to its economic and political backwardness.

THEY DID NOT CHEER

Yet it was this country which became the first to receive freedom under purely UN auspices. This is the paradox. The explanation: Contrary to the usual professions of the statesmen, Libya was accorded independence precisely because it IS so backward—given the specific situation created in the UN over the disposition of Italy's ex-colony. It was felt that it could be controlled.

And the Atlantic powers, the U. S. in the first place, intend to control it. It is a land of deserts but today it is blossoming with air and military bases. "Fast-growing Wheelus Field, which is within bomber-striking distance of the Soviet heartland . . . already is the most important U. S. air installation in Africa." (N. Y. Times, Dec. 20.) Even before the ceremonies, "independent" Libya hastened to announce a long-term agreement with Washington on bases. The British and French will also keep troops there. U. S. officials said the pact was "better" than the one by which they maintain their air base at

Dhahran in Saudi Arabia.

As King Idris I proclaimed Libyan independence on last Christmas Eve, an AP dispatch reported the following thought-provoking fact:

"The independence of their North African country was accepted by Libyans today with varying degrees of enthusiasm, and with no evident enthusiasm in this, their largest city . . . in Tripoli, a broadcast of the king's independence proclamation was received with sullen apathy. Tripolitanian leaders were angered at the first action of the new government—prohibition of an Independence Day speech by Beshir Bey Sadawi, anti-Western leader of the National Congress Party, which hopes to win power in Libya's first election February 22. The king and his government are known to be pro-Western. "Former British occupation officials expressed concern at the coolness with which independence was received in Tripolitania, the most important of Libya's three provinces. They said that should Sadawi Bey's party win the election, it might attempt to force the Western powers to give up their bases."

APRON STRING OF GOLD

There is reason to doubt whether even an electoral victory for the opposition (assuming an honest election) would seriously endanger foreign control of the country, even if Sadawi Bey's forces wanted to do so. The clamp on the country is made of money. The Idris regime will be able to exist only by grace of American dollars and British pounds. Retiring UN Commissioner Pelt's final report stated that Libya's first year will show a one-third deficit, to the tune of \$5,000,000. Up to now, Britain has been making up its budgetary deficits. The U. S. has promised a cool million dollars as a gift, plus Point Four aid. Pelt reported that the country will require a "considerable amount of financial as well as technical assistance for a number of years to come"—simply to exist, we may add.

So crass is the foreign financial control upon which Libyan independence is based that a strong but futile "revolt" of the small powers took place in the UN when Libya's admission came up this past week. By a 23-22 vote, the Special Political Committee of the General Assembly proposed in effect the internationalization of control over Libya's financing. In a classic display of imperialist hypocrisy, U. S. delegate Benjamin V. Cohen opposed this on the ground that the UN "should avoid the establishment of any regime of special guidance or control for Libya in any field of its national affairs"! But the press reports that this maverick move by the UN majority is "likely to be dropped when it comes before the Assembly," since the big powers will insist that it requires a two-third majority. Pelt himself had expressed "a certain uneasiness" about the present setup in—or over—Libya.

The case of Libya was one of the facts before the Tunisians while the UN, for over a year, spurned every effort they made even to get the question of Tunisian independence on the agenda.

Mid-East and Asian Socialists Join Forces

Readers of LABOR ACTION will be interested in the material reprinted below from the weekly of the Socialist Party of India, *Janata* (December 16), particularly in its significance pointing toward the further development of the socialist movement of the Middle East.

The first is a Joint Statement on behalf of the Socialist Party of India and the Socialist Progressive Party of Lebanon, on the need for a socialist "third force" in the present war crisis of the world. It is signed by Dr. Rammanohar Lohia for the Indian Socialists and by Professor Kamal Djumblatt for the Lebanese Socialists.

Dr. Lohia is a leading figure of the Indian

party in charge of foreign relations. Readers will remember the Joint Statement for the Indian Socialists and the Japanese Socialist Party, which was also arranged through Dr. Lohia's efforts (see issue of Oct. 8), and our report on his speech in New York (issue of Aug. 13).

The second article from *Janata* introduces Kamal Djumblatt. Further, it reports on the conference, arranged by the Lebanese Socialists, of socialist and radical parties of the Arab states, and on the ten-point program which they agreed

The Indian-Lebanese statement includes, it will be noted, the Gandhian conception of "militant non-violence," which it opposes to "dialec-

tical materialistic violence," a term which it obviously uses to refer to Stalinism, however inaccurately. There are other weaknesses from our own viewpoint but what is above all encouraging about the documents is not only their emphasis on opposition to the two big war blocs in the world but also their emphasis on the cooperation of the socialist forces of the Middle East and Asian world—against both imperialism and home reaction.

We welcome this enthusiastically, as a token of the role which can be played by the socialist movement in the solution of the problems of the colonial and semi-colonial world.—Ed.

Socialists of India and Lebanon In Joint Statement on War Line

Text of Joint Statement by Dr. Rammanohar Lohia of the Socialist Party of India and Prof. Kamal Djumblatt of the Socialist Progressive Party of Lebanon:

As a result of these discussions, we have reached the happy conclusion that full agreement exists on the following essential points:

(1) The two Parties have the same approach to the present-day political and socio-economic problems facing the peoples of Asia and Africa in particular and other parts of the world. The two Parties realize that unless certain positive steps are taken, the place of disappearing colonialism in the countries of Asia and Africa will be taken either by internal forces of feudalism and reaction or by one of the imperialist camps.

(2) The two Parties consider it imperative that religious politics in Asia, particularly a policy and action that aims at creating vast religious combinations, religious states and religious "homes," must be condemned and rejected.

(3) Similarly, every ideal and policy of violence like war and Machiavellism, government by coercion and politics by terror and assassination, must be condemned and rejected. For the use of violence is a denial of reason, the evident sign of an inferiority complex among individuals and peoples. The principle of violence comprises at the same time capitalist materialistic and dialectical materialistic violence. Violence has never resolved either an immediate or a long-term problem either on the individual or on the collective scale.

(4) So must also be rejected all egocentric and xenophobic and militaristic nationalism and any attempt at regional groupings revealing such a state of mind.

You're Invited

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

(5) The Asian peoples must reject all such separatist particularism and while coming together on the continental scale must endeavor to acquire a world mind. Further, this regrouping of the Asian peoples should constitute itself as the natural instrument and medium for the eclosion (emergence) of a new socialism, a Third World Force.

(6) As things are now, a positive conception of the Third Force becomes necessary:

(a) to facilitate and complete the liberation of the colonial peoples of Africa and Asia and other peoples subdued and subjugated by the international imperialism of the two power blocs;

(b) to combat defense pacts and the peace preparations of the Atlantic and Soviet camps, which in reality are war pacts and preparations for war;

(c) to annihilate the nefarious effects of the policy of armed appeasement undertaken by these camps;

(d) to strive to make the UN through effective influence and constructive contribution capable of realizing its role as an instrument of world peace and progress and thus to prevent this organization from being used by the two power blocs as an arena of disputes, a clearing house of international rivalries and a syndicate of selfish interests;

(e) to promote and consummate the regrouping and the cooperation of all peoples and nations through a world government and thus prevent the regrouping of the peoples under the war banner of the two power blocs.

Socialist Goal

The Third Force can become an effective instrument of world peace and progress as it potentially represents two-thirds of the world for the development and progress, to which both the Atlantic and Soviet systems are irrelevant.

We find it opportune and necessary to renew our faith in a Socialism, regenerated and liberated from its traditional stains, which alone will be capable of becoming, even among the least organized groups, a massive and victorious instrument of the liberation of man and masses.

European Socialism has failed to

realize the Socialist ideals of complete liberation of human personality and society in its institutional and humanistic aspects, due to its failure to acquire a face and aspects of its own distinct from Capitalist Democracy and Russian Communism. The Socialist Parties of the world and the international socialist movements must undertake the regeneration of socialism on the basis of a new technique and a new spirit of moral force. This regenerated Socialism should principally aim at realizing:

(a) maximum attainable equality and justice tempered by equity;

(b) a decent standard of living which, while avoiding the double impasse of capitalism and dialectical materialism, will tend to establish complete harmony between the material and moral needs of man;

(c) an industrial and agricultural technique and its judicious organizations, subjected to man and conducive to his entire physical, intellectual and moral development;

(d) the decentralization of political and economic power so as to make it easily available to the common man; and restriction of bureaucracy by the encouragement of cooperation in all domains, particularly in the domain of production, distribution and consumption of national produce.

The Socialist Parties of the world, adopting an appropriate technique of political and economic struggles of the people free from envy and hatred, based on militant non-violence, striving to realize the foregoing content of Socialism, and pursuing the foreign policy of a constructive Third Force, can yet save the world for peace and progress.

The Asian Socialist Parties must cooperate to fully realize this ideal and in doing so seek the help and cooperation of similar political movements existing in Europe, America and Africa. The cooperation of Asian Socialist Parties will be possible only when they meet to work out a program of common action and policies. In this spirit we rejoice in the initiative already taken by the Socialist Parties of the Arab world, and we hope that these parties would cooperate with the Indian Socialist Party in its initiative to convene an Asian Socialist Conference.

Introducing Kamal Djumblatt Arab Socialist-Third Camp Groups Agree on Program

Kamal Djumblatt is today one of the young members of Parliament in Lebanon. He is the voice of democratic socialism and one of the outstanding leaders of the Third Force in the Arab world.

He comes from an old family which, for a long time, remained the ruling family of the Druzes (a sect of the Mohammedan religion). Kamal Djumblatt was elected to Parliament at the age of 25. The challenge to feudalism came from Mr. Djumblatt himself. He ruthlessly exposed the fallacies of feudalism; he dealt a striking blow to the very institution which brought him in a position of influence. With great zeal he read books on economics, politics and philosophy in order to find a solution to the problems confronting the Arab world in general and Lebanon in particular. He defied customs, refused to enter the cabinet. When finally he took a cabinet post, he lasted a short period—long enough, however, to provide him with sufficient evidence to bring his struggle from the realm of the ideal to the real.

Since his dramatic resignation from the cabinet, he has been one of the foremost champions of Democratic Socialism and the Third Force in the Arab world.

10-Point Program

With a group of labor leaders, professional men and farmers, he formed the Socialist Progressive Party, of which he is now chairman. Last March this party invited the various Third Force groups in other Arab states to a conference. The Socialist Party of Egypt, the Arab Socialist Party of Syria, the Nationalist Democratic Party of Iraq, and other groups came to Beirut for the first convention of this nature.

The government, fearing such a precedent, tried to prevent the delegates from attending. They recalled their visas and forcibly broke up the meeting. This led to an outburst of public protest. The delegates met in secret and agreed to the ten-point program outlined below:

(1) Independence of the Arab states with closer integration on matters of policy.

(2) Nationalization of basic industries and foreign interests.

(3) A program of land reform.

based on making each tenant an owner.

(4) Universal suffrage, separation of church from state, and reforms in the various electoral systems and administrative apparatus.

(5) Compulsory primary and secondary education and state-planned recreational and cultural facilities.

(6) Encouragement of trade unions and guarantees for free speech, religion and press.

(7) The establishment of farm cooperatives and teacher-training programs in the villages and among the Bedouins.

(8) A program of government health insurance. The Socialist Progressive Party has started such programs among its members.

(9) Organization of the masses for responsible citizenship through political cadres.

(10) Realizing that such a program cannot be successfully implemented while the international tension remains, it was agreed, therefore, to press for a policy of neutrality vis-à-vis the two blocs and closer cooperation with other Asian nations to form an international Third Force which would act as a balancer and thus relax tension.

Panhandling

The NAM is soliciting contributions to found a new front organization for itself. The smallest acceptable contribution, according to the NAM News, will be \$100. We assume the solicitation will not take place on street corners.

The new front will be given the job of plugging copies of a new "Free Man's Manifesto," a statement of the NAM's big-business creed which was read at the association's recent convention by Robert Montgomery, the actor. The NAM's hack writers composed it, of course.

Dog Bites Consumer

A big-business outfit is starting a drive for price controls.

Before this starts to sound like a man-bites-dog item, an explanation is due.

The organization is the "American Fair Trade Council," and what it wants is another "Fair Trade" law to replace the one that was killed by the Supreme Court.

The "Fair Trade" law permitted businessmen to fix prices under their own control, to outlaw underselling: "price control" of, by and for the profiteers.

Indian Socialists Support Egypt's Demands on Britain

Addressing a press conference in Madras in November, Dr. Rammanohar Lohia said: "The Socialist Party of India fully supports the Egyptian demand for the abrogation of the Anglo-Egyptian treaty of 1936 and the evacuation of the British and other foreign interests from the Suez Canal zone."

But at the same time he added that the Indian Socialists wanted the abolition of "feudal interests" in Egypt and the growth of a full-fledged democracy there, so that she should be strong enough to protect herself against any outside interference. He thought that the control of the Suez Canal by Egypt

would not lead to any trouble. On the other hand, he said, its control by Britain has led to what he called a totally unbalanced world. So long as all vital waterways in the world were not internationally controlled, he did not see any reason why the Suez Canal alone should be singled out for such control.

As regards the Sudan, he said, it was a matter between the Egyptians and the Sudanese. But in any case, he made it clear that the British must clear out of that country whatever might happen. It was for the people of the Sudan to decide their future.

—from *Janata*

Subscribe to
LABOR ACTION