

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

FEBRUARY 11, 1957

FIVE CENTS

## Moscow Intervenes in CP Fight With Smear Attack on Clark

Virtually on the eve of the national convention of the Communist Party which will take up the conflict between the Gates-Daily Worker group and the Stalinist Foster group over the future of the party, the not unexpected intervention came from the Russians in the shape of a blast in the magazine *Soviet Russia* against a leader of the dissident tendency.

Singled out for attack was *Daily Worker* foreign editor Joseph Clark, who has been among the most vigorous critics of the old habits and approaches of the Communist movement. The Russian penman assigned to the job of denigrating Clark called him "right wing," "national-Communist," and hinted at connections with Dulles and "bourgeois nationalism."

In a preliminary comment and rejoinder, Clark wrote that "As several Polish and Yugoslav Communists have pointed out, Soviet publications often attack something they do not quote, or if they quote, it will often be out of context. Thus, I find it difficult to discern anything I wrote in the accounts quoted from *Sovetskaya Rossiya*."

Most of his reply is taken up with arguing that it is good Marxism and Leninism to adapt the ideas of the great socialist leaders to the national conditions of the U. S.

"Whoever coached the editor of *Sovetskaya Rossiya*," Clark also remarks, "certainly gave him an inflated idea of my importance." However, most political observers understand that the Russian attack on Clark was designed to intimidate other CP dissident elements as an assurance of success for the Foster-Dennis leadership.

An editorial in the *Daily Worker* assured its readers that the attack in the Russian organ will not be taken as instructions by "American Communists," who, it said, will make up their own minds at the convention. This assertion of political independence has been generally taken as a reflection of the Gates group's views.

On Monday (in the same issue which reported the Russian blast), the *Daily Worker's* letter column printed an interesting exchange. A reader challenged Clark to give evidence for his assertion that the Stalinists in the Polish CP used anti-Semitism against the Gomulka

leadership. In reply Clark cites a number of items, including the *Po Prostu* statement quoted in *LA* Jan. 28. His first citation, however, was from a Canadian Communist leader, J. B. Salsberg, who tied it up with Khrushchev himself: "Comrades, recently returned from Poland, have confirmed the following facts. First, that Comrade Khrushchev on his arrival in Warsaw while the Polish Central Committee was meeting said that he would never allow Poland to fall into the hands of the imperialists and Zionists. Surely this is the language of interference. In addition it has an anti-Jewish bias, otherwise why add the word 'Zionist' to the word 'imperialists'?"

The Communist Party convention opens February 9.

## THE EISENHOWER DOCTRINE: Is It 'Go-It-Alone'?

By SAM TAYLOR

The Eisenhower Doctrine for the Middle East cleared its first hurdle when the House of Representatives passed it by the overwhelming vote of 355-61. And the Senate will give it a similar majority later this month.

In Washington, as elsewhere in the country, the major emphasis was in an effort to find out exactly what the doctrine proposed to do in concrete circumstances. It is a vaguely worded statement which constitutes a blank check for the administration to do anything it wishes up to and including Korean-type "police actions" and Guatemalan-type revolutions.

A pall of confusion settled over Washington as congressmen struggled to find out what was the policy for the Middle East, other than being against Communism.

## AFL-CIO Is Pushing To a Show-Down on Clean-Union Issue

By BEN HALL

A showdown is coming at last, and quickly, in the fight against racketeers and gangsters in the labor movement and against their allies, apologists and defenders. That alone would be a great vindication of the AFL-CIO merger, which has led to this important move.

Three unions were found guilty of tolerating corrupt practices in violation of the AFL-CIO constitution by the Ethical Practices Committee; and the Executive Council

now meeting in Miami is taking action against them. They are small unions, total membership about 170,000; but by beginning with them, the federation gives warning to more powerful affiliates, like the Teamsters, and prepares the precedents.

The Executive Council has already adopted three sets of codes, laws that will govern the federation and that can be enforced against affiliates, to stamp out racketeering, both in its obvious forms and in its respectably decorated manifestations.

The three codes are:

(1) A set of rules governing the operation of welfare funds to outlaw practices which milk the funds for the advantage of corrupt officials, through phony "salaries" and "commissions."

(2) Provisions to prevent a tie-in between union officials and employers by outlawing "investments" by labor officers under conditions that clearly demonstrate collusion with management. (The Council seem to feel that such provisions are so unprecedented that it is constrained to reiterate its belief in capitalist enterprise.)

(3) A code of laws to bar known racketeers and Communists from union leadership. In actual practice, the adoption of this code prepares the way for action against racketeers. Most unions already enforce provisions against Communists; what is new is the adoption of a code to be enforced against racketeers. This is all to the good.

### DEMOCRATIC ISSUE

Nevertheless, the code, while aimed principally against crooks, continues, repeats and reinforces an attitude that undermines union democracy. It is one thing to outlaw racketeers. It is something different to penalize Communists solely for their political views or affiliations.

Regardless of how we may detest the opinions or program of Communists, all their democratic rights must be defended inside and outside the unions; not because we want to defend their policies but because we want to protect democracy. At some point, the labor movement will have to make a change.

(Continued on page 2)

(Continued on page 2)

Labor Action FORUM • New York City

Next Thursday, February 14

H. W. Benson

Author of "The Communist Party at the Crossroads"

speaks on

THE COMMUNIST PARTY CONVENTION

8:30 p.m. at LABOR ACTION HALL, 114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.



## LONDON LETTER

# British CP Thinning Fast As Leaders Cling to Moscow

By OWEN ROBERTS

London, Feb. 2

Just how many members have quit the British Communist Party since Khrushchev's speech at the 20th Congress and the Russian aggression in Hungary is anybody's guess. Defections from the top layer of the Communist Party's ranks are well publicized by the press, but the far greater number of defections by local leaders and active rank-and-file workers are harder to get a line on; particularly as the CP itself is going to great trouble to throw a smokescreen around the business.

But, for those who take the pains to look, there is ample evidence of hundreds of dissident CP members quitting their party and forming loose and local organizations of "Marxist Groups" and the like.

Many of these ex-rank-and-file members of the Communist Party have been drawn into the Labor Party, despite advice to local Labor Parties from the National Executive that ex-CPers should not be admitted except in special circumstances and then only after higher regional committees have conducted an "investigation."

In most cases the credit for enrolling ex-CPers into the Labor Party must go to the left-wing members of the Labor Party who have spent many hours tracking down groups of ex-Communist Party members and endeavoring to enlist them in the LP on the basis of a left-wing formation within the ranks of the mass organization of the British working class.

These tactics have met with varying degrees of success. A number of the ex-CPers still hold illusions about the nature of the economic and social set-up in Russia; they consider it to have a "socialist economy" in spite of its self-admitted evils and, flowing from this position, they consider that their task is to build "a new and real Communist Party" in Britain which, while critical of certain aspects of the Russian system, will unreservedly defend it against attacks and criticism from elsewhere.

Incidentally, not all ex-CPers holding such a position have remained outside the LP; some of them linked up with the orthodox Trotskyist elements which operate within the Labor Party and whose general attitude is acceptable to ex-CPers who still have political cobwebs in their eyes.

Third Camp elements within the Labor Party, focused around the monthly journal *Socialist Review*, have not been idle in this situation. In addition to winning new recruits from the more politically awake segments of ex-CPers—on the basis of uncompromising opposition to both Eastern and Western imperialism—the Third Camp section of the LP has also succeeded in drawing in some recruits from ex-CPers who, having linked up with the Trotskyist group within the LP, soon became dissatisfied with the bureaucratic set-up which they found themselves involved in. For, in common with similar groups in many other countries, the Trotskyist section within the Labor Party is characterized by its undemocratic practices and lack of flexibility in the face of real circumstances as opposed to theories formulated twenty years ago and now discredited.

## FACTION CONFERENCE

The big question mark now facing the left in Britain, however, is not so much those who have broken with the CP but those who remain within its ranks in the hopes of turning out the present CP leadership and making a shift in the CP policies.

There are literally hundreds of such people who have openly stated that they disagree with the CP leadership and its policies, but that they intend to stick with the CP until the outcome of a special congress due to take place within the next few months.

An indication of the depth of this meeting of CP rank-and-file members was called to discuss ways and means of turning out the present leadership. It attracted more than a hundred CPers from all parts of the country—an unusually large number for an unofficial meeting of CP delegates called in open defiance of the leadership and organized on a very haphazard basis.

The general feeling of this meeting was that the big fight against the leadership should take place at the forthcoming congress and on the basis of support for a minority report recently produced by three members of a special commission set up by the CP to study "inner-party democracy."

This commission first met in September of last year and consisted of 15 members, 10 of them full-time officials of the CP or its front organizations. From the outset it was obvious that the CP leadership was determined that the outcome of the commission's probe would be favorable to the present collection of ruling bureaucrats.

## THE OLD SYSTEM

In spite of the fact that the special congress does not take place until mid-April, the commission was given less than three months in which to conduct its work and present its report to the CP executive. Such was the farce of this commission that it received no evidence from either the past or present secretaries of the CP, nor from the editors of CP publications. It considered written memoranda from branches but did not allow branch representatives or individuals to state a case in person. It did not consider the "cult of the individual" events in Hungary or the Cominform rupture with Yugoslavia in 1948; when certain members of the commission asked for a review of these things they were told that there was no time!

The outcome was a report, signed by twelve of the fifteen members of the commission (including, incidentally, all of the ten full-time officials) which was a whitewashing of the British CP leadership and a justification of things as they exist in the CP at the moment.

The other three members of the commission produced a minority report which said that the commission failed to perform the task allotted to it, was made up of too many full-time officials and not enough workers (only one industrial worker was on the commissions), and generally blasts the CP leadership and its present policies.

Naturally enough, the CP executive has accepted the majority report—and it has done this three months before the special congress to which the report will be "presented." The "rebel" CPers, therefore, have decided to move the acceptance of the minority report as an amendment to the leadership's proposals. The outcome will be the biggest split ever witnessed in the British CP.

## "OUR PIOUS ANTI-COLONIAL SENTIMENTS"

An unusually frank comment on Washington's hypocritical pretensions to anti-colonialism, by the N. Y. *Times*' foreign-affairs columnist C. L. Sulzberger (Jan. 28):

"Almost necessarily the elements of the present world situation force us to try to ride two policy horses simultaneously. We admire and respect Britain and France, our most important allies. We wish to strengthen their position and assuage their national pride. Yet, at the same time, from the moment of

# AFL-CIO Pushes — —

(Continued from page 1)

Meanwhile, we repeat, the real power of this code, despite the inclusion of Communists within its proscriptions, is directed against corrupt elements.

While the AFL-CIO acts to clean its own house, the Senate moves to investigate racketeering in unions. The United Auto Workers, which welcomes such an investigation, insists that the Senate Committee probe not only the rackets within labor but the ties between gangsters and bosses.

Dave Beck, president of the Teamsters Union, which is under heavy fire from all sides, cries out against investigation. His point of view lacks all consistency except one.

When he was asked why his union did not act to clean its own house, he replied that this was the job of the government through its police powers. Now that the government moves in, he clamors for the independence of unions from government search.

He hastens to reassure his vulnerable henchmen that they may take cover under the Fifth Amendment from any racket probe with full support from the Teamsters Union. It is hard to see how any explanation of his actions can be found other than a determination to protect racketeers in his unions for reasons that he alone can detail.

## LINE ON THE 5TH

The AFL-CIO Council demands that its affiliates insist that all union officials reply fully and frankly to all questions about racketeering and that none be allowed to hide behind the Fifth Amendment. Its official declaration on January 29 has been the subject of much controversy and some misunderstanding. We therefore quote this lengthy extract:

"We recognize that any person is entitled, in the interests of his individual conscience, to the protections afforded by the Fifth Amendment and reaffirm our conviction that this historical right must not be abridged. It is the policy of the AFL-CIO however, that if a trade-union official decides to invoke the Fifth Amendment for his personal protection and to avoid scrutiny by proper legislative committees, law enforcement agencies or other public bodies into corruption on his part, he has no right to continue to hold office in his union.

"Otherwise it becomes possible for a union official who may be guilty of corruption to create the impression that the trade-union movement sanctions the use of the Fifth Amendment, not as a matter of individual conscience, but as a shield against proper scrutiny into corrupt influences in the labor movement."

Note the following:

(1) The Council upholds and defends the principle of the Fifth Amendment.

(2) It does not direct its fire against Communists in this connection despite its well-known opposition to them and to their right to hold union office. It is doubtful if its statement would get the support of large sections of the union movement if it was aimed to deny the moral right of political witnesses to use the Fifth. At any rate, by omission, it makes a distinction between racketeers and Communists.

(3) The statement is carefully worded so that it does not apply in general and in wholesale fashion to any and every use of the Fifth Amendment at Senate hearings but specifically where it is designed to thwart an investigation of personal participation in racketeering practices.

(4) Even here, the Council does not suggest that such witnesses be penalized by the government for refusing to answer questions but that such a witness, is not entitled to union responsibility and leadership.

The Council condemns the use of the Fifth Amendment to hide corruption. International unions which are to enforce the ruling must interpret it. For that reason one ambiguity in its terms is unfortunate. It is our understanding that the Council does not make resort to the Fifth Amendment in investigations of union finances an offense in itself but only such use of the right as is clearly motivated by a desire to hide corruption. The union, in trial or investigation processes, and in the last analysis the Federation, would have to determine whether this spirit of the Council ruling was violated.

## THE BEST DEFENSE

The union movement has failed to clean its own house and now there is a widespread feeling that they need the assistance of government bodies to root out racketeers. The tragedy is that they are driven to such a conclusion.

And why? Part of the explanation is hidden in one Ethical Practices Committee report: "The best safeguard against abuses lies in the hands of a vigilant, informed and active membership, jealous of their rights and interests in the operation of health and welfare programs as well as any other trade-union program."

We would put it more directly: the best defense against crooks in unions is democracy, full rank-and-file democracy. Sad to say, however, this is the most neglected of all areas.

There are programs and codes for virtually everything. But there is no code and no campaign for reinvigorating the democratic rights of members in unions where they have been slashed away. And, regrettably, that is the case in many unions.

# Go-It-Alone? — —

(Continued from page 1)

vacuum" created by the decline of British and French imperialism.

Dulles decided that someone has to be the policeman and do the dirty work for Western imperialism, since Britain and France are through as Middle East powers. Consequently it remains for the United States to fill the so-called "power vacuum." But how to fill it

is the big problem that Dulles has pushed under the rug.

It is true that Dulles was not impugning the valor of British and French soldiers when he said "if I were an American boy who had to fight in the Middle East, I'd rather not have a British soldier on my right hand and a French soldier on my left."

He was acknowledging the fact that Britain and France are universally hated and detested in the Middle East. Any hope for protecting the interests of the "free world" and "Western democracy"—that is, oil and military bases—had to fall exclusively on the United States.

While the United States may disentangle itself from the formal ties with its allies in the Middle East, it is not really dissociating itself from the old imperialist policies. It too will attempt to restrain the nationalist revolution.



# Behind the Big-Budget Argument: Fear of an Economic Slump

By GORDON HASKELL

The steady winds blowing into the sails of the American economy, which have kept it booming along for almost two years, show signs of slackening. While the general motion is still forward, the winds are gusty and uncertain. This uncertainty reflects itself on the government.

In the economic message sent to Congress at the beginning of the year, President Eisenhower placed major stress on the continuing inflationary dangers which face the economy. When he presented the budget for the 1958 fiscal year, however, it turned out that he was proposing the biggest peacetime budget in the history of the nation.

Big federal budgets are traditionally an inflationary factor in the economy. At the same time, the Federal Reserve Board, which had been screwing up the interest rates for sometime in an effort at tightening the credit structure and thus slowing down the inflationary boom pressures, began to give indications that a reversal of policy may not be far in the offing.

In the political realm in which government economic policies reflect themselves, major attention has recently been focused on Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey's obvious dissatisfaction with Eisenhower's big budget. The Democrats see a rift in the Eisenhower "team" which offers tempting political prospects for them. But a closer look at Humphrey's objections makes it appear that these stem more from a fixed ideological attitude on his part than from a clear, concrete idea of just where the budget can and should be cut, especially as its overwhelming mass is concentrated in the area of "national security" expenditures.

## TOO SMALL?

Now comes Leon H. Keyserling, former chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, to maintain that the budget is really much too small when looked at from the point of view of the over-all needs of the economy.

(His article, "The Case for a Big Budget" appeared in the New York Times magazine for February 3.)

His article proceeds on the assumption that federal budgetary policy has as its task to control and balance the economy, and to direct economic activity toward politically determined goals. Its approach is to view the budget in its relationship to the economy as a whole rather than in comparison to past budgets.

## Complaint

Associated with Secretary Humphrey are other voices of big business that cannot understand why their very own big-business administration under Eisenhower continues to behave like a nest of New-Dealers when it comes to spending and big budgets.

For example, the *Wall Street Journal* complained on Dec. 12:

"The Government today has a greater revenue from taxes than ever before in history, including (believe it or not) the high tax years of World War II. It is not fighting a war as it was during much of President Truman's term. There is no depression, as there was during much of President Roosevelt's term, to argue for heavy expenditures for relief, for welfare, for pump-priming public works.

"Yet, in this year without war and unparalleled prosperity, the Treasury 'sees no basis' for cutting taxes. The Administration 'needs' every extra billion it can squeeze out.

"Well, what has happened to the great resolve to give us a Government of good husbandry? And how long will it be, then, before the Government discovers a basis for reducing the people's taxes?"

Keyserling points out that the federal budget will represent about 16 per cent of the country's total national production, based on present estimates, during the year to which it applies. He points out that although the armament outlays have been increased in mass, in fiscal 1958 they will represent 9.7 per cent of total national production, while in 1953 they stood at 14.1 per cent of production. Similarly, budgetary outlays for economic and technical aid overseas have declined from 1.46 per cent to 0.46 per cent of the total national production, a decline of 40 per cent.

## NOT TOO HAPPY

In short, while appropriations for military purposes are still staggering, their function as props and boosters of the economy declines in importance as the total national production continues to grow up above them.

This means that should an economic reversal be experienced, though they would still represent a floor below which economic activity could not fall, that floor would be uncomfortably low. The budget as a whole now stands at 16.1 per cent of total national production, while in fiscal 1953 it was 20.8 per cent.

Percentages are, of course, tricky things. While the relationship of the armament sector of the budget has been declining, that of expenditures for education has "doubled." Actually, it has increased from 0.04 per cent to the staggering sum of 0.08 per cent of national production! (Of course, it should be born in mind that the overwhelming bulk of expenditures for education come from local and state funds rather than from the federal government.)

Likewise, the amount allocated by the federal government to natural resource development has declined from 0.34 per cent of national production several years ago to 0.28 per cent, neither of them a specially impressive figure.

But let us look away from the federal budget for a moment. After all, the budget may be very important when the need of the day is to take up dangerous slack in the vast private sector of the economy. But when that is booming along at top speed, isn't it capacious to pick the budget apart as if it were a major economic factor?

Keyserling looks at the economy too, and what he sees does not make him too happy.

While the economy as a whole has been growing, he feels that it has not been growing nearly fast enough, and besides that, has been growing in a dangerously lop-sided manner.

As his point of departure for the rate at which the economy should grow, he takes not so much what is needed for the better life in this country (although he is concerned with that too), but rather the fact that the relative growth of the Russian economy is so much greater that if the two continue to grow at the same

## Philly Symposium Now Scheduled for March 15

The Philadelphia inter-socialist symposium on "What's Ahead for the American Left?" is now scheduled for March 15. Another change from the notice previously published: the Fellowship of Reconciliation is not one of the sponsors. However, Charles Walker, regional secretary of the F.O.R. and associate editor of *Liberation* will be one of the speakers.

rate, Russia would catch up with the United States within a generation.

## CLASSIC PATTERN

He writes:

"During the seven-year period 1947-53, the total economy expanded at an average annual rate of about 4.7 per cent in real terms (adjusting for price change); during 1953-56, the rate fell to about 2.6 per cent; and from the fourth quarter of 1955 to the fourth quarter of 1956 the expansion was only about 2.5 per cent."

Even more immediately menacing than the slowing-down rate of growth, however, Keyserling finds the way in which the economy has been growing:

"During the 1953-56 period as a whole," he writes, "personal interest income has been advancing about 65 per cent faster than wages, and dividend income has been advancing about 75 per cent faster than wages. Corporate profits have been advancing almost 29 per cent faster than the personal income of the people as a whole, and investment has grown much faster than consumption. From the fourth quarter of 1955 to the fourth quarter of 1956, while investment in plant and equipment grew about 10 per cent in real terms, consumption grew only about 2 per cent."

And he underlines the significance of these figures as follows:

"Under these circumstances, it is a misreading of the situation to complain that wages have been advancing too fast, or to assert that this is the central cause of price inflation. While there is a real problem of unevenness in the wage structure—and of lifting low-income families relatively faster than others—consumer incomes, of which wages are the major portion, have been advancing much too slowly to maintain balance between investment and consumption at a full-employment rate of growth."

A 10 per cent growth in investment in plant and equipment, a 2 per cent growth in consumption; that is a classic pattern of the tendency of capitalism to over-produce in its boom phase.

An inflationary price rise in certain economic sectors despite abundant supply and even over-supply of all lines of consumer goods, which is caused only by relative monopoly control of those sectors of the economy—that is also a classic symptom of the terminal phases of a boom.

It is a direct product of the attempt of the economic giants to maintain their rate of profit on the expanding mass of their investment in plant and equipment in the face of consumer buying power which cannot keep the pace.

## WHAT TO DO?

What remedies does Keyserling propose for the ominous trends he sees? In this particular article, at least, he is both brief and vague.

He is against the government's "hard money" policy on the ground that it "ration's resources and rewards in the wrong direction." He is for a federal budget which "fulfills the essential purpose of meeting our prime priorities. . . . Such a budget, by breaking bottlenecks and overcoming specific shortages, would also advance our rate of economic growth and reduce inflationary pressures."

He is for a congressional investigation of prices which would "help to focus attention" on the "dangerous distortions in the economy." And finally, "We need to take a look at some of the specific bottlenecks of inadequate supply—such as steel—and find ways to break them, instead of trying to force the economy into the confining bottle through the narrow neck."

Keyserling's demand for a congressional price (and hence profit) investigation is in line with a similar demand made by the labor movement, headed by the United Automobile Workers. It is very doubtful that, as long as the boom continues sufficient support can be found in Congress for a real probe of the problem, though a

Democratic majority which sought to present itself as a real opposition to the Eisenhower government could make some very substantial political capital out of it.

## CLOUD ON THE ECONOMY

As to the other "proposals" Keyserling makes, they suggest much more an end than a means. There are two ways, for instance, in which a capitalist government could make to break bottlenecks in steel.

One would be to go into the steel business itself, along the lines of setting up "yardstick" plants in competition with the steel industry. The other would be to give such attractive subsidies to the industry, either in the form of tax relief or direct subsidies, as to guarantee it a high rate of profit on its total investment, regardless of present or even future economic conditions.

But the first is quite outside the realm of political possibilities today, and the second would simply create more problems than it would solve.

The fact of the matter is that the over-all direction and planning of the economy to which Keyserling seems to lean cannot be achieved within the limits of federal budgetary policy as these are accepted by the Republican administration, or even as they are conceived by the remnants of the New-Dealers who are still with us.

Keyserling's analysis of the basic trends in the economy falls much too close to a Marxian one for the comfort capitalists seek from their economists. While it does not mean that a depression is right around the corner, it points up a general movement of the economy which should give pause to the prophets of the "perpetual revolution" by which American capitalism is supposed to have lifted itself out of the realm where the general economic laws of capitalism apply, into a rarefied atmosphere where its own law of motion is upward and onward forever.

## READERS TAKE THE FLOOR

### Welsh Nationalism

To the Editor:

May I make a brief reply to Ness Edwards on Welsh Nationalism (your issue Dec. 24). My note on this subject attacked the British Labor Party as the struggle for the allegiance of the Welsh working class is increasingly between the Nationalists and Labor. *Plaid Cymru* is anti-Labor but not anti-labor, in the sense that you are anti-Democratic but not anti-democratic.

It is true that Wales is as afflicted by managerialism and capitalism as England but there are special circumstances, as there were in Ireland pre-1918. The real participation of working people in cultural and religious life through institutions such as the National Eisteddfod illustrates what I mean.

350,000 Welsh-speakers live in Glamorgan and these miners and steel workers will be amused to learn that they are politically backward. Nor will those who have taken part in labor disputes such as that at Gwaun-cal-Gwenn remember with gratitude the bureaucratic interventions of official Labor and some Stalinist union bosses.

Perhaps most striking of all is the way in which Labor MPs have egged on the Tories to bar a very modest proposal for political broadcasts by the Nationalists and Liberals, made by the Welsh BBC.

Talk of an economic "flight" from Wales if the *Plaid* succeeds only underlines the imperialistic way in which English capital has been allowed to "colonize" Wales under successive governments.

If Mr. Edwards' disputes any of the foregoing I should be pleased to submit chapter and verse for your adjudication.

DOUGLAS STUCKEY

We're afraid that many of the matters in Mr. Stuckey's rejoinder can't be adjudicated in *LA*. What we were interested in noting, in our Dec. 24 publication of the exchange between Stuckey and Comrade Edwards, was the political character of Welsh Nationalism. Our own sympathies lie with the Labor movement, with a capital L.—Ed.



# SWPer 'Explains'

In the Jan. 21 issue of the SWP's *Militant*, writer M. T. Weiss had charged that the ISL urged left-wingers in the SP to accept the terms for SP-SDF unity which were up for referendum vote. (These terms were embodied in political statements of position.) Two weeks ago, a letter here by Max Shachtman nailed this lie.

Below we publish, first, a reply by M. T. Weiss. Without seeming to turn a hair, she "proves" her exploded charge by a citation... of the quite different fact that Shachtman was against the left-wingers splitting from the SP.

While her letter would seem to be enough in itself, we also append two comments in letters by the two comrades concerned.—Ed.

## Myra Tanner Weiss:

To the Editor:

In a letter published in *LABOR ACTION*, Jan. 28, Max Shachtman quoted the Jan. 21 issue of the *Militant* in which I wrote about the merger of the Socialist Party-Social Democratic Federation. The leftwing of the SP denounced the proposed terms of the merger, I reported, as a "capitulation to Dulles and American imperialism." The *Militant* article further said that "the ISL instead of supporting the SP left wing in this struggle, urged them to accept these terms wholeheartedly and did everything in its power to facilitate the capitulation of the left-wing leadership."

After quoting the above lines in the *Militant*, Shachtman says, "they are a rare case of the flawless lie, unmarred at a single point by the truth. If the *Militant* writer alludes to no fact to support her assertion, it is because none exists, and she knows it. The entire story about what the ISL did or did not support... is pure invention, and she knows it."

Contrary to the charge that the *Militant* had "no fact to support her assertion," I submit the following: In a mimeographed memo issued by the Committee for a Socialist Program dated Jan. 9, David McReynolds, Sec. of the CFSP, explained why he changed his mind about opposition to the merger with the SDF.

In addition to other explanations for his sudden reversal, he said the following: "I have also been relieved following recent talks with Max Shachtman since it seems the ISL looks upon unity with the SDF as a first step toward a re-built socialist movement under the banner of the Socialist Party and will therefore refrain from that sectarian cross-fire I had feared. In fact, I thought it rather ironic that when I last met with Shachtman to urge the ISL to suspend judgment on the merger since I thought it might not prove as disastrous as I had earlier expected, that before I could even set forth this view of things, Comrade Shachtman was saying how important it was that the left-wing not leave the Party in a huff, but remain and help make the best of the unity."

If Shachtman wants to repudiate McReynolds' account of their discussion, then let him do so and the *Militant* will take note of the correction. In the meantime I am sure you will oblige me, in the spirit of the most elementary socialist regard for truth, by publishing this reply to Shachtman's letter.

MYRA TANNER WEISS

New York, Jan. 28

## David McReynolds:

To the Editor:

Thanks for showing me the copy of Myra Tanner Weiss' letter regarding Max Shachtman's alleged advice to the "left wing" of the Socialist Party. As the person with whom Shachtman had what now seems to have been a memorable lunch, and as the person who wrote a letter to various comrades in the Socialist Party—the letter to which Myra Weiss refers—in the course of which I made a passing reference to my conversation with Shachtman, let me make certain things as clear as possible:

(1) To the best of my knowledge Shachtman has never seen a copy of the "memorandum on unity"—certainly I have never shown it to him or to any

member of the ISL or any other political organization. Consequently it would strike me as very hard for Shachtman to take a position one way or another on it.

(2) At the time I saw Shachtman the referendum in the party on the unity question was over. Therefore it would seem pointless for him to give any advice to any member of the Socialist Party on what attitude they ought to take toward it.

(3) With all due respect to Comrade Shachtman, we did not have lunch with him in order to get his advice either on the referendum which had just been completed or on the convention which was about to take place. We had already taken our own counsel and reached our own decisions. Our decision was that since the referendum was over (and I make no secret of having opposed the memorandum) and a democratic decision had been reached, we would abide by it. Surely it is foolish to suggest that a man as busy as Comrade Shachtman spent his time urging us to do that which we had already decided to do.

(4) If Comrade Shachtman, by agreeing with us in our view that no good cause could be served by splintering or splitting or resigning on the question of SP-SDF unity, if by agreeing with us on that question he is thereby guilty of urging the left wing of the SP to "capitulate to State Dept. socialism," then I need a new dictionary.

(5) The very vigor and viciousness of the attack the *Militant* has made on the Socialist Party-Social Democratic Federation indicates on the one hand the importance of this merger and on the other hand the inability of the SWP to conceive of unity on any terms other than its own. The publication in the *Militant* of internal SP-SDF documents is in itself a hostile and unfraternal act, but the fabrication of positions no one ever held and statements no one ever made is, it seems to me, a violation of the simplest socialist ethic.

DAVID McREYNOLDS

New York, Jan. 31

## Max Shachtman:

To the Editor:

The facts are as stated in the letter of Comrade McReynolds.

After the referendum, about which I knew no details and could therefore express no opinion until the results were made known, I casually expressed the hope that nobody in the SP would react to the vote by leaving the party. I said this not because I thought that McReynolds or anyone like him needed such "urging" but to make extra sure that my own view was above doubt.

The letter of the *Militant* writer makes it clear that I owe her one apology in the interest of pedantic exactitude. In my original letter to you, I said her article about the ISL "is pure invention." It turns out not to be pure, inasmuch as one element of it, the letter of McReynolds to his friends, is not invented. But since what she quotes from it supports in absolutely no respect her attack on the ISL, but rather shows that she had before her a document that refuted it in advance, I conclude that the purity of her inventive gift is tainted by malicious fraud.

It is just barely possible that her vexation derives from my failure to "urge" left-wingers to split from the SP because they did not win a majority in the referendum. I don't know too much about her own abilities in the field of splitting, but I instantly concede that her party's leaders have a honed edge on that talent. But do slices cut off by the repeated practise of the talents on their own ranks really justify their zest for practising it elsewhere too? It strikes me as plain dizziness from success.

MAX SHACHTMAN

Don't miss a single week of

**LABOR ACTION**

A sub is only \$2.00 a year!

# YOU and SCIENCE

## 'SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT' TALKS DEMOCRATIC

By GENE LISTER

Since the birth of the "scientific management" movement with Taylorism over 50 years ago, certain segments of American capitalism have attempted to pose as impartial scientific managers of industry. To workers such embellishments have failed to hide the naked exploitative character of management in the interest of the owning class.

However, the mantle of science has served its purpose for management in various guises over the past several decades. Though never taken too seriously by the privileged managers of society themselves, the cover of "impartial management" and "democracy in business" has helped in selling big business to the liberal middle class. It particularly sounds good at commencement exercises and other public functions.

It has been rare that the managers of industry and their advocates drop the mask and speak frankly in public of their real role in governing industry. It is only done, as in the *Harvard Business Review* for November-December, when a re-examination by the managers themselves is necessary so that they are not unduly confused by the verbiage of "people's capitalism."

Under the title "Power Tactics," N. H. Martin and J. H. Sims propound the general thesis that:

"Beneath the general principles, attitudes and ideals of 'human relations' lie the actual tactics and day-to-day techniques by which executives achieve, maintain and exercise power. In the current enthusiasm for 'democratizing' business procedure these hard practical devices tend to be overlooked. Yet they exist just the same—and, in many ways, do not depart substantially from the scorned advice of Niccolò Machiavelli, whose name has become a symbol of cynicism, ruthlessness and deception."

To put it bluntly, whether in business, government, education or the church, executives are politicians who deal with "human relationships of superordination and subordination, of dominance and submission of the governors and the governed."

With this goal clearly understood, the question for the managers, continues the article, is:

"How can power be used most effectively? What are some of the political stratagems which the administrator must apply if he is to carry out his responsibilities and further his career? This is an area that has been carefully avoided by students and practitioners of business—as if there were something shady about it. But facts are facts, and closing our eyes to them will not change them."

What then are some of the Machiavellian tactics which the successful industrialist and contemporary executive pursue?

As advised by Martin and Sims, a power-oriented executive (and apparently there is no other kind) must be cautious in the way he seeks advice, even in consultative management, lest his mantle of omniscience be shattered. Alliances within his organization both above and below must be maintained in the struggle for power and influence. An executive should be flexible and maintain at all times the ability to maneuver. The perhaps more descriptive term "shifty" is not used. Communications, though essential for organization, should not be overdone, lest subordinates be over-educated.

Managers should develop the ability to compromise graciously, to settle differences if necessary with tongue in cheek. They need learn the advantages of "negative timing"; programs which cannot be squashed openly should be permitted to die "on the vine." Executives should put on a "good show" and develop a flair for acting, as a means of persuasion and selling their point of view. Finally, in spite of all these double dealings, the manager must give the appearance of certainty and confidence. Above all there must be no doubt that he is the boss.

The *HBR* admits that all of the above may be difficult to reconcile with the trend towards selling "democracy" in

business and industry. Even authors Martin and Sims use "democracy" in quotes, since industry obviously never has accepted its true meaning. However, in order that the managers themselves not become confused or develop an unnecessary guilt complex, they must squarely see the contradictions at work.

## "POWER PLAYS"

To quote from the article further: "As we delve deeper into the study of political tactics in business management, the contrast with modern human-relation theory and practice will stand out in ever sharper relief. Mutual confidence, open communication, continuing consultation and participation by subordinates, friendship, an atmosphere of democracy seem hard to reconcile with much of the maneuvering and power plays that go on in the nation's offices and factories every day."

The *HBR* can offer no solution to the dilemma into which capitalism has worked its managers, scientific or otherwise. There appears to be no way by which the businessman can reconcile the law of the jungle which basically governs industry with the "human relations" approach which sounds so good before women's clubs. Since there can be no consistent answer in an exploitive economy, executives will have to continue to bear the burden of hypocrisy as well as their fat salaries and expense accounts will permit them.

We can be sure that when the competitive going gets tough industry will drop the "soft-sell" of "scientific management" and revert to its unadorned exploitation. This happens every day in the case of weaker individual companies that can no longer afford the luxury of "democracy." Whole nations have followed the same course. And capitalism as a whole can only use the term scientific as a pretty cover for its naked power struggle.

## Books in Brief

**A WORLD IN REVOLUTION**, by Sidney Lens.—Praeger, N. Y., 1954. \$3.75.

Sid Lens already has two outstanding books to his credit, *Left, Right and Center* on the trade-union movement and *Counterfeit Revolution* on the Stalinist states. Now in his new book he raises a host of stimulating questions about the revolution that is going on in the world particularly in the underdeveloped lands that have been held back by feudal conditions under capitalist imperialism. What he raises most sharply is the problem of industrialization and modernization of these countries without dictatorship, but many will disagree with the concept of feudalism in the modern world which he develops, and with other aspects of his suggested solutions.

**KEIR HARDIE**, by Emrys Hughes.—George Allen & Unwin, London, 1956. 15s.

A leading pacifist, Labor MP in England has written this popular biography of the great founder of the British independent labor movement. Hughes traces the saga of Hardie's life from his childhood in a poor miners' family to his triumphs as "the greatest agitator of his day" and the leader of labor's political movement against the "lib-labs" who would keep the workers tied to liberalism's wagon.

Author Hughes worked with Hardie in campaigns in his later years and is a former editor of the *Glasgow Forward*.

**LABOR ACTION • 17th YEAR**

February 11, 1957

Vol. 21, No. 6

Published weekly by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone: WAtkins 4-9222.—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. Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH. Associate Editors: GORDON WASKELL, BEN HALL



## French Students and the Algerian War

The following discussion of the role of French and Algerian students in France's "dirty war" against Algeria is excerpted from a longer article on this subject which appears in the Winter 1957 issue of Anvil and Student Partisan.—ED.

By A. GIACOMETTI

Politically, the French students' union (Union Nationale des Etudiants Français, or UNEF) has always suffered from the contradiction inherent in the social position of the student. It arose as a by-product of the Resistance movement, and distinguished itself from the pre-war student movements by a broader, more radical position, and by a new conception of the student as a "young intellectual worker." In line with this new approach, the UNEF began to function somewhat like a trade union, engaging in "collective bargaining" with the government. One of its principal demands has been a "pre-salary," paid by the government, to students maintaining a certain grade average; this would enable young people to study regardless of their family's material situation. It has also raised other demands, tending towards a thorough reform of the school and university system, in the sense of its democratization. (At the present time, only about 5 per cent of French students are of working-class origin—counting white-collar workers, the proportion is about 25 per cent. About a quarter of all male students and a fifth of all female students work part time.)

### POLITICAL LAG

Although quite advanced in a corporative way, the UNEF has lagged behind on political questions, taking timid and evasive stands on every important issue on the pretext that students should "stay away from politics." In its relations with students from the French colonies, and on colonial questions in general, the UNEF has always been one step behind. As late as April 1955, for instance, it futilely refused to recognize the Tunisian students' union as a "national union," recognizing it instead as a "representative organization of Tunisian students on the internal (French) level."

The organization was first forced to take notice of the Algerian war in October 1955, when a sizable number of stu-

dents were being drafted for the first time. A minority demanded that the union express its concern over the Algerian situation, that it condemn the conscription in general, and that it ask the government to explain in greater detail for what exact purpose French youth were being called to battle.

Although it was possible to smooth that conflict over, events soon raised the whole issue again in a much sharper form. In the course of November and December, the French political police moved against the Algerian students and their newly formed organization, the "Union Générale des Etudiants Musulmans Algériens" (UGEMA). Several of its members were arrested, its president and secretary-general were questioned and one of its members, Zeddour Belkacem, was killed by the police in the Algiers prison, after having been terribly tortured in Oran. The police attempted to make the body disappear by throwing it into the Mediterranean in a weighted bag, and declared that Belkacem had escaped. Three weeks later the body was washed ashore and found by a passer-by. The case became a public scandal.

### FASCISTS ATTACK

On the prompting of the UGEMA a number of student organizations (among others the UNEF, the Federation in France of Students from Tropical Africa, the Catholic Student Union, the Association of North African Students and the SP's Socialist Students) signed a declaration of protest which they submitted to the government, demanding also that the government take a clear position on the crimes committed by its police.

By January, there was still no reply from the government. The UGEMA decided to organize a week of protest, with the cooperation of the French student organizations. January 20 was decided upon as a day on which all students would be called upon to boycott their lectures and go on a hunger strike. For the evening of January 20, the UGEMA had planned a meeting in Montpellier, a university town in Southwestern France. Under the leadership of Jean-Marie Mousseron, legal advisor and honorary president of the UNEF, the "patriotic" students had organized a coun-

ter-demonstration in the morning, gathering before a monument to the war dead in memory of a student who had been killed a few days before in the Aurès mountains. For fear of a clash, the city authorities refused to permit the UGEMA and the liberal and radical groups to hold an open meeting, so the meeting was held at the hall of the labor unions.

The opening speech was made by a trade unionist but before the meeting had really gotten under way a crowd of about a thousand "patriotic" students, led by Mousseron and reinforced by Poujadist commandos from out of town, surrounded the hall, trapping the liberal and radical students inside. When the latter came out, they were beaten up by the fascist goon squads. The next morning, there were incidents all over the university, usually ending in small fights. This incident, although a logical development of the tensions previously existing in the UNEF, deeply split the organization.

In April, the 45th Congress of the UNEF met. Prominently on its agenda was the Algerian question and the relations with the Algerian students. Right-wing and liberal forces were balanced with almost equal strength on each side, and motions were being passed by extremely small margins. The student union of Algiers arrived on the scene determined to make a row, which was avoided with great difficulty. A moderately right-wing leadership was elected by 48 votes to 47, the candidate of the liberal minority being a Catholic student by the name of Michel de la Fourrière.

### ALGERIAN STRIKE

In May, the students of the Ecole Normale Supérieure, a highly specialized liberal arts university in Paris, went on a 24-hour hunger strike to support a demand for government negotiations with the Algerian nationalists. Also in May, the European students' union in Algiers went on strike against one of the few liberal decisions of Governor-General Lacoste. The latter had issued a decree making it easier for Algerians to enter and to rise within the civil service hierarchy. The European students of Algiers not only called a strike against this decision, but also called for a general mobilization of the Army and for the formation in Algeria of an armed "volunteer corps" of civilians.

The answer of the Algerian students came on May 19, when the Algiers section of the UGEMA decided on an unlimited boycott of courses and exams and called on its members to join the partisans. The strike was practically general, and has remained so to this day. As could be expected, the decision of the Algerian students caused a tremendous commotion in the French student organizations. The UNEF called a special session of its Administration Council for June 3, to decide what attitude to take. In the meantime, the Paris and Montpellier sections had broken off all relations with the UGEMA, in the case of Paris against the opposition of a strong minority, while several liberal student organizations dissociated themselves from the nationalist position of the Algerian students but at the same time asserted their determination to continue to defend the latter's rights as students. In a common release, the Socialist Students of Paris, the Communist Students and the "Rally of the Student Left" (New Left) declared that the statement of the Algerian students was "neither racist nor anti-French" but showed the "difficult choice that is both theirs and ours" and asked the French students to recognize that "national interest de-

mands that a policy of negotiations and cease-fire be followed as soon as possible." Several associations of colonial students came out in strong support of the UGEMA.

The UNEF Administration Council took place in an atmosphere of patriotic hysteria. By a vote of 45 against 36, with 14 delegates absent or abstaining, the Council resolved that "under the circumstances all relations with the UGEMA had become impossible." After this vote, the liberals withdrew their five representatives from the Bureau which became, for the first time in years, a homogenous right-wing and completely unrepresentative body.

### LIBERALS WIN

After the decision of the UNEF, the situation of the striking Algerian students changed for the worse. In Lyon, nine Algerian students were arrested for distributing a leaflet explaining the reasons for their strike, and were charged with "threatening the security of the State." In Montpellier the university administration prohibited the Algerian students from using the student union cafeteria; elsewhere, too, hostility came into the open against students who were now considered fair game for the police and the "patriotic" vigilantes.

On July 3, a new switch occurred in the position of the UNEF. Perhaps under the impression of the protests from colonial students, perhaps also impressed by the mounting wave of persecution against the Algerian students, a few previously neutral delegates switched their vote to the liberals. By a majority of one vote, the liberal motion on policy was passed. It involved re-establishing contacts with the UGEMA "in order to draft in common an appeal condemning violence on both sides." This time the right-wing delegates walked out in protest, and the remaining delegates, a small majority, elected a homogeneous liberal Bureau headed by Michel de la Fourrière.

### HESITANT ANSWER

The right wing at once contested the legitimacy of this Bureau, and started organizing an opposition throughout France and, of course, Algeria. The Algiers section, a stronghold of fascist and Poujadist elements, announced its intention to withdraw from the national organization. Other right-wing sections took a similar position, but postponed their decision until the beginning of the fall semester; in the meantime, they refused to recognize the authority of the new liberal Bureau.

Yet the motion which had been passed by no means reflected a clear-cut liberal position—it was a compromise motion, incorporating certain demands of the right wing. Thus it asked the Algerian student union to do something it obviously could not be expected to do: disavow the call to arms of its Algerian section. Only such a disavowal, the resolution said, would permit the UNEF "to continue maintaining professional relations in an atmosphere of trust and friendship, without which the building of a Franco-Moslem community is impossible." By incorporating this idea in the resolution, the liberals attempted to meet the attacks of the right-wingers who accused them of "caring more for the Moslem students than for their own countrymen in Algiers." If the liberals, the right-wingers asked, so strongly condemned the European student union of Algiers for its call to arms, why did they hesitate to do the same when the UGEMA asked its members to join the partisans? There is only one answer to give this kind of argument: "Yes, we

(Turn to last page)

## Florida Students Back Negro Fight Courage on the Campus

An impressive example of white solidarity with the Negro struggle for integration has recently been displayed in the South by students at the all-white Florida State University. In the face of threats of expulsion from school by the racist Board of Controls, which is in charge of Florida's educational policy, over 50 white students have pledged to continue their aid to the Tallahassee Inter-Civic Council, which organized and leads the boycott of the buses by Negroes in that city.

Some of the students have been performing volunteer work at the ICC office in preparation for an integrated bus protest rally, with the group as a whole pledging itself to attend the rally.

One student has already been barred from school. John Boardman, a graduate student at FSU, aroused the school board's ire because he is publicly supporting a Negro bus-boycott leader, the Rev. K. S. Dupont, for City Commissioner, because

he brought three Negroes to a "white" Christmas party at the school, and because he spoke at a meeting of Negroes to express his support of their efforts to end segregation on Tallahassee's buses.

Boardman is fighting the bar against attending classes as an attack on his civil liberties.

The Board of Controls issued an order banning both white and Negro students from participating in the boycott movement. The Tallahassee White Citizens Council has called for the expulsion of all students who support Dupont's candidacy on the grounds that this violates the school board order.

And the WCC added, "they must not be allowed to re-enter any state-supported institution of higher learning ever."

Despite this intimidation, both white and Negro students are continuing their support for Dupont and the bus boycott in general.



## Social Forces in the Middle East:

# THE IMPACT OF 'NASSERISM' ON ARAB NATIONALISM

By BRIJEN K. GUPTA

Cairo's July junta, since its inception, has been an enigma to the West.

It has been interchangeably called a fascist dictatorship and a Russian stooge. It has been charged with indulging in spectacular political moves in order to keep itself in the political saddle. The prime minister of Britain considers it to be a choking threat to Britain's lifeline; the socialist premier of France considers it the greatest threat to the French pursuit of North African imperialism.

However, in Asia, Western frustrations are hardly shared. Indian Socialist Asoka Mehta, a staunch friend of Israel, calls Nasser the man who has caught the dilemma of Asia by its horns. The anti-Zionist Lohia on the one hand has advised the Egyptian dictatorship to purge itself of authoritarian vices, and on the other has hailed the nationalization of the Suez Canal as the single greatest event in Asian history since the independence of India. He considers it as the beginning of Asian economic independence. Jordan's right-wing socialist premier, Suleman Nabulsi, has called Nasserism the philosophy of the Arab awakening; even Israel's left-wing socialists of Ahdut Avodah and Mapam, though extremely critical of Nasser's Israeli policy, at one stage hailed him as a progressive force inside Egypt.

## Nasserism Inside and Outside Egypt

Nasserism has grown up in a negative atmosphere.

Jon Kimche tells us that during the last eight decades, Britain has broken eighty-six pledges given to Egypt. We also know that Britain has twice violated—nay, three times—the 1888 Convention regarding Suez. In his interview on "Meet the Press," Anthony Nutting revealed that after the Second World War 80,000 British soldiers were in the Canal Zone, and not 10,000 as it had been agreed by the 1936 treaty.

Such pieces of information not only help us to understand why the British imperialists call Nasser a liar, a man who cannot be trusted, but also why hatred for the West, and not merely an orientation toward anti-imperialism, is a motivating force behind Nasserism. Creative thinking for a philosophy of Arab nationalism has been rendered impossible by the intrigues of the foreign powers, whose main effort has been to isolate Egypt from the Asian Arabs. Witness the Baghdad Pact.

**Nasserism is a curious mixture of Peronism and Jacobinism.**

Like Peronism it has grown as a result of a hostile feeling toward the European powers. (In external relations, these powers are represented by France, Britain and Israel, and in internal politics by the Wafdists leaders and a bureaucracy rotten to its innermost core.) Like Peronism, it was engineered by a group of army officers—the "Free Officers."

Just as in Argentina before Peron there was an alliance between British capital and big land-owners, the *estancieros*, so in Egypt British capital looted the country with the open support of the pashas. As in the case of Peronism, the program of the July junta in its initial stage was threefold: to regain the lost prestige of the army, to eliminate the corrupt political parties, and to initiate an alliance between the army and labor.

Naguib was picked up by Nasser, just as Peron picked up Ramirez. Like Ramirez, Naguib instituted the minimum-wage laws and land reforms as the first part of the Revolutionary Command Council's program.

Like Jacobinism against the church, Nasserism was directed against the Moslem Brotherhood. (Note Nasser's constant refusal to be drawn into any pan-Islamic federation, a proposal that Pak-

istan has long been circulating.) Like Robespierre, Nasser has tried to assure the sanctity of private property, and quite like the Jacobin leader, though public welfare and democracy have been advocated, dictatorship and the curtailment of civil liberties have been the lot of the Egyptians. Furthermore, like Jacobinism, Nasserism seeks to become the guiding philosophy of the neighboring countries.

It is therefore not surprising that a mass of myth should have accumulated around Nasser and his *Philosophy of the Revolution*. The most unfortunate thing about the Western journalists has been that they have been narrating isolated facts about Nasserism and Egypt. Hardly ever has any attempt been made to interpret the Middle Eastern events in their historical perspective; much less has there been an attempt to trace the historical causes that have brought Arab nationalism to Nasser's fore.

**American theories of historical causation, thanks to journalists like Hal Lehrman, have been satisfied with tracing the conflicts in the Middle East to the perverse infatuations of Nasser. Such a criticism ignores the first principles of history.**

Trends like Nasserism are the results of historical forces. Individuals like Nasser can change individual features of such trends, but not the basic forces that cause them.

Like Robespierre, Nasser has tried to assure the sanctity of private property, and quite like the Jacobin leader, though public welfare and democracy have been advocated, dictatorship and the curtailment of civil liberties have been the lot of the Egyptians. Furthermore, like Jacobinism, Nasserism seeks to become the guiding philosophy of the neighboring countries.

## ROLE OF EGYPT

**Here a distinction must be drawn between Nasserism in Egypt and in Syria and Jordan. Outside Egypt, the most ardent supporters of Nasserism come from the national bourgeoisie.**

In Syria, the alliance of the army and labor has taken place under the leadership of the middle classes. In Jordan, the Palestinian refugees provide the base for mass support to Egypt. (It should not be overlooked that the Palestinians are the best-educated group in the entire Arab world.) And this support goes to Nasser in spite of the fact that most of these refugees consider Nasser to be much less a destructive enemy of Israel than they would like him to be.

The left-wing Arab movements, like the Baath Socialist Party, support Nasser because of the Republican flavor in his ideas, and because of his stress on an economic union of the Arab countries of the Middle East as a precondition for the social and economic revolution in the area.

There is a two fold explanation of this difference between Nasserism inside Egypt and outside.

First, it was Egypt that suffered most as a result of its *physical* occupation by the imperialist powers. Only three years ago, 80,000 British troops were engaged in the Canal Zone, not in defending the Suez Canal, as it has been sometimes claimed, but as Anthony Nutting has candidly pointed out, "fighting the civilian population" engaged in guerrilla activity.

And furthermore, not only has Egypt been the poorest country in the Middle East, but also there is hardly any country in the Middle East whose bourgeoisie had been as corrupt and as un-nationalistic as that of Egypt. On the other hand, in Syria and Jordan, a sensitive middle class, with genuine nationalist aspirations, has been long in the offing, fight-

ing authoritarian rulers like Shisakly and viceroys like Glubb.

**It must also be pointed out that Nasserism outside Egypt is not due to the presence of pro-Nasser quislings but to an objective identity of interests.**

Nasser, to the best of my knowledge, has nowhere asked that the Cairo junta be considered as a model for other Arab governments. Nor has he so far subverted any neighboring government. In the Persian oil-producing sheikhdoms, the organization of the working class has been the activity of the Syrian trade-unionists rather than of Nasser's yemen. In Iraq, the opposition of people like Kamil Chederjey, Faik Sammiray, Mehdi Kubbah and others, and political organizations like the National Democratic Congress, are older than the July junta.

This does not mean that Nasser has been neutral about the struggles going on in the Arab world, but his support of the nationalist movements has been far less than intervention or subversion.

## THE TEST IS AT HOME

I said earlier that Nasserism has grown up in a negative atmosphere. Movements of the dependent peoples are quite likely to grow in such an atmosphere.

**But the true test of their progressive character lies in the ability of the leaders to give a positive socio-economic content to them.**

Nasser-type Arab nationalism has been largely determined by a vague, often mystical, feeling of anti-Westernism, and the policies of Nasserism have been largely the result of Anglo-French-American vicissitudes. The nationalization of Suez serves as a prime example.

The nationalization, though it had been vaguely talked about for quite some time, was more a retaliatory measure than a part of Egyptian economic philosophy. The nationalization of the British and French assets after the Anglo-French invasion may be similarly classified. As a matter of fact, at the Brioni Conference of Tito, Nehru and Nasser the special position of the Western economic interests in the Middle East was clearly recognized, perhaps at the insistence of Nehru.

## Arab Socialists and the Israeli Issue

The most articulate exponents of Arab nationalism—and I have used Arab nationalism and Nasserism as synonymous terms—are the Baath Socialists.

The three important issues facing Arab nationalism to them appear to be: (1) elimination of the influence of the West from the Middle East; (2) unification of the Arab states of the Middle East, eventually to embrace all Arab countries from the Atlantic to the Persian Gulf; and (3) a final settlement with Israel.

Elimination of the influence of the West from the Middle East is seen as the cardinal issue; without it unification of the Arab states is impossible; without it the settlement with Israel is impossible; without it economic and social development is well-nigh impossible.

Israel is seen as a projection of the West, and it is felt that if the hold of the West on the Middle East, including Israel, is weakened, there might be a greater readiness on the part of Israel to have a settlement in Western Asia. The elimination of the Baghdad Pact would bring back Iraq into the Arab brotherhood, and the oil royalties would be the only way to finance economic development into the area.

Whether it is the same kind of thinking that Lenin and Trotsky did is yet to be seen.

**In spite of the fact that the Nasser re-**

*Brijen K. Gupta is an Indian socialist now studying in the U.S.; he is associated with the Socialist Party of India led by Rammanohar Lohia. Last summer he toured the Middle East, interviewing and discussing with prominent socialists and other leaders in the Arab states and in Israel, and as a result published a number of articles in the Indian and British press on the problems of the region.*

*In this thought-provoking article written for LABOR ACTION, Comrade Gupta presents an interpretation of Middle Eastern social forces, particularly in Egypt, which we are sure will interest our readers. It is a field of discussion which continues to require a good deal of political exploration. We will try to publish other contributions to such discussion from time to time.*

*Scheduled for publication in LA is also an informational summary of some of the material on Arab socialism and nationalism which Comrade Gupta presented in his above-mentioned articles abroad.—ED.*

The favorable orientation toward the Soviet Union has also been motivated rather negatively. Having seen that Western efforts to isolate Egypt failed, Nasser's program for some time has been to isolate Baghdad.

Though during the last couple of years Nasser has paid lip-service to the idea of a "Third Force," we cannot overlook that at one time, during the negotiations over the evacuation of the British troops from the Suez, he gave indication of willingness to join a broad Middle East defense system.

Last July, after the referendum on the new Egyptian constitution, Nasser even went to the extent of dropping those ministers from his cabinet who were too anti-West, and included ministers who had a positive preference for the United States. All of a sudden, one day last June, after having been viciously attacked for a few months, the United States government got a big build-up in the Egyptian press. Point Four was thanked. Pictures of American equipment were exhibited. This was the period just before the Egyptian decision to request assistance from the United States for the Aswan Dam; and Dulles' withdrawal of the offer made America a villain once again.

**gime is authoritarian in its character. I do not for one moment believe that the destruction of the State of Israel by violent means is its aim. The mood in the Arab countries is to continue a "No Peace and No War" policy, because any other policy would, to them, mean acceptance of the status quo. Events have proved that Western protection, under such declarations as the Tripartite Declaration, extends only to Israel, and hence for factual reasons alone, the Arab countries are not prepared to go out for a war against Israel.**

The Baath Socialists made it clear to me that they have repudiated the 1948 war, and they cite as examples the liquidation of warmongering administrations in Egypt, Syria and Jordan as a test of the Arab thinking.

According to Michele Aflak, the secretary-general of the Baath Socialist Party, a Near Eastern Federation is the only solution of the problems of Western Asia, wherein Israel would cease to be a Zionist state, and wherein the Arabs would promise to world Jewry a spiritual symbol, à la Vatican, in Jerusalem.

All this sounds too good to be true. Arab nationalism—like its counterpart, Zionist chauvinism—is reaching an aggressive stage, and unless an effort is made to look to internal affairs, the preoccupation with external affairs may bring about a big explosion in Western Asia.



## The Great White Father Washes His Hands

# UPROOTING The American Indians

By VICTOR HOWARD

*"It is hard for them to cut loose from their people and their culture has no counterpart outside..."*

This sentence, from a report on "The American Indian Relocation Program," just published by the Association on American Indian Affairs, bears on the key problem of Indian relocation.

With a Field Foundation grant, a five-member survey team examined the problems faced by the 12,625 reservation Indians who have been relocated to cities under government auspices during the last four years. This number may seem like a drop in the bucket compared with the migration of Negroes and Puerto Ricans to cities, but the dimensions of a human problem should never be measured solely by a statistical ruler.

These Indians have a far greater adjustment problem due to the wide cultural gap they are obliged to cross. With a little exaggeration, one writer has called it a transition from a Pre-Columbian to an atomic-age civilization in six months. There are still thousands of Indians who cannot speak the language of their conquerors.

Those who are persuaded or coerced into relocating often leave a rural and communitarian way of life in which they have had personal security and a measure of federal protection, and are suddenly confronted with the mad competition of the urban jungle.

The federal government launched this program of relocation four years ago with the announced intention of giving Indians an alternative to the poverty of reservation existence. There "the business of survival fills their days." Most Indians are subsistence farmers or stock-raisers on the poorest land in the country. As the report puts it:

"In Oklahoma this man and his wife and four children may live in a two-room shack where innateness contends with crowding. At Navajo they will live in a hogan, carry their drinking water great distances, and relieve themselves behind a clump of bushes. At Pine Ridge, where the Oglala Sioux are, there may be a privy, without a door. That is not all there is. In Oklahoma, there is the strong sense of historic continuity where immigrant Indians brought the first institutions of civilization to a wild frontier, and native tribes have living memories of where they hunted the buffalo or where the winter camp was pitched. There is also the beautiful, red-canyoned Navajo desert for people who are not afraid of space and quiet, and a piece of windy prairie in South Dakota for the Sioux who once roamed it all. In the Pueblo villages, reversely, there will be cozy compactness around the kiva and an immemorial intimacy."

### FALSE HOPES

In a word, "an Indian relinquishes more than mere poverty when he leaves his ethnic community for a distant industrial city."

He has seen attractive posters showing the beautiful Chicago lake front, but does not know that a foul slum hides just behind that line of green trees. He has seen pictures of relocated Indians standing in front of ranch homes with flower gardens, or indoors beside their refrigerators and television sets. He is also told that there are gas stoves, electric lights, and flush toilets, not to mention running water.

There are no matching pictures or stories of Indians drunk at city bars, youngsters in trouble with the police, or

of Indians sitting in unswept rooms on chairs with broken legs. But when the relocated Indian "sees his first city flat, drab and unlovely despite its plumbing... the old, familiar Indian hopelessness sets in abruptly."

The report adds, "It cannot be dishonest to tell an Indian man that he may some day have a television set (etc.). That he has to leave his Indian community to get them is a wrong which must be righted."

### THE CHEAP WAY

We arrive here at a point not sufficiently underlined in the report: the valid criticism of the opponents of the government program, who argue pointedly that relocation is being used by the government as a cheaper alternative to the task of elevating the level of life in Indian communities.

Much that was formerly being done to make life better on the reservations has now been stopped with the excuse that "relocation is the answer."

It is charged that the government program is designed to uproot and disperse the Indian communities, and thus relieve itself of the "Indian problem." If the displaced and rootless Indians become fottsam in the urban slum, they are then the problem of state and local welfare agencies, for they have lost their tribal connection and the right to federal services.

The relocation officers in the six relocation cities (Chicago, Denver, Los Angeles, San Francisco, San Jose, and St. Louis) were often found to be ill-equipped for their job. Many of them qualified for their posts through experience in the "relocation" of West Coast Japanese-Americans to desert concentration camps during World War II.

"Their lives have been lived mainly in cities... and they do not all seem to realize... that an Indian leaves something he loves when he goes to a metropolis." Moreover, "most of them know nothing of the comparatively intact Indian land and tradition which produced the spiritually secure Navajo, and the unforgotten military defeat, broken treaties and violated culture which produced the troubled Sioux."

### CRITICISMS

Some of the other criticisms of relocation which the team uncovered but did not necessarily endorse are these:

- Elected tribal officials are not given an opportunity to share in administration of the program and to protect Indian rights.
- Relocated Indians lose their tribal rights. They do not receive copies of papers they sign and do not know what rights they have lost.
- The Bureau's maximum figures for relocations from a given reservation in any year are really quotas which must be met; the field agent must fill it to please his superiors.

- Relocation is proceeding too rapidly for the size of relocation staffs and the ability of the relocation cities to absorb newcomers.

- There is inadequate training in the reservations for urban living. Moreover, Indians desiring to relocate are given no real choice about where to go, but are pressured to go to Chicago, for example, if the Los Angeles office cannot handle them promptly. If they receive bureau help, they can only relocate to six relocation-office cities.

- Indian family heads sometimes have to wait three weeks before placement on a job. The Bureau will not help an Indian who loses his job to find other employment. Relocation offices place Indian families at sub-standard wages.

- Relocation offices place Indian families in slum housing, or else in housing they cannot afford, whereupon the Indians move out and into the slums.

- Indian men and women are driven to alcoholism by the pressure of city life.

- The Bureau of Indian Affairs reports untruthfully the returns of Indians to reservations, making the figure much lower than it actually is.

- All relocation is to congested industrial cities, and no attempt is made to develop relocation opportunities in smaller cities where rarely raised Indians would be happier.

- Indians do not relocate voluntarily but under pressure of relentless urging, unscrupulous portrayal of prosperous urban life, withheld welfare assistance, and unnamed reprisals against their families.

- The government uses the relocation program as a device for emptying the Indian reservations, and ending its obligation to the tribes.

- Relocation offices have inadequate follow-up procedures and terminate social services to relocated families too quickly, and cut off financial help before relocatees have resided in a city long enough to qualify for welfare aid. They will provide no services to migrant Indians who come to cities on their own initiative.

- There is no leadership developed among relocated Indians which could help them help themselves and each other.

- The Relocation Office in one city wars upon the Indian center there, discredits it, has planted spies in its organization, tapped its telephone, intimidated Indians who are active in opposition to the relocation program.

- City relocation officers tried to intimidate Harper's, the Atlantic Monthly, and the National Broadcasting Company when recent pieces unfavorable to the relocation program were known to be in process, and paid threatening visits to Indian families who had made statements to these magazines or the NBC.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

The average cost of relocation of an Indian family is only \$196, which includes transportation and subsistence until the first paycheck for man, wife, and several children. It is not surprising that relocated Indians are initially housed in a third-rate hotel or boarding house, and sent to eat in a cheap restaurant while the federal bureaucrats rustle up a low-paying job and a slum apartment for them to move into.

The Bureau agents try to wash their hands of the Indians as fast as possible. Its services are no longer available after a year. Nothing but the lack of return

fare may be keeping the Indians in the city by this time, but they are listed as "successful" relocatees in Bureau reports.

The Bureau claims that the rate of returns for the fiscal year ended last July was only 24 per cent. But these figures are laughed at by everyone not on the government payroll who knows anything about it. Some place the actual rate of returns at 60 per cent and even higher.

And no one, literally no one, knows what happens to those Indians who remain in the cities but lose contact with both the Bureau and Indian centers there. "These people are lost," says the report, "whether in happiness or wretchedness no one knows."

Among some of the wise recommendations of the report are these:

- Congress should repeal House Resolution 108 of the 83rd Congress, which declares its intention to terminate the Indian tribes as rapidly as possible. It should instead declare that it is federal policy to elevate Indian communities to the level of health and well-being prevailing elsewhere in the United States, that it proposes to do this through an American Indian "Point Four" program.

- The Indian Bureau should favor continued trust protection of Indian land; it should declare a moratorium on Indian land sales and help the tribes purchase allotments which individual Indians want to sell.

- Return fare to reservations should be provided for any relocated Indians who, after two but not after four years, apply for it and are found by a caseworker of the Travellers Aid Society to be unadjusted to urban life.

- Relocation should be provided to smaller cities, especially cities in states where reservations are located.

- Steps should be taken to insure that no reservation Indian is forced to relocate because he cannot obtain welfare assistance locally.

- The Indian Bureau should recognize the fact that relocation, while an important service, is not to be imagined as a solution to the Indian problem.

- Dishonest and misleading propaganda about the benefits of relocation to Indians should be toned down.

- Because of rapid deterioration of Indian conditions in Alaska, Oklahoma, and the Sioux country, which may destroy the Indian communities there if fast action is not taken, the report recommends immediate measures for the relief of Indian communities in those areas, as well as long-range economic plans. (Small industries in or near reservations have been recommended.)

### STRUGGLE FOR IDENTITY

The report includes much more, mostly in the category of case history, social work, community cooperation, church relations, and other paraphernalia of the do-gooder. It is well to note that the reporting team included no Indians, and that the sponsoring organization is a white organization which wants to "help" the Indians.

Its intelligent head is the writer Oliver LaFarge, but the wealthy socialites who finance it would not relish heavy criticism of the Republican administration, and the report does not question the sincerity of federal Indian officials. It assumes they want to do right but that Congress has imposed bad policies on them.

They fail to mention that Indian Bureau officials lobbied for much of the anti-Indian legislation now on the books, and that Congress tends to act on the recommendations of the Indian commissioner and his boss the Secretary of the Interior.

The National Congress of American Indians, the only national all-Indian organization, is handicapped in making its weight felt by lack of funds and the paucity of large blocs of Indian voters in places where votes count.

The official policy now, essentially, is that there is nothing worth preserving in Indian societies. What is going on now is basically the struggle to preserve Indian cultural identity, just 66 years after the final shot was fired in the last Indian battle at Wounded Knee, South Dakota.

It is notable that despite their poverty and the strong pressure to relocate, less than 13,000, or about 5 per cent, of the reservation population have done so. The government's announced goal for the current fiscal year is to relocate ten thousand more. But the end is not yet.



# G. D. H. Cole and The Hungarian Revolution

By PHILIP COBEN

The Hungarian Revolution has provided a kind of measuring-scale for determining how "Stalinist" any given pro-Communist or fellow traveler is. There have been some surprises in the results.

On the one hand, inside the Communist Parties (particularly in the U. S. and England) the Hungarian battle had a considerable impact, turning the thinking of a large number of Communist militants in the direction of democratic-socialist thinking, though it is perhaps still to be seen how successfully they will continue to travel in that direction and how far.

Different in many cases has been the result outside the Communist Parties among those types whom we have been accustomed to calling "Stalinoids" for want of a better term. In general the term has had some usefulness as a political label for those persons who are genuinely independent of the CP as an organization and of its discipline, but whose political ideology is essentially the same as that of Stalinism and leads them to be political apologists for it or sympathetic with it.

This is, of course, a very heterogeneous category, and the Hungarian Revolution has had a polarizing effect upon them too. Some have been violently repelled from any Stalinoid concepts; and this has been one of the victories of the Hungarian people.

But it is also among this tendency that one finds some of the brashest examples of unreconstructed Stalinist apologetics. In the U. S., W. E. B. DuBois and Anna Louise Strong have been just about the worst examples. Critical of the Russian suppression in Hungary but tending to whitewash it have been Paul Sweezy and others like him.

There is an interesting generic difference between the CP party militants who have been basically shaken by the Hungarian massacre and the non-party Stalinoids who have not permitted this regrettable event to disturb their political equanimity.

## THEY WERE PREPARED

On the one hand, we all know the type of Communist stalwart who always energetically defended his faith in Russia as the home of genuine working-class freedom, democracy and social progress. He insisted that Russia really was a democratic "workers' paradise" and he believed what he read in his propaganda organs about the happy life of the Russian people in "building socialism."

Living on illusions, the basis of his political faith collapsed when he read Khrushchev's revelations and saw Russian troops shooting down a workers' revolution in Hungary.

The DuBois-Sweezy type are quite different.

They never swallowed the fairy stories about "democracy" in Russia. They knew Russia was totalitarian. They knew the conditions under which the Russian people were exploited and oppressed. They even regretted these blemishes on the great enterprise of building "socialism."

But they did not allow these truths to interfere with their pro-Stalinist faith. Not because they are merely cynical, but because they had intellectually thought through to the point where they rationalized and justified support to a brutal to-

talitarianism in the name of the "socialist" future.

These types were and remain far more "Stalinist" than most of the CP party cadres themselves.

Their politics could not be shaken at its roots by what has happened. In essence, they knew it all along. They were intellectually prepared, as many party members were not. Ideologically they were more Stalinist than the Stalinists.

## DARK HINTS

Using this measuring-scale of the Hungarian Revolution, we want to record the "reading" that it gives us on G. D. H. Cole.

For adequate discussion of Cole's views, we refer readers to previous articles in LA (June 4 and Sept. 3 last, for example). We have been interested in Cole not simply as an individual but also because of the influence he seeks to exercise in the international left-socialist movement; for example, his role in the International Society for Socialist Studies which was founded at a Paris conference last year and of which he is president.

Here we want to take the space only to exhibit what Cole is now writing about Hungary, confident that it will be enough to exhibit it, in view of the great deal of material we have already carried on the Hungarian Revolution and the Stalinist slanders against it.

Cole's views on Hungary were set forth in an article entitled "Reflections on Hungary" in the Jan. 12 issue of the *New Statesman and Nation*. He begins:

"... the recent events in Hungary face left-wing socialists with an appallingly difficult problem of judgment... it is still very difficult to be sure about the facts... also because the facts, as they are at present known, are not open to simple explanation."

He poo-poo's the "picture [as drawn by anti-Communists] of an heroic people rising almost solidly against its oppressors and being prevented from setting up and consolidating a free national government only by the sheer force of Soviet tanks."

He darkly points out that this is the "version" given by the "Western" newspapers, but that "left-wing socialists" (in whose name he insists on speaking) should hesitate to accept it. Why? because we know how "such agencies as 'Voice of Europe'" have tried "to stir up revolt in the People's Democracies" and how these people were connected with Horthy fascists. The doubt is only how large a role they played and just what terrible things would have happened if the Russians hadn't intervened....

## THE 'FASCIST' TALE

Cole concedes that the uprising started as a genuine spontaneous one of discontent; that the CP and also the Soviet Union were unpopular. He is willing to "blame very severely" both the CP and the Russians "for their part in bringing about the revolt, quite apart from the steps taken subsequently for its suppression." The Rakosi regime "was evidently a most unpleasant police tyranny."

But with the outbreak, "certain reactionary elements" sought to use it for their own ends, taking advantage of its leaderlessness, and seized the opportunity to "set up local 'governments' or provisional regimes of their own. Some of these groups and regimes were no doubt inspired by high ideals of freedom and democracy; but others appear to have been almost openly Fascist and determined to undo the entire revolution that had de-throned the previously dominant powers—the landed classes and the Catholic Church."

He does not reveal the source of his knowledge about these "almost openly Fascist" local regimes.

"Sheer chaos," he writes, "thus threatened the city; and it is not possible to say what would have happened had not the Soviet Union, after once evacuating Budapest, sent back its tanks and lent its backing to the attempt to construct a new Communist government under the leadership of Janos Kadar."

Yet despite all the "uncertainties," he comes up with the opinion that the Russians were "wrong" to use force to keep the Hungarian Communists in power. (He writes as though Kadar represented a Hungarian movement that was helped by the Russians instead of being an isolated quisling.)

## KEY IDEA

Hereafter follows a great deal of backing-and-filling. He alternately keeps explaining just why the Russians felt the way they did and why he, of course, cannot agree with the "Communist philosophy" on such matters. The idea is that although he himself cannot approve of drowning the uprising in blood, one must "recognize that the Russians had a difficult choice to make." He jabs only sneers for the "anti-Communists" who hurry to condemn these poor bedeviled Russians. For anyway, he argues, the Hungarians would not have been able to decide their own fate democratically if the Russians had left them alone.

Here he lets out very revealingly his version of the fundamental Stalinoid rationalization of totalitarianism: the masses can't be trusted to emancipate themselves anyway. For he argues that the Hungarian people's majority could not have carried out its will in the revolution; he explicitly sees "the majority of the people... playing hardly more than a negative role" while the reactionary minority took over.

For him in any case the people can never be anything but a pawn. Isn't it better for them to be suppressed for the sake of "socialism" than suppressed by the (other) reactionary minority? This is the mind of Cole.

## COLE CHIDES

From this Cole derives the amazing ending of his article, after he insists that he is for self-determination:

"To that extent, I believe that peoples have a right to self-determination, and reject the notion that the only true right is the 'historic' right of the proletariat, or of the working class in a wider sense, as a single worldwide power, to overbear all its opponents in the general interest of the world revolution."

It cannot easily be believed but Cole is here agreeing that the Russian butchers do represent "the historic right of the proletariat... in a wider sense, as a single world-wide power," but begs to differ only with the conclusions which the latter draw from their anointed role. After all, Cole is a democrat and an English gentleman. Just because you are The Revolution, he chides the Russians, you shouldn't exaggerate your rights. Don't be so carried away by the General Interest of the World Revolution....

This is what our democrat explains to totalitarianism who are engaged in suppressing a proletarian socialist revolution in Hungary!

What could the Russians do, even if they tried, to convince Cole that they are not The Revolution?

Would it make any difference if they held daily public executions of a thousand dissenters in Red Square? Cole would not approve such sticky business, but he would want to know "the facts" before he would hurry to condemn The Revolution. Would it make any difference if gas-oven chambers were set up for the mass extermination of restless Ukrainians? Cole would assert that such high jinks were "wrong" and not really justified by the historic rights of the proletariat.

After all, he is not a Communist, as he always sincerely reminds his readers. And he isn't. In his vocabulary, "Communists" are people who do these things.

## The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Get Acquainted!

Independent Socialist League  
114 West 14 Street  
New York 11, N. Y.

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

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

## Read and subscribe to

### THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

The Marxist review for serious students of social issues

50 cents

\$2 a year

## CHALLENGE

(Continued from page 6)

support the Algerian students in their struggle because their cause is just, and because the regime our countrymen are maintaining in Algeria is one of oppression which we must oppose. As to our fellow students of European origin in Algiers, they are misled by a crew of irresponsible political gangsters, and we feel under an obligation to oppose anything they do under their present leadership." However, this kind of answer the liberals were not prepared to give, as they were not prepared to assume full responsibility for their ideas and to meet the right-wing attack head-on.

## STALINIST RUSSIA

A  
MARXIST  
ANALYSIS

By Tony Cliff

\$2.00

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE  
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.