

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JUNE 28, 1954

FIVE CENTS

Who Can Save Democracy in Germany?

... page 6

The Record of British Terrorism in Malaya

... page 3

The Trade-Union Press and the Indochina War

... page 2

A Great University Turns the Clock Back

... page 5

THE WAR-CRIME AGAINST GUATEMALA: U.S. Is Accomplice of Reactionary Rebels, Guilty of Moscow-Style Fake 'Liberation'

By PHILIP COBEN

The United States government is guilty before the world as accessory before the fact in the war crime that has been committed against the government and people of Guatemala.

The intervention in Guatemala, which is partly an invasion and partly a counter-revolutionary rebellion, uses as its troops reactionary forces disaffected by Guatemala's social reforms, but behind it stands the aid, encouragement and blessing of the powerful imperialism of the U. S. From the point of view of the U. S. role, it is a Moscow-style "liberation."

Where the Kremlin has on occasion used duped workers to win power, the U. S. uses the extreme right of Guatemalan society, who are not duped at all. This is no small difference from the above analogy with Moscow-style "liberation." But the crime against democracy and national freedom is not less.

In few cases has Moscow been quite as crude as the U. S. has been in this case, simply because the State Department is no doubt sure it can get away with it.

Up to the very hour of the right-wing rebels' armed assault, the United States government was agitating the whole world about the danger to "hemisphere peace" by the Guatemalan government—even though there are few informed people anywhere in the world who believe

that Dulles was ignorant of what was going to happen.

Up to the very hour of the attack, the U. S. was trying to organize the world to keep Guatemala disarmed, on this

lying plea that its victim represented the danger of aggression.

While, with the knowledge of the U. S. and with the friendly aid of the Honduran dictatorship, the rebels were openly mustering their forces for invasion, the U. S. was demanding the unprecedented right even to stop and search the ships of friendly nations on the high seas, in order to make sure that no arms would arrive in the hands in the government that was scheduled to be the butt of its interventionist plans.

The press reports (N. Y. Times, June 20) that for "several days" the interven-

tionist army carried out "secret forays into Guatemala" before the official invasion. It is certain that the U. S. knew it was going on, just as its stooge, the Honduran government, knew it was going on.

This was virtually admitted by the Times correspondent in Honduras in the usual qualified language in which such statements are put journalistically: "It is assumed in informed quarters that Washington was fully aware of the probable march of events involving Guatemala once the State Department took its strong stand against last month's arms shipment. . . . Since the start of the invasion, Colonel Castillo Armas and his top aides have been careful to avoid suggesting that the U. S.'s attitude in any way brought their plans to fruition." (June 21.)

HOLD 'M DOWN WHILE YOUR PAL DOES THE BLACKJACKING

Yet, with great show of indignation, the U. S. tried to make a world scandal and provocation out of the fact that Guatemala, denied arms by the U. S., was forced to buy its means of defense from a Stalinist country; and while it was blessing the buildup of an invasion army, it used the affair for a propaganda-pogrom against the Guatemalan government.

Four days after this shipment, the U. S. made a military pact with Honduras, the country where the intervention was being incubated. In a terrific rush, it air-lifted (Turn to last page)

Imperialist Liberalism Lays Bare the Issue

By HAL DRAPER

It has taken the imperialist liberals to strip the Guatemala issue down to its bare bone.

This is the dubious service performed by the editorial endorsement given by the liberal New York Post to the Washington policy of supporting the reactionary rebels against the Guatemalan government.

Not even the N. Y. Times, we should note, rushed editorially to proclaim such endorsement. In fact, for two days running (June 20-21) Times editorials pretended that they didn't know what was really happening and would have to "withhold judgment," speaking of "confusion," "obscurity," "lack of information," etc.

Of course, we need have no doubts about the Times' loyalty to the American Party Line, but its behavior at least bespeaks a formal recognition of certain copy-book maxims about international democracy.

It does this in the same way that (for example) the government of Honduras bows to democratic principles when it lyingly denies its obvious complicity in the invasion-revolt. For if the Hondurans had bluntly admitted the truth, how callous that would prove them! A pretense of virtue is one of the last remnants of moral behavior to be shucked off by the vicious and depraved.

But our liberals of the N. Y. Post—undoubtedly one of the most genuinely liberal papers in the country—will have no truck with such hypocrisy, not even in order to assuage their souls. They want to Face The Truth. They want to have No Delusions. They want to Think It Through.

And in an important respect they do, even though, as we shall see, they do not quite succeed in Facing The Truth.

They think it right through to the principle, virtually proclaimed, that in the interests of its war against Russia, the U. S. can ride roughshod over the democratic rights of any other nation which refuses to line up (unspoken addendum: if it can get away with it). They think it right through to the principle that in its "good" cause the U. S. has a right to do what it condemns on the part of the bad Russians.

Like virtually everybody else, the Post has often enough waxed indignant at the crimes of Moscow in suppressing small peoples, properly using these acts to prove that Moscow's cause must be bad. But faced with a crime by its own government, our liberals stand their own thinking on end: the same, or at least fatally similar, acts by the U. S. are justified on the ground that these crimes are directed

(Continued on page 7)

'Massive Retaliation'?

A naive confession of the U. S. role in the Guatemala blackjacking came from the Associated Press Washington bureau as the Castillo Armas rebellion hit the front pages. Here is how it interpreted the event, in an article which we quote from the Philadelphia Inquirer of June 20:

"By its action, the Eisenhower administration dramatized one aspect of the 'basic decision' on U. S. military policy which Dulles announced in New York last January.

"That policy, he explained in effect, was not to attempt to match man for man, in every trouble spot in the world, the hordes under control of Soviet Russia. Rather, Dulles said U. S. military men had decided to 'depend primarily upon a great capacity to retaliate, immediately,' against an aggressor.

"The speed with which the arms were sent to Nicaragua and Honduras was regarded as a local application of the theory that the United States has the power and the mobility to strike quickly.

"And then, Friday, anti-Reds started their move against the Guatemalan government."

MORE ON GUATEMALA NEXT WEEK— Crowded out of this issue: articles on (1) Is Guatemala "Communist-dominated"? (2) The Imperialist Apologetics of Max Lerner. (3) The "Guatemalan Revolution" Since 1944. (4) A Footnote on British Honduras.

Chile Socialists for Continental Congress Against Imperialism

The socialists of Chile have called for a continental congress of socialist and national-liberation movements of Latin America to discuss common resistance to the inroads of U. S. imperialism. This appeal was issued after the Caracas Inter-American Conference and before the present crisis around Guatemala.

The proposal of the Chilean socialists came in its organ *La Calle*. They said:

"There is no doubt that very soon there must be held a preliminary meeting of representatives of the various socialist and libertarian parties and movements of Latin America, in order to take up common strategy in the struggle against imperialism, whose arrogance has reached such an intolerable point as in the case of Guatemala. The situation is ripe for an understanding which will quicken the rhythm of revolutionary action by the people and overthrow bloody and reactionary dictatorships like those of Venezuela, Peru, Paraguay or Nicaragua."

The Popular Socialist Party of Chile is both anti-Stalinist and anti-Peronist.

The Trade-Union Press And the Indochina War

By BEN HALL

The trade-union press has not been overconcerned with the course of the war in Indochina. While the country may have been on the edge of a new war, labor leaders and labor editors—all men of restraint and balance—succeeded in arranging daily affairs in a mood of routine calm.

But they have commented. In a common consensus, they agreed that things were critical for a moment; French imperialism came in for outright rebuke; Eisenhower and his administration were chided or castigated for muddling; above all, the curtain of official censorship which smothered the facts was deplored. All in all, the labor leadership made clear that it was not happy at the possibility of involvement in Indochina.

But did they oppose actual entry in the war, did they demand, or even urge, a hands-off policy? Seek not a clear-cut answer to such simple questions.

Instead of forthright opposition, the trade-union press voiced vague and cloudy complaints. The "official" attitude in all its evasive uncertainty is summed up unwittingly by Willard Shelton in his regular column in the CIO News.

"Most of our people do not know it, but the Eisenhower administration has twice been on the brink of direct American intervention in the Indochinese war," he writes, citing sources, proofs, dates. "It is still suggested by Republican leaders," he adds, "that we may go to war within 30 days."

And Shelton comes right to the point in explaining what kind of war it is: "The war in that unhappy land is, fundamentally, a colonial war, in which the majority of the people . . . seem to sym-

pathize with Ho Chi Minh, the Communist and Nationalist leader rather than with the French." Further, "the French tried to hold on to their 'empire' nonsensically."

And still further: "The issue in Asia is only secondarily military. It is primarily political, and the politics is the urgency of the people to get rid of the white man's colonial overlordship, French or American."

ANTICLIMAX

If this is all true, we await the concluding call to keep out of this "colonial war." But like our labor leadership, Shelton is not to be trapped into a policy line merely because it is obviously just and right.

He finds the stories of contemplated intervention "shocking," as he puts it, "not because the Eisenhower administration was seriously considering the intrusion of American force in Indochina but because the policy line was shortsighted and because the president, apparently, spent his time in 'agonizing reappraisals' rather than in making firm decisions that he could take to the people."

The important thing, it seems, is to be "firm."

What is the writer's own firm conclusion? "If President Eisenhower thinks it is his duty to take up the intervention in Indochina he should express his reasons plainly and answer our doubts rather than let military and civil subordinates experiment with alternate shock treatments and frightened withdrawals." Period. The column ends.

Capsule summary of the column: This is a rotten, unhappy, colonial war. Therefore, if we are to get in it, the president should tell us personally and clearly.

CIO Candidates Wins in Newark Election

By CARL DIRKSON

NEWARK, June 16—Yesterday James Callaghan, an organizer of the progressive CIO electrical workers union (IUE), District 4, was elected to a councilman's seat in the newly reorganized Newark city government.

His victory came as the climax of a long and bitter fight between an original 19 rivals for the four "at-large" councilmanic seats, eleven of whom were eliminated in an election last month.

Although there was one other "CIO candidate," Raymond Santoro, in the run-off, Callaghan represented by far the more legitimate aspirations of the militant political activists in the New Jersey CIO. Santoro's support was mostly along nationalistic lines, his strength lying in the predominantly Italian North Ward, whereas Callaghan derived his support almost entirely from the labor and liberal elements from which he arose.

Although, due to a number of reasons, Callaghan did not have enough of organized labor backing, he was definitely a CIO candidate and his victory will be a shot in the arm to advanced elements of the trade-union movement in Newark and in New Jersey.

Callaghan was backed by the Essex-

West Hudson CIO Council, the traditional center of all CIO political activity in this area, by Mayor Carlin, who originally came out of the AFL Teamsters, and by the Newark Citizens Committee, an independent organization with a liberal leadership which sponsored a movement to rewrite the city charter and organize the city government along "good government" lines last November.

He also had his own organization, the Callaghan Boosters, which was organized at the last minute, and which consisted predominately of workers from shops in the IUE District 4 who met and knew Callaghan in connection with his trade-union activity.

Callaghan received some financial help from the CIO Council, but his organization was characterized by its continued bankruptcy and his workers were mostly volunteers.

Some of the reasons advanced to explain the inadequacy of ORGANIZED CIO support in the campaign were as follows.

A number of the local CIO secondary leaders were tied to Democratic and Republican machine politicians along racial or nationalistic lines, in their districts. In the CIO Council and the CIO-PAC these elements were either apathetic to-

LABOR SCOPE

NEW CIO RETAIL UNION FORMS BY MERGER

By BEN HALL

A special convention of the CIO Oil Workers Union, on June 1, voted to ratify the merger of the union with a group of independents. The new organization, the Oil and Chemical Workers International Union, is to be set up formally in August. Details of this merger have been reported previously in LA.

Meanwhile another merger has already gone off. At Atlantic City on May 24-27, three unions united to form a greater Retail Clerks Union within the CIO.

The new union will start with a membership of 140,000. The CIO Retail Union brought in 70,000 members. The CIO Jewelry Workers came in with 20,000. And the Distributive, Processing and Office Workers joined with 50,000. This merger comes after a long and devious evolution.

The Distributive Union had been set up by the Office Workers Union; the Food and Tobacco Union, and District 65, shortly after the expulsion of Stalinist-dominated unions from the CIO. After an internal factional struggle, the Stalinists were defeated and last year the union received a temporary CIO charter pending a merger with the CIO Retail Union.

As all this was taking place, the CIO Retail Union entered a period of stagnation and disintegration culminating in a near-revocation of its CIO charter. Under Phil Murray, the CIO allowed the union to remain in existence but chartered a new Department Store Organizing Committee which was presumably destined to supplant the old Retail Union. But the new committee failed utterly to make any progress; it remains an insignificant force.

Recently, Walter Reuther proposed that the CIO Retail Union surrender its charter; that a new Organizing Commit-

tee be set up to begin a big campaign to unionize the field. But a majority of the union's executive board rejected this proposition.

The formation of the new Retail Union once again establishes a strong and independent union within the CIO. It can count on 60,000 members in the New York metropolitan area and 25,000 others in the East. It has the nucleus of a strong organization, 11,000 in Michigan and 10,000 members in the South.

Barry Miller Case Raises Issue of Army 'McCarthyism'

The first reported victim of the army's new McCarthyite policy on the treatment of "subversives" has been discharged at Fort Monmouth on June 8 with an "undesirable" discharge.

Barry Miller was accused by the army of having belonged to the Politics Club of the University of Chicago, the Socialist Youth League and the Independent Socialist League. Miller did not deny the "charges," but insisted in his reply that none of these organizations are "subversive," and that his former political associations and his beliefs have no bearing on his correct behavior in the army and should not be used as a basis for penalizing him or discriminating against him.

Miller was broken to a private, and given an "undesirable" discharge despite the fact that he had been informed by the adjutant general on April 1 that he would be retained in the army without promotion, and would be given a discharge "appropriate to his service record." Miller, who had been a radar instructor at Fort Monmouth, had an excellent service record, and received the highest commendation from his civilian superiors.

Norman Thomas, and Rowland Watts of the Workers Defense League (Watts has been acting as Miller's attorney) have protested the discharge in most vigorous terms to Secretary of the Army Stevens.

Norman Thomas has written that "it seems to me that a man is entitled to a hearing for which he has asked, before he receives the serious stigma of an undesirable discharge, and not after. . . ."

"Your procedure seems to me a little like putting a man in jail on a charge of theft, and then dragging him out to find if he is guilty."

A full story on the case of former Corporal Barry R. Miller will appear in next week's LABOR ACTION.

STRIKES REPORTED BEHIND IRON CURTAIN

News of the "second successful strike conducted behind the Iron Curtain" has been announced by the headquarters of the Free Europe Committee. Women employees of the Vigona organization in the Bohemia section of Czechoslovakia, manufacturers of work clothes, staged a one-day strike last April 3 in protest over the dismissal of 45 women workers. The layoffs, which management said were necessitated by a lack of work, resulted in a strike by the firm's 215 female and 22 male employees.

When preliminary negotiations between the workers and management ended in a stalemate, the district trade union council intervened and reinstated the discharged workers.

Two women, Helena Podlipska and M. Vackova, were arrested two days later for allegedly giving shelter to criminals, although the workers at the Vigona factory believe their arrest was an act of vengeance for organizing the strike.

Free Europe Press goes on to say that the "first successful strike" reported in a satellite country took place a month earlier by miners in Varpalota, near Budapest, Hungary, who staged a successful two-day sitdown strike for improved working conditions.

These two victories by workers behind the Iron Curtain reflect a deterioration of the economy in the satellite countries and a determined effort on the part of Stalinist officials to avoid irritating a potentially explosive situation.

Labor Action FORUM

New York City

HAL DRAPER

on

GUATEMALA Between U.S. Imperialism and Stalinism

THURSDAY, JULY 8 at 8:30 p.m.

LABOR ACTION HALL

114 West 14 Street, New York City

In a 'Backward' Country

News item from the N. Y. Times, June 9:

RIO DE JANEIRO, June 8—Two Brazilian courts have ruled that human need outranks property rights.

A labor court, on appeal, upheld a decision that "to steal in case of extreme necessity, as for example when there is sickness in the family, does not constitute a crime worthy of being punished." Consequently, a shoe factory in the state of Minas Gerais was ordered to reinstate with full back pay a workman who had been caught stealing.

Counsel for the defense said he had been earning a "starvation wage" and had been made desperate by his family's needs.

Burma Inaugurates Big Land Distribution Program

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, June 17 — Important events have been happening in Burma which may well change the history of the whole area.

On June 4 the Speaker of the Burmese Assembly, on behalf of Thakin Tin, the minister of land nationalization, presented farmers with the title deeds to 35,000 acres of land being distributed under the Land Nationalization Act of October 1953.

Under this act, a 10-year plan has been drawn up to distribute 10,000,000 acres to be farmed by 200,000 mutual-aid schemes and 50,000 cooperatives. This plan is intended to be completed by 1962.

No farmer is to have more than 50 acres, and all his produce is to be marketed cooperatively. The government of the union is giving financial aid where necessary to help both mutual-aid schemes and cooperatives.

In Lower Burma half of the available acreage, and in Upper Burma one sixth, is now owned by non-agriculturalists. The government envisages the distribution of this unused land first before it proceeds with the splitting up of the large estates.

BLOW AT LANDLORDS

It has always viewed with economic suspicion the large areas owned by absentee landlords. Thakin Tin pointed out that they were not even as useful as capitalists who reinvested their money in industry. They just spent it away from the land. The profits the state derives from the land will help to capitalize the new industries of which Burma is in such great need.

There are very good reasons why land in Burma is ripe for nationalization. Very many farmers were ruined by the 1929-1931 slump in the price of rice. They had become seriously indebted to money lenders.

The war in Burma not only disrupted communications, preventing the marketing of rice, but it left the oil wells and wolfram mines in the hands of various political adventurers masquerading as Karens, nationalists, communists, etc. Furthermore, since the war, about one quarter of the whole of Burma, particularly around Toungou, has been inaccessible to government control and at the mercy of various groups. Some of these have plundered as an occupation, but others have had to steal crops to keep themselves alive.

The government has attempted to solve

the problems of the Karens by creating a semi-autonomous state for them, with a minister in the government responsible for them. With the various insurgents' armies, however, the Burmese government has been in a difficult position.

Most of its troops have been deployed since 1949 in an attempt to expel the Chinese Nationalists (about 10,000) from their northern border. The biggest fear of the Burmese government is that Mao's Chinese will use the provocative raids of the Kuomintang men as an excuse for invading Burma.

For the last two years many reports have been reaching Rangoon of Chinese Stalinist infiltration. An agreement between the Burmese, Siamese, United States and Formosan governments about the evacuation of these troops resulted in the return of only two thousand out of the 10,000 Nationalists. Meanwhile the Burmese army drains its military resources trying to expel them.

Despite all these difficulties the Socialist Anti-Fascist Peoples Front led by Thakin Nu has carried out a large number of important measures, of which land nationalization is far and away the most important. Rice, tea and teak are the three most important exports of the country. These exports last year reached 81 per cent of the 1938-39 figure, compared with 74 per cent the year before.

NATIONALIZATION

The following industries and services have been nationalized since the war: (1) The Irrawaddy Flotilla Company and the Arakan Flotilla Company; (2) the tramways and electric supply of Burma; (3) the teak-exporting industry; (4) the hospitals; (5) a company has been formed between the Burmese government (one third shares) and the important pre-war oil owners to mine oil. The Burmese government reserves the right to increase its percentage of ownership.

No one could pretend that the situation in Burma is all that it could be. The government has no control over large areas of territory, threatened by adventurers. The chances of trouble from Stalinist China are quite considerable, and there is no way of avoiding it.

Nevertheless, the tackling of the land problem, the rehabilitation of the Karens, the attempt to reject the Nationalist Chinese, and the improvement in economic health of Burma all augur well for the future. We can only wish the socialist-led government the very best of luck.

Behind Mau Mau Lies White Oppression in Kenya

From *Toward Freedom, A Newsletter on Colonial Affairs* (Chicago), June issue.

By SIDNEY LENS

There is much that does not meet the naked eye in this Mau Mau business.

Most significant is the age-old problem of African land hunger which lurks menacingly in the background.

Liberal circles in London are convinced that unless this issue is met no solution for Mau Mau or anything else in Kenya is possible. The white man came to this land at the end of the last century at the invitation of the British government and settled there. He got the choice acreage on both sides of the newly built railroad, in parcels of 1,000 to 40,000 acres, and he himself, according to African sources, has never lifted a hand in manual labor since.

The five and a half million tribesmen, on the other hand, not only lost this choice area and were pushed into reservations, but also had to give up their rights in reserve areas that they had always considered their own. Since their poor farming techniques quickly exploited the soil, these reserves were desperately needed. For all this there was not one penny of indemnification. And to make matters worse the colonists devised a slick system for recruiting cheap labor from amongst those whom they had dispossessed. Taxes payable only in money, not in crops, were levied on the populace and those who couldn't pay up were forced to go to work on the white plantations.

INCREASED POVERTY

Here they were given the materials to build their own hut, an acre of land, sometimes two, for their own use, and a contract for a year's work. These "squatters," as they are called, receive even today monthly wages varying from 98 cents to \$2.24—monthly, not daily or weekly. The difficulties of keeping body and soul together on this kind of wage can be judged by the fact that the staple food of the area—*posho*, a sort of maize—has increased in price by 60 per cent since 1938.

Those natives left on the reservations have been constantly pressed into smaller and smaller strips of land. As each generation died and the brothers divided the holdings, the average acreage became smaller and the poverty of course greater.

Some natives left the reservations for the big cities, but they are no better off. Industry is undeveloped and jobs are not

too easy to find. In Nairobi alone there are 10,000 homeless. Two British Members of Parliament, Fenner Brockway and Leslie Hale, visited Kenya and on their return described apartments in a municipal house ten feet by ten feet square in which three married couples lived, and somewhat better accommodations, twelve by fifteen, which housed two married couples, four children and one goat.

Africans are segregated into their own schools—the few there are—their own clinics, etc. They must be out of the towns and back on their reservations before dark, and they must constantly carry a hated work card, called Kipandi, wherever they go. This Kipandi had been abolished by the Labor government but was later reintroduced. Above all, what rankles most is the inequality of life.

Until recently the African had no representation at all in the Legislative Council of Kenya. The recent "reform" in representation gives 5½ million Africans one member of the ministerial council and about 30,000 Europeans, three members.

SCARED WHITES

Under these circumstances of life, rebellious sentiments are bound to fester. The demand for land has been so pressing that the very Kikuyu chiefs who are supposed to be serving the British have taken up the cry. One venerable chieftain in particular, Koinange Mbiyu, has been giving vocal expression to this demand. The white settlers plant only one million acres while 6 million lie idle. About 150,000 square miles of land and water are "unallocated."

The whites fear that any compromise on this land issue can only mean a loss of their own holdings. Any political changes, they feel, will eventually mean a lower standard of life for themselves. The Africans, on the other hand, insist that 5½ million people must have at least equality with 30,000 settlers and 120,000 Arabs and Indians. A moderate native organization, the Kenya African Union, has been urging a new constitution and a sensible resolution of the land question. Its pleas have not only gone unheeded, but it has been banned on the pretext of connections with Mau Mau.

When all the sensationalism of Mau Mau eventually dies down it seems certain that what will emerge in clear focus is a burning desire by a native population for some kind of land settlement, the same kind of burning desire which is activating hundreds of millions of colonials in Asia and other parts of Africa to seek independence.

Has British Terrorism Stopped the Stalinists in Malaya?

In its issue of May 14, the London Tribune presented the following assessment of the record made in the Malayan war by General Templer, Britain's "strong-arm man" in the colony. Templer was scheduled to return to England on May 31, his period of duty ended.

By IAN AITKEN

"Imagine the aftermath of a moderate earthquake and you have a fair picture of much of rural Malaya today."

The author of this sentence, Dr. Victor Purcell, was for 25 years a member of the Malayan Civil Service. He had sincerely believed in the progressive role of Britain in leading Malaya to nationhood and self-government, and had said so repeatedly in his position as Malayan Director General of Information.

But in 1952 he paid a return visit to the Federation of Malaya. He was horrified by what he saw.

"Malaya had become a vast armed camp in which no one could call his soul his own, and the clock of progress had been stopped for the duration of the emergency.

"The basic policy was a crude divide and rule. If this was the logical consequence of eighty-odd years of British administration and development, I had better think again, and from the beginning."

He thought again, and his conclusions were so alarming that he felt bound to publish them. The result, *Malaya: Communist or Free?* (Gollancz, 15s.), is a devastating assault on Oliver Lyttleton and his strong-arm tactics.

The Tory Colonial Secretary has described his own policy more succinctly than anyone else: "a muscular organization, a clear chain of command, and then

the men to make the measures live."

In Malaya, the man who made the measures live, the Federation's "moderate earthquake," has been General Sir Gerald Templer. He was, to use his own expression, "the boss."

Sent to Malaya within four months of the Tory victory at the polls in October 1951, he immediately became the most powerful High Commissioner ever to rule the country.

Armed with a directive from the Colonial Secretary which gave him complete operational command over all armed forces in the Federation, his official instructions were that his primary task would be "the restoration of law and order."

FIRE IN HIS BELLY

He set about it in a manner characteristic of his personality. He had "fire in his belly," and he let the world know it.

His methods were harsh. From the beginning he used reprisals as a weapon against the Communist "bandits." Communal punishment of villages suspected of aiding the terrorists became an accepted policy, with only the most half-hearted protests from Britain.

Huts were burned, curfews were imposed, food rations were cut.

Whole villages were taken into detention. And, in one terrible instance, an entire hamlet was razed to the ground.

But instead of growing in volume, the protests against this Black and Tan policy gradually faded. For strongarm Templer seemed to be getting results. Figures of "kills" were rising, and those of "incidents" were falling. One woman's verdict, quoted by Dr. Purcell, became the almost universal verdict of the

British press: "Templer is the best thing that ever happened to Malaya."

"British 'justice'" and "British fair play" were thrown overboard. "The requirements of law and order" took their place. This was the justification for official terrorism.

It was a barbarous and stupid justification for a barbarous and stupid policy. But what is worse, it was based on an illusion.

CP TURN

Dr. Purcell has revealed that it was not Templer's police state which caused the Communists to abandon their terror drive. It was called off by the deliberate decision of the Communist leadership itself. And this decision was taken well before General Templer had even arrived in Malaya.

In other words, if any victory had been won, it had been won by Templer's moderate predecessor, Sir Henry Gurney.

Dr. Purcell's evidence for this conclusion is a document captured by the security forces late in 1952, long after the arrival of General Templer. It was a Communist directive issued to the guerrilla forces in October 1951, four months before the general took office.

And its purport was that the expansion of the party's organization among the masses was in future to take precedence over purely military and terrorist activity.

Acts of terrorism were to be abandoned except in specific cases. Instead, the party machine was to be directed to the infiltration of the trade unions and other popular organizations.

This directive took some time to filter through to the scattered guerrilla forces.

But it reached them eventually. And it was obeyed.

This, then, was the explanation of the remarkable falling off in terrorism in General Templer's first year of office. Its resurgence this year is plain evidence that the by-product of Templerism—hatred of the British—is now taking its inevitable effect.

Left with only the shreds of his military policy, what has General Templer achieved in the political and social fields? Dr. Purcell's answer is as uncompromising on this point as on the military one. The only positive feature of the Templer regime, he says, is "the policy of divide and rule."

Ignorant of the complexities of racial relations within a population composed of Chinese and Malays in almost equal proportions (plus a large addition of Indians), Templer's deliberate efforts to accentuate communal divisions are childishly obvious to everyone.

And far from making any progress toward the professed British objective of democratic self-government, Templer has presented Malaya with nothing more than an insulting and bogus system of village councils.

His action has served only to emphasize his fundamental distrust and contempt for the Malayan people.

What is the alternative policy? Purcell does not believe that Communism offers any genuine solution of the Malayan dilemma. He does not believe that it is a truly national movement.

If it were, he says, he would be in favor of clearing out of Malaya without further ado. But it is still confined largely to a small section of one part of the community—the Chinese.

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

Rebuttal in Dispute on Inventions and Inventors

The following letter by Comrade Howard is in reply to J. R.'s letter published last week.—Ed.

To the Editor:

J. R. is a simple national chauvinist. He is worried about the "denigration of our national traditions." He believes that history will eventually judge that "the word American will stand for that technological development which made possible an abundance that will guarantee a full life to free men." The nationalistic arrogance here revealed is an article of religious faith, and is not shaken by the most imposing array of facts.

I hold that as socialists our loyalty belongs not to any particular nation, but to all humanity with the exception of the exploiting ruling classes. The greatest divisive force among the workers everywhere is national chauvinism, that patriotic devotion to a certain piece of real estate and a colored rag, in defense of which they will join hands with the class enemy.

I am charged with being one-sided, a chauvinist in reverse. I mentioned, and only mentioned, some of the areas in which the U. S. is superior. I did not dwell upon them because that is already being done by big-business advertising, by political orators, and people like J. R. I saw my task as pricking the air out of a lot of fraudulent bubbles.

To return to J. R., he does not demolish my facts. Most of them he does not even discuss. The criteria of progress which I cited were in the fields of scientific achievement, health progress, life expectancy, infant mortality, diet, education, literacy and culture. J. R. ignores all of the facts I have presented on all these subjects save a single phase of scientific achievement. Of the three criteria I used to measure this, Nobel prizes, discovery of elements, and inventions, J. R. chose to dispute only the last, and on this his whole case rests.

And even here he does not show that Americans have invented most of the items I mentioned. He merely says that I have given too much credit to certain individuals, but when he gets through naming those whom he believes should really get the credit for these discoveries, we find that the foreigners are still stubbornly leading by a mile.

The question of who was the first man to invent something, or whether any single individual can be credited with any discovery, could be argued forever, and to no purpose. Foreseeing this kind of fruitless disputation, I wrote that "inventions and discoveries are never truly the result of any single investigator or nation, but are the fruit of international research and progress." I mentioned also William F. Ogborn's *Social Change*, which lists a large number of inventions and discoveries made almost simultaneously in various countries.

Even the reference books do not always agree as to which inventor made the first successful doohickey. I used the listing of the 1954 *World Almanac*, for the most part, but my aim was not to show that any certain man invented any certain thing, but to demolish the arrogant assumption that Americans invented everything.

He says that Benz and not Daimler should get the credit for the first gas-powered auto. They both produced their cars about the same time, although the *World Almanac* gives Daimler the credit.

But they are both foreigners, both Germans. Where is my argument shaken by this kind of silly wrangling?

He rages because I gave Diesel the credit for inventing "the" internal-combustion engine. I am aware that different kinds of such engines have been invented, many before Diesel, but the type of engines which Diesel made was quite different, and is no more like the one in my car than a canoe is like Fulton's steamboat. Here again, J. R. is merely being petty.

I confess an error in one question of fact, when I inadvertently called Langley an Englishman. Such an error can creep into the most respectable textbooks, but nevertheless I accept responsibility for this one. (Would it pain J. R. too much if I added that the Smithsonian Institution, where Langley worked, was established by an Englishman?)

However, Langley has no important bearing on my case. The Englishmen who contributed to the development of the airplane before the Wrights were John Stringfellow, William Henson, and Sir Hiram Maxim. One source asserts that the first man-carrying powered plane was flown by the Frenchman Clement Ader in 1892, eleven years before Kitty Hawk. Santos Dumont flew a gasoline-powered plane in France in 1906, before he knew of the Wright brothers' flight, which was not widely publicized.

J. R. seeks to strengthen Kelly's claim to priority in steel-making by citing claims that Kelly was able to convince the courts of his priority. I never expected to see an alleged socialist lean on the decisions of the courts for support. The 1954 *World Almanac* gives Bessemer priority over Kelly by one year in this particular matter, but it does not matter much if the book should be in error also. I concede that there have been some American inventors, if that is what J. R. wishes me to concede.

J. R. believes that the U. S. can claim the Russian inventor Ipatieff because he lived in the U. S. since 1931. However, he is credited with the discovery of high-octane gas a year earlier. Da Vinci "proposed" a helicopter in the 16th century, so I am considered wrong in giving Brennan the credit. Why not give Da Vinci the credit for the airplane also, since he also proposed that? And since J. R. delights in going as far back into history as he can go to find the very earliest inventor of everything, why not give the credit for all inventions to the guys who discovered fire and the wheel? Shall we credit Hero of Alexandria with the invention of the steam engine? He made a primitive one in the 2nd century B.C., but society being in the condition it then was, there was no use for it and no point in developing it. A steamboat was constructed in Spain in the 16th century, and a steam-powered automobile was built in Paris in 1769 by Nicholas Joseph Cugnot, in the same year that Watt is supposed to have perfected the steam engine, which was again merely an improvement of Newcomen's engine built more than three decades earlier.

I do not give Marconi "all the credit" for inventing wireless, or Baird "all the credit" for inventing TV, or anyone else "all the credit" for inventing anything. I merely listed the inventors as shown in the latest reference works, adding the paragraph of caution already quoted.

J. R. concludes that he will not try our patience with similar examples of "statistical abuse" in the rest of my article. But since he smacked us with that lurid phrase "statistical abuse" he should certainly have been obliged to show us at least a few examples of it to justify his use of the phrase.

J. R. picks at trivial detail and inconsequential minutiae but he never manages to get around to my thesis that American superiority is a myth, nor does he get around to demolition of a single supporting pillar upon which my thesis rests.

Victor HOWARD

In Memory of Andres Nin

A memorial meeting on the occasion of the 17th anniversary of the assassination of Andres Nin will take place in Paris under the auspices of the Spanish POUM. Nin was tortured and murdered by the GPU machine in Spain during the civil war.

The POUM, the revolutionary socialist party of the Spanish working class embattled against Franco, asked the ISL to convey its message to the commemoration meeting, if possible through a representative in France. The following letter by the national chairman of the ISL was addressed to the meeting:

PEDRO BONET
Executive Committee of POUM
Paris

I regret very much that there is presently no representative of the Independent Socialist League in France to pay tribute, in its name, to the memory of Andres Nin at the meeting you have organized on the seventeenth anniversary of his assassination. You understand, surely, that what I am writing you in this letter expresses the feelings of every one of our comrades and our friends in this country, and all of them would be grateful to have them communicated to the comrades of the POUM.

I had the good fortune to meet Comrade Nin for the first time only after the overturn of the monarchy, when he was already in a position to demonstrate his distinguished qualities in the free and turbulent arena of the revolution in Spain. Before visiting him I already knew about him. He was one of the very first champions of the great Russian Revolution of October 1917, and of the Communist International when it still represented the hopes and aspirations of the freedom-seeking proletariat of the world. His magnificent work in the Red International of Labor Unions was just as well known.

Also well known to me, and especially appreciated by me as a representative of the tardy American supporters of the Trotskyist movement, was Nin's fearless, clear-cut and stubborn championing of the Russian Opposition from the very inception of its unsuccessful but unfor-

gettable fight to save the proletarian revolution from the cancer that had already begun to eat away its heart.

I had the bad fortune to remain in Catalonia for less than a fortnight only. But that was enough time to see that in Nin the Spanish Revolution had a man whose gifts of leadership could not be concealed by his unassuming modesty, and who was distinguished above all, it seemed to me, by that characteristic which is so rare today in the somber and critical times of our movement—a quiet, unquestioning confidence in the inexhaustible creative power of the working class, in the mission of human emancipation which belongs to it and to nobody else, and in the certainty that now or later it would accomplish its social destiny.

Behind the sinister hand that struck the assassin's blow lies a mind to which this confidence is not only alien but repugnant and disastrous. To this diseased mind, revolutionists like Nin were and remain an unendurable obstacle. He was struck down, like all the victims of the GPU, in the dark of the night and not in open struggle, and by base, depraved cowards whose "socialism" stands for the slave-owner's knout, the assassin's dagger and the hangman's noose.

To the diseased mind of Stalinism, as has been true of reaction throughout the ages, its crimes against Nin, as against Trotsky, as against the Russian Revolution, as against the world revolution and the world working class as a whole, can forever be committed with impunity. The Stalinists are profoundly mistaken. The day of reckoning is bound to come for them, too. When it comes, not only will the accounts be settled with them as they should be settled, but the names of their martyred victims will be restored to their shining purity in the records of man's struggle for socialist freedom. On the list of its noblest pioneers will stand the eminent name of Andres Nin.

On the occasion of this anniversary, we dip our flag in his honor and send, through you, the assurances of our firmest and warmest solidarity to all the militants of the POUM.

Max SHACHTMAN

From the STALINIST JUNGLE

Conscript Labor

The Polish Stalinist regime has used the army to rescue its mine management from what was an all but catastrophic labor situation.

Army brass has offered to discharge soldiers with at least two and a half years of service. The fine print on the discharge papers says that those discharged must first contract to work two years in the mines. The soldiers have the option, of course, of remaining in military service. Many of the troops, however, have elected to swap their uniforms for miners' outfits and some of them have had experience as miners.

Moreover — according to information released by the Free Europe Committee — the average Polish unit does only nine months of actual soldiering during his two and a half year hitch. The remainder is actually spent in the mines, or helping with the harvest, or helping fulfill the regime's plans on the industrial front. It is not unusual, for instance, to have a soldier sent directly from the induction station to the mines.

Of course, this use of soldiers in the pits also gives the Stalinist government a source of cheap labor, for while civilian miners receive the equivalent of \$45 per month for a 48-hour week, soldiers get nothing except their tiny military pay.

Not in the Cards

Edward Crankshaw, in the *Progressive* (May), gives two new and piquant illustrations of Russian censorship caught in the act.

Subscribers to the *Great Soviet Encyclopedia* have recently gotten instructions on how to fix up their copies on the entry "Beria." Current editions have a 3-column biography of the "traitor," plus a full-page portrait and a note on the town of Beria.

The instructions say: "The said pages [pages 21-24 of Vol. 5] should be cut out with scissors or a razor blade, keeping a margin next to the spine of the book to which the new pages can be attached." The new pages to be attached carry photos of whaling on the Bering Sea.

The East German Librarians' periodical

recently reprinted an article originally published in the Russian *Bibliotekar* in 1951, on the duties of librarians. Its in its explicit discussion of what is well known. The author, Ambartsumian, gives the "theory" of how librarians must make sure that their very catalogs are ideologically pure—i.e., that no material for criticism of the regime can be found except by approved specialists.

"The Soviet theory of library science has, in cataloguing, always followed the principle of partisanship, based on the ideological-political tasks of our libraries. This general ideological development of the Soviet theory of cataloguing has encountered resistance by a few who are still dominated by reactionary theories on libraries and catalogues. These 'theorists' who blindly accept the bourgeois theory consider the catalogue as an informative and technical instrument..."

"By making accessible the most important and valuable material, reading is directed. Systematic arrangement and cataloguing is subordinated to the aim of maximum usefulness and ideological conformity..."

So the librarian has to be careful what is included in the cards. To include the wrong stuff "would be an offense against the principle of ideological conformity of the catalogue."

For the special scholar who gets a license to read prohibited material, there is to be an additional "informative catalogue" strictly limited in use.

Russification

A leading Bulgarian philologist, Vladimir Georgief, has declared—according to the Stalinist regime's organ *Rabotnicheskoye Dielo*—that the Russian language has already become "every Bulgarian's second language." But that is not enough, for he adds: "From the pedagogical point of view, the pupils in Bulgarian schools must learn to think in Russian."

What this indicates, as a Bulgarian scientist is forced to mouth the Russians' hopes of domination like a robot, is that the aims and methods of Russification of the subject peoples have by no means been changed under the Malenkov regime.



LABOR ACTION

June 28, 1954 Vol. 18, No. 26

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

SUBSCRIBERS—ATTENTION!

Check your NAME—ADDRESS—CITY—ZONE—STATE appearing on the wrapper.

If there are any mistakes or if anything is left out, especially the ZONE NUMBER, cut out your name and address and mail it to us with the corrections clearly printed.

18-26

If the above number appears at the bottom of your address, your subscription expires with this issue.
RENEW NOW!

Univ. of Chicago Administration Turns the Clock Back

By EDWARD HILL

The University of Chicago, long known as a center of educational experimentation and as a radically oriented campus, was confronted with Philistia this week—in the chancellor's office.

Lawrence A. Kimpton, the chancellor of the university, was reported to have told a dinner of the "Order of the C" (the university's lettermen's association), that Chicago had a reputation for being "queer," and that therefore "this school has attracted every God-damned queer kid in the area."

Kimpton later denied making the statement, but more or less repeated the substance of it, using the phrase "quiz-kid" instead of "queer." The whole incident aroused student protest, and a letter was sent from the Summer Executive Committee of Student Government, by unanimous vote, recording the shock of the campus at Kimpton's behavior.

The incident did not appear to be isolated. It reportedly occurred at an "Order of the C" dinner where Frank Whiting, president of the group, stated that "Hutchins educated only the intellect; we want to educate the whole boy." This educational approach seemed to be chiefly characterized by an "Order of the C" campaign to return Chicago to intercollegiate sports by means of athletic scholarships, i.e., "educating the whole boy."

How does it happen that the head of one of America's greatest universities stigmatizes his own school.

Kimpton's immediate answer was financial—the "queer" reputation was keeping away students—but it was obviously related to broader issues. Within the educational field, reactionary attack had usually been directed against "progressive education" and John Dewey,

as "left-wing," "pink," etc. But the massive drift toward conformity, and particularly the Chicago incident, reveals that this concern was not one with experimental approach in education but with educational experiment itself.

BACK TO ORTHODOXY

Chicago, after all, had been noted as a center of the educational theories of Robert Hutchins, Mortimer Adler, Richard McKeon and others of their general school. Its ideology had been continually attacked by progressive educators as a reactionary traditionalism. Yet, whatever the actual estimate of the neo-Aristotelean along the Midway, their approach was a radical one; and if they called for tradition, it was for a radical renovation of tradition.

Under Kimpton's regime, a return to normalcy had been instituted. This is how Whiting, of the "Order of the C," describes this advance: "The present administration has done the university a great service in bringing back a more orthodox educational setup. . . . With the four-year degrees we will not have so many 14- and 15-year-olds; the older boys will have a better chance in athletic competition."

Thus the new theory. The idea of changing the archaic age system of American education falls, for it fails to meet the test of athletic competition.

That the attack was launched in this manner is, of course, only one part of the story. Finances may well be involved, but beyond that, there is the growing hostility toward any ideas, the propounding of a rigid orthodoxy which includes Apple Pie, Mom and Sports. In such a context, the relation between the new, garrison-state philistinism and Kimpton's reported use of the word "queer" is worth noting.

ANTI-INTELLECTUALISM

As Joseph Schumpeter pointed out, in his *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*, the intellectual is a relatively new arrival in America. The founding of the University of Chicago itself, at the turn of the century, as a maverick intellectual institution, could serve as a good date to mark the beginnings of a real American intellectual community. At the same time, America was one of the first nations to develop the notion of "common sense." This tradition had progressive origins in frontier democracy, but it also produced excesses, like the border-state congressman of the mid-nineteenth century who was elected because he could not read or write.

Suffice it to say that there is a long-standing American populist distrust of intellectuals, city slickers, and the like, derived largely from agrarian and frontier democracy. By itself, this tradition would probably have been a healthy phenomenon, an assertion of popular independence.

But within the context of the garrison state, the tradition has become perverted (indeed, one could argue that a whole host of American traditions have been effected in a similar way). A more or less politically bankrupt America could not look toward the creativity of its tradition of dissent and iconoclasm; it could only hoard it. Real discussion, whether by intellectuals or by anyone else, threatened the status quo.

Thus anti-intellectualism became one of the hallmarks of the permanent war economy. A university like Chicago, built on the egghead assumption that higher education was for education and not football, could not long remain immune from the trend. The shocking thing is that the attack seems to be coming from within the university and not from without.

QUEER SMEAR

Tied in with the anti-intellectualism of the garrison state were the sexual undertones in Kimpton's reported use of the word "queer." For another hallmark of the new Know-Nothings was their identification of scholarship and sexual deviancy.

The homosexual has been specifically under attack for well over five years. In the nightmare of the loyalty and security program, he or she becomes a "security risk," not on the grounds of dubious loyalty, but because of being open to blackmail. Why a homosexual is more open to blackmail than a philandering heterosexual is not explained. Indeed, it cannot be. But deeper than any pseudo-theory of blackmail-proneness is the other Know-Nothing identification, that of the homosexual with "radical" and "subversive," and of all of them with the intellectual.

It is within this trend that an American senator could make the broadest hints about the sexuality of a presidential candidate. It is within this trend that the chancellor of an American university can stigmatize his own student body with the appellation "queer."

What the Chicago incident points out is, I think, quite ominous. The distrust of any kind of deviance has permeated into the very heart of our educational system. It could not do so without a concomitant drift in all areas of American society. The significance is that a kind of totalitarian principle seems to be at work.

For totalitarianism is "modern" in the sense that it seeks the total substitution

High School Strike

The role of the student in colonial anti-imperialist movements has long been well known. In underdeveloped countries, the youth, especially those who have had the opportunity of secondary-school or college training, usually form a forward element in the struggle against foreign exploitation.

Great Britain has had this lesson brought home to it many times in the twentieth century, but the student has to continue to instruct the master.

Last week, a thousand students at Chung Cheng Chinese High School in Singapore went on their second sitdown strike in less than a month. The demonstration was staged against compulsory military service.

The anti-imperialist students carried on the struggle against the entreaties of Chinese leaders and of their own parents. While the pleas rang out over loud-speakers, the students barricaded themselves in the school building and refused to leave.

Spokesmen for the demonstrators said that they would send a new demand for exemption from conscription if their position is not recognized by Tuesday. They added that they would make a civil-disobedience campaign if they are refused. One hundred and thirty are ready to refuse national service.

of its principle—the State, Loyalty, etc.—for all principles in society. It does not, as tyranny or dictatorship, confine itself to the military and political orders. It must penetrate to the very will of a society, to the voluntary and autonomous centers of human activity as well as to the politically organized.

Incidents like Chicago do not mean that the United States is totalitarian, or that actual totalitarianism is imminent. They do mean that we are confronted with something far deeper than reactionary legislation. We are confronted with a reactionary movement in all areas of society, in the voluntary as well as in those ruled over by the state coercive machinery.

In this particular area, that of education, the issue may well depend on the American student. Only vocal, organized opposition to this trend can stop it. At New York University, in the smearing of the YSL at Berkeley and Los Angeles, the Young Socialist League attempted to participate in this struggle. We will do so at Chicago. Yet unless there is a real awakening on the American campus, Philistia will prevail, not by military fiat or political repression, but by the voluntary capitulation of the American university to fear, to hysteria, to conformity.

The YSL's Aim

The Young Socialist League is a democratic socialist organization striving to aid in the basic transformation of this society into one where the means of production and distribution shall be collectively owned and democratically managed. The YSL attempts to make the young workers and students, who form its arena of activity, conscious of the need for organization directed against capitalism and Stalinism.

The YSL rejects the concept that state ownership without democratic controls represents socialism; or that socialism can be achieved without political democracy, or through undemocratic means, or in short in any way other than the conscious active participation of the people themselves in the building of the new social order. The YSL orients toward the working class, as the class which is capable of leading society to the establishment of socialism.

—From the Constitution of the YSL

YSL FUND DRIVE

We Need a Big Spurt Right Now!

By SCOTT ARDEN

The first national Fund Drive of the Young Socialist League officially ends on June 30. As the score below indicates, unless a considerable amount of money is received within the next week or so the drive will fall far short of its \$1500 goal.

How far short depends completely upon you, our members and readers. The only thing that can save the drive now is one final spurt of energy—and a big spurt at that.

Every unit is urged to do the maximum possible now, while the drive is still officially on. The decision of the National Executive Committee is that the drive will formally end for all units at the same time.

However, several units (most notably Berkeley and New Haven) have indicated that they would be able to complete (or even go over—in the case of New Haven) their quotas but would require an extension of time to do so.

It has been decided that these, and all other units, are instructed that they must make a real effort to finish the drive completely, 100 per cent, this month. Those

units, however, that simply cannot manage to do so should immediately inform the National Office.

Rather than extend the drive, the remainder of the quotas will, in these cases, be considered pledges payable to the N.O. within a specified length of time. We hope that these cases will be few, needless to say, but it is essential that the N.O. be informed without delay by any unit in this category. The final Fund Drive report will announce the final scores and will, additionally, indicate which of the "incomplete" units intend to fulfill their responsibilities.

Members-at-large should do the same. That is, send in every cent available now, and make specific pledges where this is indicated.

DO IT NOW

Those who are not members of the YSL but who consider themselves friendly to us are reminded that their financial help is both needed and welcome. Contributions are always in order but it is now that they can do the most good.

The newly formed Pittsburgh unit of the YSL has not been assigned an official quota for this drive but it is hoped that our comrades there will make every effort possible, of an immediate nature, so that Pittsburgh will be included in the final tally.

At this stage of the drive there should be no necessity to reiterate in any detail what failure will mean to the organization. It is sufficient, in our opinion, to repeat simply this: The YSL needs every dollar it can get, and its up to you, as a member or friend of the YSL, to demonstrate that the YSL will get every dollar it needs. We call upon you to demonstrate this now.

What's the Score?

	Quota	Paid-in	%
Total	\$1500	\$976.50	65
Chicago	200	164	82
New York	675	515	76
At Large	170	110	64
Newark	50	30	60
New Haven	35	20	57
Berkeley	100	50	50
Los Angeles	200	87.50	44
Boston	70	0	0

Who Can Save Democracy in Germany?

Middle Class or Working Class? Adenauer or SPD?

By L. G. SMITH

One of the standard liberal-capitalist criticisms of Marxism revolves around the Marxist conception of the class structure of society and of the dominant importance of the struggle between classes in both economic and political affairs. The liberals tend to maintain that democracy in modern society is a product of the rise of a large middle class, and that it can be maintained only as long as this middle class is healthy and can act as a powerful counterweight to, or middle ground between, the extremes of wealth and poverty in a society.

Liberalism rejects the idea that as capitalism develops the middle class is bound to lose in social importance, and that the tendency is toward a polarization of society between the big capitalists and the working class. It rejects the idea that in these circumstances the working class becomes the real bearer of democracy, that its struggle for democracy and for political power is the only safeguard against a degeneration of capitalist society into authoritarian and eventually totalitarian patterns.

The June 20 issue of the New York Times Magazine carried an article by veteran Times foreign correspondent M. S. Handler entitled "Now the Nationalists Challenge Adenauer." The article is written from a strictly American liberal pro-capitalist point of view. But curiously enough, when it deals with a criticism of the role of the German labor movement and the Social-Democratic Party of Germany (SPD), the assumptions of the criticism are much closer to those associated with Marxist socialist views.

Where's the Bulwark?

The main theme of Handler's article is the resurgence of German conservative nationalism under the leadership of the big capitalists of the Ruhr and Rhineland. The chief immediate danger, as he sees it, is that Adenauer's pro-American, "European" policy may be scuttled in favor of a policy designed to place Germany in the position of a "bridge" between the Stalinist and capitalist worlds, or more accurately, to give Germany a much greater latitude for maneuver and hence more leverage in bargaining with the other capitalist powers. As evidence, he points, among other things, to the recent speeches of former Chancellors Bruening and Luthner in which they advocated a return to the "Locarno" policies of the Weimar Republic.

But Handler is also concerned with the revival of nationalism in many fields, including that of education. Despite his almost worshipful attitude toward Chancellor Adenauer, he freely admits that "the organic basis for a new German nationalism has been reconstituted despite Adenauer's vigorous political leadership. This basis is to be found in the forceful reassertion of German social, economic and educational traditions in the past four years."

It is at this point that Handler launches into his criticism of the German labor movement and, a bit later on, of the role of the Social-Democratic Party:

"Paternalistic management-labor relations, for example, have been restored completely. The paternalistic hold of management over the workers and the use of management arguments by union leaders in the assessment of economic problems have resurrected the almost unbroken uniformity and drive for conformity which have characterized German social and economic relations since the beginning of the Industrial Revolution in this country.

"As a defensive bulwark for West Germany's new-found democratic political order the trade unions are no longer rated high. Conformity, the fear of creating any sort of disturbance, and the failure to break with management concepts of profit, loss and wages have again transformed the trade-union movement into a potential collaborator of any regime that will promise full employment, social security and a welfare that will take care of a citizen from the cradle to the grave."

The second paragraph quoted above is, of course, an outright slander of the German labor movement. The implication is clear enough that the union movement was at least a "potential collaborator" with the Nazi regime which promised the welfare-state benefits listed. The actual fact of the matter was that the Nazis had to destroy the old German labor movement, imprison the bulk of its leadership, and replace it with a new "Labor Front" before they could feel any degree of safety for their regime.

Americanization

The rest of the quotation, though not altogether accurate, comes a bit closer to the truth. The German trade-union movement is in theory for a degree of "co-determination" in industry which would amount to a healthy slice of workers' control within the capitalist framework. In theory the labor movement is also for a good deal more in the way of higher wages and other benefits for the workers.

But the ideological leaders of the German labor movement are also for labor-management cooperation, for a "constructive" relationship between the unions and the corporations. The economic boom in Western Germany has led them to accept the idea that capitalism can be made to work, and that as long as the workers are getting a higher standard of living as a result of the boom, there is not really much point to putting up a big fight for demands which exceed what the employers are willing to give over the bargaining table.

In fact, the German labor leaders and theoreticians tend to talk and act so much like American labor leaders

and theoreticians that it is hard to tell them apart without an official program. In reading their material, one at times gets the distinct impression that many of them have absorbed American attitudes while they lived here during the war. They apply the same theories and attitudes in a somewhat different environment.

The difference resides not so much in the German character as in the fact that despite the boom German industry is built up on a far narrower base than is that of the United States, and hence it is far shakier. Thus, the employers can make a convincing argument that they can regain an adequate share of the world market (absolutely essential to continued growth and prosperity) only if the German workers are willing not to press their economic demands too far, that is, only if they are willing to take low wages, and thus make it possible for the capitalists to make a good profit and yet charge low prices.

Such arguments, if accepted by the workers, preclude a really serious struggle for higher wages and better working conditions. But it is exactly such arguments which are accepted by the textile unions in New England when they accept wage cuts, and by other unions in weak, over-competitive industries. They are the arguments accepted by workers in other industries in this country who back their bosses' demands for high tariffs to keep out competitive products from abroad.

Of course, accepting the arguments leads to giving up serious struggles, to what Marxists call "class collaboration," and if carried far enough, to the "paternalism" and "conformity" described by Handler.

But what is the alternative for the German workers? Handler does not say. What he probably has in mind is the kind of relationship which obtains between the best, most militant American unions and their employers in the strong industries where there is plenty of room for strikes and other struggles—plenty of room, that is, for struggles to take place which neither damage "national security" nor ruin the competitive position of any group of employers.

Of course, there is plenty of room for the German workers to conduct purely economic struggles against their employers. But the tighter the economy, the narrower its markets and its base of raw materials, the less room there is for such struggles inside the capitalist system, the more necessary and unavoidable it is for the workers, the labor movement, to oppose their own general interests to those of the employers, the more unavoidable is it for their struggles to pose an alternative economic, social and political organization of the society to the existing one.

The Social-Democrats

The political arm of the German working class, the Social-Democratic Party, faces the political struggle in the same framework. Handler discusses their political behavior as follows:

"Politically West Germany most certainly has the structural frame of a democratic order. But it is a democratic order which is so orderly and so cooperative with the executive that it is beginning to cause concern. . . .

"Even the Social-Democratic opposition to the government coalition has subsided into a well-disciplined and obedient group. Unlike the Labor Party opposition in the House of Commons, the Social-Democrats in the West German Bundestag rarely if ever exercises any influence on the policies of the chancellor.

"In domestic affairs the differences between the Social-Democrats and the government coalition are more apparent than real. True, the Social-Democrats ask for more tax relief for the workers, higher wages, more social security and better housing. They give lip service to the nationalization of iron, coal and steel. But in point of fact these claims are argued in the rarified atmosphere of academic discussion. The dynamic force which is expected of an opposition party in a democratic regime has disappeared since the death of Dr. Kurt Schumacher in August 1952.

"In matters concerning the very nature of the West German economic structure there is little choice between the Social-Democrats and the government coalition. The Social-Democrats and the trade unions oppose the prohibition of the cartels. They and the industrialists believe that cartels are useful and that only cartel abuses should be punished by the law.

"The Social-Democrats share with the government coalition the concept that free competition on the domestic market would produce harmful results and create unemployment. In other words, the Social-Democrats believe, as do their opponents, in a closed non-competitive market, regulated and carved up by a highly cartelized industry.

"Weighting high prices and a low but guaranteed standard of living against the fear of unemployment arising from free competition, the Social-Democrats have chosen the former."

Unattained Dreams

The first thing that strikes one about this quotation is the parallel it presents to the American political scene. The differences between the majority and opposition parties on domestic policies are "more apparent than real," the opposition party acts like "a well-disciplined and obedient group," etc., etc.

But the parallel runs only on the shallow level of the lack of any consistent, aggressive attack by the opposition on the policies of the party in power. All other conditions in the two countries are different.

Handler, it appears, here again would like the German Social-Democrats to act like good, old-fashioned American liberals of the populist variety. They should be against cartels and monopolies, for free trade and open competition, and democracy in general.

This program never did the populist liberals much good in this country, and in Germany it would be a really fatal anachronism. American liberalism itself has strayed far from the old paths of simple free-trade, open-competition ideology.

Within the confines of the capitalist system, in the actual conditions which confront Germany, the cartels are bound to have their way. Free trade, convertibility of currencies, a free world market—these are unattainable dreams for capitalism, and even thinkable only for the strongest capitalist country at that. For Germany or Japan or even for Britain, such policies would be sure-fire and rapid suicide. They would mean competing with each other and the United States on terms which preordain their defeat.

Thus, if the German Social-Democrats are to put up a real fight in parliament and in the country at large, it could not be as a loyal pro-capitalist opposition. The British Labor Party has been able to present the picture of a fighting opposition only insofar as it has been willing to fight for a radical reorganization of the whole of British society. To the extent that its leadership has tended to adapt itself to British capitalism as a "responsible" opposition, it has lost the drive, the sense of mission, and hence the ability to fire the popular imagination which made it such an irresistible force in British politics right after the war.

The German Social-Democracy suffers from the same loss of a sense of mission which is hamstringing the British Labor Party. But in Germany the process has gone even farther than in Britain, to the extent that there is no powerful, vocal, semi-organized left-wing opposition in the SPD, as exists in the Bevanite wing of the BLP.

An Admission

But to return to the opening theme of this article. Nowhere in Handler's discussion is there a mention of the role of the German middle class as the bearer of democracy in that country, as the guarantor of social stability and the democratic process. Yet Germany is not some underdeveloped semi-colonial capitalist country in which a sturdy, enterprising, well-developed middle class has never been permitted to come into existence due to the one-sided development of the country by foreign capital. The post-war prosperity in Germany has spawned a vast class of small traders and producers on the classic model of capitalism. The vast majority of them are in the parties bound together in the coalition headed by that savior of his country, Adenauer.

Why not look to them, rather than to the labor movement and the workers' SPD, as the source of healthy democratic opposition to the developing strength of right-wing nationalism in Germany? There is an admission here.

Although in the United States the liberals may still theorize about the independent, democratic role of the middle class, in Germany the social and political reality is, or should be, too brutally apparent to permit that kind of discussion. Everyone knows that German Nazism was primarily a middle-class movement in its mass base. And today it is quite evident that the German middle class is not an independent force, capable of presenting the country with an independent democratic program, but rather that it tends to follow whichever social force or movement appears to be dominant at the moment.

German Labor's Error

The trouble with the German trade union and SPD leadership, however, is that their thinking has grown far too close to that of American Fair Deal ideologists. After their defeat by Adenauer in the last elections, they have sought to break through their isolation from the middle class not by giving Germany a bold, aggressive, democratic working-class program (that is, a socialist program) but by adapting themselves to middle-class ideology. They are trying to solve the political and economic problems of West Germany inside the capitalist framework, and therefore fall prey to "paternalistic," "conformist" "obedient" or, to use an old-fashioned word, class-collaborationist attitudes. In the specific circumstances of Germany even more than in a country with the vast wealth of the United States, this means to yield the political initiative to the reactionary forces headed by the big capitalists.

Handler's implied attitude is quite right. The German labor movement, the German Social-Democracy, are the only social force in the country which could stand up to the reactionary bourgeoisie, which could lead the country in the direction of democracy and progress. To enlist the support of the middle class which now goes to Adenauer and beyond him to the extreme right, the SPD would have to give them a bold social and economic program for the reorganization of German society, and for its integration into an Independent Western Union also reorganized on socialist foundations.

But a program of working-class independence cannot be fitted into the framework of Adenauer's Germany and the policies laid down for it by the U. S. State Department. It would have to burst that framework. Socialism and democracy are inseparable for Germany in the very real, most immediate sense.

Imperialist Liberalism & the Issue — —

(Continued from page 1)

to a good cause. We will not pursue this into the question of "means and ends" that liberal pundits so delight in discussing when they are explaining the sins of Bolsheviks.

No, the *Post* will not be hypocritical and it admits with some asperity that "We [by which it means not itself but the U. S. government] have plainly encouraged the rebels, and we render ourselves a trifle ludicrous by joining in a solemn call for a 'cease-fire' as they start marching."

INSINUATIONS

But the *Post's* basic justification is that Guatemala is CP-dominated and that therefore anything goes.

And yet, although it must make this claim in order to make its point, it does not quite make this claim but only insinuates it.

Because, of course, there is not a single responsible observer who has been able to show that Guatemala is decisively dominated by the CP in any real sense. The facts amply prove the influence of the CP, the government's toleration and aid to the CP, etc., but they do not go even halfway to proving what the *Post* must prove if its argument is to reach even first base: and that is CP domination and nothing else.

Unless, of course, our liberals are also prepared to argue that a small country must be crushed even if there is only a danger that the CP may dominate some time in the future!

How does the *Post* editorial present this factual question? Our liberals, who insist on being so honest, edge up to it like guilty men, with the following series of verbal approximations:

- (1) "the Arbenz government has steadily succumbed to Communist pressure";
- (2) "real Communists were doing real business in Guatemala";
- (3) "it was the Communist movement which was gaining the ascendancy";
- (4) Arbenz chose to make a "deal" with the Communists;
- (5) "the underlying sham is the Russian claim that the Communist drive in Guatemala is independent of Moscow."

Next week we will take up more fully a discussion of the claim about CP "domination" of Guatemala, but note that the above formulations by our liberals are quite another matter. Yet in this same editorial, just as if it had been half-proved, the honest editors also throw in the following:

- (1) "Arbenz was letting the Communists assume dominance in his regime";
- (2) "this Soviet base of operations";
- (3) "the central fact was Russian intervention on this continent."

ENDORSEMENT

And the liberal conclusion is that "in the real world it was inconceivable that the U. S. would—or should—remain indifferent to the establishment of this Soviet base of operations."

"We are committed to the rebels," proclaims the *Post*. This is its understanding of how liberals must live "in the real world."

Thus our liberals endorse the Dulles principle that a "Communist government" cannot be tolerated anywhere even if established legally, democratically, and with the will of the people. This is also the principle which the British established in the case of British Guiana. It is an open repudiation of their claim that Stalinism's crime is to impose its will over people's necks.

The *Post* must endorse this principle because its basic argument, so "courteously" faced, points to it inescapably. If Guatemala must be crushed, because a CP is too influential in its government circles — a government, moreover, which has been one of the more democratic in Latin America, relatively speaking, and not among the dictatorships that are Washington's pets — certainly any country must be crushed as soon as the CP becomes dominant, however legally.

But if the U. S. can crush a country in

which its imperialist rival (Stalinism) is too influential—by what right do our liberals condemn the Russians for doing the same thing?

Do not the Russians have the right to feel endangered when the U. S. builds up armies, and establishes bombing bases, on its very flanks? Do not the Russians have the right to crush any neighboring country (if they can get away with it) which is being used by the U. S. as a war jump-off-point?

There is Iran on the Russian flank. There is Turkey. No one in the world is uncertain as to whether these regimes do or do not represent a dagger pointed at Russia. And there was Korea. . . .

This is exactly the pro-Stalinist, Stalinoid or merely "neutralist" thinking of so many elements in Europe and Asia: we cannot condemn the Russians, for their crimes, they say, because the poor Russians are afraid and encircled. . . .

We independent Socialists will have no truck with this Stalinoid or "neutralist" whitewash of the Kremlin. But our liberals, who are even more bitter about such talk? Do they not agree completely with these apologists of oppression, except that they are willing to whitewash ONLY the U. S. camp and vilify the rival war camp?

WHY THE PANIC?

Our liberals of *Post* caliber want to live "in the real world" and they are willing to go along with an international crime (swallowing hard and painfully) because it is simply inconceivable for them that Guatemala should be allowed to go on its own way.

Why? Why—even if we grant what is not true, that Guatemala is truly already controlled by the Stalinists?

Taking it only on the most immediate plane, why is it that these good liberals of ours cannot even take such a calmer view as that of the *Times's* military analyst Hanson Baldwin, who might have been exposing the *Post*-type liberals when he wrote the passage which is boxed in this article.

Or even if a "Communist" Guatemala would be a more serious difficulty than Baldwin makes out, why does that justify a Moscow-type suppression? Russia has been forced to live with a ring of hostile bases for years. Can the U. S. not stand a single "beachhead" of the enemy in an insignificantly weak country which is itself ringed by U. S. satellites?

We can easily understand that this is enough to panic a Dulles, an Eisenhower, even a Truman, into action which parallels Russia's: what exactly is it that has panicked our liberals? Why, in the editorial under discussion, did every prop of democratic thinking and moral inter-

Hanson Baldwin on the 'Menace'

Following is the comment by the N. Y. Times military analyst Hanson Baldwin which is referred to in the accompanying article. Appearing on June 22, in the midst of the hysteria over the "threat" from Guatemala in justification of the suppression, it struck a virtually unique note in the press. Yet what it says is painfully obvious to anyone who has not been sent into a dither by propaganda. The conservative military analyst thereby succeeds in sounding more like a liberal than does the *Post*.

"The dimensions of the Guatemalan military force indicate that it cannot possibly be taken as a serious threat to United States interests—though, under a Communist government, a peasant army of considerable size that would be capable of overawing neighboring states might be formed in time.

"Nor does Guatemala's geographic position constitute too serious a threat.

"The capital is 840 air miles from the Panama Canal, and Communist airfields hacked out of the jungle could pose a potential threat to the Canal. But the concealment of such airfields would be difficult and their construction could not be hidden, and the Canal itself, though important economically and logistically, no longer is the vital lifeline it was prior to the age of air power.

"The public importance attached to the Guatemalan situation, therefore, is disproportionate to Guatemalan military capabilities. Yet, in the over-all context of strategy, the problem deserves the attention it is getting though it cannot be solved by the means so far employed. In fact, the military elements of what is essentially a political, economic and ideological problem have been greatly overstressed, with results that already are reacting against the United States."

nationalism collapse in their minds like papier-maché?

BASIC ERROR

But these are "immediate" considerations. We are willing to Think It Through further. What if the threat were even more serious than that which is presently represented by Guatemala?

Anyone who starts thinking along these lines—hypothetical ones, we emphasize—cannot avoid posing the whole question in an entirely different manner than the purely imperialist framework in which the *Post* editorialist is caught.

Stalinism can become such a danger, even hypothetically, only because it feeds on, and grows on, the crimes of capitalist imperialism, on the hatred of the peoples for U. S. overlordship and national brutality.

Stalinism can get to the point of even posing the problem in the fashion feared by our liberals only because of the inability of capitalist imperialism to offer the peoples an alternative they can live with.

AND WHILE STALINISM GROWS ON THE BRUTALITY OF IMPERIALISM—AND THIS IS THE LESSON OF OUR ERA WHICH OVERSHADOWS EVERY OTHER ONE WITHOUT EXCEPTION — OUR LIBERALS PROPOSE TO SUPPORT THAT IMPERIALIST BRUTALITY IN THE NAME OF DEFEATING STALINISM!

This is the basic error made by liberals who reluctantly, and with much heart-burning, feel that they have to go along with imperialism in order to live "in the real world."

They are living in a delusion, in a dream.

That dreamlike quality comes right

out in the *Post* editorial itself. It ends by raising the question whether the rebels, to whom it is committed, aim only at "a cold-blooded military adventure which ends in destroying the limited economic reforms that poverty-drenched Guatemala has achieved." Do they fly the flag of United Fruit or of freedom, it asks.

TO THE HARDHEADS

—Come, come, gentlemen of the *Post*: we know you want to show that your heart is in the right place, but leave us not be mushbrained about it all. If you want to be hardheaded and live in the real world, as you say, then go ahead; but with a minimum of silliness. The army which Washington is supporting (with the not valueless additional support of the *Post*) is the armed force of the landlords who want to destroy the agrarian reform, of the bosses and hangers-on of United Fruit and the coffee *fincqueros* who long for the good old days before this pestiferous Guatemalan revolution started. Overthrow of the Arbenz regime will mean a reign of bloody terror by these elements not only against the CPers but against the far more numerous nationalists of all stripes who supported the Arbenz social program. The center of gravity of Guatemalan politics will inescapably swing far to the right.

Face it, dear liberals. You can't have your revolution and crush it too.

WHOSE "REAL WORLD"?

In your own way—little or big, with the best of liberal intentions and not at all as part of a deep-dyed imperialist "plot"—you will thus educate all the world that it is only the Stalinists, for all their own horrors, who can consistently support movements of social progress against landlordism and colonialism. You will rightly explain, no doubt, that the Stalinists bring worse evils in their train, but you will show in life and not in words that you attack Stalinist crimes only in order to reconcile the peoples to capitalist-imperialist crimes. And they will not be reconciled.

They will not cease fighting. They will not take your advice to be good and bow the head to United Fruit because of the necessity of defeating Russia somewhere else in the world. You cannot make them live in that world, because it is not the "real world" of their misery and poverty.

You cannot make them think like an American liberal any more than—much of the time—you can even succeed in thinking like liberals yourselves.

It is American imperialism, and basically nothing else, which is responsible for the growth of Stalinism in Guatemala. Because you cannot bring yourself to oppose American imperialism, when the chips are down, you are among those greasing the road for Stalinism.

Which, then, is in and of the real world: your whitewash of imperialism or our Third Camp approach to the defeat of Stalinism?

Panama Parallel: Revolt a la Carte

The situation around Guatemala has recalled a number of historic parallels in recent history, none of them exact, to be sure, but all pointing to some aspect.

References made in this issue to Moscow-style "liberation" are one, of course. In many ways the U. S. has engineered an international squeeze play which plagiarizes from the Stalinists. But in turn, the Stalinists cannot claim to have invented their own methods out of the whole cloth. The U. S. has been among the pioneers in provoking fake revolutions in order to impose its own will, and nowhere as much as in Latin America.

One such parallel is rehearsed by correspondent Milton Bracker of the N. Y. *Times* (June 21):

"It already has been suggested that the situation is something of a throwback to the Panama incident of 1903, when the United States encouraged revolt in Panama, then part of Colombia, because Colombia had refused to ratify the accord making possible the building of the Panama Canal. On that occasion the uprising came November 3 and United States Marines landed November 4 'to preserve order.'

"Clearly, the biggest single difference between that era and this is the word 'marines' and all it has come to connote in this part of the world. Even the bitterest foes of the United States these days do not think President Eisenhower would revert to that particular tactic of Theodore Roosevelt's. But the Guatemala case

is sure to make them suggest—with or without Communist instigation—that the United States, by extraordinarily underlining its own position, has tended to encourage a violent move against a constitutional government."

That's frank enough talk.

Another historic parallel that has been pointed to before the start of hostilities, with regard to the propaganda campaign against the Guatemalan government, refers to Mexico:

"Only a dozen years ago and three regimes back, under Cardenas, the same things were being said about Mexico that are now being said about Guatemala. The burning issue in both countries has been foreign investments. Mexico went through that phase with the expropriation and nationalization of the oil industry in 1938."—*The Reporter*, Nov. 7, 1950, article by T. Draper.

But in Guatemala the government has not even expropriated or nationalized foreign holdings, except for a part of United Fruit land by its agrarian reform law; and of this law it should be remembered—

"The 1952 agrarian reform law [of Guatemala] . . . has been roundly condemned and fought as Communist-inspired. Actually it is less fundamental and gives more protection to the plantation owner than did the Mexican agrarian laws stemming from the Constitution of 1917."—*Current History*, Mar. 1953, article by Prof. C. C. Cumberland.

THE FIGHT FOR SOCIALISM

by

Max Shachtman

A basic primer on the ideas of Independent Socialism!

\$1.00 Cloth \$2.00

Labor Action Book Service
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

There's No Angel Around

to finance LABOR ACTION. It has appeared every week since 1940 because it's been backed by the dime and dollars of independent socialists — AND YOUR SUBSCRIPTIONS.

A sub is only \$2 a year—
Subscribe now!

SPOTLIGHT on GUATEMALA

Alone in the World

The world—including some of the U.S.'s best friends in Europe, insofar as it has any at all—has once again been appalled by the crudity and humiliating contempt with which the U. S. has treated them, in the course of its assault on Guatemala.

This last example has been Washington's demand for ship-search of any nation's carriers, to check any bearing arms to Guatemala—that is, its arrogation of the right to act as a world police force or international FBI.

Up to the very day of the armed attack on Guatemala, the U. S. was pressing this embargo action frenetically under the claim that it was Guatemala that was a threat to "hemisphere peace"!

Britain energetically rejected the U. S. demand, replying: "There is no general power of search on the high seas in peacetime," though the U. S. press consoled itself with the fact that Britain also indicated it might search its own ships. Other nations either explicitly rejected it also or ignored it.

A small news item also reveals that, even without right or permission, the U. S. actually went ahead to seize and search a Dutch freighter. On June 21 the Netherlands announced their formal protest against this violation of their national sovereignty. The U. S. found no arms on the ship.

In England Dulles was again denounced as "inept" and as giving "100,000 votes to Nye Bevan." An editorial in the Manchester *Guardian* asked the government to tell him "that we do not trust his judgment as to whether a state is untouchable or not, and that we cannot allow either the Atlantic or the Caribbean to become his private preserve." The Labor press, of course, also headlined the U. S. indignity.

Even the London *Times* was cool to the general trend of U. S. policy on Guatemala, pointing out that it "is by no means shared elsewhere on the American continent where there is much sympathy for the Guatemalans."

In Scandinavia the Norwegian Labor Party paper said there was "scarcely any doubt" that the U. S. has been trying to change Guatemala's government through pressure. In France *Combat* indicated its belief that the rebels' arms came from the U. S. The leading Paris paper *Le Monde* started a series of articles by a correspondent from Guatemala City, before the armed attack, whose first installment said:

"The first American warnings against the Communist danger took place at the same time as the first expropriations of land belonging to the United Fruit Company. That does not mean that there are no Communists in Guatemala; but in the interest of truth this coincidence of American disquiet with the beginning of a Guatemalan nationalist movement working for economic independence should be noted."

In Germany the right-wing *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* warned that "those who want to fight the tyranny of Bolshevism must have clean hands. The independent *Frankfurter Rundschau* scoffed at the U. S. claim that it was just an internal Guatemalan revolt.

In a round-up article on the European press, a Reuters dispatch (*N. Y. Times*, June 21) failed to point to a single paper which approved the U. S. course.

French Joke

The special session of the UN Security Council which was summoned to hear Guatemala's charge saw a sparkling example of Gallic wit from the French delegate, Henri Hoppenot. It is hard to believe that Hoppenot was not deliberately and consciously mocking the U. S. and Washington's representative Lodge.

On Saturday, with the outbreak of hostilities, Guatemala's Castillo-Arriola asked for an immediate Security Council meeting that day or Sunday. The demand went to Lodge, who is president of the

Council this month. Lodge (the press reported) told the Guatemalan that he would not call the meeting till Monday afternoon.

The press then reported that all day Saturday Castillo-Arriola and his staff were on the telephone rounding up support for a council meeting to be held at least on Sunday. Finally Lodge capitulated and the meeting was held Sunday.

This is the background for the following incident. At the council meeting, the press reported, Hoppenot—

"quoted to Mr. Lodge a statement that the American had made last week that he hoped he would never live to see the day when a small country seeking help was told by the United Nations, 'What's the hurry?' M. Hoppenot thanked Mr. Lodge for summoning the Council so quickly."

The ironical Frenchman, no doubt, took the opportunity for the barb while thinking of the hypocritically deploring speeches and statements that American leaders have made about France's colonial policy.

The Imperialist Mind

The headlines on the special Security Council meeting on Guatemala featured U. S. delegate Lodge's warning to Russia to "stay out of this hemisphere." The whole passage in which this occurred is even more interesting as an example of the imperialist mind. Lodge is denouncing Russia's veto of the motion to get the Guatemala issue out of the council by referring it to the Pan-American Union:

"Why does the representative of the Soviet Union, whose country is thousands and thousands of miles away from here, undertake to veto a move like that? What is his interest in it?" cried Lodge. "How can this action of his possibly fail to make unbiased observers throughout the world come to the conclusion that the Soviet Union has got designs on the Western Hemisphere? There is no other explanation of it."

Russia's designs on every loose bit of territory, or on any people it can possibly oppress, are undoubted; but notice Lodge's crushing proof!

We can put aside, of course, Moscow's claims of being interested in Guatemala solely as a partisan of democracy and justice; but surely this is not disproved simply by the fact that Russia is far away?—except to Lodge's provincial and naive thinking as an American chauvinist.

Crime Against Guatemala — —

(Continued from page 1)

loads of arms to Honduras and Nicaragua, just a few days before invasion-day. Its guilt is open.

And now its diplomats calmly lie their way through meetings of the UN Security Council and the Inter-American Organization.

As an historic memento to imperialist cynicism, we suggest engraving the following sentence on a plaque in the UN:

"There appeared to be no doubt but that the uprisings, the bombings, and the poised invasion force in Honduras—if the report from Guatemala is true—could seriously disrupt plans for a meeting [of the Inter-American Organization] based instead on the potential threat of Guatemala to her neighbors." (*N. Y. Times*, June 19.)

One of the roles undertaken by Washington in this international war crime was to keep Guatemala disarmed and on the defensive while its pals got ready to blackmail it.

UP dispatch of June 18: "One [top-level defense] official said he was sure the U. S. 'is not going to shed any tears over what happened.'"—i.e., the invasion. (The joker must have been in real good humor that day.)

U. S. AGENTS AT WORK

Dispatches from the war area have openly referred to "reports" that U. S. agents have been at work in Guatemala and Honduras in connection with the planned invasion. One man, a Joseph Rendon, described as an OSS agent in Guatemala during World War II, has openly announced his joining the invasion forces.

Another dispatch, before the attack was launched, described in some detail the "strange" case of the Guatemalan

Nor can the U. S. explain satisfactorily to Lodge why it is interested in Indochina or Korea, which are "thousands and thousands of miles away."

This speech by Lodge was extemporaneous; hence the revealing piece of stupidity.

Stupid Deceit

The Russian propagandists, of course, have been making hay of the crime that is being committed against Guatemala; and these scoundrels, experts in totalitarian suppression themselves, need only tell the truth about Washington's role in order to have plenty of ammunition.

Uneasy, the editors of the *N. Y. Times* wanted to strike back somehow in their editorial of June 21. There was plenty of opportunity. They need only truly point out the Kremlin's own suppressions of subject peoples—a "You too" sort of retort. But naturally such a reply, even in irritation, would also be a confession. What to do?

As in the case of Ambassador Lodge's stupid attack on the Russians at the Security Council (which see), the editors of the *Times* could think of nothing to write except an equally stupid and obviously mendacious attack on the Russian veto. Lodge at least had the excuse of speaking extemporaneously, but the *Times* editors presumably re-read their stuff and found it fit to print.

The background fact is that, at the Security Council, the U. S. tactic was to get the issue out of the UN by referring it to the Organization of American States. Passage of the U. S.-concocted motion would have stopped further UN action or discussion, at least until a report came back from the OAS. This motion was indeed passed, but annulled by the Russian veto. It is this veto that the *Times* is trying to snarl at.

And yet the editorialist has the gall to write that the question of the "nature of the present uprising" was not taken up or answered by the Security Council because of the Russian veto! Or to quote his words:

"The Russian delegate vetoing the will of the other ten delegates saw to it that there would be no answer except hot words."

And further down, this fatuously deceitful editorial says:

"Had it not been for the Soviet Union's 60th Council veto, it [the Guatemalan complaint] would have been referred where it rightfully belongs, to the Or-

ganization of American States. That veto tells again the story of Communist chicanery."

But the simple fact is, as pointed out at the Security Council meeting itself, that the Russian veto—whose sole effect would have been to keep the Guatemalan issue before the UN—did not and could not prevent the issue from also being taken up by the OAS. In fact, the OAS did proceed to take it up.

One must conclude that the *Times* editorial tells once again the story of imperialist chicanery.

Dual-Stalinism

In Latin America, Stalinism is carrying out a policy which is unique for it. This policy consists in setting up different Stalinist parties. The object is to be able to adapt to all situations that may arise and, no matter what happens, be in a position to serve the interests of Kremlin strategy.

Today there are two Stalinist parties in Venezuela; three in Mexico; two in Colombia; three in Argentina; two in Bolivia; and two in Peru.

The splits which gave rise to these dual parties were originally due to questions of local tactics. But in every case both the "official" organizations and the "dissident" organizations are rigorously orthodox with regard to international questions and in their loyalty to Moscow's policies.

In Venezuela, one of the Stalinist parties exists in illegality and tries to collaborate with Acción Democrática, the opposition to the Venezuelan dictatorship. The other Stalinist party enjoys the favor of the reactionary military junta which controls the government.

In Peru, the split in the Communist Party permits one group to support the hateful military dictatorship of Odría while the other one opposes the government and maintains relations with APRA and other opposition forces.

In Bolivia, where the Stalinists have not succeeded in infiltrating working-class circles thanks to the existence of a strong revolutionary workers' party (the POR), there are also two organizations obedient to Moscow's dictates. One of these collaborates with the National Revolutionary Movement of Paz Estenssoro, and the other is in opposition.

In Argentina the situation is truly strange. The official Stalinist group (Codovila) fervently supports the "anti-imperialist struggle" of Peron. But there is another Stalinist group which is even more pro-Peron—that of Rodolfo Pigrós. And finally there is also a small group, formed mostly by intellectuals, which fights against "Justicialist" (Peronist) policies.

—La Batalla

flyer who fled the country to join the rebels and, on his desperate flight out, stopped to pick up an American who (also "strangely") had previously had a reputation as non-political and even friendly to the Arbenz regime. This American, who had to be picked up in this emergency, was (the article mentioned) also a former U. S. military man who had been in Guatemala during the war and had presumably returned to be a peaceful farmer. . . .

In the State Department, the lady protested too much. Lincoln White, State Department press officer, took it upon himself to refute Guatemala's charges that the rebel forces were using American arms that had been sent to Honduras. White denied these charges. Perhaps he did not stop to think that, on the basis of the U. S.'s official fairy tale, he was in no position to deny it! How could he be so certain that Honduras, which had gotten U. S. arms, had not turned them over to Castillo Armas?

It is with good reason that, according to all accounts so far, the bulk of the anti-Communist European press scoffs at or ignores the official U. S. story that it is an innocent bystander in the scalping party down under (see our news item on page 2).

OFFICIAL EXCUSE

But in the U. S. the big press—from right to liberal left—spreads the official fable even while their own correspondents obviously keep their fingers crossed in their dispatches. And the excuse which solves the government of all sin is the cry that since Guatemala is "Communist-dominated," the need for its suppression cannot be questioned.

In one aspect this is discussed in another article in this issue, and it will be

discussed at greater length next week, but it is important to emphasize immediately that no evidence of increased Stalinist "domination" of Guatemala has been adduced that was not known last year. Last year even conservative observers agreed that the Arbenz regime was not "Communist-dominated."

There is little or no dispute over many descriptions of strong CP influence on the government, and of the deal which obviously exists between the Arbenz regime and the Stalinists, but no one has even begun to show evidence of any great turn in this respect during the last year. This is apart from any discussion of whether even "Communist domination" of the government justifies armed suppression by self-styled democrats of an alien imperialist power.

HATE WILL RISE

Moscow could never have hoped to get much military use out of a "beachhead" in the Americas in case of war; but U. S. complicity in the crime against Guatemala will be—right here and now—a thousand times more useful to its aims and machinations in Latin America. The U. S. will come out of it more hated, if more feared.

But another Stalinist threat will have been "defeated," we will be told, even if at the cost of everything worth defending against Stalinism, and even if at the cost of inoculating all Latin Americans with even greater susceptibility to Stalinist demagoguery.

Truly, Stalinist influence feeds on the crimes of capitalism, and truly American imperialism expands its world power by using the Stalinist threat as a club against subject peoples. Against these symbiotic evils, there is no alternative except the viewpoint of the Third Camp struggle against both.

WEEK by WEEK . . .

LABOR ACTION screens and analyzes the week's news, discusses the current problems of labor and socialism, gives you information you can't find anywhere else.

A sub is only \$2 a year!