

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

OCTOBER 19, 1953

FIVE CENTS

EAST GERMANY SINCE THE UPRISING OF THE JUNE DAYS

... page 6

Why Won't Washington Tell Us The Truth about the H-Bomb?

... page 2

Have the Bevanites Made a Deal With the BLP Right Wing?

... page 3

The Real Background of a World Scandal: THE SUPPRESSION OF BRITISH GUIANA

By HAL DRAPER

Up to yesterday British Guiana was an insignificant little corner of the world, as far as most of that world was concerned. Today British Guiana is on its way to becoming one of the most powerful battle-cries that the Stalinist propaganda machine has ever handed—free-for-nothing—by the rival imperialists of the West.

It will not only resound through South America and the Caribbean; it has an immediate impact on India, whose people constitute close to half the population of the British colony and which has always been closely interested in events there. It will resound through Africa, especially since (similarly) the second largest racial group in British Guiana is of African descent.

And in order to make their use of the outcry over British Guiana they will only have to tell the truth—the truth which is not being told, or which is being expertly glossed over where tag-ends of it peep out, in the American press.

The truth indicates that the suppression of self-government in British Guiana by the British, cheered on by the U. S. government, is one of the crudest and most blatant exercises of the imperialist iron heel to be seen in the post-war world. And this truth is not to be negated by whatever weight one wishes to give to the trumpeted danger of a "Communist regime" in British Guiana, even if one believes the charges on this score about the political character of the native government that was ousted.

One solid fact towers so high over the rumble of "American party line" propaganda that not a single politically informed person can ignore it:

The British government ousted, by force and violence, a government which had been elected under the constitution which Britain granted—elected completely freely, by an overwhelming popular vote, legally, constitutionally, indisputably representing the will of the people; a government which has *not even been accused* of any unconstitutional or illegal actions (contrary to the impression slyly conveyed by the official statements and the press furor).

And the British government has announced that it will "revise" the constitution; but since it cannot revise the existing sentiment of the Guianese by an Order in Council, this only means that it proposes to deprive the colony of self-government because the people so "misused" the constitution as to elect a party inimical to Britain.

"COMMUNIST PLOT"?

Let us make this point right now as strongly as possible:

The N. Y. Times editorial on the scandal (Oct. 11) said that "Great Britain, in the Guiana crisis, is confronted with a pattern that has become all too familiar." This is a stupidity. The Times pundits go on to wring the tears about the Communist habit of taking over countries by totalitarian methods . . . but the whole NEW point about the Guiana crisis is that the pattern is not at all the familiar one of Stalinist coups.

The general strike called by the PPP in British Guiana against the occupation of the country by British armed forces has "almost completely paralyzed the sugar industry," reported the N. Y. Times on Wednesday.

Consider: our Western democrats like to say on holiday occasions: "You understand, what we object to about the Communists is not their proclaimed political ideas about this or that, but their detestable habit of suppressing all freedom, taking over countries by terror, etc. If only they would play the game and contend for influence within the parliamentary constitutional framework, we wouldn't mind their presumed ideas too much. . . ."

And now, the People's Progressive Party of British Guiana, which is exaggeratedly called a Communist movement, which played the game, which won governmental power constitutionally and freely, which since it took power has taken no totalitarian steps whatsoever—this party is ousted no less quickly (in fact, somewhat more precipitately) than if it hadn't played the game.

But—you read in the papers—if this was really a "Communist regime," surely you are not so naive as to believe that it will continue to act within the democratic framework; tomorrow comes the coup, and pouf! all democracy is gone. . . . Act now before it is too late. . . . That's all the British did." And parroting the British colonial office, the press talks about the Communist "plot" and "conspiracy" in Guiana which the British nipped in the bud.

Fast readers of the daily newspapers may not believe that literally no charge, not a single accusation, has been made against the Guiana regime for having hatched any hidden plot! The British crackdown was taken on the basis of the public acts, program and statements of the native leaders. No "plot" was unearthed; there was none. We will see what these public acts were, and what precipitated this world-wide scandal.

Secondly, we will see whether the Guiana native government was a "Communist regime." What we will find

(Continued on page 7)

THE CHILDREN'S HOUR

Unto the Second Generation . . .

The two young sons of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg have been kicked out of their elementary school by the principal at Toms River, N. J.

The boys have been staying with friends of their parents, Mr. and Mrs. Bernard Bach, who have a farm there, and have been going to the school for over a year.

Clyde Slocum, supervising principal of the local schools, gave as a reason the consideration that the publicity given the children while the Rosenbergs were in the death house had "given the town a black eye." Slocum ordered the children to stop tainting the school on October 8 and gave them a week's grace.

The pretext used by the school was that it was enforcing a regulation to prevent overcrowding by excluding non-resident pupils. The Rosenberg pupils were residents of the area, but the excuse was that the Bachs were not their legal guardians. (Emanuel Bloch, the Rosenberg's attorney, has legal custody.)

The N. Y. Post notes that "Toms River, a farming community, has much itinerant labor and children of the migrant workers are admitted to the public schools for short periods although they are not legal residents of the district."

Mrs. Bach states that Slocum told her when she registered the boys last year: "It would be advisable to change their last names so the other children won't know who they are."

DeWitt Ricketts, the school principal, said the boys were quiet and unassuming and had had no difficulty getting along with the other pupils.

But the Toms River school had no room for them. They were overcrowding the classroom with Rosenbergs.

Start Them Young . . .

The following news item is reprinted verbatim from the Los Angeles Times, October 1:

Pasadena city schools have owed Janet Gray, 5, the sum of \$3 for the last two years, but Janet can't collect because she can't write her name on a loyalty oath—and her parents, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Gray, 1815 Kenneth Way, refused to sign as a matter of principle.

The impasse came about like this:

Janet earned the money modeling for a John Muir art class at 75 cents an hour, in 1951. When the youngster's mother asked for the money she was told that it could not be paid until Janet signed a loyalty oath required of all school employees.

"But Janet can't write," explained Mrs. Gray.

When told that she could sign the oath for her daughter, Mrs. Gray looked over the form and declared:

"Ridiculous. How can I sign this part for a 5-year-old?" she asked, pointing to the section reading:

"Within the five years immediately preceding the taking of this oath I have not been a member of any party or organization, political or otherwise, that advocated the overthrow of the government of the United States or of the State of California by force or violence or other unlawful means."

A Pasadena school official said yesterday that the \$3 debt will continue to be carried on the books until either the parents change their minds or Janet learns to write.

What's the Truth About the H-Bomb? Why Won't Washington Tell the People?

By GORDON HASKELL

The Stalinist government in Russia has enough atom bombs to devastate the major cities of America. Within the next few years, they will have several hydrogen bombs, each of which can wipe out any city in the world. These are not only facts which are of prime military importance to the world, they are facts of first-rate political importance to all of us.

It is typical of the American government's attitude, and of what passes for politics in this country, that confronted with this stark reality the government's first reaction has been to launch a confused and muddled propaganda campaign among the American people.

For weeks hints have been coming out of Washington that the president is considering informing the people of this country about the true danger to them of the atomic-warfare age. Big public relations organizations have worked out a major advertising program through which the president was to tell all to the people, and have labeled it "operation candor."

But before the operation could get started conflicting statements by various government officials have led to a general censorship over them by President Eisenhower. No government official can now speak out on atomic warfare without first clearing his remarks with the Atomic Energy Commission or the president's office.

Before the gag was firmly placed on the mouths of government officials, however, one thing was made amply clear. The Stalinists have atom bombs in considerable supply. They have planes which are capable of delivering them over the main cities of America. The development of operational hydrogen bombs is only a matter of time, with the most "optimistic" estimates of when they will have them running to three or four years.

The first thing which the American people must understand about the new situation brought about in world politics by this fact is that it nullifies a foreign policy based on the superior strength of American arms.

As a matter of fact, it reduces the importance of superior American industrial capacity, on which American military and diplomatic theory and policy have been based up till now. If this superiority can be wiped out or seriously curtailed in a few days, no plans of winning a war "in the long run" can be based on it.

UNDERMINES POLICY

The second thing which the American people must understand is that now, for the first time, a realistic understanding of their own prospects places them in about the same situation in which the peoples of Europe, including Russia, have been since the end of the last war.

Specifically, this means that the prospect of having themselves and their cities blown to bits in any future war is no longer something reserved for foreigners. Now Americans must face this also in a way which has never been true for them in the past.

It is inevitable that at this time the most responsible officials of the government should seek to conceal the full extent of what this means for their own policy.

Up till now, American foreign policy has been based on one major idea: that Stalinism can be "contained" or even rolled back by the threat of American technical and hence military superiority. That is why the A and Z of American policy has been to build up the armed strength of this country and its allies to the maximum.

That is why this government has been willing, and in fact compelled, to subordinate all other political considerations abroad to one question: Will the continuation in power of this or that group or party in any foreign country contribute toward, or be harmful to, the further build-up of the military potential and power-in-being of the country?

As long as the United States had a monopoly of atomic weapons, such a policy seemed to make some sense. This was true not because the Americans planned to use atomic weapons freely the moment World War III breaks out, but because the knowledge was there that these could be used in the event of major military reverses in the field.

It is paradoxical, and yet likely, that

Russian possession of the atom bomb and the ability to deliver it makes its use by the Americans less likely in the initial stages of World War III. Unless such a war should open with the attempt of one side to wipe out the other with a surprise blow, an attempt which would probably draw immediate retaliation and might result in the destruction of the industrial power of both sides, in any future war the military staffs will have to plan victory without dependence on the use of the atom bomb.

And yet both must prepare their war with "conventional" weapons with the knowledge that however successful they may be with these, the moment complete victory seems within the grasp of either of them, the whole course of the war can be changed overnight by the mass application of atomic weapons by the enemy.

TALK OF SETTLEMENT

It is evident that whatever long-range conclusions the American government may reach as a result of this situation, the immediate reaction in Washington has been to start talking about a negotiated settlement of the cold war with the Stalinists.

An administration which came to power with the charge that Truman and Acheson were some kind of appeasers of Stalinism now hints it would be willing to enter a mutual non-aggression pact with the Russians. Eisenhower now talks about his administration striving "faithfully" for "a firm and durable peace," and says that "we must seek to know and respond to the legitimate hopes and aspirations of all peoples," including, presumably, those who control the destinies of Russia. Secretary of State Dulles now stresses the need of "easing tensions . . . particularly having regard to the growing, mounting peril of the new weapons."

It appears that the administration is impressed with the difficulty of continuing its policy of purely military containment. But this does not mean that it has any alternative policy, any policy

with a positive principle, or that it is capable of developing one.

The prospects of atomic war are so horrible that they defy the human imagination. Particularly for the American people it is difficult to really understand, to feel in their bones, what this can mean for them. The peoples of Europe who lived through the last war have a much better idea of what another one could do to them, with or without atom bombs. And this is why there is no real enthusiasm in Europe, in any class in society, for the adoption of policies which have war as their only logical issue.

That is why "neutralism" in all its forms has been so powerful in the countries of the old world. That is why, all along, the socialist movements in Europe have been most anxious for a negotiated peace with Russia, despite their own vigorous anti-Stalinism.

But here also, a desire for negotiations, for a settlement of the cold-war over the conference table, has been a substitute for a foreign policy animated by a positive principle.

What has to be constantly remembered is that the power of Stalinism does not stem solely or even chiefly from the military might of Russia, but rather from the mass desire for a social change which has been created by a capitalism which is at dead end. It is not the Russian armies which give weight to the contention that Stalinism's appeal among the peoples of the world outside the Stalinist empire is a product of poverty, exploitation and hopelessness. And that is why Stalinism can be halted, undermined, and defeated not by superior military force, but only by a social program for the world which is superior in all respects to the "solution" offered by Stalinism.

An attempt at a negotiated world deal with Stalinism can no more create such a program than could the attempt to stop Stalinism by sheer military superiority. Now that the possession by the Russians of an effective supply of atomic weapons has more clearly than ever exposed the futility of the "superior force" doctrine, it is incumbent on socialists to redouble the vigor with which they press for a social and political alternative to this policy as well as to the Stalinism which it was designed to combat.

For us in America, this means primarily a continuation of our efforts to arouse the conscience and consciousness of the labor

movement and the broadest circles of liberal opinion against the anti-democratic and militarist foreign policy of the government. These groups and movements must press for a foreign policy which supports the struggles of the peoples of Asia, Africa and South America for self-determination and an end to foreign exploitation rather than supporting the imperialists and exploiters.

ALTERNATIVE TO H-BOMB

They must attack a policy which binds economic support to foreign nations to military commitments, and which uses such support to keep in power the groups and classes which oppose social and economic change. They must offer support, completely independent of the government's policies, to social movements abroad which are struggling for democratic political change, on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

This is the only way in which a worldwide social dynamic can be created which cannot be captured and used by the Stalinists for their own purposes, but which can undermine Stalinism wherever it has gained support among the masses. But it must be clearly understood that such a dynamic cannot be created or aided by a government or a social movement which is determined to preserve capitalism all over the world. Its goal must be the furthering of social and political democracy, and that is incompatible with the continuation or restoration of capitalism over the vast bulk of the world.

To turn from the support of American atom-bomb diplomacy and all the horror for the world which it entails, now more clearly than ever, it is not necessary that the liberal and labor movements of this country begin by committing themselves to a socialist foreign policy, to a policy which has as its object the promotion of socialism on a world scale. That is certainly beyond the realm of political possibility, at the moment.

But what is not excluded is that the labor movement and the liberals begin to take their DEMOCRATIC ideas seriously, and to apply them to the field of foreign affairs.

That would be the most effective answer to the menace of the imperialist world rivalry which, if left to itself, can only end up in the explosion of the hell bomb.

Young Liberals Take Militant Stand On Civil Liberties at N.Y. Conference

By R. HACKER

NEW YORK, Oct. 8—The convention of the Young Liberals, youth group associated with the Liberal Party, was moderate both in tone and attendance. Perhaps its brightest feature was the passage of a militant civil-liberties program.

Both Rudolph Halley, Liberal Party candidate for mayor of New York City, and the Rev. Robinson, candidate on the same line for Manhattan borough presidency, spoke to the delegates.

The New York City policy platform was liberal in nature and called for eventual city fiscal independence from state domination as well as for immediate greater state aid to the city. Advocated were strengthened low-income housing and education programs, a ten-cent fare, financial independence for the Board of Education. Opposed were the city sales tax and police brutality.

The general attitude of the convention toward civil liberties was noteworthy. The convention was opposed to all forms of censorship, believing that the only valid form of censorship in a democratic society was each individual's determination. It set itself against the Smith Act, the McCarran Internal Security Act of 1950, loyalty oaths and undemocratic governmental investigative procedures.

A motion opposing subversive lists was defeated, however, with the argument that while liberals were opposed to the undemocratic methods used to draw up the lists and many of the practices to which they were put, it was impract-

icable to be against everything; there was a danger which everyone recognized and the government had to be left certain tools to defend itself; furthermore the government had a right to ascertain the loyalty of sensitive employees.

In relation to academic freedom the convention had a generally progressive tone, opposing the Feinberg Law, restrictions on campus speakers, groups and publications. While membership in the Communist Party per se did not disqualify a teacher from teaching, it was felt that such membership should be a further cause for investigation by proper authorities as to competency to teach. The civil-rights plank favored FEPC, abolition of the poll tax, etc.

Not discussed, for lack of time, was the foreign-policy resolution. This will be acted upon at a meeting in the near future. The draft platform emphasizes the threat to peace by Russian aggression and the need to arm and resist this aggression, favoring the Marshall Plan, NATO, etc., toward this end.

Certain critical notes were struck, however: criticism of Eisenhower's Point Four reductions; belief that the United States should give moral and political support to the peoples of Asia and Africa in their effort to achieve for themselves greater economic security and national independence; proposal for French withdrawal from Morocco and Tunisia (though only urging France to implement in practice the self-government already granted to each of the associated states in Indo-China and to allow them full independence as soon as possible).

Rudolph Halley's speech to the convention was his usual muckraking one

attacking the Yonkers Raceway deal, Wick's visit to the racketeer labor leader Fay, exposing the deals between Republican and Democratic bosses, but not really discussing city program or his relation to the Liberal Party. Questions from the floor were not generally critical, with the exception of a couple asking him whether he had approached Tammany boss DeSapio for electoral support.

Robinson's speech to the convention was somewhat better, going into certain areas of city program, emphasizing his ties to the Liberal Party. Robinson, candidate for Manhattan's borough presidency, has run a relatively militant campaign. He deplored the rigging of the Manhattan borough presidency in favor of Negroes (the four major candidates are Negroes, including Robinson himself); he noted that revolutions were occurring in Asia and Africa and would occur with or without our support, and he criticized aspects of American foreign policy.

The Young Liberals during the coming period will be quite active in the Halley campaign. However, they are following the general line of the Liberal Party in subordinating their own organization to that of the Independents for Halley. In fact they will be working out of independent headquarters rather than that of the Liberal Party—if not for deliberate political reasons, then due to the relative inactivity of the Liberal Party.

Young Liberals should be encouraged to build their own organization and that of the Liberal Party in the coming period, for in spite of its weaknesses the Liberal Party represents the need for independent labor politics in New York City.

LONDON LETTER

Have the Bevanites Made a Deal With the Right Wing of the BLP?

By ALLAN VAUGHAN

LONDON, Oct. 7—Now that the Labor Party conference at Margate is over, perhaps it is easier to gain a truer perspective of what did in fact take place.

It may be difficult to see how the defeat of all the important proposals for the extension of social ownership fits in with our previous interpretation of the direction of the Labor Party, that is, to the left, toward socialism.

It must be borne in mind that last year's instructions, from both the Trade Union Congress at Scarborough and the Labor Party conference at Morecambe, came as a considerable surprise to the right wing of the movement. The heavy defeat inflicted on the General Council and the party NEC was all the heavier precisely because no organized effort had been made to secure it. It was a spontaneous revolt against the go-slow cautious policies of the official leadership of the movement.

A brief glance at the agenda of the Margate conference and a careful examination of the speeches by rank-and-file delegates from the constituency parties and trade unions at the conference itself indicate that the movement as a whole has gone quite a distance in a leftward direction since Morecambe.

The resolutions, the amendments, including the amendments to the statement "Challenge to Britain," all testify to the fact that the Labor Party had reached a stage where it not only desired further nationalization, workers' control and an independent socialist foreign policy, but actually had specified what was meant concretely, in the proposals published in the agenda which were defeated.

LEFT-WING AMENDMENT

Take, for instance, the amendment to the section of "Challenge to Britain" entitled "Reshaping Our Industry," moved by Cassasola of the Amalgamated Union of Foundry Workers on Tuesday morning at the conference. This amendment to the section runs as follows:

"Having in mind the fact that a comprehensive plan for engineering on the lines proposed by the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions would give a Labor government the economic power on which to build a socialist economy, the principle of nationalization or a public administration as recommended by the plan, in respect of the following sections of the engineering and shipbuilding industries, is accepted: (a) aircraft; (b) agricultural machinery; (c) builders' and domestic castings and metal fittings; (d) coal-mining machinery; (e) electrical equipment—heavy electrical engineering; (f) locomotive wagon manufacture and repair; (g) machine tools; (h) marine engineering, including shipping, shipbuilding and ship repairing; (i) motor vehicles; (j) radio; (k) textile machinery; (l) foundry."

How then can the massive 124-page agenda with its detailed resolutions and amendments—each section revealing a great understanding of all the basic problems facing the Labor Party—square with what looked like a political and organizational setback for the left wing?

"GOT AWAY WITH MURDER"

In the first place, it must be remembered that the Platform (the leadership) was invited for the first time since the Scarborough conference of 1951. This meant that despite a degree of jockeying by the Bevanite members of the NEC, no serious flank attack was made on the right-wing trade-union NEC members, as had been the case both at Scarborough and Morecambe.

The chairman of the Conference Arrangements Committee, Jim Haworth (of the Transport and Salaried Staffs Association) confided to a delegate that "we [i. e., the Platform] have got away with murder this year!"

To put it simply, the Bevanites and right wing of the NEC have signed what R. H. S. Crossman delightfully described as a "contract" at a Tribune meeting of the Bevanites last Monday. Whether the contract or pact is formal or not cannot be determined. However, it was noted that the Bevanites on the platform silently acquiesced with their

colleagues during all the important and major debates.

The Deakinites are now the right flank of the reunited party leadership, and the Bevanites are the left flank of a unified leadership now bound by formal or informal ties. As a result of this unity pact, the bureaucracy was able to organize its forces in the trade-union leaderships, and inflict a setback on the left wing.

The Bevanites have gained a certain position as a result of this deal. They are now a "legitimate" left wing of the party, in the same way as Arthur Deakin is now a "respectable" right-winger of the movement. This very fact is a measure both of the phenomenal rise to influence of the Bevanites within the space of two and a half years, and—what is equally important for our purposes—a measure of the limitations of Bevanism.

BEVANITES HALT

The Bevanites have stopped short just before the goal. They realize correctly that what was printed in the agenda was nothing less than an instruction and a blueprint for the transformation of British capitalism—for the replacement of private property by social property. But this in turn implied a fundamental clash with the dominant class in British society, a clash that would not confine itself to purely constitutional channels.

And more particularly, the acceptance of such a revolutionary program, revolutionary in its tendency, could lead to a split within the movement. Arthur Deakin's threat on Tuesday morning, during the nationalization debate, to split from the Labor Party if it accepted the Foundry Workers' amendment was no idle one. It was real and quite menacing.

It was this realization that must have halted the Bevanites just as the hour of possible triumph approached. The Bevanites were not and are not prepared to face a split in the Labor Party and trade unions over the program which they

look on quite correctly as Britain's only salvation, the programs of further inroads into private property.

This is the essence of the matter. This explains how the Labor Party and trade-union bureaucracy was able to win a victory for policies which the very course of events will expose as inadequate.

That this analysis of the role of the Bevanites is correct was confirmed by Crossman at a Tribune meeting at Seymour Hall on October 5. He described the Bevanite situation as the "ratification of a truce in a war that had gone on for two years in which certain people wanted to exterminate us—exterminate the Left."

"WAIT AND SEE"

During the course of a very able speech, Crossman outlined the Bevanite perspective: "To carry out what we have agreed to do at Margate [such as raising food production by 50 per cent—A. V.] the Labor government will find—I hope not too late—that it will have to go far, farther towards public ownership and socialist planning of our national economy than has been agreed at the Margate conference. If some of our colleagues are not prepared to admit the logic of the program, events will teach them in due course." (Italics added.)

This very effectively sums up the Bevanite attitude: Wait and see! Events will teach!—The only trouble with this "passive" attitude is that it may be too late by the time Crossman's right-wing colleagues tumble to the logic of events.

Apparently the Bevanites are taking it for granted that just as the right wing of the Labor Party have become "Bevanites" on the arms-level issue and the Health Service changes, so too the right wing will become "nationalizers" when the force of economic stresses and strains points in the leftward direction. Of course, it is true that the Foreign Policy Statement represents just one of these shifts to the Left occasioned by the international drift of American policy rightwards.

But the almost fatalistic attitude which now appears to have some hold on the Bevanites is the exact opposite of the

BRITISH GET JITTERS IN SOUTH RHODESIA

"South Rhodesians Act to Curb Unrest" was the headline in the N. Y. Times on Oct. 4.

By the "South Rhodesians" are meant, of course, the British white authorities who are there to keep the South Rhodesians under. More important, it turns out in the news item that the "unrest" which is the cause of the "curb" has not happened yet.

The minister of justice in the colony explained that South Rhodesia has a fortunate record of peace and it never has been necessary to invoke the Peace Preservation Law of 1901, but he added:

"But some of our neighbors have had disturbances and while we do not anticipate anything of that nature in this country, the government feels that we should be prepared for anything that may arise."

So just in anticipation, the colonial government has passed laws which the dispatch likens to those of South Africa and Kenya without describing them further, all restricting the rights of the natives.

bold, robust, and forward-looking policy which they correctly point out is lacking in the official leadership of the movement.

Only an active, forward-looking organized struggle from below, drawing in the trade unions as well as the constituency parties, and placing socialist principle above all other considerations up to and including the "unity" of the movement, can possibly effect the basic social and economic transformation that Britain requires. It is precisely for this reason that Marxist theory and practice is urgently needed in the Labor Party to carry on, to extend, to deepen the Bevanite advance on the road to a socialist policy.

Arthur Deakin has repudiated Tom O'Brien's statement in favor of a changed relationship between the TUC and the Labor Party—in order not to embarrass the TUC in its dealings with the Tory government and the employers." This on the one hand. And the Bevanites have cold-shouldered Bryn Roberts; this, on the left hand. And to the outside observer, all is quiet on the Labor front.

But deeper down, the vicissitudes of reactionary economic policies and the cold wind of international reaction will make null and void the conservative go-slow decisions of Margate. The decisions were made on shifting sand, and the Bevanites know this. History will shove the movement left. But will it be in time?

African Nationalist Spokesmen Tell of Suppression of Rights at London Rally

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, Oct. 6—Last week we reported the important conference held here over the preceding weekend by the Congress of Peoples Against Imperialism. Now we want to go into greater detail on some of the proceedings and speeches at the conference.

Fenner Brockway moved the General Resolution (reported in last week's article) very expertly, and he was followed by Reginald Reynolds, who had recently been visiting Central Africa.

Reynolds found considerable suspicion among the Africans of the intentions of all Europeans. He thought that if we were not careful, what would take place in Africa would be the growth of chauvinism as opposed to anti-imperialism; there might be a black-white struggle.

He appealed for socialist-minded people who were prepared to live under tough conditions to go to Africa and help to organize cooperatives there. He would like to see each British cooperative "adopt" an African one. The police, he said, were always too ready to break up any African organization, but if it had Europeans in it who could appeal to London, it was more difficult for the police to find a pretext.

Next came Seretse Khama, exiled chief of the Bamangwato tribe. (It will be remembered that he was expelled from Bechuanaland because the British government gave in to pressure from Malan, who objected to Seretse's marriage to an English girl.)

He said that Africans had to be very careful; at home there was no free speech for them; they could travel a few thousand miles and speak freely in England but many had been victimized on

their return home; he knew of many cases of people whose scholarships had been endangered.

Seretse could not feel that the governments of the British protectorates of Bechuanaland, Basutoland and Swaziland were acting in the interest of the Africans. They lived in constant fear that the colonial secretary would cede the native-administered territories to their powerful neighbor, South Africa. He wanted English progressives to be constantly aware of this possibility, and to fight it tooth and nail.

Both Laborites and Conservatives had made trouble in Bechuanaland by expelling him and setting up their own puppet. No one had any confidence in the new nominee, and the latter had to be supported by armed force.

Seretse's main plea for Africans was for the elementary right of free speech. He asked the question: "Are Africans British, and what can their loyalty be based on?" He concluded, "Africans do not hate white people, but they detest British administration."

FROM KENYA

Perhaps the most important speaker at the Congress, because his problems were most topical, was Joseph Murumbi, secretary of the now banned Kenya African Union. This African organization of about 100,000 members is the most articulate organization of Africans in Kenya.

Murumbi's talk went as follows: Just as the English people had fought slavery in the 19th century, they must fight it again today. Africans had played their part in the last war fighting for freedom and democracy, he said. Why had it been denied to them? On October 23, 1952, the British government, in declaring a state of emergency, had acted totally contrary to "British justice." This had completely shaken the confidence of Africans in them.

There was no doubt whatsoever, he continued, that the cause of the trouble in Kenya was basically economic. He quoted figures from a report of Dr. Anderson (a medical officer). In 1944 the average family (six) holding of land was 3.35 acres; by 1955 it would be 2.61 acres, as 100,000 Africans were returning to the Reserve from the European Highlands. This same doctor estimated that 11½ acres were necessary for a family to live. Malnutrition is so widespread that in one recruiting drive 90 per cent of those applying had to be rejected because of their low state of health.

Murumbi went on to say that it was not just the British government, which was responsible but those who elected it. He asked for practical help from the British people, in forming cooperatives, granting scholarships, etc. He paid tribute to the government of India for the scholarships it had granted to Africans in its universities.

In answer to a question about the difference between the Tories and Labor with regard to attitude toward Kenya, Murumbi said the Africans could not distinguish "the niceties of British politics."

Abu Mayanja reported to the Congress

(Turn to last page)

BOOKS and Ideas "Generation in Revolt"

Tale of a British Ex-CPer

GENERATION IN REVOLT by Margaret McCarthy.—William Heinemann Ltd., London, 276 pages, 15 shillings.

By L. G. SMITH

This is another one of the "I was a Communist" books now pouring from the presses, but with a difference. This one comes to us from England, and is written by a woman who is now the Woman Officer of the Trade Union Congress of that country.

Although her present political views are not expressed in the book, she is still part of the labor movement, and in England that means that she is still a socialist. That is a far cry from our American Philbrick, Chambers and Budenzes.

The first part of the book is a warm and gripping story of the life of the cotton-mill workers in Lancashire during the first two decades of this century. It is the story of a sensitive and intelligent girl who had to go to work in the mills at the age of 12, and who, after a short and pleasant stay in America, returned to the despair and desperation of the mass unemployment in the Lancashire cotton districts from the middle '20s on.

Margaret McCarthy joined the Independent Labor Party's youth organization when the conditions around her first led her to take an intense interest in politics. Shortly afterward, disillusioned by the lack of initiative and spirit in the ILP youth, and the iron hand with which the adults sought to control all the activities of the youth organization, she joined the Young Communist League.

In the YCL she found a revolutionary spirit, and what seems to have been of equal importance to her at the time, a youth movement which ran its own affairs. Apparently a girl of boundless energy and willingness to sacrifice for the movement, she soon became involved in work in the textile workers' union, the unemployed movement, and in the YCL itself.

THROUGH NIAVE EYES

The picture Margaret McCarthy paints of the idealism and drive of the YCLers of her day is a moving and appealing one. Soon she was selected to go to Russia with a delegation to attend the celebration of the 10th anniversary of the Russian Revolution. There she got a feeling for the international Communist youth movement which made a deep impression on her. As in the case of so many others, her best impulses and aspirations were what made her a good Communist, and eventually, without her being able to perceive the change herself, led her into the transformation of becoming a good Stalinist.

In 1931 she went to Russia again to work as a trainee in the World International of Red Trade Unions (Profintern) headquarters. Working for a year in Russia, she became disturbed over the differences in standard of living between the bureaucrats and workers. She met other foreign Communists who hinted to her that all was not well with the way their own parties were being increasingly run from Moscow. But through it all, Margaret appears to have remained so naive, so incapable of breaking with her own image of what was going on in Russia, that it appears that none of these

people dared confide in her for fear that she would simply run to the Stalinist officials and tell all.

This is not a sophisticated political book. The reader will not get from it a penetrating history of the Communist movement and of its Stalinization. Even today, the author does not seem to quite understand how this movement was changed over a period of years, the struggles which accompanied that change, and the like. It is not even clear that she really understands that it *did* change, and that when she left it shortly after Hitler came to power it was no longer the same movement it had been when she joined. But she tells the story well and as she saw it, without too much of the "editing" of hindsight, and from this story the person who has some knowledge of what was going on in the Communist International on a world scale can see something of how that change *felt* to one who was in the middle of it.

DISENCHANTED

Margaret McCarthy was badly shaken by the rise of Hitler to power and the failure of the powerful German CP to do anything about it. (She had spent a few months in Germany while the Nazis were on the rise.) In her own organization in England, it appears that she was considered as a slightly dangerous person . . . perhaps because she had been in Moscow too long, and no leader could be quite sure whom she was working for.

All this led to her disenchantment with the Stalinist movement. She left it abruptly, and eventually found her way into the respectable bureaucracy of the British trade unions. Here again, the reader will seek in vain for even a serious attempt at a theoretical justification for the politics of the new movement which she has embraced.

But the fact that she has ended up as a TUC leader rather than as an investigator on the staff of the Wisconsin senator whose name she shares is a tribute to the continued power of the British working class from which she came.

Prof. Barrows Dunham Fired by Temple U.

By KARL CRAIG

PHILADELPHIA, Oct. 9—Dr. Barrows Dunham, head of the philosophy department of Temple University and author of *Man Against Myth*, was fired recently by the institution's Board of Trustees.

Dunham is one of the many victims of the House Un-American Activities Committee's probes of "subversive" activities in colleges and schools throughout the nation.

At the committee hearings, Dunham refused to testify except to give his name, place of birth and his address.

While it is no secret to anyone in political circles, as well as to the Board of Trustees, that Dunham has long been in the Stalinist orbit, though recently he has been some sort of independent or dissident in that orbit, it must be assumed that he was dismissed because he refused to be "cooperative" in that he not only refused to confess his own sins but also refused to implicate others.

It is important to note that Dunham was not charged by the Board of Trustees with incompetence, or with having slanted his lectures in class, nor was he accused of the dissemination of "Communist propaganda." The fact that the professor refused to testify was enough for the board.

The American Civil Liberties Union has named a committee of three lawyers to study "possible violations of due process and academic freedom" in Dunham's dismissal.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, New York City
specializes in books and pamphlets on the Labor and Socialist movement, Marxism, etc., and can supply books of all publishers.
Send for our free book list.

MARXISM for TODAY

II—WORKERS' GOVERNMENT and WORKERS' STATE

By HAL DRAPER

In last week's column we discussed the question of the class character of the nationalization measures taken by the last British Labor government, taking off from an inquiry posed by Comrade Jack Walker's discussion article. His main question, however, concerned the class character of the British state during this period, and (thirdly) the class character of the Labor government itself.

I am therefore taking this opportunity to begin the discussion of a question of Marxist theory which, I have long felt, has been a continuing source of confusion in dealing with this subject. It is, briefly, the meaning of the term "workers' government" AS DISTINCT FROM "WORKERS' STATE."

Before doing so, however, let us note that Comrade Walker says he wrote his discussion piece as a polemic against "certain ISL comrades" (we don't know them) who want to label the British Labor government a "conservative workers' government," whereas he thinks that the label of any kind of "workers' government" should be rejected as far as it was concerned. As we shall see, the ISL resolution did not use the term "workers' government."

Now this would seem to pose the matter as one of those terminological questions which are often so dreary though often so inevitable. And, to be sure, whatever else is involved, we will not be able to get away from the question of terminology, of label. But we can make an attempt to see whether there are any POLITICAL differences behind what may seem to be a mere matter of label.

It is not a question which can be disposed of in a few words, especially since for present purposes we do not want to take too much for granted. The present column will be devoted only to clearing some ground in order to get at the question.

The state is the political superstructure (machinery, institutions) of a class society—particularly and at bottom, the instruments of organized coercion used by that society in maintaining class rule. That's the crux of the Marxist conception on the point. But in that case, how is this term to be distinguished from the government of a country, which normally plays that role?

(1) The question is somewhat complicated, but not much, by the fact that in many popular socialist writings—with justification—the use of the term "state" is avoided and the term "government" often substituted, in contexts where it would obviously be "state" that is meant from the viewpoint of scientific-Marxist usage. (This is especially true, perhaps, in the U. S. where "state" has an additional meaning which is totally irrelevant to the whole point.) But let us ignore this popularized usage as having nothing to do with what we're talking about here.

(2) As far as Marxist "scientific" terminology is concerned, there is another case which can be put aside with a mention. The state, in the Marxist conception, is a class instrument. It arises with the development of a society split into irreconcilable classes, and it exists as "the executive committee of the ruling class." Very well, but does that mean, then, that no state existed in the putative classless societies of primitive-communist communities, and that no state will exist in the classless society of complete socialism?

Yes, answers Marxism (and this is partly a matter of terminology too), the "state" will wither away under socialism, just as it was not yet born under conditions of primitive-communism. What this means to the Marxist is that those functions and attributes of the political structure will "wither away" which have to do with the independent power of coercion exercised by one class in society against another. It does not mean that every kind of governmental setup will somehow disappear (apart from speculations or extrapolations concerning a more distant era).

Now obviously this conception itself requires that a distinction be made between the terms state and government; but this particular distinction still does not seem to bear on the question before us now. For while there can be a "government" without a "state," the reverse is not true.

We are concerned here with a distinction between the GOVERNMENT of a capitalist state AND THE STATE ITSELF.

When Is a 'Workers' Government'?

In this case—the "government of a capitalist state"—the government would seem to refer to what is called in the U. S. the administration in power. That is, it is used for the personnel, as a team or party or coalition, that are in charge of a state at a given time. This is the distinction we are going to use. It is obviously what is meant when the "Labor government" of Britain is mentioned.

Surely Comrade Walker uses it in this way himself. He has no compunction about talking of a "Labor government" but would he translate that automatically into "Labor state"? The latter term wouldn't even make sense. We will see that there is no more reason to equate "workers' state" with "workers' government"—though this is what Comrade Walker does do.

Now, as we pointed out last week, "normally" or statically the government of a capitalist state is a capitalist government. But what happens in "abnormal" times, i.e., revolutionary periods or periods of crisis, when a WORKING-CLASS PARTY takes over the government of a capitalist state?

When a working-class party takes over the government of a capitalist state, does that mean that we thereupon have a "workers' government"?

To make the question sharper, let us exclude from consideration for the moment two cases which may come to mind.

(1) A working-class party may "take over the government"—that is, merely form a cabinet—without even a parliamentary majority behind it, as was the classic case of the two Ramsay MacDonald "Labor governments" in England. In this case it is perfectly clear that the Labor cabinet (government) is a prisoner of the capitalists; it cannot move against capitalism without falling; it therefore aims to govern strictly within the confines of the interests of capital. The reformists who have played this role have thought of themselves, even consciously, as the "socialist" doctors who come to repair a sick capitalism, refurbish it, make it healthy, in anticipation of the blessed time when this capitalism will obligingly turn into socialism with the inevitability of gradualness.

Such a Labor government therefore cannot avoid acting, and has always acted, as a front or window-dressing for the capitalist system, to tide it over a rough time when the masses are "getting out of hand," as caretakers of the capitalist system at a time when openly pro-capitalist representatives would not be able to do the job. There have even been "socialist" leaders who have put this role of theirs into virtually just those words.

The policy of such a Labor government will be, wherever there is a conflict, to SUBORDINATE THE INTERESTS OF THE WORKING CLASS to the interest of capital (while of course stoutly maintaining that there is and can be no conflict at all).

(2) The above assumes a government formed by a working-class party which has a program to abolish capitalism but no majority (or other effective power) to put it into practice even if willed. Somewhat similar is the case of a working-class party which might "take over the government" with a majority but which itself has not even adopted any program to take anti-capitalist measures. The effect is the same as the first case.

We are therefore going to go over to the question of a working-class party which takes over a government with a program to abolish capitalism and with the parliamentary or other power to effectuate this program. Can we call such a government some kind of "workers' government," even if we may hesitate about the other types?

(Next week: The Case of Two "Workers' Governments")



LABOR ACTION

October 19, 1953 Vol. 17, No. 42

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: GORDON HASKELL,
BEN HALL, MARY BELL
Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

After Milo Radulovich — The Case of Sgt. Harvis

By M. J. HARDWICK

DETROIT, Oct. 11—The welcome intervention of the United Auto Workers (CIO) in behalf of Lt. Milo Radulovich, in the so-called security case raised against him by the air force, highlighted fresh developments in the new version of witchhunting that spreads across the country.

Emil Mazey, UAW-CIO secretary-treasurer and director of the veterans' department of the union, urged Air Force Secretary Harold Talbott to drop ouster proceedings against Radulovich, and he blasted the secret hearing held in this case as "star chamber" proceedings.

Meanwhile, another fantasy occurred here which emphasizes the new and insidious nature of the trend toward police-state measures.

Another Detroit, this time an active army sergeant with an excellent combat and military service record of 14 years, was requested to resign, again as a "poor security risk."

PRECEDENT-MAKING

Sgt. Harvis, who is stationed in Germany, was found to be in continuous and close association with his father, who had attended Communist meetings during the early days of the depression. Likewise, Sgt. Harvis as a 12-year old child was put in the YCL, according to the army charges against him. His father, incidentally, has been dead 21 years! As for the sergeant, not even the army questions his loyalty, his record, or suggests he had any political beliefs, etc., whatsoever! He enlisted voluntarily! Both a Detroit Congressman and a Catholic priest are aiding Sgt. Harvis in his plea against this ruling.

What's going on? In a very good dispatch from Washington, a Detroit *Free Press* correspondent explained the new checkup campaign under way:

"The Air Force regards the [Radulovich] case as possibly precedent-making. The outcome, and especially public opinion on the outcome, will show how far air force officials can go towards purging its Reserve Corps of persons it might hesitate to use in sensitive positions if they were called to active duty.

"The checkup stems from an order issued by President Eisenhower April 27 which abolished the Loyalty Review Board and instructed all departments and agencies to invoke new and tighter security standards.

"For most civilian agencies (as well as military) the new order adds security standards to previous loyalty standards for federal employment. This will mean reviewing for the third time the cases of several thousand persons previously held to be loyal."

UAW'S INTEREST

The Radulovich and Harvis cases are good examples of the kind of thinking the military mind employs to judge its victims. For perhaps the first time in American history, the strictest and often absurd rules of the brass in wartime have become applicable to peacetime and to all civilian agencies! In fact, the present "security" regulations seem to go far beyond anything used by the military services in World War II.

The vicious public attack made personally on Radulovich by the commanding colonel of the air force board suggests the kind of arrogant Prussianism that is now accepted here. This same colonel is the man who is supposed to judge Radulovich. As far as the military mind is concerned, the very fact that this young lieutenant dared bring his case to light is enough evidence that he is a dangerous individual, not to be trusted.

The intervention of the UAW-CIO is public recognition of the danger of the new witchhunt campaign. Under the kind

of reasoning employed by the brass today, there are very few officials or members who could pass the "security" test. Imagine finding a man suspect because his father read the *Daily Worker* or Another Stalinist paper! Or because he associated with his sister who associated with Stalinist causes in the past! Try using that criteria to judge UAW-CIO members and leaders, and the results would seem like a chapter from Orwell's "1984."

The dangerous criteria used for "loyalty" apparently didn't work enough to produce the kind of fear and conformity needed for a pre-war period. McCarthyism wasn't deadly enough; therefore now a new gimmick: "Sure he's loyal but he's a poor security risk." It becomes increasingly apparent that what is involved is any record of dissidence.

In ten days the verdict on the Radulovich case is due. It will be quite a test of how much counterpressure has worked. If the rest of the CIO and the AFL join to prevent the expansion of this vicious campaign, then perhaps the flight from civil liberties in this country may be halted in this section.

Labor Journal Hits Sacrosanct FBI

By W. R. JANSEN

BERKELEY, Sept. 18 — The united front against any criticism of J. Edgar Hoover and his FBI was broken on September 11 in Alameda County when the *East Bay Labor Journal* ran an editorial titled "Hoover of the FBI," in response to statements about the friendship of J. Edgar with Joe McCarthy appearing in the *San Diego Evening Tribune* on August 23. Besides bringing some much-needed criticism to this sacrosanct organization and its powerful head, the editorial indicates the mentality lying behind Mr. G-Man himself.

Whenever "non-Comms" remark that the FBI "might develop into an American Gestapo," says the editorial, "there's a rush to the loudspeaker by all and sundry to explain the fact that there's no such danger in this country especially as long as J. Edgar Hoover heads the FBI." It adds:

"Nevertheless, labor people who know the history of the trade unions' struggle with state police and the like are always prone to keep a corner of the mind open for any news that may indicate the FBI or any other big police agency is getting off the beam."

J. EDGAR AND JOE

The comment was provoked by the AP story which mentioned "that he [Hoover] considered Senator McCarthy a friend and described him as earnest and honest, and 'a vigorous person who isn't going to be pushed around.'"

"He said he was not passing on the technique of Mr. McCarthy's committee, but added that it and other Senate committees 'do a valuable job.'"

"Was Mr. Hoover just being politically polite, or does he actually believe what he indicates in the above story? Here are two things so indicated.

"(1) That he considers McCarthy a friend.

"(2) That McCarthy is earnest and honest.

"If we are to take Mr. Hoover seriously, hereafter when we think of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, we are to bear in mind as a clue to his attitude toward civil liberties that Mr. Hoover is a friend of McCarthy and that he considers McCarthy honest.

"Sure. The FBI is wonderful. There's no chance of it ever violating civil liberties. It'll never become an American Gestapo. It's headed by a man who is a good friend of Joe McCarthy, and who knows that Joe McCarthy is earnest and honest."

To carry the picture one step further, it was former Attorney General Francis Biddle who spoke this way about J. Edgar Hoover when he visited California a few years ago. Hoover's mammoth dossier system was then dismissed as the normal filing of information coming across Hoover's desk—for Hoover was an honest man and a friend—even when it tried to reach out for the 1940 census material, after incorporating service records and wartime industrial files of fingerprints, photographs, and work histories.

SP Organ Denounces Gov't Case Against ISL

The Reading (Penna.) *Labor Advocate*, Socialist Party organ, has editorially come out in support of the Independent Socialist League's fight against inclusion on the "subversive list" by the government.

Its statement in the issue of October 2 was evoked by the material published two weeks ago in LABOR ACTION, reprinting the text of the attorney general's "Statement of Grounds and Interrogatories" with reference to the case of the ISL. Also carried in that issue was the statement on the question by Rowland Watts, secretary of the Workers Defense League, which the editorial quotes.

The SP organ vigorously declared that "we join most emphatically" with the WDL view as expressed by Watts.

Following is the editorial from the *Labor Advocate*.

IS SOCIALISM SUBVERSIVE?

We have had in the past, and do now have, differences of opinion with the Independent Socialist League on the nature and practice of socialism.

We do object, however, to the ISL's inclusion by the attorney general, on the list of subversive organizations. We join most emphatically with the Workers Defense League and their secretary Rowland Watts, in the statement on the matter issued by the League.

Watts said:

"The Workers Defense League has taken the case of the Independent Socialist League as a means of challenging the whole procedure of the attorney general in setting up his list of subversive organizations.

"The list was drawn in the most undemocratic manner. No organization ever received notice that it was under consideration by the attorney general. None was even notified directly that it had been placed on a list. Thus these organizations never had an opportunity to examine any evidence against them, or to cross-examine witnesses who presumably gave allegedly damaging evidence to the attorney general.

"We are challenging the validity of the list itself, procedurally and politically. The WDL does not believe that the ISL is subversive and it should not have been added to the list under the Executive Order.

"After having seen the interrogatories of the attorney general submitted to the ISL, this is even more apparent than before. What the administration has done is to equate capitalism and democracy. It is the first time to our knowledge that an official government document has done this."

The paramount issue at stake here is one of civil liberties. Yet, it is the secondary issue raised in the last paragraph of the WDL statement which intrigues us more as democratic socialists. Here the U. S. government is doing officially what commentators, writers, etc., have been doing for decades—equating capitalism and democracy. More, they are making one's individual rights as a U. S. citizen contingent upon the acceptance of this equation!

Capitalism is a system of economics; democracy a concept of government; that they should co-exist at the present time in this nation is a social condition subject to change to any time. In fact, it is changing at this very moment. Adam Smith would scarcely recognize even the function of a GOP administration in American life.

So long as socialism is not destructive of democracy it is not subversive to the higher ideal of mankind toward which it is presumed Americans are striving. In the field of democratic rights capitalism itself has been guilty of greater subversion than the most lurid dreams of press-agents have ascribed to Socialism. On this score the record is clear and abundant.

Come and Hunt a Witch at Our Halloween Witches' Sabbath

SEE the Attorney General's actual "Grounds" used in making up the Subversive List!

They are shown preserved in their original coffee cup!

SEE our own Smith Act!

He can too! See L. G. imitate Gordon-Haskell . . .

SEE a Master Spy Ring actually rotating!

as they do a circle dance . . .

SEE Joe McCarthy in our own Star Chamber!

being presented with the keyhole to the city . . .

GET a personally signed autograph from the author of "Fallacy—Yes! Democracy—No!"

YOU ARE INVITED TO INFILTRATE LABOR ACTION HALL

114 West 14 Street, New York City

ON SATURDAY EVENING, OCTOBER 31 at 9 p.m.

The standard biography

KARL MARX

by

Franz Mehring

\$3.50

Labor Action Book Service
114 West 14 Street, New York City

East Germany Since the Uprising

By A. STEIN

The June uprising of the East German workers demonstrated to the world—and to Moscow—that the Grotewohl-Ulbrecht regime was built of sand and rested on water. Since it could no longer pretend to represent anyone but its Russian masters, its usefulness as a pawn in Moscow's game to draw Western Germany out of the American orbit seemed at an end.

Nevertheless, Moscow did not sweep the wreckage of the discredited regime aside and attempt to install a new government that could bid for some degree of popular support. Instead, the Kremlin began to do everything within its power to rehabilitate and prop up the old ruling Stalinist party, called the Socialist Unity Party (SED).

At the same time, the policy of economic concessions was reaffirmed. However, to the East German workers the combination of the old Grotewohl-Ulbricht gang and the new policy, especially after the June revolt, must have seemed as monstrous and unbelievable as the unfortunate character of Bottom in Shakespeare's *Mid-summer Night's Dream*—a reasonable body crowned by the absurdity of a donkey's head that brayed when it thought it was speaking.

The New Pretorians

In the course of the last three months, Moscow's line has been symbolized by the growing power of Walter Ulbricht, deputy premier of the regime and first secretary of the SED. It is he who has been given the power and the responsibility for rebuilding the shattered party-police-state apparatus. Today, Ulbricht's most important task is the creation of a party within the party, a hard core of party faithful who are to supervise the activities of the ordinary run of party members.

This corps of party elite, according to Ulbricht, is to number 150,000 to 200,000 out of a total membership of 1,230,000. The members of this pretorian guard will receive special political training and have periodic conventions separate and aside from the regular party congresses, at which they will discuss the most important problems facing the regime.

Members of this select group will be chosen, says Ulbricht, on the basis of their behavior during June 17. Only those will be so "honored," and receive of course the corresponding material privileges, who neither "faltered" nor "gave in" to the demands of the "provocateurs," that is, the workers, during the uprising.

Behind the political shock troops will stand the newly rebuilt Volkspolizei ("People's Police") and the East Germany army which is poorly concealed under the name of Bereitschaften (alert units). The factories are being combed for those who refused to join the strikers or actually resisted when the workers spontaneously rose up against the regime. Ulbricht is even dreaming of creating factory militias by arming "loyal" workers who are not recruited into the police or army. Truly, Ulbricht is taking upon himself the labors of a Sisyphus!

Workers' Demands

When the Russian occupation troops intervened on June 17, they saved the satellite empire from being broken at its weakest link by preventing the strike demonstrations from turning into the first stages of a revolution. They could not and did not, however, crush the spirit of the workers, who retreated and shifted the scene of the struggle from the streets to the factories.

There's No Angel Around

to finance Labor Action. It has appeared every week since 1940 because it's been backed by the dimes and dollars of independent socialists and your subscriptions.

A sub is only \$2.00 a year—

Subscribe now!

The slogans underwent a corresponding change: from the most general political demands to more limited ones which could serve as a point of departure for undermining the regime within the given framework, i.e., the presence of the occupation troops. And in those first weeks the workers won some notable victories.

On June 17 the workers, supported by the rest of the population, called for the liquidation of the Grotewohl-Ulbricht government, the unification of Germany, and the election of an all-German government by universal secret balloting. Driven back to the factories, they raised a new set of slogans which they backed up with strikes and slowdowns in production.

Among the demands they raised, the most notable were:

- The release of all arrested July 17 demonstrators and the promise of no further reprisals.
- The political "neutrality" of the trade unions, their independence from state control.
- Election of new non-party trade-union offi-



cial from the shop upwards on the basis of genuine secret balloting.

- The immediate reduction of work-norms and their subsequent abolition altogether.
- The 46 hour work-week at the same rate of pay as the 48-hour week.
- The lowering of prices by 40 per cent in the state commercial stores.

Pressure and Panic

First and foremost the workers demanded the immediate and unconditional release of their comrades who had been arrested, and they struck to enforce their demand. One example out of many will suffice to demonstrate their courageous actions and class solidarity.

The workers of the Zeiss Works in Jena demanded the release of their strike leaders, and when it was learned that the chairman of the strike committee, Norkus, had been sentenced to three years in jail, the workers delivered an ultimatum to the factory directors: Norkus was to be released by July 10 or there would be another strike.

It is difficult to adequately describe the panic which took possession of a good part of the bureaucracy in the face of this militancy, but the actions of the regime itself are testimony to the powerful pressure from below.

The minister of justice, Fechner (deposed by Ulbricht in the middle of July) capitulated to the demands of the workers when he wrote in the official party paper *Neues Deutschland* of June 30 and July 2nd that "only those persons will be punished who are guilty of major crimes. Other people will not be punished. This holds true of the strike leaders. The right to strike is guaranteed by the constitution. The strike leaders will not be punished for their participation in such an action."

That Fechner kept his word to a degree was shown not only by his subsequent disgrace, but by the actions of his successor as minister of justice, Hilde Benjamin, who has earned for

herself the description "Hilde, keine milde." The news service of the West Berlin Social-Democratic Party reported that in the last two weeks of July, 562 participants in the June 17 events, who had been released from jail by Fechner's orders, were rearrested.

Split in the Bureaucracy

In factory after factory, the workers drew up their list of demands and presented them to the factory directors and the trade-union bureaucracy. In the great Buna chemical works near Merseburg, the factory personnel drew up a list of 29 demands and presented them to the management (in this case Russian, since the works are controlled by the Russian holding corporation, SAG). On July 15 they went on strike to enforce their demands.

In the Heavy Machine Building Works, ABUS, in Nordhausen, the workers elaborated a 16-point program to be submitted to the factory administration. In the clothing, textile and leather union, the workers demanded and won a 46-hour work-week with the same pay for the previous 48-hour week.

The intense struggle waged by the workers by means of slowdowns and sit-down strikes exerted a tremendous pressure on the entire state apparatus, and created a profound split that spread to the very top—a split that was quite distinct from the personal struggle for power between Zaisser, minister of internal security (Beria's man) and Ulbricht, which reflected the fight in Moscow. The "moderate faction" in the SED Politburo—consisting of Grotewohl, the premier, Fechner, the minister of justice, and Herrstadt, the editor of the official party organ *Neues Deutschland*—wanted the program of concessions that had been publicly set in motion on June 13 to include the workers, but it was just on this point that Ulbricht continued to resist bitterly, after as well as before June 17.

The resolution of the struggle in Moscow with Beria's fall permitted Ulbricht to eliminate not only Zaisser, who represented Beria, but also the majority of the independent "moderate faction" from the Politburo and their jobs. This was accomplished officially at the plenum of the SED Central Committee held on July 24-26. Nevertheless, although Ulbricht had triumphed, it was impossible for him to set the New Line of June 13 in motion again with the bureaucratic apparatus in its current state of demoralization. Particularly was this so since the essence of this program of concessions was its anti-working-class nature.

Winning Over Officials

Not only did the organized underground groups have their adherents strategically located in the trade-union and party apparatus, but in addition sections of the bureaucracy had simply succumbed under the intense pressure and gone over to the side of the workers. At a plenary session of the official trade-union organization (FDGB) on August 13-15, Herbert Warneke, its head, cited the activities of some top-ranking trade-union officials during and after June 17.

The district president of the Postal Workers Union of Magdeburg, for example, had collected all the demands he could from the workers—55 in all—and presented them to the government. The recently dismissed chairman of the Metal Industrial Union (IG Metal), Hans Schmidt, had carried on an "anti-trade-union and anti-working-class activity" in the secretariat of the union's executive committee, which had been condoned by the members of the secretariat. The second president of the Power Workers Union, Sturm, had "failed to take suitable countermeasures at certain critical moments," and therefore Sturm had been dismissed from office.

On September 7, the official trade-union federation newspaper *Tribune* published a list of over a hundred trade-union officials and factory administrators who had been fired from their jobs. Of this number 82 alone had been dismissed from the great Buna Chemical Works,

Of June: The Struggle Goes On

the heart of the workers' resistance movement in the Merseburg-Bitterfeld area.

Inside the party Ulbricht has been personally carrying through the purge of the infected cadres. On August 11 Ulbricht fired the SED party chiefs in four of the large industrial centers: Magdeburg, Dresden, Halle and Chemnitz. In each case he accused the deposed bureaucrats of treason in connection with the June 17 revolt. But there is more to it than this. It so happens that in each of these areas the workers have been carrying on a vigorous struggle since June 17.

For example, the railway repair shop workers in Halle have been conducting a slowdown that is apparently still in progress, for planned output in these shops was kept down to half of the quota in September. In Chemnitz, the SED paper *Volkstimme* complained bitterly in its issue of August 12 that the coal mines in the area were consistently failing to meet their daily quotas of output. The paper further noted that the failure to restore production was directly due to "poorly organized party work."

In brief, the local SED party groups from top to bottom were either passive in the face of the workers' resistance or secretly sympathized with it.

Back to Before June

The purge of the old cadres and the creation of the new party elite have apparently progressed to the point where Ulbricht feels secure enough to renew the offensive against the workers. As mentioned, the distinctive feature of the New Line of June 13, with its concessions, was its anti-working-class character. And it is to this point of attack that Ulbricht has returned, apparently intent on proving to his masters in Moscow that he is in full control of the situation.

On September 24, the official press quoted Ulbricht to the effect that the demand for a general 46-hour work-week in industry could not be accepted because it involved a "reduction of production and hence a cut in goods for the population." And where the 46-hour week had been wrested from the trade-union bureaucracy by the workers, as in the leather, textile

and clothing union, it was to be cancelled.

But this declaration was only a trifle compared to the news that the campaign to raise the work-norms was being resumed! Again the press has begun to carry officially inspired stories, as in the early June days, of workers "voluntarily" demanding that their production quotas be raised. Whom the gods would destroy, they first make mad. For this is the same inflammable issue that ignited the explosion of June.

How the Workers Resist

To be sure, the regime is prepared for mass strikes and demonstrations. But the resistance of the workers is taking forms that do not and will not permit the regime to succeed in its provocations.

The workers have raised the "peaceful" but extremely effective demand for the "political neutrality" of the trade unions, their independence from state control. Specifically, this means they want genuine secret elections of trade-union officials from the factory up. Furthermore, these officials must be chosen from the ranks of the workers themselves, and not from the party apparatus.

And as we have seen earlier, the workers are maintaining a persistent pressure on the regime by means of the slowdown of production. Against such forms of struggle the regime is helpless, because it cannot jail every worker who engages in such acts of defiance. Nor can it call on the Russian occupation authorities to put a soldier behind every worker's back.

The workers understand very well that they can engage in defensive actions only within the given framework, i.e., the presence of the Russian occupation troops, and it would be irresponsible to call it by any other name. But at the same time, the Ulbricht regime rests on nothing else but the tanks and machine guns of these same foreign troops. And just this is its Achilles' heel.

For if the uprising of June 17 revealed how profound and unbridgeable the gap between the regime and the masses, the days and weeks that followed revealed how complete was the demoralization of the bureaucratic apparatus.

This is what Ulbricht means when he inveighs against the mood of "depression and skepticism" that persists among party members.

The regime can no longer convince its own party members, as it could to some degree before June 17, that the ruling SED represented and had the support of the advanced class-conscious workers. Its ability to perpetuate this illusion for so long rested on the historical fact that in the post-war beginnings of the regime Stalinism did have such support to a considerable degree.

The Russians were able to force the creation of the SED in 1946 only because a considerable number of Social-Democratic workers as well as Stalinists genuinely desired the unity of the working class, expressed in the formation of a single workers' party. The tragic experience of the division in class ranks in the pre-1933 days had, after all, etched a bitter lesson in their hearts and minds.

These workers in the Eastern zone hoped the SED would serve this function. June 17 marked the end of this road forever.

The Stalinist "SS" Corps

The creation of the new "elite" party is the response of Germany Stalinism to this new historic situation. For the chief characteristic of the SED today is that it hangs suspended in mid-air.

It has no support below and it must be severely and increasingly policed from above. The mass of the party no longer have any stomach for their jobs and stay only because of the material privileges which result from membership, and the danger of persecution if they leave. When called upon to execute the anti-working-class directives from above, they recoil. Not only do they lack faith, but they are confronted by the open hostility of a united working class.

To combat this situation, Ulbricht has created an elite, an inner party to keep watch over the ordinary party member. But who will exercise vigilance to see that in its turn this inner party "elite," this new pretorian guard, does not succumb to the pressure of the working class?

The Suppression of British Guiana — —

(Continued from page 1)

is that the majority party, the PPP, had strong Stalinist influence within it and some pro-Russian sympathizers among its leadership; that is certainly true. But was that all one needed know in order to justify this suppression of the democratically elected government? Why was this drastic step necessary? Was the British government in fear of an imminent armed coup by the PPP which would drive the governor (and his veto) into the Caribbean?

No, that is a fantasy. London could not wait until it had a real case to present (if that was to come) not because it had to act now or else something irreparable would happen. Nothing like this was the real motive that triggered off the suppression. The real trigger was what took place last month in British Guiana, in September.

FAMILIAR PICTURE

We first have to see something about the country. It would be a waste of space, for informed readers, to spend much time describing the grinding poverty and misery of the people while an infinitesimal minority of white exploiters reap the profits of the sugar plantations, rice fields, bauxite deposits, gold and diamond mines. This is indeed the "all too familiar pattern" of capitalist imperialism, in one of the few colonies left in the Western Hemisphere.

The capital, Georgetown, is a city of slums. The sugar estates exhibit their collections of pitiful huts where Asian Indian workers live "almost surrounded by stagnant water" (as a British commission once described it frankly). Sugar field workers living on the estates get something over \$3 a week for their labor (that's for adult males, others get less). Sugar factory workers (the aristocrats) get something over \$4 to \$5 a week. And the cost of living has recently been rising sharply.

The country has a long history of the most cruel exploitation of the people, first by the Dutch and since the 18th century by the British, who are the overlords of the sugar plantocracy. Upon the emancipation of the slaves in 1834 (the slave owners were compensated),

the labor need was filled by large-scale importation of indentured (bond) servants from India, to save the plantation system, which still exists. Hence the dominant position of the Asian Indians among the population numerically. (Incidentally, American Indians play no role whatsoever in the life of the colony, and "Indian" always refers to the people of Asian descent.) The bond-servant trade was stopped only in 1917, and only after fierce attacks upon it by Gandhi. The heritage remained.

The Indians are the chief sugar workers, and there are few places left in the world where the "upper classes" consist so exclusively of a bourgeois-feudal group so completely controlled by a tiny aristocracy of big planters. In 1927 a British parliamentary commission wrote:

"The survival of an industry [sugar] without which the population of the Colony would by now have practically disappeared was, however, secured only at the price of a plantocracy or government of sugar, by sugar, for sugar, inevitably tending to restrict development in other ways."

Remember that, because, most of all, the present suppression was in the interests "of sugar, by sugar, for sugar"—that is, for the sugared lords of the estates.

RULERS IN A STATE OF SIEGE

But by the 1930s the people were becoming increasingly restive under this rule of sugar. The 18th century was long past, but the plantocracy had not yet found it out.

It was in the 1930s, in a movement initiated by widespread riots, that the political development of the people began to shift to the left. The Indians were organized by a fiery editor, Ayube Edun, who launched what was up to recently the chief trade union, the Manpower Citizens Association. The British Guiana Labor Union, which had been formed even earlier, gained in strength, led by a Negro, H. N. Critchlow. The former organized the sugar workers; the latter the Negro city workers. By 1942 there were 19 registered trade unions, a trade-union council, and several militant labor papers.

In 1942 strikes swept over the sugar estates. Powerful as they were, the strikes failed to move the plant-

ocracy to grant a single wage raise. As Paul Blanshard wrote (in *Democracy and Empire in the Caribbean*):

"These planters live almost in a state of spiritual siege. Their white ownership of most of the 26 estates and 17 sugar factories is resented by both East Indians and Negroes, and the domination of 70 per cent of the industry by one British combination adds to the resentment. The pure British whites constitute less than two-thirds of one per cent of the population. . . . A kind of chronic sitdown strike has been going on in the sugar industry for several years. . . ."

NATIVE RADICALISM

Radical extremism in British Guiana is fully indigenous. It was not imported by Moscow agitators or dentists' wives from Chicago. In 1944 the British Guiana Labor Union was host to the Caribbean Labor Conference, consisting of unions and socialist groups from all over the British Caribbean. It raised radical immediate demands, economic and anti-imperialist. A 1945 meeting of this conference raised demands for nationalization and appropriation of imperialist profits by the people.

The Manpower Citizens Association (the moderate labor group in Guiana, as we shall see!) has repeatedly come out for nationalization of the sugar industry. At the height of the war, in June 1944, a labor paper dominated by its leader, Edun, attacked Churchill, praised Russia, and said: "if an Allied victory would mean the perpetuation of the parasitical tendency of one class and one 'superior' race of people to live off other classes and other 'inferior' races commonly described as natives [and much more to this effect] . . . then surely such a victory, if won, will be empty and vain for mankind generally."

We cite this because, in the September crisis, this MCA of Edun's was the "right wing" union favored by the planters in order to keep out the greater evil of the PPP's union!

The new party, the PPP, arose 3-4 years ago as a new development out of this tradition of militant anti-imperialism, socialist radicalism and fighting anti-landlordism. Parallel with it was organized the Indus-

(Turn to last page)

The Suppression of British Guiana — —

(Continued from page 7)

trial Workers Union, which has more and more supplanted the two older (and more or less racially divided) unions, with an all-racial appeal and militant policy. Leading elements influenced by Stalinism went into it too, as might be expected.

In 1951, Britain finally granted a new constitution to the colony which for the first time put virtually all power in the hands of a native government elected by universal suffrage, with the exception of power over finances, the police and national defense, and with the over-all exception of the power of the governor to impose a veto. This was started by the Labor government, but when the Tories took over they endorsed the step and in fact it was they who put it into effect.

PPP's PROGRAM

In April of this year, therefore, a new election took place on the basis of this constitution. The results amazed everyone, including no doubt the PPP. That party swept in with 18 seats out of 24. Only two went to the party representing the "upper classes," businessmen and planters, the National Democratic Party. The other four are independents, one of whom votes more or less with the PPP.

There never has been, and there is not now, one word of suspicion cast on the methods of the PPP in the course of the election. It swept the field in a straight contest.

It won because of its program, openly and vigorously put forward. It was for complete independence from Britain. It was for "a just socialist society in which the industries of the country shall be socially and democratically owned and managed for the common good." It had a program for racial unity. It denounced imperialism and colonial oppression. Its immediate demand was for dominion status (like Canada) in the Commonwealth. The people voted for it and ignored the other parties.

BRITISH ARE SHOCKED

Its victory did not much impress Britain then or scare its colonial secretary. Not until an unexpected thing happened: the PPP, in office, proceeded to work militantly and courageously, though within the framework of legality, for everything it had openly and publicly proclaimed in its program! This "shocking" turn of events led to the crisis, through the development of three issues.

One was the demand by the PPP-controlled legislature for independence from Britain, and especially demands for the curtailment of the governor's right to veto. This open reiteration of the chief point in the program by which the PPP was elected is now being referred to as evidence of their "Communist plot"! Obviously, if they were not "Communists," they would have quietly forgotten about the independence issue as soon as they were safely in office. . . . Thus the imperialists heap flattery upon the Stalinists by their reactionary mode of thought!

The second issue was the trade-union bill pushed in the new legislature by the PPP. This bill proposed that employers had to recognize a union which was determined by the Labor Ministry to represent a majority of the workers. In all the sinister references to this bill, no more "sinister" provision than this has been alluded to. This is underlined by the following item from the N. Y. Times of Oct. 10:

"A. Chase, Labor Minister . . . described the act as following the principles of the Wagner Act in the U. S.—but the Opposition spokesmen said it lacked a barrier to Communist leadership in the unions."

You see, unless the government were to pass a super-Taft-Hartley Act, it was proved to be a "Communist regime" . . . or so we must suppose from the dark allusion in the British government's indictment to the crime of fostering this "non-anti-Communist" labor act.

THE SUGAR STRIKE

Behind the fight over this bill, however, was the third and most immediate issue that led to the crisis.

The new Industrial Workers Union, organized by the PPP movement, had

gained rapidly on the old MCA, but the sugar planters refused to recognize it, preferring the MCA. In September the IWU called a strike in sugar and completely shut down the estates. It thereby proved that it had the support of the workers, though the demands raised in the strike were not in the first place for union recognition (contrary to the newspaper reports) but for economic improvements and working conditions.

It is clear that the general strike against sugar appeared to the plantocracy as a specter of revolution, and they reacted to it as such. The strike lasted through much of September and into the beginning of this month, while the British landlords and their local authorities (the British governor and his appointed State Council) prepared for a showdown. They granted nothing.

In this strike the PPP leaders, including government ministers (some of whom were themselves trade-union leaders), took an active part. This is now cited as the No. 1 item on the list of "Communist" crimes for which they are being punished by the suppression of the constitution.

GOVERNOR HERDS SCABS

We must remember, however, that while active support to a strike by a minister appears to the British as a heinous offense, no one has even bothered to claim that there was anything "unconstitutional" or illegal about it.

But if the PPP leaders shocked the British by refusing to be neutral in the class struggle, it is also true that the British governor, representing the Crown, was no less lacking in neutrality.

On Oct. 6, the N. Y. Herald Tribune candidly reported that the PPP's "'get tough' policy started when Governor Savage used trucks and police guards to carry workers into the strike areas"! In other words, the governor, from his high office, organized scabherding and strike-breaking.

This was no "crime." It obviously was the simple duty of a governor to see to it that the lords of the land got what they wanted; that's what he was there for! The activity of the PPP ministers on the other side of the class struggle was, on the other hand, definite evidence of "Communist conspiracy."

THE PLANTERS SCREAM

A direct link runs from this sugar strike to the British order for the suppression of the constitution. On September 21, in the midst of the strike, the governor's State Council met and adopted a resolution, which was later to be prominently quoted by the British government in order to justify its action. As quoted by the latter itself, the resolution expressed "grave anxiety at the sugar strike . . . regretting that 'certain ministers in the colony had been actively engaged in various parts of the country in promoting and sustaining the strike and that such action by these ministers was a grave danger to the constitution and a direct threat to the peace and security of the citizens [the tiny handful of planters] and the negation of good and responsible democratic government.'"

Here was the "plot."

Moreover it was this State Council resolution, adopted by a body of appointed British agents beleaguered by the strike, which called on the British secretary of state to take action, specifically, "after the inquiry to take such action as he may deem fit to ensure confidence in the government and proper and efficient working of the constitution."

This was what impelled the British government to "take action . . . to ensure confidence in the government." This was what started the wheels turning in England.

THE PLANTERS CHEER

That the "communist plot" consisted in the first place of the sugar strike is attested to from various directions. On Oct. 7, the London Daily Telegraph (Tory) wrote: "British Guiana now has a restless popular tyranny pledged to seize privately owned industries. It looks on indifferently as crops are burned and innocent priests attacked. . . ."

The Daily Telegraph is not fazed by the fact that in England too there is a party which is pledged to "seize" (in its language) "privately owned industries." The Labor Party MPs, however, should be interested.

On Oct. 9 the British colonial secretary, Lyttelton, put the sugar strike at the top of his explanation for the sending of warships: "ministers while holding their portfolios," he said, "were organizing the strikes on the sugar es-

tates, the principal industry of the colony. . . . They attempted to organize a general strike. The economic life of the country is menaced."

No wonder that, when London stepped in with an iron fist, the majority of the people were appalled—"but the businessmen, big farmers and industrialists here [in Guiana] cheered the decision and supported London's charges," as the N. Y. Times reported on Oct. 12.

Such is the real basis for the British suppression. That the British have not even accused the PPP of a "plot" in any other sense was indicated by the colonial office statement which said (after referring to "intrigues of communists and their associates") that "if these processes were to continue unchecked an attempt MIGHT be made, by methods familiar in some other parts of the world, to set up a Communist-dominated state. This would lead to bloodshed." (Our emphasis.)

And so since the sugar strike meant that an attempt might be made, it was not necessary to prove that there was any plot going on at all.

HYPOCRITICAL CHARGE

The fullest list of British charges appeared in the colonial office statement printed in the N. Y. Times for Oct. 10. Not one of the charges points to any unconstitutional or illegal acts. One charge not yet mentioned, which appears here for the first time, is the charge that "The Minister of Education has announced his intention to remove churches from their present participation in the educational system of the country. . . ."

The truth: the educational system of British Guiana is CONTROLLED by the churches, and this is what the PPP "plot-ters" demanded an end of. More than that: it is dominated by the Christian churches, whereas the Indian population is not Christian.

The big charge is the Communist sympathies of government ministers. What are the facts about this?

First of all, we must note that not even the British accuse the PPP as a whole of being Communist. As the colonial office's press release put it, "Up to the present, however, few members of the PPP or trade-union movement are

convinced Communists, though those few hold most of the important positions of power."

Professor Robert J. Alexander, leading U. S. authority on Latin America, had a clearer picture to offer, writing in the N. Y. Herald Tribune on August 3 before the September strike. Alexander, who had just returned from British Guiana, said: "There are generally considered to be three people in the high command who are out-and-out Communists: the two Jagans, and Sidney King, minister of transport and communications." (The British add the claim that Westmaas is an "out-and-out Communist" too.)

FACTIONS IN PPP

But Alexander points out that there is a split in the PPP on this matter. When the PPP took office, there was a fight in its ranks between Jagan, the avowed pro-Russian sympathizer, and the No. 2 man in the party, Burnham, who did not want Jagan to be premier even though he was recognized as the leader of the party.

As a result, reports Alexander, Jagan's wife—an American who is supposed to have been a YCLer in the U. S. and may well be the only "convinced Communist" in the party—did not succeed in getting a cabinet post.

Furthermore, after listing the three leaders who are considered to be "out-and-out Communists," Alexander writes: "On the other hand, it is reported that certain other members of the high command have expressed a willingness to throw over the Jagans and take the party along a different tack altogether."

This would seem to be a more objective appreciation of the situation. Plentiful opportunities existed, if the British were really only concerned with the threat of a "Communist-dominated regime," to work with this PPP which represented the people and, by a democratic policy of concessions to the workers, help the anti-Jagan militants keep the party away from any future Moscow control.

But the British line is the line of the sugar plantocracy and is not at all decisively based on the question of how to separate the PPP from Stalinism while furthering the interests of the people of British Guiana.

African Spokesmen — —

(Continued from page 3)

on behalf of the Uganda National Congress. He gave an account of the national movements and of the brutal measures the government had taken to suppress them. He also stressed the great importance of the Uganda National Congress, as an organization designed to unite all African peoples. This was a reference to its attempt to embrace the strong Indian minority.

It was unfortunate, he thought, that one of the few groups in Africa which made a serious attempt at unity had not so far managed to attract any Indian support. While agreeing that their economic interests were often with imperialism, while their political interests were with the Africans, he reminded them that they were all in the same boat.

A particularly welcome speaker at the Congress was Kofi Baako, the political secretary of the Convention People's Party of the Gold Coast, whose government is led by Nkrumah. The speaker described the riots which had taken place in Accra. Ex-servicemen had been demonstrating for more political rights; the police attacked the unarmed people and arrested many. However, they had stood firm, and they were now effectively the government of the Gold Coast.

They had many problems, social, political and economic—he went on—but Premier Nkrumah was preparing a bill demanding dominion status very soon. If this measure is carried, despite Malan's opposition, the Gold Coast would enjoy the same status as Canada.

Commander Fox-Pitt, in his report on Central Africa, drew attention to the unhappy state of the trade unions there. Recently the employers had refused to collect union fees. There was no doubt that where trade unions were properly organized, as in the copper belt of Northern Rhodesia, the standard of living of the Africans was much higher. There was not yet, however, sufficient realization by European workers that they were in the same plight as the Africans, but he felt that this consciousness was growing.

Mary Klopper gave a very interesting account of the low standard of living in

North Africa and of the French suppression of all national movements in Morocco, Algeria and Tunis.

Dr. Szur from South Africa delivered a penetrating analysis of the situation in his country. By the "Suppression of Communism Act," a person can be fined 500 pounds, be given 5 years' imprisonment and 15 strokes of the lash for aiding the Africans.

The immediate outlook in South Africa was extremely bad, he said. The parliamentary struggle there was of no use, since the Nationalist Party and the Labor Party of the country were all allied to support repression of Africans. The real struggle must come from the Africans, and their effectiveness in passive resistance had already been demonstrated.

PRACTICAL STEPS

Dr. Szur pointed out what the Congress could do practically: (1) It must force the Labor Party to wipe out Malanism in the colonies; (2) it must prevent the South African government's annexation of the adjacent protectorates at all costs; (3) it must fight strongly against the stand of British governments (Labor as well as Conservative) in supporting South Africa's contention that its domestic policy should not be discussed at the UN.

These indeed are some of the practical measures which we can take to help the anti-imperialist struggle. Among others suggested by Fenner Brockway in his proposal of the Conference Resolution were:

- (1) Hold meetings on anti-imperialist issues.
- (2) Sell the African and Colonial World, a new left-wing monthly.
- (3) Keep the press conscious of interest in Africa.
- (4) Create fraternal relations between cooperatives and trade unions here and in Africa.
- (5) Reject the Labor Party's support of Central African Federation.

Perhaps the most important, however, is to educate the rank and file of the Labor Party, trade unions and cooperatives in their responsibility for events in Africa.

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.