

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

OCTOBER 12, 1953

FIVE CENTS

Ryan, AFL, Government, Shippers—

Four Cross-Currents In Waterfront Strike

By BEN HALL

There was no shape-up on New York piers on October 2. All shipping was shut down by a coast-wide longshore strike until a Taft-Hartley injunction brought it to an end four days later.

Two years ago an unofficial dock strike petered out after three weeks, beginning in opposition to a contract handed down by officials of the International Longshoremen's Association and ending as a dramatic protest against gangsterism.

Virtually no one supported that strike, not the racketeering union officials, not the AFL, not the press, not the government—only the longshoremen. But a lot has happened since. This time there was "official" endorsement galore.

The strike was officially called by the ILA but it didn't want it. Employers permitted negotiations to break down but they were really anxious to sign a new contract to replace the one which expired on October 1. Above all, they wanted to avoid a strike. But both the ILA and the Shipping Association were trapped.

In the middle of negotiations, the ILA was expelled from the AFL for failure to root out racketeering; a new longshore union was chartered the same day by the recent AFL convention; it quickly won support from ILA locals outside of New York and immediately moved to challenge the ILA on the East Coast, stronghold of criminal elements. ILA officials desperately wanted a quick settlement; if they could put over a new con-

tract, they would not have to face an NLRB election for a year; and in this year—who knows, maybe everything would blow over.

In a single day, Joe Ryan, ILA president, sliced down the union's demands from 50 cents to 10 cents an hour; the employers raised their offer from 7 cents to 8½ cents. They would not "let a few cents stand in the way" of a settlement, said John V. Lyon, head of the Shipping Association.

An immediate agreement loomed. Racketeering unionism meant degraded working conditions for longshoremen but it brought "labor peace" to the employers who were not anxious to see Ryan and the ILA disappear. Besides, they had a chance to grab a cut-rate contract without a strike and they were about to take it.

But the deal broke down when the union spirit of longshoremen broke through racket control, as it has done time and time again. In locals which ostensibly remain loyal to the ILA, angry protests rose.

(Turn to last page)

A STATEMENT BY THE NEW YORK ISL ON THE CITY ELECTION—

Vote for Halley and the Liberal Party!

The Liberal Party has taken an important step forward along the road to independent political action by labor in the current New York City elections. For the first time since the party was founded, it is presenting the voters of New York City with a nearly complete slate of its own independent candidates pitted against those of the two major parties, including its own candidate for the mayor's office. For the first time, it is raising its own banner and proposing that it wave over City Hall. It is challenging the hegemony of the Democratic Party over the labor and liberal forces in the city.

This great advance represents a continuation of the strong tendency within the party set into motion when the party ran and elected Rudolph Halley as City Council president in 1951, and then in 1952 when it ran another independent candidate for U. S. senator, its own party leader, George S. Counts. The Independent Socialist League of New York supported both campaigns in line with its policy of encouraging steps toward independent political struggle on the part of labor against the two capitalist parties.

In this campaign, the Liberal Party is running candidates not only for the three highest city offices (mayor, City Council president, and comptroller) but is also running its independent candidates (in many cases stalwarts of the Liberal Party) for the five borough presidencies and for membership on the City Council. It emerges as a major political force, based on a coalition of labor and liberal forces, in a transitional stage between allegiance to the old parties and separation from them.

Reflecting all of the hesitations and confusions of such a transitional period, the Liberal Party is running a campaign marked by timidity and inconsistency. Not one of the three major candidates is a leader or spokesman for the Liberal Party: Halley is an "independent" Democrat; Canudo, for City Council president, is an "independent" of unknown political vintage; and Mellen, for comptroller, is an "inde-

RUSSIA:

Bureaucrat and Peasant

... page 3

BRITISH LABOR PARTY:

'Unity' Was the Password

... page 2

MOROCCO:

The French Iron Heel in Morocco

... page 6

Non-Aggression Pact: The Empty Gesture

By GORDON HASKELL

A new fall fashion is being set in the diplomacy of the cold war. Or it would perhaps be more correct to say that there are whispers and rumors that the U. S. Department of State may come out with a new autumn line, tailored to meet the needs of the occasion, or at least to cover up its stark and unappealing form. What is being suggested, of course, is not that the United States and Russia clothe themselves in the garments of peace, but rather that they sign a non-aggression pact.

A non-aggression pact is a rather harmless kind of thing in and of itself, and socialists would be the last people in the world to denounce governments, even imperialist governments, for promising each other that they will not attack each other. In fact, only a person or a government who is for a war of aggression against another country could denounce a non-aggression pact as something "bad" in itself.

Yet, when a mutual non-aggression pact between the United States and Russia, or between all the North Atlantic Treaty Organization powers and Russia, is proposed as an important step in bringing peace to the world, it is incumbent on socialists, as well as on all people who want to prevent

World War III, to take a close look at what lies behind the proposal.

At the moment the proposal has been made openly by the former Democratic nominee for president, Adlai Stevenson. He told reporters that the Eisenhower administration is considering the proposal, and it appears from the press that they have put out feelers on the question to some of the allied governments. And already a number of liberal publications have begun to hail this idea as a master-stroke of statesmanship, as a possible step in the direction of breaking the diplomatic stalemate and reopening the road to negotiations with Russia which seemed so smooth and promising after the death of Stalin, but which appears since then to have petered out into a dim and pitted wagon-trail which looks more like an obstacle course than a super-highway.

No one on the American side has yet claimed that a mutual non-aggression pact with Russia will really change the cold war into a hot love affair or even a

(Turn to last page)

pendent" Republican. Given the level of labor politics in the United States, the fact that these candidates run on the ticket of a party which may be described as a quasi-labor party, against the candidates of the two capitalist parties, must still be considered as strengthening the growth of working-class political action.

In particular, the Liberal Party finds itself pitted against the Democratic Party, whose "liberal" candidate, Robert Wagner Jr., won in a primary fight against the incumbent mayor. While in the past the Liberals have endorsed and supported the Fair-Dealers and echoed their ideology, they now find themselves "going it alone" and forced to conduct some kind of an offensive, feeble though it be, against the Democrats. The Democrats, in turn, find themselves compelled to attack Halley as the candidate of the "labor bosses"—Dubinsky of the ILG and Rose of the Hatters' Union.

Entering this campaign with something of a divided mind, the Liberals are handicapped likewise by the kind of program they are advancing. They are centering the campaign around the issue of "good government," crime and corruption. There is no satisfactory program which boldly and aggressively grapples with the appalling local problems—such as the housing shortage and high rents, inadequate transportation facilities and the fare increases, crumbling schools, the acute Puerto Rican discrimination, and the plight of underpaid city workers.

With all the limitations of its candidates and their program, or rather lack of it, nevertheless the objective potential of the campaign cannot but lead to a greater development of the independent character of the party and drive an even deeper wedge between it and the two capitalist parties. A strong vote will ensure and enhance this development, and for this reason we call upon our friends and supporters in New York City to cast their votes for the independent candidates of the Liberal Party and to support their campaign.

REPORT ON THE BRITISH LABOR PARTY'S CONFERENCE—

Unity Was the Password at Margate

By ALLAN VAUGHAN

MARGATE, England, Sept. 30—The main decisions of this 52nd Annual Conference of the Labor Party, being held here, will have reached American readers of LABOR ACTION by the time this is published. I hope to convey some impression of (1) the background to the conference; (2) the feeling of the rank-and-file delegates, and (3) the facts about the "behind the scenes" conferences which largely decided the voting at the conference proper.

Last month's conference of the Trade Union Congress, held at Douglas on the Isle of Man, represented a distinct organizational strengthening of the right wing—the extreme right wing of the TUC. At the same time the parallel development of the organized left wing of the TUC has not proceeded with the same rapidity.

It was thus possible by organizational manipulations to push through the TUC Conference a policy (The "Interim Report on Public Ownership") which is not only in diametrical opposition to the wishes of the TUC last year in its Scarborough conference but also distinctly to the right even of the milk-and-water "Challenge to Britain" (the document of the Labor Party's national leadership).

It is interesting to note, of course, that the TUC Council's spokesman, Charles Geddes, made it absolutely clear that the Council was not opposed to the extension of social ownership and that the TUC Report was but an "interim" report on nationalization. Many delegates who attended gained the impression that Geddes was actually opposing the conclusions to which his speech arrived: Yes, we are all in favor of social ownership but not now.

That was the battle cry of the right wing, and it served to detach an important center group from the left-wing unions that were advocating nationalization now.

This Labor Party Conference would have followed the pattern of the Douglas conference in all respects but for the intervention behind the scenes of a very powerful center grouping of right-wing Labor Party leaders and a center group of Trade Union Council members. A significant fact is that the TUC speakers—like Williamson of the Municipal Workers Union at today's session, and Arthur Deakin of the Transport Workers himself—were having to defend "Challenge to Britain," which, before the conference, they had attacked from the right as a concession to Bevanism. And this shows that "Challenge to Britain" and support for it is now the policy of the TUC as well as the Margate party conference.

BLOC VOTE WINS

The center group—Attlee, Greenwood (chairman of the National Executive Committee), and Griffiths on the Parliamentary Labor Party side, and Percy Knight of the National Union of Seamen together with Morgan Phillips, the party secretary—were able to prevent the Big Four from precipitating a head-on clash between Morrison and Greenwood for the post of treasurer, which carries with it a position on the NEC.

The Bevanites have been very quiet at the conference so far, and it can be assumed that they are being tied to some sort of unity pact, as long as the conference lasts.

Here are a few diary notes on the proceedings so far:

On Saturday, September 26, the National Union of Seamen (Percy Knight's union) announced its decision to support Greenwood in the contest for the post of treasurer. On the same day, the NEC issued a Foreign Policy Statement which indisputably indicated a shift to the left.

On Sunday the Eve-of-Conference Rally was held at the Winter Garden Hotel. Both Attlee and Bevan spoke. The keynote was unity and an end to factional quarrels. There were also meetings organized by the Fabian Colonial Bureau in the afternoon; and the Communist Party "came down" from London to give any interested delegates advice on how to vote during the conference.

On Monday the conference opened. Morrison withdrew from the contest. His election was by no means certain in any case.

The Standing Orders Report was given by Jim Haworth, chairman of the Conference Arrangements Committee. Delegates protested about the fact that the Foreign Policy Statement could not be amended, and there was an uproar for about ten minutes when Greenwood, who was chair-

ing the conference, refused to allow a point of order.

"Challenge to Britain" was divided up into sections and composite resolutions relating to it were taken together with amendments to the document submitted by constituency parties and trade unions.

As a matter of fact it was not until Tuesday afternoon—during the closed session, when amendments to the constitution and the NEC Report were discussed—that it was discovered that a two-thirds majority was necessary to carry any amendment to either the constitution or to "Challenge to Britain"!

On Monday morning and afternoon discussion ranged around resolutions on East-West trade and the cold war. The delegates had the conference with them—but the trade-union votes swamped the amendments again and again. It was clear that a deep cleavage separated the conference delegates and the platform. It was noticed that none of the Bevanites on the NEC were asked to speak on behalf of the 27-man NEC (heavily weighted with right-wing trade-union appointees) against these amendments.

Histadrut Takes Partial Step Forward In Opening Its Locals to Arab Workers

By AL FINDLEY

A first step toward a single Arab-Jewish trade-union organization was taken on May 7 by the Executive of the Histadrut, the general labor federation of Israel.

By a unanimous vote, the Executive Council voted to admit all Arabs who are not members of other unions into the Trade Union Division of the Histadrut. The former Histadrut organization for Arabs, the Brit Poale Eretz Israel, was dissolved, but seniority of membership in the Histadrut is to be counted from the date of original membership in the dissolved organization.

The Arabs excluded by the clause barring members of other Arab unions are those organized by the Stalinists in the Congress of Arab Labor. The Mapam and CP representatives tried to amend this provision to give the Congress members the same rights and privileges as are being accorded to members of the Brit. This was defeated. A few weeks later the Congress of Arab Labor was dissolved and its members urged to join the Histadrut unions as individuals.

The months of May, June and July were set aside as a period for recruiting Arabs into the Trade Union Division.

Within the local and national trade-union organizations, the Arabs will have full equality. They will be entitled to all social-welfare benefits of the Histadrut—i.e., Kupat Cholim, the sick benefit fund, etc. The "labor exchanges" in mixed areas are supposed to register Arab workers and give them jobs.

The number of Arab workers that are eligible to join is estimated at 10-11,000, about a fourth of the Arabs in Israel.

CHALLENGE

The Executive decision for joint trade-union organization—which still has to be ratified by the Histadrut convention this fall—was hailed by all labor groups in Israel. Many pointed out that this could be considered only a first step in the right direction.

The head of the Arab Affairs Division of the Histadrut correctly pointed out that the action not only posed a challenge to Jewish workers to welcome the Arabs on an equal basis but also laid the groundwork for a better Arab-Jewish relationship both in Israel and the Arab states. The move is therefore also a challenge to Arab working-class organizations in the Arab countries. Better

On Tuesday morning, the results of the NEC elections were announced. They were as follows, with last year's vote in the last column:

	1953	1951
Aneurin Bevan	1,142,000	965,000
Barbara Castle	1,026,000	868,000
Harold Wilson	934,000	632,000
Jim Griffiths	913,000	700,000
Tom Driberg	842,000	744,000
Richard Crossman ..	788,000	621,000
Ian Mikardo	637,000	630,000

These votes were for the seven posts on the NEC allotted to the constituency parties. Once again, all these elected were Bevanites except for Griffiths.

POLARIZATION

After this announcement the debate on nationalization began. A terrific upsurge from the conference took place on this issue.

The conference was clearly solidly with the Foundry Workers resolution. However, when the debate was resumed this morning, it was obvious that the right wing had seen the red light and the chairman chose right-wing delegates to speak against the Foundry Workers resolution throughout the session. Again, an "overwhelming majority" threw out the resolution. In fact, Arthur Deakin threatened to split from the Labor Party if the resolution were passed. The militant mood of the conference was never more apparent than in this debate.

The afternoon's debate on land nationalization was in a similar vein. The delegates and Labor MPs who spoke for this important resolution spoke with passion and real feeling. The conference was with them. But here again, the chairman, under prodding from the trade-union bureaucrats, called on the rightist MPs again and again. Once more, this key resolution was defeated.

The polarization of forces in the Labor movement was clearly and sharply defined on all the basic issues. The constituency parties have never been more solidly left, more solidly "Bevanite." And if proof were needed of this, the Tribune meeting tonight proved this beyond any shadow of doubt. This meeting was the greatest and most enthusiastic meeting I have ever had the privilege of attending. Ian Mikardo was in the chair. Among the speakers were Bryn Roberts, secretary of the National Union of Public Employees, and Michael Foot.

Roberts, who moved the 1952 and 1953 composite resolution on further social ownership at Scarborough and the Douglas TUC Conference, made the most violent speech against the TUC General Council at this conference. He denounced Deakin and Williamson as traitors to socialism in all but name. In fact, the Bevanites on the platform looked on with astonishment and bewilderment at his ferocious peroration. Bevan spoke in a somewhat lighter vein.

Of one thing there can be no doubt—the rank and file are coming of socialist age, even if the bureaucracy is not.

Jewish-Arab relations can be a potent factor in bringing peace to the Near East.

The Arab representatives at the Executive meeting hailed the decision despite its limited nature and joined in the talk of Jewish-Arab brotherhood. However, from Israeli press reports, it seems that they also placed great stress on another point: now that the Arabs are equal members, Arab workers should no longer be driven off jobs to make way for Jewish workers.

The Mapam representative pointed out that a real basis was laid to free the Arab worker from the political influence of the Arab landlords, who still dominate the local Arab communities both economically and politically. The road was now open for ideological unity of Arab and Jewish workers.

He also rightly emphasized that a resolution, no matter how good it is, will be judged primarily by how it is carried out. A great deal depends on how the new decision is implemented.

DANGERS

While the Arabs are now eligible to join local and national trade-union organizations of the Histadrut, they are still not accepted into the agricultural sections of the federation, nor are they eligible to join the agricultural marketing cooperative of the Histadrut, the Tnuva. They will not have a voice in the Histadrut itself.

Congress of Peoples Against Imperialism Holds Influential Conference in London

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, Sept. 30—At the Beaver Hall headquarters of one of Britain's oldest imperial enterprises, the Hudson Bay Company, the Congress of Peoples Against Imperialism held a very successful conference last weekend.

The Congress of Peoples Against Imperialism is a very important socialist organization founded in Paris in 1948. Its secretary is the French socialist journalist Jean Rous; the president of the British center is Fenner Brockway, the Labor MP, well known for his quarter-century of service to the British labor movement.

The Congress is an association consisting of all the important nationalist organization in Africa and many in Asia as well. Its British center is the organ-

The fact that they will not have a say in the Histadrut itself is a very serious shortcoming. The Trade Union Division is subject to the discipline of the general Histadrut organization and must follow its orders. This can have serious results. In 1924 Arabs were organized in the Transport Workers Union of the Histadrut together with their Jewish brothers. But after a while they became dissatisfied with their limited rights and resented the authority of the Histadrut in which they had no representation. As a result, the Stalinists, in alliance with the Mufti, were able to split the organization and form the Palestinian Arab Labor Federation, which adopted an anti-Jewish line.

The importance of Arab-Jewish relations to Israel and to the Arab states cannot be exaggerated. It is next to decisive. For the Israeli labor movement, this means that it must carry out this decision loyally and proceed to further organizational steps for Jewish-Arab unity.

In addition the labor movement must take the lead in the broader political arena to obtain in fact (where it now exists only on paper) full Arab rights with respect to the citizenship law, free travel inside the country, the inviolate right to their ancestral land, civil liberties for their people, and, in a population overwhelmingly peasant in character, support for their economic development such as is given to the Jewish sectors of the economy.

through which anti-imperialist non-Stalinist organizations coordinate their work. It also has centers in the Western European imperialist countries.

In this writer's opinion its importance to progressive elements cannot be exaggerated, and it has already rendered valuable service to anti-imperialism by publicizing the truth about Kenya, Morocco, etc. Its role in the future is expected to be even more important in view of its increasing strength and the likelihood that some of its affiliate parties may form governments in their countries in the foreseeable future.

Furthermore, its democratic activities are carried on in countries where pressure can be brought to bear on reactionary regimes in the colonies. It is well

(Continued on page 4)

BUREAUCRAT AND PEASANT:

The Malenkov-Khrushchev New Line in the Countryside

By A. STEIN

The formal confirmation several weeks ago of Nikita Khrushchev, the late Stalin's trusted lieutenant in agricultural affairs, as first secretary of the Russian Communist Party, indicated that the Malenkov regime had not the slightest intention of surrendering its monopoly of political power. It indicated that the policy of economic concessions to the collective farmers would be complemented by a political line that went in the opposite direction—toward a more thorough and strict control.

This interpretation of Khrushchev's role in the execution of the new policy has been completely confirmed by the contents of a recent decision of the party's central committee. According to this important decree, reported in the *New York Times* of September 28, a thorough reorganization of the party apparatus in the countryside has been ordered. As a result of this change, tens of thousands of additional party bureaucrats will be sent into the countryside to supervise the work of the government-owned Machine Tractor Stations and the collective farms.

In 1947, the position of assistant director for political affairs in the Machine Tractor Stations was re-established. This party official was formally subordinate to the director of the MTS, but was, in reality, responsible only to the secretary of the district (*rayon*) party committee.

Back to the Old Setup

Under the new setup, the post of assistant director is abolished, and in its place a party committee or bureau of several party functionaries, headed by the first secretary of the district party, is to be established. This new group will supervise the work of the MTS and the collective farms it services. The first secretary of the district party committee will be directly in charge of all the MTS party committees or bureaus that operate in his district.

Until the amalgamation program of 1950-51, there were about 254,000 collective farms served by about 9,000 Machine Tractor Stations. Since the process of merging the collective farms was in large part an administrative fraud which changed nothing in reality, this means that an enormous number of party officials must be drawn into this work. Accordingly, the party's central committee has ordered its subordinate organizations to provide the personnel needed for this tremendous expansion of the party apparatus in the countryside.

One of the more striking aspects of this reorganization of the political apparatus in the rural areas is that it is being returned to almost the same form it had when it was first created by Stalin. A special party order issued on January 11, 1933, right after the great mass of peasantry had been forced into the collective farms, ordered that each MTS should have a political bureau, the head of which would hold the position of vice-director of the MTS.

The order also stated:

"The duty of the first order of the Politburo is to assure complete and timely fulfillment by the kolkhozy and kolkhozniki (collective farmers) of all their obligations toward the state, especially the determined struggle against the theft of kolkhoz property, the combating of sabotage of orders of the party and government with reference to the procurements of grain and meat."

Bureaucrats vs. Bureaucracy

Now the political institution which Stalin first set up in his struggle to break the will of the peasantry completely has been re-established in practically its original form by his heirs. The old saying seems quite appropriate. "The more it changes, the more it stays the same."

Concurrent with the enlargement and strengthening of the party apparatus in the countryside, the regime is engaged in a cam-

paign to deflate the swollen economic and state bureaucratic machine in the agricultural sphere! And in fact, this is one of the reasons the regime is intent on expanding the political network.

The use of coercion from above is necessary to reduce the ranks of the non-productive bureaucracy. The regime knows no other way of resolving this problem, which is always with it but becomes especially acute and critical at certain times. And as is apparent from the frank admissions of the regime, such a point has been reached in agriculture.

Crackdown on Specialists

At the present time, for example, there is a great lack of technically qualified agricultural personnel in the Machine Tractor Stations and on the collective farms. According to official Russian figures, there are now 350,000 farm specialists with college or secondary education. But of this 350,000, only 18,500 work directly on the collective farms, and only 50,000 in the Machine Tractor Stations. The rest have administrative or non-farm jobs. That is, out of 350,000 qualified agronomists and other technicians, less than 20 per cent are engaged productively in their own sphere of work. The number of such personnel who are employed in administrative jobs is indirectly revealed by the fact that the regime hopes to transfer 100,000 such persons to productive jobs by the spring of 1954.

The flight of agricultural specialists to non-productive jobs is but one example of the tendency of the bureaucratic apparatus to expand uncontrollably. Nor does the present campaign represent the first attempt of the regime to reduce the administrative apparatus in agriculture to manageable proportions.

Right after World War II, the salaries of agronomists employed in office jobs were reduced by 25 per cent as a means of forcing more of them into useful work. In 1946, 535,000 members of collective farms were transferred to productive work, and another 213,000 persons who had no real connection with the collective farms were removed from the payroll. Again, in 1948, a decree was issued, ordering all administrative workers in the collective farms except the chairmen to put in a minimum of 25 per cent of the work-days in the field required of ordinary collective-farm members. And in 1950, when the drive to amalgamate the collective farms into big units, the "agrorods," was begun, one of the chief arguments in its favor was that the number of administrative workers necessary to run each enlarged farm would be reduced.

Yet it is only too plain that this constant battle between the regime and the state and economic bureaucracy never ends, and the regime is never quite victorious.

Compelling Motive

In reality, the inflation of the bureaucratic apparatus is an inescapable product of the totalitarian regime and its policies. The regime needs the bureaucracy in order to squeeze as much as it can out of the workers and peasants. And the harder it squeezes, the larger is the bureaucratic apparatus that it requires.

The regime has a vested interest in the inflation of the bureaucratic machine. And only when sections of this bureaucracy become an absolute threat to the functioning of the entire economy does the regime move to deflate it as in the present case of agriculture.

The chief reason, however, for the need to strengthen and greatly expand the political machine that supervises and controls the work of the Machine Tractor Stations and the collective farms is not the conflict with the state economic bureaucracy. The compelling motive for a tightening up of political control in the countryside lies in the very nature of the concessions granted the collective-farm peasantry.

These concessions concentrate in large part

on the private plot which each collective-farm family is allowed to work for its own private benefit. The entire collective leadership, from Malenkov to Kaganovich, is quite familiar with the fact that if the collective-farm peasant is given an opportunity to choose between working chiefly for the benefit of the state or for himself, he will hardly think twice about choosing the latter course. The enlargement of the party ranks and the extension of its control are intended to see that he does not take this latter course.

The Peasant's Private Plot

In the struggle between the Stalinist regime—of which the entire present leadership was a part—and the peasantry, during and immediately after the major phases of the forced collectivization, it was necessary for the regime to grant one basic concession—the right of the peasant to have a small private plot on which he could raise some vegetables and keep some livestock. And not only was it important to the peasant, it was one of the chief means of supplying the towns with vegetables, dairy products and meat. Then, as now, this was an important reason for granting concessions to the peasantry.

The peasant earned a great deal more from laboring on his private plot, small though it was, than from working on the collective farm for an uncertain and very low share of the income in money and kind at the end of the harvest. As a result, the peasant tried to spend less and less time working on the collective's property and more on his own piece of land. Since he had a personal interest in the welfare of his livestock and none in that of the collective, the livestock herds of the collective farmer grew at a much more rapid rate.

The period of concessions came to an end in 1938, when the regime began a threefold attack on the peasant and his private holding. The myth that membership and labor on a collective farm were voluntary was ended by a decree that compelled the member to work a minimum number of days during the year. The second point of attack was to assert that the collective-farm peasants held some collective farm land illegally. However, from the viewpoint of the regime the danger lay not in the amount of land a peasant held, which could never be very large, but in the fact that it was more profitable than working on the collective farm.

On Stalin's Model

The third phase of the attack was to compel the peasants to sell their livestock to the collective farms. As a result of this decree, the peasants were forced to sell at least five million head of cattle and millions of other livestock to the collective farms in 1939-1940. Thus the livestock of the collectives, which had been in a rather declining condition, began to multiply rapidly by the simple method of expropriation. The number of such cattle grew from 14.8 million to 20 million in 1940, while the cattle of the collective farmers declined from 25.1 million in 1938 to 20.1 in 1940.

It is clear that the Malenkov-Khrushchev leadership has taken as its model Stalin's policy from 1935 to 1938.

It is quite willing to grant concessions to the kolkhoz member and permit him to work his garden plot. But it is aware of the acid dissolving effects such concessions will have on the discipline that binds the peasant to the collective farm. For the peasant is bound by compulsion and not self-interest. And none of the concessions given by the regime have altered this fundamental relation.

Under such conditions, the state must exercise more, not less, control and supervision over the mass of ordinary collective farmers. More, not fewer, party officials are necessary under the condition of economic "relaxation." Instead of thousands in the apparatus, tens of thousands are necessary. And that is just what the Malenkov regime is doing at the present time.

YOU *and* SCIENCE

The Fluoridation of Water and the Social Pressures of Anti-Scientific Unreason

By CARL DARTON

In our recent column on biological advances we did not wish to imply that public controversy over the assimilation of scientific and technological advances was wrong. Rather we certainly believe that public concern over the use or misuse of science is desirable. Furthermore, a society which debated the value of controlled experiments to determine the biological and social benefits of youthful marriage would be considered superior to one which debates such matters as the relative merits of a fifty or seventy group air fleet.

Our concern is not over the debatability of a given technological change but the manner in which the debate is conducted. Of still greater concern to us is the lack of debate, and the existence of public apathy, on the use of technology by the dominant political and economic class. We certainly would be in a more healthy social state today if atomic energy were more of a political issue.

We will not discuss now the manner in which technological advances are spearheaded by groups profiting by change. Rather we wish to illustrate the way in which possible beneficial changes are delayed by the forces of unreason and reaction. This obscurantism is often at its worst in the medical and public health fields where there is a long history of resistance to such advances as dissection, vivisection, vaccination, and isolation of diseased persons.

We long for the day when the citizenry and lawmakers can debate, without hysteria, the social benefits of new discoveries of the biological and medical sciences. It is true that social processes probably never will be reduced to an exact science, at least not according to present-day concepts of exact science. Certainly a society where all social problems are decided by professional sociologists, with the "ordinary" citizens following along docilely, would not be a healthy one.

One thing that will distinguish the healthy society of the future, the socialist society, from present-day decadent capitalism will be the level at which public debate is carried out. For scientific advancements to be assimilated today there are usually many obstacles to be overcome, obstacles which merely reflect the prejudices and vested interests of dominant ideological and economic groups.

DISCOVERY

The fluoridation of public drinking water as a means of preventing dental caries offers an example of a medical discovery which has wide social significance in addition to being an interesting chapter in the history of science. It is also a case where there can be an honest difference of scientific opinion, an opportunity for controlled human experiments, as well as economic and (believe it or not) religious opposition.

The history of fluorides and dental health is an interesting one. It started over 40 years ago when two Colorado dentists described the problem of brown stains on many of their patients' teeth and called this condition mottled enamel. The cause remained unknown until the early 1930s when an Arkansas industrial

chemist associated mottled enamel in his area with the high fluoride content of the drinking water (14 parts per million).

About the same time two University of Arizona scientists found by animal experiments and chemical analysis that high fluoride water was the cause of mottled teeth prevalent in that area. Also about the same time other investigators found that dental decay was lower in the case of people affected with mottled tooth enamel. Both were associated with the fluoride content of the drinking water.

DEAN'S WORK

In the late '30s Dr. H. T. Dean, now director of the National Institute of Dental Research, carried out extensive epidemiological studies of fluoride and non-fluoride areas. From the detailed examination of over 7000 children in 21 cities throughout the country, Dr. Dean concluded that 1.0 to 1.5 ppm fluoride is the amount which reduces teeth decay two-thirds and produces none of the brown stains characteristic of mottled enamel. During the early '40s controlled experiments were run on areas drawing water from the same sources. After periods of five years the children in areas having 1.0 ppm fluoride showed definitely less tooth decay. By early 1952, 158 communities in 33 states were fluoridating their drinking water.

Any evidence of an adverse effect due to fluoridation has been meager or lacking. The main scientific counterargument is that widespread fluoridation should be slowed up until more evidence is available

as to the absence of adverse effects.

Inasmuch as fluoridation has required changes in local public health laws the pros and cons have been widely debated in communities throughout the country. Many of the arguments against fluoridation emphasize our opening remarks about the influence of non-scientific or backward social ideologies.

BUGABOOS

"Socialized medicine" as a bugabo is often heard. In San Francisco the Christian Scientists opposed fluoridation as being against "religious freedom." However, a public referendum, with a campaign put on by dentists, resulted in favorable action. In Stevens Point, Wisconsin, using the argument that sodium fluoride is a rat and roach poison, the opponents of fluoridation won out.

Some months ago public hearings on the fluoridation bill at Albany, N. Y., brought forth the accusation that putting fluorides in drinking water was socialistic, un-American, unhealthy and hard on fish. One opponent warned that "You can call this forced mass medication but it might turn out to be mass liquidation. This is something that the Russians might well consider." Numerous statements were made about the harmful effects of fluorides without any scientific evidence whatsoever.

Industrial users of water have found no evidence of the adverse effect of fluoridation in dairies, beer or soft drinks. Yet such is the play of economic factors that Milwaukee breweries have repeatedly forestalled its use there. Finally the brewers conceded that they had no tests show-

ing harmful results but they were afraid fluoridation would hurt their sales, because national competitors might use it in a whispering campaign against them.

The complete history of fluoridation is yet to be written. Debate continues in the legislative halls. Whether the movement will die out as an example of professional and scientific overenthusiasm, or continue and usher in a new day in dental health is still uncertain. Our main interest here is not so much over the scientific merits of fluoridation but the manner in which it is discussed as a public issue.

SOCIALISM AND SCIENCE

How will a socialist society permit the more orderly discussion and assimilation of scientific advances? We do not know all the answers but the following conditions certainly will help.

(1) Greater confidence of the people in the authority of science as compared with other authorities.—People will have more open and inquiring minds. Today people in general are so accustomed to taking a "shellacking" from those above that many tend to oppose everything new as a hidden evil, regardless of the source. With the removal of economic exploitation people will have less fear of intellectual leadership.

(2) Greater appreciation by the people of the significance of things scientific.—Much formal educational time now lost in narrow patriotic studies will be spent on "life-meaningful" subjects with a scientific background. Science clubs and camps which even now are finding greater acceptance will increase. At the same time scientists and technicians will be more socially conscious as the result of broader education and participation in politics, and be more capable of presenting scientific facts to the people.

(3) Greater leisure and a more settled life, free from the strains of economic exploitation and war, will permit more physical and emotional time to evaluate things scientific. Socialism will foster a mature mind so essential to a scientific approach.

(4) Because of all of the above, there will be fewer and eventually no institutional forms of obscurantism and unreason. These organized groups are the leaders today in fighting scientific advances until they have satisfied their invested "moral" requirements.

As has been repeated many times in this column much political work needs to be done before science and its proper social use can achieve real maturity.

Congress of Peoples --

(Continued from page 2)

known that only in one or two self-governing African territories can political propaganda be diffused by Africans. Ignorance and terror have suppressed it in practically every colony.

ANTI-IMPERALIST PROGRAM

The theme of last weekend's conference was "Africa Must Be Free." About 110 delegates attended from the following organizations:

British: Independent Labor Party, Cooperative Societies, constituency Labor Party branches, branches of the Labor League of Youth, trade unions, Labor student organizations.

National organizations: Action Group (Nigeria), All-Pakistan Youth Movement, Cooperative Commonwealth Youth Movement (Canada), National Peace Council (non-Stalinist), South Africa Freedom League, Toldas Group, Zanzibar Student Movement, Socialist Party of India, West African Student Movement, etc.

The number of observers and visitors was at least equal to that of the delegates. Messages of support came from Kwame Nkrumah, premier of the Gold Coast, Sir Richard Acland, MP, and Canon Collins, as well as many constituency Labor Parties and cooperatives which could not send delegates.

The general conference resolution was presented by Fenner Brockway. "This conference affirms its belief that democracy is not the prerogative of any one race or people... democracy is applicable to all peoples, whatever the present position of their political and social organisms...."

"Conference accepts the view that nations of the Western world have a duty of service to Africa by economic and technical assistance. But such service must be given as free and equal peoples...."

"Accordingly this conference protests in particular against:

"(1) Imposition of Central African

Federation against the wishes of the majority of the population in the territories concerned.

"(2) The system of political, social and economic oppression of Africans instituted in Kenya under White domination and, particularly, the Emergency Regulations.

"(3) The Apartheid [segregation] policy of the South African government.

"(4) The continued exclusion of Setse Khama from Bechuanaland.

"(5) The oppression by the French government in Morocco, Algeria and Tunisia and its refusal to concede the right to self-determination of the peoples of these countries.

"(6) The retention of British troops in Egypt despite the request of the Egyptian government that they be evacuated.

"(7) The existence of racial discrimination in common to all countries in Africa where the indigenous people are denied the right to govern themselves.

"This conference therefore calls for:

"(A) The setting up of a timetable for the institution of democratic self-government throughout Africa.

"(B) A program of all-out economic and technical assistance to raise the living standards of the African peoples.

"(C) The immediate abolition of all forms of racial discrimination in the political, economic, social and legal fields.

"(D) The unqualified right of Africans to publish newspapers, pamphlets and books without interference.

"(E) The right of all Africans to organize politically or in trade unions, peasant and cooperative organizations.

"(F) The right of all people to education irrespective of race or income.

"(G) Democracy at all levels of government.

"(H) Full application of the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights."

We shall report in a following article on the many able and interesting speakers who addressed the conference.

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, AND CIRCULATION REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF CONGRESS OF AUGUST 24, 1912, AS AMENDED BY THE ACTS OF MARCH 3, 1933, AND JULY 2, 1946 (Title 39, U. S. Code, Section 233) of LABOR ACTION, published weekly at New York, N. Y., for October 1, 1953.

1. The names and addresses of editor, and business managers are: Publisher, Max Shachtman; Editor, Hal Draper; Managing Editor, none; Business Manager, L. G. Smith, all of 114 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.

2. The owner is: Labor Action Publishing Co., Emanuel Garrett Geltman, Max Shachtman, Albert Gates, all of 114 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.

3. The known bondholders, mortgages, and other security holders owning or holding 1 per cent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: None.

4. Paragraphs 2 and 3 include, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting; also the statements in the two paragraphs show the affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner.

5. The average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed, through the mails or otherwise, to paid subscribers during the 12 months preceding the date shown above was 2514.

L. G. SMITH

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 29th day of September, 1953.

MURRAY M. TITTLER, Notary Public, State of New York No. 24-9344600. (My commission expires March 30, 1954.)



LABOR ACTION

October 12, 1953

Vol. 17, No. 41

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

Editor: HAL DRAPER. Asst. Editors: MARY BELL, BEN HALL, GORDON HASKELL. Bus. Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

FOR A SOCIALIST EDUCATION

Get it EVERY week!

A subscription to Labor Action

is only \$2.00 a year.

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

Kutcher Case and the Subversive List

Dear Comrade Gates:

I am afraid that you have made a serious error in your article, "Labyrinth of Justice: The Story of the ISL vs. the Subversive List," page 2, LABOR ACTION, Sept. 28, 1953.

On Page 2, column 3, you write: "Up to that time, the only ones fighting the attorney general's list had been the Stalinists. Given the times and the nature of Stalinism, no genuine test could be made by them. . . ." The idea in the second sentence sounds questionable to me; a test of the unconstitutionality of the "subversive" list could be made by any group on it, even though the courts might not rule fairly or genuinely on it. But that is incidental to my main point: It is simply not correct to say that up to that time, which from the context I take to be the latter part of 1950, the only ones fighting the attorney general's list had been the Stalinists. By that time, my own case (and it is not the only one) was two years old, and had passed through all the administrative stages and into the federal courts, where it was introduced in February 1950 by my attorneys, including Mr. Rauh. This, as you know, was a fundamental test of the whole "loyalty" program, challenging the "subversive" list among other things as unconstitutional and demanding its withdrawal. By that time, also, my case had received the support of more than 700 national and local labor, liberal and other organizations, including your own. As you should also know, my court case resulted last October in a U. S. Court of Appeals decision which led to the junking of the Loyalty Review Board's Memorandum 32, which had made mandatory the discharge of any government employee belonging to any of five organizations, one of which was your own.

Your error, therefore, creates the following wrong impressions: (1) It gives the Stalinists more credit than they deserve. (2) It may lead uninformed readers to believe that all cases dating before the end of 1950 were initiated by the Stalinists. (3) It minimizes the progressive role of the organizations representing millions of people who were fighting the attorney general's list in their own way—by supporting my case and by numerous other actions, which may be limited from your and my point of view but which were genuine just the same.

I am sure that you had no wish to give these impressions to your readers, and I hope that in the near future you will find it possible to correct them.

Sincerely,
James KUTCHER

The best way of commenting on Comrade Kutcher's letter is to take it up point by point. On the whole, there is not disagreement between us but a misunderstanding. In referring to the Stalinists and the struggle against the attorney general's list, the article had in mind only this: that no other organization listed, except the Stalinists, had attempted any action, as an organization, that would lead to a legal test of the Truman Executive Order.

What Kutcher says about his own fight is absolutely true as readers of LABOR ACTION know by the material we have published about the case. Kutcher's case, while it was a test of the list and

not merely his own personal struggle, was yet, in the form in which it came before the courts, the case of an individual victimized by the list because of membership in the Socialist Workers Party, and not an action by the organization listed, pursuing the necessary preliminary steps for a legal test of the attorney general's action.

Without exaggerating the Stalinist efforts, its organizations tried to make the first test. While it is true that the unconstitutionality of the "subversive" list could be made by any organization, our

Food as a Weapon—Yesterday and Today

To the Editor:

The recent cynical rejection of American surplus foodstuffs in July by the East German Stalinist puppet regime in the face of desperate food shortages, balanced by the U. S.'s withholding food from famine-struck India in May 1951 in order to force a "friendlier" UN vote by India, are particularly depraved aspects of imperialist class societies. As a new-generation socialist myself, I thought it worthwhile to review a somewhat similar situation in the past, when a "generous" U. S. was confronted by mass famine conditions in the revolutionary Russia of Lenin from 1919-1923, and how the political weapon of food was handled by both sides at that time. (My source of information is: *American Food in the World War and Reconstruction Period* by Surface and Bland, Stanford University Press, 1931.)

The outstanding feature during the year 1919 was the complete funneling of all relief supplies by the American Relief Association (ARA), the European Children's Fund (ECF), and all private charities—i.e., Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, the American Red Cross, the American Friends Service Committee, and others—to anti-Bolshevik centers exclusively, ceasing aid immediately when areas were recaptured by the Bolsheviks. The \$15 million accounted for and huge additional sums were also given in various forms, in 1919 dollars, to Yudenitch and his "Russian Northwest Government," Denikin and his "Russian Volunteer Army" government, Kolchak and his all-Russian provisional government in Siberia, and the non-Soviet Ukrainian government.

The Allied Supreme Council, meeting for the Paris Peace Conference in March 1919, angrily rejected the demand of the Bolshevik government to supervise the delivery of relief supplies itself (under civil-war conditions!), out of a most pious fear that supplies might be diverted toward its armies, and then it turned around, with Mr. Hoover's aid, to unconditionally deliver its supplies to the respective counter-revolutionary forces to dispose of as they sought fit! Such hypocrisy, not to mention class-consciousness, does not deserve to remain in obscurity.

In addition to supplying food, clothing and medical supplies, the ARA undertook a more ambitious program—to solve the "scissors" problem of the Ukrainian government, by supplying miscellaneous manufactured articles to the government so that it could persuade the peasants to turn over their crops, which they had

view that "given the times and the nature of Stalinism no genuine test could be made by them. . . ." seems an inescapable conclusion by all that has transpired in the last several years.

We certainly had no intention of minimizing the efforts made by Kutcher in his fight against the list. All we had said was that the case of the ISL is the first in which an organization already listed has, to our knowledge, received some information from the attorney general on his action in the form of a Statement of Grounds and Interrogatories, and the prospect of a hearing that makes possible a coming to grips with the matter, also for the first time.

Albert GATES

how unsuitable a socialist government was to exist, after inheriting famines and worn-out agricultural implements from the czar and Kerensky!

The \$63 million dollars (including that paid for in gold) spent on relief had to be supervised by representatives of ARA, the American Red Cross, YMCA and other organizations contributing—down to the consumption level. Congressional appropriations of \$18 million had to be spent on corn, seed grain and milk, so that the enormous surplus of corn in the U. S. in 1921 (where it was being burnt at times rather than sold at 14 cents per bushel) could be bought up. In this manner, dovetailing national-interests with the "distressed" surplus products that exist under capitalism, Soviet needs served to raise corn prices significantly from fall 1921 to spring 1922, predicated on the new market it presented. Russia also had to pay for transportation, storage, and unloading of products, plus granting living facilities, office space, and essentially diplomatic immunity to relief personnel in return for their promises of non-participation in politics.

Lenin, faced by the real distress of the working class and peasantry, yielded to these terms because of the relief they would bring, at a time when the Soviet government was far from internal political and economic stability. As against his example, we have both the "conditions" of the Allies at that time—exchange payments and severe inspection—and the cynicism of the expanded Stalinist power in East Germany today in the face of hunger and the limited "conditions"—minimum supervision, no payments—that the Allies would enforce.

How clearly are the facts of political life demonstrated by the attitude toward food!

Jack WALKER

Witch or Witchhunter?

It doesn't matter witch, we're democratic.

Come to our HUSH-HUSH HALLOWEEN HULLABALOO

No extra charge for black cats and other familiars if accompanied by adult abracadabra.

Top Government Secrets for All!

as extra door prizes. The password is "How do hoodoo?"

The Date is:

Saturday evening, Oct. 31, at 9 p.m.

The Place is:

Labor Action Hall, 114 West 14 Street, N.Y.C.

Anthony Ramuglia

Sad news has reached us from California that Anthony Ramuglia, a leading CIO unionist on the West Coast, died of a heart attack while attending a conference last week at Porterville.

Only in his middle fifties, Ramuglia had been an indefatigable participant in the socialist and union movements for thirty-five years. He was a long-time activist in the Amalgamated Clothing Workers; he had been an early member of the CP, who broke with it in the late twenties.

Tony was a member of the National Committee of the American Workers Party and became a member of the National Committee of the Workers Party after the fusion of the AWP and the Communist League of America. During the long years of the economic crisis in the thirties, he was one of the leaders of

the unemployed movement represented by the Unemployed League.

In recent years, Ramuglia transferred his activities to the West Coast where he functioned in the Textile Workers Union for a time, and in the educational field for the California state CIO. Even though he was not a member of any political organization in these latter years, he followed the political movements closely and kept himself well informed.

We have lost a close friend in the death of Tony Ramuglia, for he was one of our closest sympathizers and an outspoken champion of LABOR ACTION and the *New International*. We know that a change in the political fortunes of the working-class socialist movement would have found Tony active once more. He was never a pure-and-simple trade-unionist.

'THE NEW INTERNATIONAL'

is the leading Marxist magazine in the United States, internationally recognized as among the foremost organs of Marxist thought and political analysis in the world.

SEND 35 CENTS FOR THE CURRENT ISSUE

OR SUBSCRIBE AT \$2.00 A YEAR

New International, 114 West 14 Street, New York City

The French Iron Heel in Morocco

By LE MOGREBIN

The thesis of the French government is that what has taken place in Morocco has been a "movement of opinion" on the part of the pashas and kaïds."

(1) There are no "pashas and kaïds" in French Morocco. Behind these pompous titles there are only agents of the French administration, appointed by the French administration, recalled by the French administration, always held in a very tight leash by the French administration.

There is one exception: El Glaoui, who was a lord before the coming of the French protectorate and is still indeed a true overlord. He is the last—a real feudal lord, if by that term is understood (however superficial the sense) a lord who wields absolute power with the greatest harshness. He reigns over a very vast region which stretches from Marrakesh to beyond the Atlas region. This rule is far from beneficent (forced labor, etc.). His is the sole region of Morocco where there can be seen the phenomenon of the "breakup of the tribes" described by M. Robert Montagne of the Collège de France. Because of his exactions, tribes are disappearing: the people are leaving their lands, scattering over Morocco, joining other tribes, or, particularly, entering into the proletariat of the towns.

About a score of years ago, a picture covered Morocco: "Morocco is a cow; the French hold her down by the horns while the kaïds milk her dry." El Glaoui is nowadays the last of these kaïds. It is easy to see that such a type needs France very much. He follows her faithfully in all her twists and turns. In 1947 he proclaimed his rock-bottom loyalty to His Majesty the Sultan. (That was under the policy of M. Labonne.) Then the anti-sultan Residents-General came in and he became the main enemy of the sultan.

(2) These agents of the French (the so-called "pashas and kaïds") are totally incapable of any "movement." (Even in the literal sense of the term. They cannot move from place to place without the authorization of the administration.)

(3) They have no right to an "opinion"—strictly none. Like Communists and curés, they can have only the opinions of the hierarchy and must follow all the latter's changes of line. At the time of the great purge carried through by General Guillaume in December '52, many of them were kicked out of office and interned simply because it was suspected that at the bottom of their hearts they were not as great enemies of the sultan as they had to be. (This is called by the administration being "nationalist." It is the crime of crimes.)

Secret "Petition"

These "pashas and kaïds," numbering 370, were supposed to have signed a petition [for the removal of the sultan].

What this means is that 370 of these agents were ordered to put down their signatures by the French authorities (called the "control authority," as if these two words were compatible).

The Parisian magazine *Match* (March 22) tells us that the majority of them arranged to let the sultan know that they had signed under constraint. (There is every reason to consider this report to be true.)

Besides, neither the document that was signed nor the signatures have ever been made public.

It is a question here of a secret administrative "petition."

Whom Will They Fool?

The "petition" reproached the sultan with being a bad Moslem. This, indeed, proves how the whole farce was intended for external consumption.

Only people totally ignorant of Islamic affairs can be fooled into believing that the very moderate modernism of the sultan was incompatible with the Moslem religion. And there is not a single Moroccan who could honestly think that the sultan's desire to modify the dependent status of his country was heretical.

It was for external consumption. At the time of the big intrigue in 1951, I met a functionary who, although one of the agents executing the intrigue, was willing to be outspoken. In face of the "demonstrations" which he was ordered to organize and with which he had only poor results (although the press and radio made a to-do about them), I asked him whom he thought he was fooling. "Oh well," he told me, "the Americans—the French in France—and maybe even the French in Casablanca!"

Those Tribes on March

The tribes were ready to "march on Rabat," we are told!

Quit kidding: That is just the expression needed by people who refuse to see what is happening in reality.

Match published a photo of these tribes "on march," a photo taken at Camp Marchand, the base camp of the "threat" against Rabat. What do you see? At the most, 200 tents. That would mean four or five hundred horsemen assembled on the order of their kaïds, but without any real cohesion and without arms. Little enough to overthrow a power protected by the French army!

The "Neutral" French

The French forces remained "neutral" in this internal affair among Moroccans. . . .

That's rich!

At the same time that it organized a big parade against the sultan, would the French administration have permitted the same sultan to show the hollowness of the staged performance? Who will believe that it is so stupid?

Force was used, as was logical. First there was, in December, the banning and physical suppression of the Independence party (Istiqlal), which was considered to be too pro-sultan (at the same time that the sultan was held to be too much a partisan of independence).

And, of course, at the same time that the men were arrested, the newspapers were banned.

Then the *purge* was extended to suspected sympathizers, even distant sympathizers.

Finally, while the French tanks were training their guns on the Palace, the Moroccans had been left with just about a single way of expressing their resentment, a very passive way: to close the shops. But even that was not permitted by the French forces.

French Atrocities

Give the floor to an eye-witness—Jean Eparvier, writing in *France-Soir*, August 21:

"Since the Residency [the headquarters of the French administration] cannot or will not give out any estimate on the number of tribes on march toward Rabat, I must be satisfied with telling what I have seen.

"At 11 o'clock I went out on the Marchand road. Fifteen kilometers from Rabat, I found a first group of horsemen who had stopped to make camp. They had already put up their tents and, when I asked questions, they refused to answer, saying that it was an affair among Moroccans.

"I kept on my way and, in the course of 10 kilometers, I ran across three more groups. Outside of some who carried guns used in riding exhibitions, they did not seem to be armed. They rode excellent horses; the chiefs were perched on ceremonial saddles.

"After 25 kilometers I retraced my course and had all the time in the world to count the horsemen. Their total effectives were not more than 180 to 200, and on the way I saw Europeans replenishing their water supply.

"Returning to Rabat, I took myself to the Medina, where some trouble had taken place. A thousand five hundred demonstrators had gathered to sing 'La Tis,' that is, the song of lament. Immediately the police, using clubs and tear-gas bombs, dispersed the demonstrators.

"Officially, there were no dead and none hurt.

"On the other hand, about noon I was present at the following scenes: The Pasha Police [who are under the orders not of the pasha but of the French Contrôleur Civil—Le M.] of Rabat and the local police had gotten orders to keep open the stores which had closed since the day before on the orders of the Istiqlal nationalist party. Let us not forget that this was on the eve of the holy day of Aïd el Kébir, and since the day before the Moroccans of Rabat could no longer buy supplies for the ritual meal.

For a half hour I followed the operation around. The police were armed with iron crowbars or hammers, or with clubs. A detachment of the French police armed with submachineguns and teargas bombs had the task of following the operation without intervening. Through the lanes of the Medina, a void was created before us as we went on. From time to time the French police raised their arms toward the house balconies and roofs, lest we be stoned.

"All closed shutters were broken, doors smashed in, the glass windows shattered; sometimes the window displays were tumbled about. This methodical devastation went on in silence. Sometimes there was a store that was destroyed more methodically, no doubt on recommendation. I even saw them break the glass windows of a store that was open. The shopkeeper, livid-faced and motionless, stood by during the sacking; and if his eyes had been revolvers, all of the police would have fallen dead on the spot.

"There was not a single cry, no one called out; and the curious who wanted to come too close were shoved back into the side streets.

"I have just seen in front of the south gates of the sultan's palace two French tanks whose guns, as I passed, were trained in the direction of the palace."

Why Now?

So that was how the coup was carried off.

The real question is not why the French administration in Morocco did it. The question is: Why did Paris permit in 1953 what it had not permitted in 1951 or before?

This time there was cowardice, capitulation and resignation at the Quai d'Orsay, the Hôtel Matignon and the Elysée, perhaps especially the Elysée—that honest socialist Elysée in which the sultan, Mohamed ben Youssef, seemed to place his greatest confidence.

The main reason seems to be that the external situation has changed since 1951. The year 1952 showed that the Moroccans could not count on any of the external supports which up to then had scared the French governments. They could count neither on "America" nor on the UN—that farce!—nor on the Arab League, which will never use the very substantial economic methods at its disposal (aren't they supplying France with a third of its oil?) and which is only concerned with Israel anyway. . . .

Under these conditions the socialism of Papa Auriol did not count very much. The 1880-style "realism" of the colonialist "specialists" could take its course to the end.

Now that the coup has taken place, the reader will ask what is going to happen now. Of course, I know nothing in any positive way. But it seems evident that the cure that has been used cannot be worth any more than the diagnosis which led to it—that is, very little.

It Won't Help

Nationalism has been in full course of development in all the Arab countries for more than 40 years. It reached Morocco about 20 years ago and had had a certain amount of development for 10. The cause of such a phenomenon clearly is not to be found in one man. And suppressing this man will not lead to the disappearance of the phenomenon.

Besides, experience has a bit to say about the results of such administrative dethronements of colonial kinglets.

Did not General Juin, in 1943, dethrone the bey of Tunis, Moncef, in order to replace him by the present bey, Lamine, who he hoped would be a docile quisling?

The present king of Cambodia, who has gotten some notoriety these days—wasn't he also put on the throne in place of a ruler who was considered too patriotic?

Did it do France very much good that, one night in 1943, General Catroux threw the president of the Lebanese republic into prison?

And Sidi Mohamed ben Youssef himself, who has just given so much trouble to Messrs. Juin and Guillaume—wasn't he the son of that Moulay Youssef whom Lyautey put on the throne of Moulay Hafid because the latter was held to be insufficiently docile?

So these coups de force by the French administration against colonial rulers do not give that administration any lasting tranquillity. And they are very apt to do harm to France. As for the coup which has just taken place, the prognosis is so much the worse because, insofar as a Moroccan public opinion existed (not very great, but something) this opinion was with the sultan.

(Translated from *La Révolution Proletarienne*, Paris, September issue)

MARXISM *for* TODAY

Discussion: Questions About the Class Character of the British Labor Government

By HAL DRAPER

Comrade Jack Walker has submitted the accompanying discussion piece (see columns to the right) and requests some comment on it. Here are some remarks on the question which he poses directly.

The fullest statement by the ISL on the character of the British Labor government appeared as a convention resolution, printed in *LABOR ACTION* for July 23, 1951. I think it quite adequately met and took up the theoretical and political problems which the British experience brought to the fore, particularly the new elements which it posed. With the fall of the Labor government, that particular experience came to a period, or rather, to a semi-colon, and therefore interest in it rather slackened; but surely there is no possibility of disagreement with Comrade Walker that the political and theoretical lessons and analysis of the experience are no less important now than they were then, even though they seem less contemporary.

So we're discussing Comrade Walker's question in this column from the viewpoint of its general educational interest, and not merely for the immediate purpose of answering his question.

Comrade Walker asks THREE different questions about "class character," at different points in his letter, and the first thing I would be interested in doing is making sure that he is not under the impression that all three are the same question. They are not. The three are:

(1) "What was the class character of these measures?" where the question seems to refer mainly to the nationalization measures of the Labor government.

(2) "What was the class character of the British state while the nationalizing BLP was in power . . . ?"

The third question cannot be given by another quote, perhaps because Comrade Walker thought he had already asked it in Question No. 2. This third question, which is not the same, should have been:

(3) What was the class character of the Labor government? Was it a "conservative workers' government"?

A NEW APPROACH

Now under "normal" and more or less static conditions, such a distinction is unnecessary. "Normally" a capitalist state is administered by a capitalist government and the latter's measures are also pro-capitalist. A schematic and oversimplified confusion of the three concepts—whether simply out of loose usage or for agitational simplicity—would not then lead to confused results, even though it is a kind of short-cut, theoretically speaking.

But it is precisely at times when the social system is not stable ("normal") that the distinction takes on important political meaning. We are living in such a period; and therefore we, who regard Marxism as a living instrument of analysis and not a dead collection of formulas, must constantly watch out lest habits of Marxist "short-cuts" substitute themselves for a constant Marxist re-examination of changing reality.

Not only are we living in such a period in general, but specifically the British Labor government experience took place in the context (and could have taken place ONLY in the context) of a capitalist system which was and is visibly disintegrating.

Note: it has not disintegrated; Britain is a capitalist state, and its capitalism is still very much with us and with the British people. It would be just as wrong to speak of British capitalism in the past tense, as it would be to think statically of this capitalism in the same terms as, say, even before the Second World War. And I venture to say that nine-tenths of what we would consider confused thinking on the subject stems from the habit of trying to analyze the phenomena of such a period from the viewpoint of one or the other side of that pair of alternatives: either British capitalism is dead or else it is just the "same old thing."

In a fundamental sense, this whole mode of approaching the new problems of today is a distinctive contribution that Independent Socialism has made to the Marxist understanding of our era. The basic analysis along these lines was made in a very long document of ours in 1949,

but let me give a different example of its importance.

For example, is the coming Third World War an imperialist war like the first two? The dichotomy appears to too many socialists as follows: *Either* it is a war "just like" the first imperialist war, in which case Lenin has already said all that we have to know about it, barring some changes of names and references; *or else* it is entirely new, all signals are off, everything is new and different and has to be "re-evaluated" from scratch as if we had just been transplanted to another world, the "old authorities" are "outmoded" and no longer relevant, and anything goes. (In practice, it is true, the latter course of thought, if so it can be called, usually winds up with a return to a kind of politics which is as "outmoded" and "old" as Lenin—namely, that of the social patriots whom Lenin combated . . . but that is another story.)

On this question, what we have tried to do is analyze this coming imperialist war, not in order to prove that it is "just the same" as the First World War, only more so, but to take as our starting point precisely the fundamentally new factors that have supervened in our new era of capitalism and Stalinism, and show how and why a Third Camp anti-war policy flows from them, in a Marxist analysis.

BISYMMETRIC MISTAKES

Somewhat similarly in the case of many new phenomena that have appeared in this era of the disintegration of capitalism, when the old system can no longer go on in the old way but the working class has not yet succeeded in burying it.

Thus our resolution on Britain pointed out that we reject both of the following two apparently opposite analyses of the Labor government period:

"On the one hand (a) the claim is made that Britain is advancing toward socialism . . . that reformism is therefore 'proving' itself. . . . On the other hand (b) many or most left-socialist critics of the BLP have by and large taken the view that the BLP leadership has essentially been following the same course as classical reformism, that it seeks to do, and in fact does, no more than prop up and patch up capitalism and bourgeois power. . . ."

And it goes on to say: "We consider both of these views as basically incorrect, and as sharing the same defect: both, from opposing points of view, revolve within the circle of ideas which ignore the new phenomena of the present stage of capitalism."

Thus (leaving aside the first group, namely, the reformists who hailed the "Socialist England" of the Labor government) it was common for left socialists to claim that the Labor government's nationalizations were "nothing new" because it was "merely" nationalizing the losses of sick industries (coal) and "really" only "propping up capitalism." They had a little more difficulty with the steel nationalization, but what was important to them was to prove that "nothing has changed."

On the contrary, we have insisted that the Labor government's course was anti-capitalist and that its "anti-capitalist measures . . . are striking at the heart of capitalist society," unlike the case of any previous government led by social-reformists.

We adduced the evidence for that, and here the reader must be referred to these longer discussions of the point. But for some socialists, on this question, there has been a greater difficulty than merely that of objectively weighing the evidence.

The difficulty seemed to be: *Once we admit that this reformist Labor government showed itself capable of taking anti-capitalist measures, then (so to speak) we are lost—we must go on to admit that it is squarely on the road to socialism, that the reformist road to power has shown new vitality, that revolutionary Marxism was wrong in denying that it could happen, etc.*

In other words, the difficulty existed in terms of the habit of equating "anti-capitalist measures" with a "socialist course."

Fear of this conclusion, or, if you will, reluctance to come to it, and not the evidence, was behind the sometimes strange convolutions of reasoning adopt-

The BLP and Its Nationalizations

By JACK WALKER

One of the new phenomena that emerged from World War II, along with Stalinist expansion into Eastern Europe, Titoism, and native Stalinism in China, was that of a resurgent social-democratic movement led by the example of the British Labor Party in power from 1945-1951 when it proceeded to nationalize the most important "20 per cent" of the British economy. Such a departure from social-democratic history in this late day of capitalism, along with the German Social-Democratic opposition's demands for nationalizing basic industries (coal, iron, steel), posed two problems for Independent Socialists: (1) What was the class character of these measures, their extent and limitations? and (2) how should Independent Socialists relate themselves to these forward moves of social-democratic parties, in pressing for the realization of internal socialism?

On the perspective of entry into the BLP, pushing its nationalization program, working in its left wing for a program of workers' control of nationalized industries and a Third Camp socialist international program—general agreement seems to have been reached in the ISL. However, the discussion of transitional measures and programs, along with the overriding war question as it touched England, posed a more fundamental problem that still remains with us today: What was the class character of the British state while the nationalizing BLP was in power, and when it was removed from power what was it succeeded by?

Stated categorically, I believe that no fundamental change of class character took place; that capitalism with state-capitalist overtones was the extent of the "transformation" realized. This does not preclude what a long-term Labor government might have developed into, if new forms of development and organization had arisen in the English working class and these had overridden the narrow parliamentary measures in-

ed to "prove" that the Labor government was merely "strengthening capitalism."

LABOR'S COURSE

But we Independent Socialists had been prepared to face this problem with a different approach. We had long since understood thoroughly that "anti-capitalist measures" do not automatically mean a "socialist course." Not in our era of capitalism, when there is a new social tendency abroad which points away from both capitalism and socialism—the tendency which points toward a new social system of bureaucratic collectivization.

As we see it, we gained this understanding first of all in the course of clarifying, and generalizing from, the new phenomenon of Stalinism in Russia, then of the modified Stalinism of the new satellite states, then of the national-Stalinism of the Titoist state. In 1949 for the first time, we used this understanding of the fully formed bureaucratic collectivisms of the Stalinist world to analyze the tendencies toward such a social formation which exist under the disintegrating capitalisms of our era outside the Stalinist world.

Stalinism, which is both anti-capitalist and anti-socialist, had taught us most vividly that "nationalization does not equal socialism," that "anti-capitalist" did not equal "pro-socialist." We asked the indicated questions about the British Labor government's course:

Under the conditions of a disintegrating capitalism, and for the first time only because of these new conditions, it had now become possible for a reformist Labor government to start carrying through anti-capitalist measures: what was necessary in order to ensure that this course, if it were to be continued uninterrupted, would go toward a socialist reorganization of society and not toward the throwing-up of a new bureaucratic social formation?

This is the question which our resolu-

tioned by the BLP against the capitalists and for working-class legislation, but it does preclude the consideration of the Labor government as a "workers' government" filled with any Marxian content. We are familiar with social-democratic and Norman Thomas "socialists" arguments representing a Labor government as being "socialism." The ISL naturally has rejected this formulation. Another formulation which has not been formally rejected is that this was a "conservative workers government," implying that the workers held power in some sense with "bureaucratic deformations." This position, unfortunately, is held by certain ISL comrades, and it is to their refutation that I submit this discussion to *LABOR ACTION*.

In these opening remarks, which I hope will soon be answered, I will only mention a few underlying considerations which can be contested and developed in the course of discussion.

(1) At no time did the working class directly control state or economic institutions in the daily conditions of life.

(2) The trade-union and Labor Party bureaucracy stood committed, and has not changed to date, to co-existence in a mixed economy with capitalism, at home and abroad.

(3) The denationalizing of industry and the "expropriation" of working-class representation, as embodied in the BLP, was a painless process in terms of restoring direct bourgeois control of the state and its economic institutions—including the nationalized industries that remained nationalized.

I do not maintain that in every country and under every circumstance capitalism will invoke fascism or military intervention, internally or externally, to maintain its privileges against the majority will—but I do maintain that if the ISL is not to join the ranks of Austro-Marxism, that more fundamental criteria must be established before any social-democratic government can be certified as a "conservative workers' government."

tion on Britain broached, and short of repeating the document here, we cannot go much further along this point.

Suffice it to say that, with this kind of analysis, we viewed the Labor government's measures as opening the road to an historic fork in social development—either toward socialism, or (insofar as one raised the theoretical question of the end-result of an uninterrupted continuation of the Labor leadership's bureaucratic course) toward a new bureaucratization of society. (That is from the longer-range perspective in which capitalism is doomed as a viable alternative for the future.)

What then was "the class character of these (nationalization) measures" of the British Labor government? Terms can be found in past literature only insofar as the phenomenon for which the term is sought has existed in the past, and has been "labeled." What terms exist from the past for our purpose?

These measures were anti-capitalist; they (the nationalization measures) were measures which are a necessary and integral part of a socialist program; they are therefore "socialist measures" in that limited sense only; they are necessary but not sufficient to define socialism; they open the road to two different class developments—and which road would be taken depended on the adoption of other measures which were signally lacking in the Labor government's policy and which it was vital for our resolution to highlight, explain and put at the top of the agenda for British Marxists. This we did.

The nationalization measures were anti-capitalist measures which could open the road to socialism provided that they were integrated into a total socialist program by a genuinely socialist leadership.

There remains the question of the class character of the state and the government.

(Continued next week)

The Non-Aggression Pact - -

(Continued from page 1)

long period of tepid coexistence. In answering the reporters who besieged him when he left his conference with Eisenhower, Stevenson said that the idea is "to put the Russians on the spot as to their intentions."

Now there is nothing dishonorable, or even inconsistent, in proposing something to an enemy which you are sure he will not accept. That is true, provided that you are willing to go through with your proposal if the enemy should cross you up and accept it after all.

NOTHING CHANGED

In the present instance, for example, the American government may make such a proposal because John Foster Dulles and President Eisenhower are convinced that (a) the Russians will reject or evade it; (b) it will make a good impression on America's allies who fear that this government is far too inflexible and "tough" in its attitude to the Russian government; (c) if the Russians do reject or evade the proposal for a non-aggression pact, the allies and their peoples will finally become convinced that the Russians really do not want peace, and therefore that rearmament to the teeth and a tough policy all over the world are the only things which will keep them at bay.

The trouble with this whole approach to the problem is that whether the Stalinist government would be willing to sign a mutual non-aggression pact or not, nothing—literally nothing—would be changed in the conflict of these two imperialist powers for the world. At the very most, a temporary illusion might be created that something had changed, and

at this stage of the game illusions are, next to atom bombs, the one thing the world has far too much of.

If the American government were actually to make such a proposal to the Stalinists, the latter can be expected to do one of two things: either to accept it immediately, or to "accept in principle," and then propose certain conditions which would show honest intentions on the part of those who make the proposal.

It would not be difficult to write Vishinsky's speech in advance. Point No. 1 would probably be a renewal of the demand to outlaw the atom bomb. Point No. 2 would be that America dismantle the ring of long-range air bases it has built within striking distance of Russia. Point No. 3 would be the unification and neutralization of Germany, etc., etc., etc.

Whether these demands came as conditions for signing a non-aggression pact, or the day after it had been signed, as an earnest of honest intentions is immaterial. Those are the real concrete way in which the United States has prepared itself to wage war on Russia, regardless of which power finally strikes the initial blow and thus becomes the "aggressor."

And, of course, the United States would make its well-known demands on the Russians in turn, as an earnest of their honest intentions. We could write Dulles' speech also: for international inspection of atomic stocks and facilities; decrease in the mobilized strength of the Russian armies; democratic elections in Germany looking to the unification of the country with no "neutral" strings attached; a peace treaty for Austria; Stalinist withdrawal from Indo-China; and the like.

Would the United States draw great propaganda advantage from such a move, regardless of whether or not it would actually be a stage in the solution of any of the conflicts which are dragging the world toward World War III? It does not seem likely.

At the moment, millions of people all over the world who are not Stalinists themselves believe that America is the real danger in the cold war. There are still widespread illusions that the Russians act tough because they are afraid of American aggression, and not because they are imperialists themselves. Such people tend to believe that if only the U. S. would yield at this or that point, would make this or that deal or concession, the Russians would demonstrate themselves to be men of peace and reason.

Whether these demands came as conditions for signing a non-aggression pact, or the day after it had been signed, as an earnest of honest intentions is immaterial. Those are the real concrete way in which the United States has prepared itself to wage war on Russia, regardless of which power finally strikes the initial blow and thus becomes the "aggressor."

SOMETHING TO "HAIL"

Of course, such people have their counterparts, heavily concentrated in this country, who believe that Russia is the only source of danger, and that the United States is actually concerned only with the defense of freedom and democracy all over the world. Even when such actions as the military pact with Spain raise doubts in their minds, they dismiss them on grounds of "practicality," and continue to hold on to their illusions.

These people, in their mass, are neither American nor Stalinist imperialists. They are people who look to the governments as the only possible initiators and executors of foreign policy. Thus they see everything that happens in the world as depending on the good or evil of the men

who control this or that government, and never as depending on themselves.

Thus liberals in this country and abroad who want peace will hail and welcome any sign of "softness" or "conciliatoriness" and deplore every sign of "toughness" by either the Stalinist or the capitalist governments primarily involved. The last thing they want to do is to recognize that as long as the present social and economic systems endure on both sides of the Iron Curtain the conflicts are irreconcilable, and hence, in the long run, that war is inevitable.

But the recognition of this fact is necessary if one is to take the first real step in the struggle for peace. For once people become convinced that on both sides the governments are fundamentally and irreformably imperialist, they can then proceed to the idea that what has to be changed is not just this or that policy but the governments which make the policies.

Thus a non-aggression pact, or the proposal for it, cannot affect the real cold-war struggle. It may keep alive the illusions of some people for a certain period of time, and whether it will be the pro-Stalinist or the pro-capitalist illusions which are strengthened will depend primarily on the diplomatic skill with which one or the other side exploits the idea. But all the time, those who are really striking a blow for peace are those who are fighting against both capitalism and Stalinism, and the governments which hold their systems together; those who are fighting for the Third Camp of the common people who really want peace, and not a shabby diplomatic cloak over the preparation for war.

Waterfront Cross-Currents - -

(Continued from page 1)

Ryan's own group began to fall apart; opposition elements prepared for a repetition of the rank-and-file strike of '51; the new AFL union, already agitating on the docks, summoned longshoremen to oppose the deal.

Ryan had barely been able to hold on 2 years ago in the face of an isolated "unofficial" strike; this time, with the opposition spurred on and backed by the AFL, his pending fate was clear. It would have meant an abrupt end for the ILA and an immediate victory for the AFL.

The ILA was forced to retreat. Ryan withdrew his offer; he raised the ante to 13 cents, and when it was rejected, called the strike under ILA leadership before it could be called against the ILA. Meanwhile, Governor Dewey hinted that it would be scandalous for employers to sign up with the ILA when everyone from legislator to labor leaders was denouncing it for gangsterism.

THE "EMERGENCY"

When the shippers realized that a cheap settlement was impossible and a strike inevitable, they permitted themselves to be guided into the channels of virtue. But not without guarantees against a long strike. They were assured of a Taft-Hartley injunction.

In 1951, the port was closed for almost a month; no "emergency" was discovered and there was no injunction. But today in 1953, an emergency is felt in 3 days; an injunction becomes essential to national welfare. The explanation seems obvious: an "understanding" between Dewey and the employers. The companies would not sign with the ILA; prominent public figures would get the injunction.

Here are Eisenhower and the Republican Party, reputedly eager to keep government out of labor relations, manufacturing an emergency and manipulating the Taft-Hartley Law to make their weight felt in a struggle inside the labor movement.

To make amply clear that they are not acting out of love for pure unionism or to advance the cause of the AFL against the ILA the New York Shipping Association announces: "We serve notice here and now that our final contract offer made to the ILA will apply to any union and regardless of who the authorized representatives may be in the future."

By issuing the call for a work stoppage, the ILA has avoided catastrophe, but only momentarily. The strike reveals what forced loyalty oaths and phony votes in the ILA conceal. It is dealing not with a

whipped and docile membership but with one whose militancy remains and threatens at any moment to get out of hand. And this spells doom, sooner or later, for corrupt ILA officials.

CLEANUP?

Some months ago, the New York and New Jersey legislatures passed laws to regulate the piers. They go into operation on December 1 and make a union hiring hall illegal as control over longshoremen passes into the hands of government officials. Originally, the AFL opposed this law but now, presumably in the interests of cleaning out criminals, has agreed to cooperate in its enforcement.

Major General Edward C. Rose, the New Jersey member of the bi-state control agency, allowed us to gage its value when he said, jocularly, that it would take 999 years, under its provisions, to drive rackets from the waterfront. The cleanup of the piers and of the longshore union takes place from within the labor movement and is guaranteed by the actions of the longshoremen themselves.

At the outset, the new AFL union starts with a minimum of 10,000 of the ILA's 60,000 members, recruiting its original power in the Great Lakes and Gulf of Mexico regions. In the port of New York, where the main battle begins, 5 of the ILA's 71 locals have voted to switch allegiance to the AFL. The strike and the 80-day injunction give the AFL time to win recruits before a contract is signed. And the signing of a contract between the ILA and the employer may be postponed indefinitely when the AFL petitions for an NLRB election.

Longshoremen who want decent unionism now have strong moral backing inside the labor movement for the first time: on the one side, an ILA strangled by racketeers; on the other, the AFL. In the end the choice will be made for the new union.

Elementary as the choice may seem to outsiders, the picture is not quite so black and white to longshoremen. In the New York locals which have already voted AFL, strong minorities want to remain in the ILA.

In part, of course, racketeers have built their own machines based on jobs, patronage, graft—and force. At the same time, however, the AFL by no means enters glowing with the light of unsullied virtue.

At the head of the new AFL union stands a five-man board of trustees who are to run its affairs for 6 months to a year. Dominating this board are two well-known labor officials: Dave Beck of the

Teamsters Union and Paul Hall of the Seafarers International Union. The irony lies in this: the AFL calls upon longshoremen to build a free, democratic union; but it turns the new AFL union over to two men who have fought their way into power by crushing democracy in their own unions.

AFL's PALADINS

Not long ago, Hall beat down critics in his SIU by a combination of physical terror and expulsions. Beck, presumably a paragon of union virtue for the waterfront, has rejected the AFL-CIO no-raiding pact, and looks to cut away sections of smaller and weaker unions. His entry into the longshore picture is heralded by his announced intention to turn the job of public loading over to his own union. Public loading has always been under the jurisdiction of the longshore union.

ILA officials have been cleverly and demagogically playing upon the fears and misgivings of their own membership. If Hall and Beck take over, says the ILA, your jobs will disappear, unemployed teamsters and seamen will push you out. From any point of view, this threat is manufactured and false, but, knowing Hall and Beck, longshoremen hesitate.

But Hall and Beck are not the AFL, prominent though they be. However, it has come about, the AFL has decided at last to come to the aid of workers in one union against their own rotten officials. The code of mutual protection of labor officials breaks down under the pressing need to fight criminals. As the AFL extends its hand to longshoremen, every union man must welcome, support and encourage its action. The tragedy is that the best representatives it can find are Hall and Beck.

An outstanding victory was won by the AFL in Brooklyn Local 808, in the heart of Anastasia territory. Here the first free election took place under the auspices of the Honest Ballot Association. And although 11 of the 12 local officials were for the ILA, this 1,300 member local voted 541 to 359 for the AFL.

This is a first portent of what will happen when longshoremen get a fair chance at a free choice. But before the elections, a lot of members, good honest members, were unsure.

"Where was the AFL in 1951 when we went on strike and we fought Ryan and Anastasia? They were against us." So spoke one member to a reporter for the N. Y. Herald Tribune. Others recalled that they had fought on alone, de-

nounced as Communists. They were suspicious of the motives of an AFL which had ignored them for so long.

And after a series of such interviews, the reporter concluded: "Many of Local 808 longshoremen are confused on just who is going to run the new union. Some believe it will be a union controlled by the SIU and they don't want any part of being bossed by the seamen. They want their own union under the AFL."

In this case, longshoremen have the opportunity to break loose from thugs, murderers, gangsters, and racketeers by accepting the help of an AFL committee dominated by union officials with a long record of undemocratic practices in their own unions. They will undoubtedly make the right choice and work together with union bureaucrats to get rid of criminals.

When this fight is over, longshoremen who have carried on a long struggle for real unionism, often at the risk of their lives, will never permit their new union leaders. Longshore militants are now in to become the preserve of self-appointed the forefront of the struggle for democracy and unionism.

YOU'RE INVITED

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

Labor Action FORUM New York

Panel Discussion on the NEW YORK CITY ELECTIONS

Thursday at 8:30 p.m.

October 22

Labor Action Hall
114 West 14 Street