

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

APRIL 15, 1957

FIVE CENTS

SPOT-LIGHT

The Case of The Dubious Do-Gooder

Let's put together some clippings.

All around one subject: the sweet unselfishness and angelic altruism of the American foreign-aid program.

We hand out millions of dollars just out of overflowing humanitarianism.

We don't want anything from those people. We just want to do them good.

Everybody knows that because we've all read it printed in the newspapers in black and white, and if it wasn't true, they wouldn't dare say it, would they?

For example, there's the cherubic old man in a red suit now going around the Middle East on a reindeer sleigh, named James P. Richards, Special Representative of the President. What's special about him. Well, he has bags of money in his sleigh earmarked by the government for some purpose or other. Then he talks to people in the Middle East.

Just talks.

Then things happen.

For instance, on the 3rd of this month the *Christian Science Monitor's* lead article hailed: "Mideast Policy Sees First

(Continued on page 4)

Liberal

The Democrats retained control of the Senate by the victory of Ralph Yarborough in the special Texas election for the seat vacated by Gov. Price Daniel.

Yarborough is widely pictured as a liberal, and his triumph has been widely hailed as a victory for liberalism in Texas. Compared with the other contenders, he probably is. For example, he campaigned in favor of a cut in personal income taxes through an increase in individual exemptions from \$600 to \$800.

In a Dallas dispatch to the *Christian Science Monitor* on April 4, further details of his variety of liberalism is shown:

"Although considered a liberal faction spokesman, Mr. Yarborough in his campaign urged a reduction in foreign aid and retention of the oil-depletion allowances. He opposed racial integration in the public schools, and spoke out against federal aid to education, if it means federal controls."

Some liberal!

British A-War Decision Shatters Political-Military Basis of NATO

By GORDON HASKELL

The British government chose the eighth birthday of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to tell its allies and the world that it considers obsolete the concepts on which NATO was originally based. This is the chief feature of the new policy for the reorganization of Britain's military forces announced in their White Paper, namely, overwhelming concentration on atomic weapons rather than "conventional" military forces to defend Western Europe from Russian attack, accompanied by a planned elimination of the draft and the creation of a central mobile force primarily as a Colonial police force.

The action of the British government can hardly fail to force upon the government and people of the United States a re-evaluation of many aspects of American foreign policy. It presents the labor movement and the forces of liberal opinion in this country in general with another opportunity to reassess their own attitude toward the foreign policy of the government, based on a reassessment of the world political relations to which this policy is supposed to be relevant.

The basic political premises on which the new British policy is based are stated in a couple of paragraphs in the White Paper. After the Korean war, it states:

"The immediate danger of major war receded and was replaced by the prospect of a prolonged period of acute international tension. It was clear that the plan for a short intensive rearmament spurt no longer fitted the needs of the situation, and that for it must be substituted the conception of the 'long haul'... The Communist threat remains, but its nature has changed."

And a later paragraph states:

"The frontiers of the free world, particularly in Europe, must be firmly defended on the ground. For only in this way can it be made clear that aggression will be resisted."

BIG CHANGE

The last paragraph quoted makes explicit, in the context of the proposed reduction of British land forces in Europe, what has been apparent to many critics of NATO for some time. This is that the NATO land forces in Germany are not really designed to defend Western Europe from a massive Russian invasion, but rather to serve as an expendable screen, any attack on which would serve to demonstrate Russian aggressive intentions to the world and thus justify the employment of the atomic weapons with which the war would really be fought.

The British White Paper in this respect, as in many others, simply and frankly makes explicit the way in which the political, economic and military situation has changed during the eight years of NATO's existence.

For the purpose of such a largely symbolic military land barrier, a few tens of thousands of troops are as good as a few hundreds of thousands. Hence Britain proposes to cut her component of the

NATO forces to the bone.

The White Paper does not spell out the way in which the "Communist threat" has changed. But from the context, from the measures proposed, and from a reading of the military significance of the Hungarian and Polish revolutions, what the British government has in mind should be clear enough.

When NATO was formed, the chief argument for it, and for all the other military pacts organized by the United States, was that the chief "Communist threat" was that of military invasion and conquest of countries lying on the borders of Russia and China. The incorporation of Eastern Europe into the Russian socio-economic-political system by military means was a powerful example. In the Korean war, the willingness

UAW Convention Told of 'Dirty Mess' in the South

By JACK WILSON

Atlantic City, Apr. 14

At each convention of the United Auto Workers, some incident occurs at the beginning that serves to focus attention on major issues confronting the union and the nation. This 16th UAW convention, attended by nearly 3000 delegates, was no exception.

The big publicity was centered around the UAW's program for a short work-week and more money, and around the issue of racketeering within the labor movement. Walter P. Reuther's press conference and his opening speech dealt mainly with these problems. Reuther spent less than a minute reiterating the UAW's traditional views on civil rights.

Yet the first question which held the close attention of the convention was a minor part of the credential committee's report on the seating of delegates from International Harvester Local 988, in Memphis, Tenn.

For it brought before the convention not only the whole Memphis story of the UAW, but spotlighted the burning issues facing the union movement, as well as the nation, in the South.

It came as a shock to many delegates to hear, for example, that under the rules adopted by the local union leadership, a clear-cut case of discrimination against a Negro union leader was in-

of the Chinese and their Russian allies to back up an invasion by a satellite which backfired added weight to this argument. On the other hand, Indochina and the less spectacular spread of Communist influence in other parts of the world showed that this was by no means the sum and substance of the "Communist threat."

REALIZATION

Further, the weakness revealed by the Russian rulers after the death of Stalin and the upheavals in Eastern Europe demonstrated decisively that for the coming period the Kremlin could not seriously contemplate a major war, and certainly not an aggressive one.

The realization began to spread that instead of an impregnable political monolith, ready and able to exploit any weakness of its opponents to overwhelm them by military force, the Communist part of the world was wracked by its own economic problems and contradictions, and its rule undermined by the seething discontent of its own people.

Added to this was the further realization that the development of nuclear

(Turn to last page)

involved, although legally and within the frame-work of the present (and soon to be improved) constitutional requirements of the UAW.

It came as a shock to the UAW delegates from many of the old Northern locals to hear that a White Council-influenced and -directed local union leadership in the UAW was using the union to drive hard against Negro unionists in that local and to spearhead a reactionary drive against the top leadership of the UAW.

Before this convention is over, the whole UAW will be discussing the problem of unionism in the South. Just the briefest debate on the floor over the credentials committee report already brought many things to light, about what a member of the credentials committee called the "dirtiest situation" in the history of the UAW.

JIM CROW STRATEGY

Local 988 has a membership of nearly 2300, of whom about 40 per cent are Negroes. Since the UAW won bargaining rights, the outstanding union leader in that shop has been George Holloway, who has been elected convention delegate each time since 1949. At the last convention he served as secretary of the resolutions committee.

(Continued on page 2)

THE ROAD OUT OF GAZA

... page 6

Snapshot of a Communist Opposition

... page 7

Why Was the British Strike Called Off?

... page 3

ADA Takes a Step Back on Civil Rights

... page 2

Letter from a Russian Student

... page 5

ADA Convention and Civil Rights:

A Step Back for the Liberals

By PAT PARKS

In an otherwise dull convention of Americans for Democratic Action, held in Washington over the March 29-31 weekend, the one significant debate that took place on the floor marked a step back by the liberal organization. This was on the issue of the "Powell Amendment."

The amendment, sponsored by Rep. Adam Clayton Powell in the House and Herbert Lehman in the Senate, is a rider to the bill for federal aid to education which provides that such federal aid must be used by a state in compliance with the Supreme Court decision on desegregation.

At last year's ADA convention the debate on the Powell Amendment sharply divided the liberals on the civil-rights issue, but the majority did support it. This time ADA reversed itself.

While the federal courts are faced with cases which would enforce integration in the Southern schools, the ADA convention thus gave assistance to those liberal leaders who argue that education for segregation is better than no education at all.

The convention delegates voted 111-104 to delete a paragraph from the draft resolution. After urging the executive and judicial departments to give federal aid through "continuous and resolute effort, by every available expedient, to bring about speedy integration to every area of our country," the following mild but hotly disputed paragraph was taken out:

"That in the absence of clear assurances from the Executive Department that it will thus enforce the Constitution and law of the land, the legislature should require as a condition of receiving such assistance that the state and/or local school system affirm that it will use any funds which it may thus receive in compliance with the decisions and orders of the federal courts."

The principle behind this amendment is not new. It has been debated by liberals and ADA Conventions, in particular, for many years. It is always an emotionally packed question in ADA for it forces liberals to apply their "pure" civil-rights positions to a real political problem.

Perpetually seeing a dilemma which is not really there, many liberals have become convinced that if the Powell

Amendment is attached to a federal aid bill it will mean that no federal aid will be voted by Congress, or, more accurately, by the Senate. This notion is what the 1957 ADA Convention debated for nearly an hour.

CORE OF THE PROBLEM

The argument goes something like this: The Republicans and even some conservative Democrats will vote for the Powell Amendment for the purpose of defeating a federal aid bill. When the bill itself is put before the Senate, the Dixiecrats will then vote against it, because of the integration enforcement procedures included; and so also will conservative GOP opponents of federal aid itself. This bloc can defeat federal aid. On the other hand, if the Powell Amendment were not attached, the Dixiecrats, as "good Democrats," would vote for the bill for federal aid to education; and through better education in the South, integration would come about eventually—the slow way, it is true, but nonetheless better than nothing.

The arguments for the Powell Amendment were expressed with varying degrees of dexterity, but many were telling blows against the continuation of segregation.

A Southern student leader who was expelled for leading a student protest against segregation was one of the most hard-hitting speakers. He spoke in the name of Students for Democratic Action, the student affiliate of ADA, and insisted that giving federal funds to segregationist states and school districts means perpetuating the system even after the Supreme Court has made segregation illegal. He added that education for segregation only keeps segregation alive, that it does not educate for tolerance.

One of the speakers on the side of the

Powell Amendment hit the core of the expelled for leading a student protest problem. He said that everyone knows that a strong federal aid bill would be defeated in Congress regardless of whether the Powell Amendment is attached or not.

Behind this is the central difficulty of the ADA's politics, attached as it is essentially to the Democratic Party.

The difficulty is not that there is anything wrong with the Powell Amendment but that congressional liberalism is so weak that even the principle of federal aid to education is shaky. The Democratic leadership under Lyndon Johnson is not exactly enthusiastic about it. The Democratic Party leans heavily on the South for its congressional strength. These are the main real powers in the party that most of the liberals feel they have to support.

PRACTICAL?

There is thus a big gulf between the liberal principles which the ADA believes in abstractly and the party machine to which they have to look to give effect to these principles. Obviously there is something "impractical," "unrealistic"

NAACP Conference:

Racism in Housing Is Still Strong Bar to Integration

By FRANK HARPER

Phila., Apr. 7

At the northeastern states' regional conference of the NAACP, held in this city yesterday, it was made clear that the two most important problems facing the organization are the segregated housing pattern in the North and the implementation of school desegregation in the South.

The regional conference is not a policy-making body but primarily an educational affair. Speakers from the deep South gave reports on that area.

Madison Jones, National Housing Coordinator of the association, summarized the status of housing laws in the states represented at the conference. Most have such a law (except Delaware and Pennsylvania, and the latter is considering one) but the housing situation is far from satisfactory. There is no national policy for racial integration even in public housing.

Chester, Pa., was offered as a good example of the gap between intention and fulfillment on integrated public housing. Two "lily-white" housing projects were ordered integrated 18 months ago. One that was near a Negro neighborhood was integrated quickly. The other, McCaffery Village, saw its first Negro inhabitant only three weeks ago.

From the discussion it became plain that there are very few, if any satisfactorily integrated public housing developments in the entire Northeastern region. One of the reasons for this is that whites in projects save money to make a down payment on a private home and move out; but the Negroes cannot get mortgage money and so stay in the project.

FROM THE SOUTH

The afternoon opened with a joint session of adult branches and youth councils on youth work. In general the NAACP has a serious shortage of active youth. The speakers scheduled for the "Key to the Future" session were Herbert L. Wright, Youth Secretary, and Herbert Hill, Labor Secretary.

Two Southern branch presidents made "Reports from the South." Dr. George D. Flemings of Fort Worth, Texas, said the Southwest situation on school integration and on the NAACP's future looked good to him from New Mexico and Oklahoma. Hopes were high for Arkansas and Louisiana. However the speaker expressed the opinion that the NAACP in Texas could not come back

and "visionary" about tying these liberal principles to that party machine. But which is impractical—the principles, or the support to the machine? Under present conditions, it is their liberal principles, or consistent adherence to them, which begin to appear "impractical" to ADAers who think in these terms.

Thus, insofar as "realistic politics" in liberalese means maintaining one's clutch on the Democratic Party, no matter where it is going, because one has no other alternative, then things like the Powell Amendment tend to go by the board, when they bring out the clash between fine aspirations and the limitations of pro-Democratic Party-ism.

It is particularly ironic that the Powell Amendment section was deleted directly after an entire resolution on civil rights was passed unanimously which stated that the "federal government is doing little to halt the deprivations [in the South]." This resolution goes on to denounce Rule 22 (the cloture rule) and calls for federal enforcement of the right to vote, but when it comes to enforcement of a Supreme Court decision on integration, ADA hesitates and turns back the clock.

Speaker after speaker at the convention, including its chairman, bemoaned the terrible plight of liberals who must make a decision either for education without segregation or no education at all. The plight was there indeed, but it goes deeper than a mere tactical decision on a congressional amendment.

as an organization. He believed that the work would have to be done by a similar organization under a different name. This analysis was based on the opinion that the federal Supreme Court will not challenge the Texas courts on their illegalization of the NAACP.

The other speaker, Kelly M. Alexander of the North Carolina State Conference, disagreed on estimate of the NAACP's future in the South. He believed it would win through and be given legal status. Alexander's main attacks were against the political power blocs which divide white and colored.

He could not refrain from taking a pot-shot at the Montgomery movement under the guise of ridiculing those who are for not fighting back. It appears there is serious organizational rivalry between the NAACP and the boycott movements in the South. It would be deeply regrettable if the NAACP did not do everything possible to merge with the boycott movements and to widen activity beyond both the legalistic and passive-resistance phases.

Late Saturday evening the conference delegates were saddened to learn of the death of Father Thomas E. Little, a vice-president of the Philadelphia NAACP, Father Little, rector of a small struggling church in a depressed Negro neighborhood, was beloved in the community where he served, but he was more than a white churchman serving a section of the whole community. He was a well-known leader in the NAACP, on a city, state, regional and national scale.

Socialists active in the Philadelphia NAACP will remember Tom Little as a steadfast proponent of full democracy in the NAACP, for a fighting and functioning branch, and for his condemnation of both the Republican and Democratic Parties for their support of the vested interests and mistreatment of the Negro people.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

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

UAW Convention — —

(Continued from page 1)

Although the UAW had its normal share of problems, including a walk-out by whites against the upgrading of Negro workers, it was doing a good job of making this local union an integral part of its structure, until the Supreme Court decision against segregation in the schools.

As part of the whole Southern picture, the anti-Negro elements within the union movement first talked big about setting up another federation of labor, etc. In a way it's a pity that they didn't try, for it would have been relatively easy to smash them on those grounds, isolate their influence in the unions, and make the local unions in the South a firm base of operations for improving race relations and bringing equality in the union movement and elsewhere into a reality.

What happened, however, is that these elements decided instead to work from within the unions, take them over, and spearheaded the drive against Negroes through the union organizational structure.

This has been going on in Local 988, in spite of various efforts of the UAW to prevent known White Council leaders from controlling the local.

STORY COMES OUT

In the case before the convention delegates, what happened essentially was this:

The White Council-influenced slate won the delegate election. Three persons were to be sent here with full voting rights for the local unions. One of them, the chairman of the bargaining committee, was killed in an accident, and that left an opening. The fourth highest vote had been obtained in the election by Holloway, and under ordinary UAW practice he would have been chosen.

In this case, after much argument and publicity, the local union Executive Board voted not to allow an alternate. Various anti-labor daily papers were allowed to be at the board meeting, and they did a terrific job of baiting Walter Reuther and Emil Mazey, and supporting the White Council elements.

The international union was going to rule in favor of Holloway anyhow, when Holloway, in an effort to calm a tense situation, withdrew with a letter to the credentials committee.

His modest letter was read to the convention, and this burned up many delegates who knew the real situation. Soon the Memphis story came out, as old UAW men like Paul Silver of Detroit and Carl Shier of Chicago brought out some of the facts in the situation. The convention was also treated to a slick performance by a genuine 100 per cent anti-Negro leader from the South, defending the local's action.

Since all that was formally before the convention was a technicality, a full discussion was not held, although delegates from Ford Local 600 wanted to know how they could bring charges against the local union officers and delegates from the Memphis local.

Before the week is over, the whole problem of civil rights, organizing in the South, and the fight against racism in the union movement will be discussed openly on the convention floor. It should be something special, for this hasn't happened recently in the union movement, where the problem of racketeering has dominated the headlines and actions of the labor movement.

Among other controversial issues that should bring debate are the proposals for dues and salary increases for the international union staff and officers.

LONDON LETTER

British Workers Blast Leaders For Calling Off Great Strike

By OWEN ROBERTS

London, Apr. 6

Britain's biggest strike for many years came to an end this week when 1,750,000 engineering and shipbuilding workers were instructed by their union leaders to resume work while a court of inquiry, set up by the government, examined their case for a ten per cent wage increase.

It was a shabby ending to what had been a fine display of solidarity and trade-union militancy which had the bosses and the government distinctly worried. It was an ending which has left behind it confusion, uncertainty and angry men.

The decision to call off the strike was taken by representatives of the 41 different unions which make up the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions, after a long and stormy meeting during which it was touch-and-go whether the vote would swing one way or another.

That it finally descended in favor of a return to work was decided by the vote of the Amalgamated Engineering Union, the largest single union in the confederation and one which is generally considered to be left-wing. And the way the AEU vote went was determined by the casting vote of its president, Bill Carron, after its executive had split 50-50 on whether to return to work or not.

Of the 41 unions in the confederation only four supported the decision to return to work, while 35 opposed it, and two, enrolling office workers engaged in a separate struggle with the employers, abstained. But the voting strength of the four unions in favor of a return to work was sufficient to outmatch all the others. Thus one man, Bill Carron, and four unions were responsible for calling off the strike and cutting the ground away from under the feet of the men on the picket lines.

This, not unnaturally, has led to a great deal of bad feeling within the trade-union movement. Ted Hill, general secretary of the boilermakers' union and member of the Trades Union Congress General Council, described the action of the confederation in deciding to call off the strike as "treachery." He said he was "terribly disappointed" that the workers had been "let down," particularly in view of the fact that "never before has a movement responded to the leadership in such a splendid fashion" in supporting the strike call.

Equally angry, but not perhaps so outspoken, was Frank Cousins, general secretary of the Transport and General Workers' Union and another member of the TUC General Council. At the confederation meeting Cousins backed up Ted Hill and strongly advocated the continuance of the strike, thus pushing further out on the leftward direction which the TGWU has taken since right-wingers Arthur Deakin and Joek Tiffin died.

In addition to Carron, who is also a member of the TUC General Council, the back-to-work move was supported by the

General and Municipal Workers, led by Sir Thomas Williamson, the present chairman of the TUC.

MASS PROTESTS

Thus four of the biggest men on the TUC General Council are now standing toe-to-toe making angry gestures at each other. A sorry state of affairs when one recalls how only a couple of weeks ago it was possible to record with satisfaction how well these leaders had lined up in a united front against the employers.

In addition to this top-level fall-out, the premature winding up of the strike has also had serious repercussions among the rank-and-file trade-unionists.

Firstly, many of the local leaders are angry with the confederation leaders—particularly Carron and Co.—for folding up the strike. When the "finish the strike" meeting ended, the confederation leaders were mobbed by demonstrating strikers who jeered, "We've been sold up the river." Tempers were so angry that Carron had his hat knocked off in a scuffle and it was necessary for the police to escort him to his waiting car.

In the localities, too, there were demonstrations against the decision to return to work.

At Glasgow a mass meeting of angry strikers for more than an hour refused to give local trade-union officials a hearing, and order was only achieved when a shop steward told them: "This is what we call a sell-out, but you must appreciate that many of your local officials feel as you and I do."

Thousands of strikers at Manchester passed a resolution condemning the decision to return to work "at a time when the solidarity of the workers, if the strike had continued, would have forced a settlement."

Men at the big shipyard center of Newcastle-on-Tyne held a meeting under the title of "Guilty Men" and passed a resolution of censure on the confederation leaders.

In the steel-making city of Sheffield a strike committee representing more than fifty thousand workers expressed its "deep disgust" at the decision to return to work which, it said, would only lead to the hardening of the employers' attitude and would encourage the Tory government to continue its attacks upon the workers' living standards.

WORSE OFF

This catalogue could be continued. Everywhere meetings of strikers agreed to follow their leaders' instructions and return to work, but added words of condemnation, dismay, disappointment and betrayal.

Commented one national newspaper, which had opposed the strike: "It seems that part of the cost of averting the biggest outbreak of industrial strife since 1926 will be division and recrimination within the trade-union movement on a scale it has not known for many years."

Perhaps this may be a magnification of the situation, but that there will be a round of bitter fights within the trade-union movement for some months to come is beyond dispute. And that this should take place at a time when the trade unions need every ounce of their weight to meet the combined attacks of the government and employers is tragedy in itself.

But however much solidarity is desirable at this moment of time, it is equally desirable that the trade unions face the facts as they really are and not build up unity on false foundations. The blunt and brutal fact is that the strikers have returned to work in a worse position than when they came out and therefore have

every right to demand the heads of the men responsible for such a situation.

Before the return to work the engineering employers had offered a pay rise of 3½ per cent and the shipbuilding employers one of 5 per cent, both in response to a demand for 10 per cent by the unions. Moreover, these pay offers were tied to conditions concerning the ending of "restrictive practices" by the unions, increased output and a standstill on further wage claims for twelve months. The raises and the conditions were rejected by the unions, and deadlock followed.

BOSSSES TAUNT

At this point the government stepped in and the minister of Labor set up a court of inquiry to examine the dispute. Frequently a condition of the functioning of such courts is that the strike must be brought to an end while the court carries out its work, but in this case (doubtless due to the determination of the strikers) no such condition was made by the minister of Labor. Thus there was absolutely no reason why the union leaders should have ordered the men back to work, particularly as the bosses had made no advance on their offer and had made it clear that they would not do so.

In such circumstances it was understandable that the employers felt they had scored a victory when the unions instructed the men to resume work. And that they did feel so was clear when an official of the employers' organization, on being asked whether the pay offer stood, replied:

"Oh, no! They turned that down. There is no cash offer at all. They are going back to work on the same terms and conditions. There is no question of payment at all. We did not ask them to go back. They went back by themselves."

In actual fact the strikers went back under worse conditions. Because of the strike many men will find there is insufficient work for them for the next few weeks; and as the bosses ended the guaranteed-week agreement during the strike, it will mean light pay checks.

In the Merseyside shipyards the bosses have gone a step further and scrubbed out a wage increase which they made some months ago. In isolated incidents up and down the country, odd collections of workers are now still on strike on these and similar issues, and with the employers feeling so cock o' the hoop they are going to have a tough time reaching any sort of settlement.

BEVAN'S BONER

What made the union leaders decide to call off the strike? At this early stage accurate analysis is difficult, but certain factors stand out which undoubtedly influenced those union leaders who got cold feet at the vital moment.

Firstly, it must be recalled that this dispute in engineering and shipbuilding was a test case. The Tory government has been setting its sights on a general halt on wage claims as part of its general economic policy and has given encouragement to employers to resist demands for higher wages. And the engineering employers were extremely co-operative in this respect. Thus the engineering strike had a very strong background of a challenge to the government's policies—so much so that most newspapers on the right played up that it was a "political strike," or that many unionists were trying to make it so.

Secondly, the strike received a tremendous response from the whole movement and one of the problems confronting the union leaders was to restrict it to the immediate sections directly involved in the dispute. An example will show the depth of feeling for the strike in the labor movement as a whole.

In Parliament Nye Bevan suggested that the minister of Labor should get the two sides to put their cases to an independent assessor who would then make a recommendation around which they would negotiate. This suggestion was welcomed by

the Tories and the employers—but by the union men involved in the dispute it was brushed aside and Bevan received a rap over the knuckles for his intervention by the Parliamentary Labor Party.

The following quote from an editorial in the extreme right-wing *Daily Telegraph* puts the matter in clear perspective:

"Mr. Bevan has brought his colleagues back to the only proper position for a responsible opposition in a situation like the present. Both in the shipbuilding and the threatened engineering strike there are strong political undercurrents. The Socialist Party should beware lest its attitude in Parliament gives even the faintest encouragement to the idea that the strike could or should be used to political ends."

Thus Bevan, for making a suggestion which smacked of compromise with the employers, received a rebuff from the unions, a rebuke from the Labor Party, the support of the Tory minister of Labor and the applause of the Tory press. This not only indicates once again how unstable Bevan can be, but also shows how widespread in the labor movement was the support for the strikers and their determination not to concede points to the employers or government.

WHY THEY DID IT

Thirdly, the employers and the government used every possible means to try to show how irresponsible the unions were to engage in a strike which "threatened Britain's economy."

The right-wing trade-union leaders did not want to get too deeply involved in an apparent challenge to the government's economic policies; they did not want the support for the strike to grow to the point where pressure of mass action led to a development of the strike in wider issues, and (because of their essentially reformist character) they did not want to pursue a dispute which the employers and government said was crippling the country.

At the first opportunity, therefore, they called the strike off. And they now have to face the consequences.

Just what developments will take place in the near future is anyone's guess. If the court of inquiry comes out with an offer unacceptable to the mass of the workers maybe there will be renewed demands for a continuation of the strike.

Ted Hill has already promised that his union at least will down tools again if there is no acceptable offer and Frank Cousins has stated in no uncertain terms that his union tossed out the idea of a "wage freeze" at last year's Trades Union Congress and it intends to stick by that attitude.

Maybe the other union leaders will string along for fear of repercussions from their own members if they don't. Maybe large numbers of the workers, disgusted with the recent sell-out, will not feel inclined to support another strike call so readily as they did the last. In fact the whole situation in Britain's industrial front is at the moment one big maybe.

SUBSCRIBERS — ATTENTION!
Check your NAME—ADDRESS—CITY—ZONE—STATE appearing on the wrapper.
If there are any mistakes or if anything is left out, especially the ZONE NUMBER, cut out your name and address and mail it to us with the corrections clearly printed.
27-15
If the above number appears at the bottom of your address, your subscription expires with this issue.
RENEW NOW!

THE FIGHT FOR SOCIALISM
by
Max Shachtman
A basic primer on the ideas of Independent Socialism!
\$1.00 Cloth \$2.00
Labor Action Book Service
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

World History—Year by Year
The bound volumes of LABOR ACTION
1950-54.....\$3 per vol.
are an invaluable record of the social and political issues of our day, and a socialist education in themselves. Completely indexed from 1949 on.
Bound volumes of LA are also available back to, and including, 1942, at somewhat higher prices depending on the year. Prices on request. A complete set of bound volumes for the 11 years from 1942 to 1952 is available for \$40.
Independent Socialist Press
114 West 14 Street, New York City

SPOTLIGHT

(Continued from page 1)

Fruits." This fructiferous event referred mainly to Syria and Jordan. What these two countries had in common was that in both, the pro-U. S. right had suddenly become active and was trying to get rid of its opponents.

In Syria the nationalist Col. Serraj was going to be exiled to a foreign post. He objected, thereby proving how "pro-Communist" he is. . . . "Though the internal struggle for control of the army still is inconclusive, the conservatives are believed to have drawn new hope from the evidence of a vigorous American policy in the Middle East," says the *Monitor* story.

What evidence? King Hussein of Jordan seems to know one piece of evidence. He is engaged in trying to oust the socialist-nationalist premier, Nabulsi, and form a new government "devoid of leftist control"—

"A possible goal of a new Jordanian government would be to invite James P. Richards, President Eisenhower's Special Ambassador to the Middle East, to visit Amman to discuss the application of the Eisenhower Doctrine to Jordan."

Just for a talk:

TIMEO DULLES ET DONA FERENTES

The same day this appeared, the papers carried the report of Secretary Dulles' news conference, the one that was precipitated by his new biography. The book had revealed that Dulles quashed the Aswan Dam loan to Egypt as a "gambit in the cold war," that is, for reasons somewhat less altruistic than advertised. In fact, it gave ground to suspect that American foreign aid was not always keyed to sheer self-denying magnanimity.

But what we're thinking of right now about this conference is another section, a passage dealing with Poland.

A reporter had asked Dulles whether he thought a \$75 million chunk of baksheesh to Warsaw was "sufficient to encourage Poland and other Communist satellites to veer away from Moscow." The reporter wasn't trying to provoke anything; a good American, he was wondering whether the price was right.

Dulles was just as businesslike: "Well, I don't think that the question of whether or not Poland veers away from Moscow is quite as simple as saying, can it be bought for \$60 million or \$70 million or \$100 million. . . ." It's very complicated, Dulles continued. "We don't think we are going to buy anything spectacular just by putting up a certain number of dollars."

So, in spite of all slanders to the contrary, it's not true that Dulles thinks the dollar can simply buy everything.

A STEAL AT THE PRICE

It's more complicated than that; but while we American statesmen would rather die of shame than be caught bribing a foreign government, still . . . when there's a bargain. . . .

Last December, for instance, Iceland's government decided to cancel its previous request that U. S. military forces (based in Keflavik for war with Russia) leave the country.

A. N. Y. *Times* dispatch from Washington on Dec. 7, reporting the State Department announcement, went on to explain in part:

"The Icelandic economy, based almost entirely upon fishing, is reported in financial and economic straits, with a prospective deficit of about \$30 million. Settlement of the disagreement over Keflavik is expected by authorities here to be followed by United States economic aid."

The reindeers are coming.

JUST NO GRATITUDE

Or take Guatemala. It's not a question of buying out Castillo Armas. That market has already been cornered. We're talking about the way in which we self-abnegating American statesmen just pour out our money to a lot of unappreciative foreigners with no thought of gain or reward.

After all we did for and to Guatemala,

you'd think at least the "influential landowners" would be grateful. We saved them from Communism, or if that isn't quite accurate, then from something worse—land reform. But in a *Times* dispatch from Guatemala City on March 24, we find out:

"Influential landowners also resent refusal of United States officials here to conduct research on cotton. Guatemalans have been trying to build up an export crop to lessen dependence on coffee as a foreign-exchange earner. United States officials told the Guatemalans that United States funds could not be invested in trying to make Guatemala produce more of a crop of which the United States had a surplus. Louis E. Franke, director of the Servicio here, confirmed this, saying it was a matter of policy."

It stands to reason that the U. S. has to cram Guatemala's economy into a mold that suits us—because we can't let the Guatemalans impair our national sovereignty, can we?

We must add, in explanation of the reference to "U. S. funds," that Guatemala contributes an equal amount to the running of the Servicio (agricultural service bureau), but this amount is not as equal as others.

Since Castillo Armas overthrew the previous democratically elected government of Arbenz in 1954, after a bracing talk with U. S. Ambassador Peurifoy, the United States out of sheer generosity has allotted about \$66 million in all forms of aid to Guatemala. This is more than twice as much as the bargain-basement rate for Iceland, but something below the contemplated "encouragement" to Poland.

While on the subject of Guatemala one might mention that most of the \$66 million has gone for . . . highway construction. This mind-stupefying fact is another proof of Washington's selfless liberality. That imp of Satan, Arbenz had all sorts of plans in his day to waste money on an ambitious program of land development for the peasants; but the U. S. knows that what the little man in Guatemala wants — after a hard day picking bananas for United Fruit—is a good high-gear road where he can take a spin in his Cadillac.

FRUITS OF A POLICY

Now, after this orgy of praise for U. S. benevolence, let us permit a faint note of doubt to intrude, as we come to the last clipping.

This is a column by the *Times'* foreign-affairs commentator C. L. Sulzberger, April 3. He has moments of dubiety about the American aid program for India and Pakistan, economic and military.

It's vital that India make good, he says, in order to prove that Mao Tse-tung's system is not the only way to develop a country. But India's chances in this contest are hampered by its arms race with Pakistan—

"Part of India's budget is supported by our economic generosity. But another part is drained off by New Delhi's determination not to lag behind Karachi militarily. Pakistan's materiel comes from us."

"Both countries spend on defense infinitely more than they can afford. The amount in each case is probably over half the national income. Neither, within the foreseeable future, can become strong enough to stave off open Soviet aggression. But each is rapidly attaining a capability to cripple the other."

"American policy of arming Pakistan tends indirectly to weaken disastrously the Indian economy. It has also provoked another neighboring land, Afghanistan, to make an unhealthy weapons deal with the USSR on the assumption such equipment is required because of a frontier argument with the Pakistanis."

"Therefore, by our policy, we encourage indirectly a sterile military spending race. None of the South Asian countries can afford this. And India's new five-year plan—upon which we ultimately base such hopes—is going down the drain."

Conclusions: (1) "Clearly the time has come to think this through more carefully." (2) "But hasn't the moment already arrived to cut down military assistance to that country [Pakistan] and

GREECE Greek Labor Perks Up No Thanks to Lovestone

By ANDRE GIACOMETTI

The report that follows on the activities of the Greek Anti-Colonial League was written by Lucien Weitz, a leading member of the left wing of the French Socialist Party until his expulsion from that party last December for criticizing the Mollet government in the *London Tribune*. It appeared in *Correspondance Socialiste Internationale*; the sections below are excerpts.

As Comrade Weitz points out, the creation of the League may contribute to the crystallization of the independent tendencies in the Greek labor movement, which is at present in a state of prostration.

Since the end of the war, there have not been any organized socialist parties in Greece. The organization that went under the name of "Socialist Party" after the war was a motley Stalinist-oriented group which has dissolved since. The trade-union movement, organized as the Greek Federation of Labor, is in the hands of a government-controlled apparatus; in spite of its affiliation with the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, it is more akin to the state-controlled labor organizations of Spain and of certain Latin American republics.

At the end of the war, the Stalinists were in a dominating position. The failure of the Stalinist-led revolution and the repression during the civil war had

disastrous consequences for the labor movement as a whole.

The present leader of the G. F. of L., Makris, owes his post to the Greek government and to Irving Brown, the American AFL's international operator to whom he is directly responsible. He maintains himself in power through intimidation and economic reprisals against opponents, complicity with the police and a peculiar check-off system: according to Greek labor law, the union dues of the workers are paid by the employer directly to the head office of the Greek Federation of Labor (i.e., Makris) who then doles them out to the men he has placed at the head of the various industrial unions.

All unions that show signs of militancy and independence are thus cut off from their own dues. This goes a long way to explain why there has been no important strike movement in Greece in recent years in spite of one of the lowest living standards in Europe.

In this connection, the disgraceful role of Irving Brown and of Jay Lovestone's "Free Trade Union Committee" must once again be noted. The present corrupt set-up in the Greek trade-union movement is primarily due to its activities; it has even been reported that Irving Brown was in a position to threaten a liberal government in Greece with a cut

(Turn to last page)

ISL FUND DRIVE

Speed Up for the Finish!

By ALBERT GATES Fund Drive Director

We don't know whether it was our warning of a week ago or not, but this week the contributions reached their highest total for a weekly period, a sum totaling \$1091.50. This is still below the weekly average that we need for the rest of the month to finish the drive successfully by May 1, but it is a good start toward that end.

Chicago came through handsomely with a contribution of \$430, lifting the Windy City over the 50 per cent mark and into the running to finish near the top where it customarily ends the drive. The National Office quota also took a big jump with a \$500 contribution for the week, putting the N.O. in third place behind St. Louis, which still heads the list, and Bay Area. Los Angeles, Streator, Newark, Pittsburgh and Philadelphia also came through this week, helping to boost the weekly income.

CONTRIBUTE TO THE ISL FUND DRIVE	
Independent Socialist League	
114 West 14 Street, N.Y.C.	
Enclosed is \$.....as my	
contribution to the ISL's Fund	
Drive.	
.....	
NAME
.....	
ADDRESS
.....	
CITY	STATE
(Make checks out to Albert Gates)	

Though this may sound like a great deal of activity, it is so only in part. Eleven areas contributed nothing during the week. This means heavier going for the rest of the campaign, since, to finish at the top, we must receive payments from every area, every week. As it is, a glance at the box score shows that more than half of the quotas assigned are still below the fifty per cent mark when the drive is two-thirds over.

This alarm signal may sound like old stuff, since we have never failed to carry out a fund drive successfully. But we have never been so far behind at this date. Saying this is no expression of lack of confidence about the finish. All we are trying to do is spur the ISL, its friends and sympathizers to push the drive a little harder, and, most of all, to get their contributions collected and moneys remitted a little faster.

Reading, Oregon and Massachusetts are long overdue. Pittsburgh, New York, Cleveland and Los Angeles are far behind in their local campaigns. We have no doubt that all of them will make their quotas, but at this time they are lagging far behind the pace set by other areas.

FUND DRIVE BOX SCORE			
City	Quota	Paid	%
	\$10,000	\$4708	47.8
St. Louis	25	25	100
Bay Area	400	365	91.2
Nat'l Office	1,250	1120	89.6
Seattle	100	80.50	80.5
Buffalo	100	65	65
Detroit	400	235	58.7
Chicago	2,000	1170	58.5
Newark	450	260.50	57.8
Philadelphia	200	98	49
Streator	25	10	40
Los Angeles	650	200	30.7
Cleveland	150	45	30
New York	3,900	1079	27.6
Pittsburgh	200	55	27.5
Reading	75	0	0
Oregon	50	0	0
Mass.	25	0	0

LABOR ACTION • 17th YEAR

April 15, 1957 Vol. 21, No. 15

Published weekly by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone: WATKINS 4-4222—Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.—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 HASKELL, BEN HALL

help develop its disturbingly backward economy?"

Or as Dulles said in that news conference: "This is all part and parcel of a very complicated . . . process. . . ." That's the thanks we get for being so good to everybody.

Chicago Symposium: The Legion Misfired

Last week, Challenge published an account of the meeting in Chicago which was attacked by the American Legion. That report was taken from newspaper clippings. The following story is an eyewitness description of the event. Given the importance of the meeting—from a general political, and a civil liberties, point of view, we are carrying this account.—ED.

Chicago, Apr. 3

In spite of two stench bombs, about 600 people, mostly students, crowded Mandel Hall at the University of Chicago on Wednesday, to hear a symposium on the relationship between socialism and democracy and how it affects the American scene.

The big audience, in demonstrating solidarity with freedom of speech and assembly, disregarded an American Legion's demand that the meeting be banned. They came to hear the following speakers: Max Shachtman, chairman of the Independent Socialist League; Mulford Sibley, a well-known speaker of the Socialist Party and a member of the faculty of the University of Minnesota; and Fred Fine, a National Committee member of the Communist Party.

Chancellor Lawrence A. Kimpton of the University of Chicago firmly refused to Tuesday to cancel the meeting. The American Legion's Cook County Council had demanded that Kimpton ban the symposium, which was sponsored by the Socialist Club and Young Socialist League of the University of Chicago.

In a letter to the Legion, Kimpton stated that in his judgment it would not be "desirable or wise" for him to cancel the meeting. He also remarked that "It can be anticipated that the socialist representatives in the debate will be in no applicable agreement with the Communist representatives."

He stated further that he was confident that the student body "will be able to judge at their real worth the assertions the Communist representative makes."

Legion members passed out handbills outside the hall, urging the public to boycott the meeting. Inside the auditorium two stench bombs were released. One of the bombs, consisting of foul-smelling material in glass, was broken on the floor. Apparently, the second bomb was poured into an air vent. Although the odor permeated the hall for most of the evening, nobody left.

SOCIALIST CASE

The meeting got under way when moderator Lawrence Scott, of the American Friends Service Committee, announced that each speaker would have 25 minutes for his main presentation; this would be followed by a period for questions from the audience, and concluded with five-minute summaries.

Applause greeted his congratulations to Chancellor Kimpton for defending civil liberties, and each speaker subsequently added his appreciation also.

Sibley, a pacifist, speaking first, outlined the need for democracy and socialism in America in sweeping analytic terms. The bankruptcy of New-Dealism and New Republicanism, he said, is revealed by their inability to provide solutions to the realities of poverty, unemployment and war.

He showed that the distribution of the national wealth, percentage-wise, had

not changed appreciably since the turn of the century, contrary to most liberals' belief that our main economic difficulties are over.

Nor has liberalism made a dent in solving the problems of democracy, he asserted. And the labor unions, which could lead the nation, are still tied to the coat-tail of capitalism.

He further noted that by and large the people of America are politically backward and apathetic. Their level of political consciousness is low and must be raised through socialist education, since the major political parties have nothing relevant to say about expanding or even safeguarding present democracy.

As second speaker, Max Shachtman stated his essential agreement with Sibley and proceeded to an analysis of the isolation of American socialism. He ascribed this not only to the objective situation but also to the fact that the Stalinists and capitalists had succeeded in identifying socialism with Stalinism in the minds of the people.

He vigorously stated that there is no room in the movement of American socialism for the defenders of the Stalinist regime. In unequivocal terms he emphasized that only through democracy can socialism be achieved.

He defined democracy as all the freedoms outlined in the Bill of Rights plus the fullest socialist application of these in the economic and social realm.

CPER WHITEWASHES

The Communist Party spokesman Fine, apparently a Dennis faction man, read his speech. His remarks centered one-sidedly on the fight for civil liberties. He also talked of an "anti-monopoly coalition" and "anti-monopoly government."

When he quoted G. D. H. Cole as saying that only a small minority in Russia were affected by the lack of freedom, the audience promptly hooted. In defense, Fine said that he was only quoting.

In passing he glossed over Russia's totalitarian outrages by calling them "mistakes." And even in case of these admitted mistakes, the impression given was that Stalinist politics was not at fault, but rather that Russia was driven to "mistakes" by outside forces.

Following the main presentation, the audience sent up a stack of written questions for the speakers to answer. Lack of time demanded that the moderator select a few.

Both the CP and Shachtman were asked to comment on the recent Hungarian events. In explanation, Fine talked of "60,000 fascists" who had crossed the border and caused the revolution. In passing he said the CP neither condemned nor condoned Russia's action in Hungary.

By way of reply Shachtman proved that even the foreign editor of the *Daily Worker* had branded as a lie the tale about the 60,000 fascists entering Hungary. And even if they had, what a commentary it would be on the Communist rulers of Hungary when Hungarian people could welcome fascists after 12 years of Stalinist rule!

Sibley was asked how he could trust the people to rule themselves when he thought them backward and apathetic. On this score Sibley felt ambivalent. On the optimistic side he thought that people's need for democracy must lead them to fight for socialism. But as to whether the people could rise and succeed in this, he could offer no advance guarantee.

"Some wiseacre felt it necessary to ask, 'Are you guys serious?'" Each of the

Letter from a Russian Student

The following are excerpts from a letter, written by a Russian university student, which appeared in *The Nation* of April 6. *The Nation*, reprinting this item from *Forum*, an Austrian magazine, notes that the letter was translated into English by Helmut W. Bonheim, but gives no indication of whom it was written to or how obtained. As Challenge readers will see, the letter presents impressive evidence on the wide range of student unrest in Russia, about which there has been many fragmentary reports in the press recently.—EDITOR.

Moscow

November 30, 1956 is a memorable day for us Russian students; some say, a historic day. After Professor B. E. Syrojtschkowitch's required lecture on Marxism-Leninism [in Lomonossow University, Moscow] there followed the usual discussion, during which a student . . . posed a question of decisive importance, perhaps the question which will determine the destiny of our form of Marxism: How was it possible for a general strike to occur in a socialistic state—to speak plainly, in the Hungarian People's Democracy—since a general strike against a workers' and peasants' government was impossible?

Professor Syrojtschkowitch was only able to give as an answer what we could read in our daily newspapers. For a discussion at the university level this was too little. He began to speak about the terror of Horthy-fascistic officers and diversionist Western imperialists, but his words were drowned in the protests of the students, who proved to him with a flood of Lenin quotations that he had not attempted to answer the actual question. . . . The discussion became noisy and confused and the professor preferred to withdraw. . . .

On the following day the notice boards of the Komsomol organization of the Lomonossow University carried handwritten sheets demanding an honest report and a frank discussion of the situation in Hungary. By lecture time, the notices had been removed, but their contents spread that morning from mouth to mouth.

At midday fresh notices were posted announcing a meeting of the Komsomol

speakers was put in the position of giving a personal moving affirmative answer, which brought applause from the audience.

In the summaries, Fine reiterated his apologetics for totalitarian Stalinism.

Shachtman concluded by stressing that from the time of Marx on, socialists have maintained that the only road to socialism is through democracy and that there can be no democracy without socialism. He solidified himself 100 per cent with the Hungarian people against their Stalinist butchers.

Sibley explained that even should the socialist democratic ideal never be achieved, nevertheless the struggle for it—the tension between reality and the ideal—is absolutely necessary for any social progress.

The reaction of the campus and city-wide daily press was to poochpooch this very successful meeting, where it didn't garble it or slander it. The meeting had all the ingredients for an educational success: a packed hall; stimulating discussion; a lively question period; enthusiastic audience response; and a victory over the anti-democratic American Legion gag policy.

at which the "shameful" events of the previous day were to be discussed. The meeting took place in the Ostrowskij Clubroom and was opened by Linkow, the secretary of the Komsomol Organization. His first remark necessarily acted as a provocation to most of those present: he declared that it was the Komsomol's duty to avoid in the future "such excesses as had degraded the academic halls" the day before. The result was only that a new "excess" immediately developed. In a quickly improvised vote, "The Hungarian Question in the Light of Marxism-Leninism" was declared the only item on the agenda and thus the control of the discussion was wrested from the officers. The very first speaker spoke of an "over-bureaucratized system" which had estranged itself from the masses and was therefore trying to maintain itself with the methods of the recently unmasked Beria.

This referred to Hungary, but the comparison with the Soviet Union was obvious and was even . . . spoken of openly: if the conclusions reached by the Twentieth Party Congress are not followed up, must we not expect a similar development here and will not our workers rise one day under the banner of Lenin against those who have developed into their bourgeois, bureaucratic exploiters? When Linkow objected to these "anti-party sentiments," and tried to get the floor from the speaker, he encountered such vehement opposition among the students, that he left the hall together with his associates. But the discussion continued and even involved several activists of the Komsomol. . . .

FERMENT SPREADS

On December 3 the administration actually expelled 140 students because of "chuliganstvo" (rowdiness) and at the same time announced that the lectures on Marxism-Leninism would be suspended until after the New Year's holidays.

It was the first time in the history of the Moscow university that the administration found itself forced to suspend lectures because the teaching staff was not equal to dealing with questions which might arise in the discussions. The student-body recognized in this a victory which they had bullied out of the Komsomol. Contrary to the expectations of the Komsomol secretaries, who counted on an ebbing of excitement, the discussions in the clubs and student quarters continued. . . .

The significance which the Komsomol attributed to the discussions at the university had the interesting result that similar discussions broke out in other places too. In the middle of December, the Komsomol activists of the Moscow army district were forced to convene in order to deal with similar developments in the garrison. We in Moscow also heard of occurrences at the Leningrad Universities. . . . Lively discussions are also in progress at the universities in Kiev, Charkov, Sverdlovsk, Novosibirsk and even in central Asia, in Taschkent.

Almost the whole of the Soviet youth has been seized by the wave of discussions. This is undoubtedly one of the most interesting political movements to have emerged since Stalin's death. Significantly enough, however, it was not started by the men in power, not "from above," but spontaneously and from within the socialistic camp itself. Probably the solution to this movement will also have to be found within the socialistic camp, a solution which those above can advance but can hardly hinder. . . .

A Chapter in the Tragedy Of the 'Zionist Fulfillment'

THE ROAD OUT OF GAZA

By HAL DRAPER

One doesn't often go to the *New Yorker* for serious political issues, as we did last week, but here we go again. The occasion is a second dispatch from embattled Palestine by A. J. Liebling; this time (March 30) a "Letter from Tel Aviv" which wends its way through the back-of-the-book cartoons, ads, and clippings for the Raised Eyebrows Dept.

In spite of the title Liebling is again writing about what he found in Gaza. Here in a no-man's-land between the Israelis and Egyptians he saw both contestants quite plain and, more than that, dares to say so. The result is unusual reportage.

There are two things he does very well. The first continues a theme in his "Letter from Gaza." He goes into it again, and we do too now, since there is nothing more important than this point in any discussion of the Middle East conflict.

It is the opportunity that was not taken by Israel.

Parenthetically, Liebling thinks an opportunity was also lost by the UN, for he seems to favor the UN's forcible internationalization of Gaza, as the least evil. We can go along with him a certain distance, for, as we explained March 4, we favored a free plebiscite by the people of Gaza and would hope in such a plebiscite that the choice be for internationalization under UN administration. But unfortunately Liebling simply takes for granted that this solution should be imposed on Israel and Egypt by foreigners, just as both of the rivals yell for UN imposition of their own desires on the other fellow.

But the conditions which Liebling describes are very relevant to the line of policy for Israel which socialists should favor—and which has shown itself to be so impossible for the chauvinist Israeli regime.

There was plenty of potentiality in Gaza—even in the hell-hole of Gaza!—for a genuinely socialist Israeli government to appeal to the people of Gaza themselves, as against the Egyptian enemy.

This fact is the starting-point of a program for Israel-Arab relations which turns a sharp edge against both the provocative chauvinism of Ben-Gurion and the reactionary dictatorship of Nasser. It undercuts the propaganda of both sides, which is about the only reading fare one usually has.

As mentioned, Liebling goes back to the theme of his previous dispatch: "The state of belligerence between Israel and Egypt gave both countries an excuse for ignoring the refugees. The two governments were in a sense allies against the Gazans, just as Israel and Jordan, though belligerent, are tacit allies against the internationalization of Jerusalem. . . ."

HATRED OF EGYPT

"Egypt," writes Liebling, who does not suffer from even a smidgin of pro-Nasserism, "which has steadily refused to offer the refugees Egyptian citizenship or to permit them to immigrate, has profited by their presence as an excuse for holding her Calais [i.e., a bridgehead on foreign territory] and at the same time refusing to accept any surcease of their woes short of what she knows to be impossible—mass return to their precise points of departure." Israel too has put off the subject of compensation.

Liebling puts no stock in the pro-Egyptian demonstrations held in the Strip after the Israeli departure; he derides their "spontaneity" and reports they were organized by Egyptian henchmen. For background on this and other points, by the way, Liebling is very good in conveying the atmosphere of idleness and despair which is forced on the Gazans and crowded refugees by condi-

tions for which not they have the responsibility but the Egyptians and Israelis together.

"The Egyptians had built up a big reservoir of resentment against themselves because they treated both the long-time Gaza residents and the refugees as subject peoples. . . . I heard several spontaneous testimonials to the former occupants, among them, 'The Egyptian soldiers took off their shoes so they could run faster,' 'Only the Palestine Regiment [recruited from refugees] fought—that's why it had all the casualties,' and even (if the speaker was sure his interlocutor wasn't an Israeli) 'All the fedayeen were refugees. Do you think an Egyptian would dare go across that line?' On the night of the Egyptian surrender, a mob looted the enormous, hideous new palace of the Egyptian governor. . . . While there was a prospect that the United Nations would take the Strip over for an appreciable period, a good deal of anti-Egyptian sentiment—even in the presence of known Egyptian informers—was audible."

THEY DIDN'T WANT TO

The fact is, then, that hatred, militancy and despair were forces that boiled up in the Gazan population against both the Egyptian and Israelis. The Egyptians were able to channelize this elemental force against Israel for obvious reasons: the country right across the border was the one that had robbed the refugees of their land and property. This Israel was their enemy.

The thought that obviously haunts Liebling is that a different Israeli government, one of justice and mercy, could and should have made friends and allies of the Palestinian Arabs of Gaza.

In February-March, says Liebling (who was there at this time), "there were a great many people who, for disparate reasons, had become approachable by an honest broker." But Israel took no steps; plainly didn't want to. "And from the moment when the Israeli leaders recognized that they would not be there long—which must have been indeed early in their negotiations with the Americans and the UN—they did nothing to lay a foundation for future reconciliation."

Like the Egyptians, Israel treated the Gazans as simple pawns, objects that were in the way, deplorable encumbrances on the scenery; the attitude was the callous one of the colonialist. (One notes that Lt. Col. Gaon, the Israeli military conqueror and then military governor of Gaza, had gained his military experience "with the Dutch army in the Far East.")

Here the remarks Liebling made in his first dispatch would come in; but in the present article he does something additional that is interesting. For from a distance it is only on the big issues that one can concretize what it would mean for a new Israel to make an appeal from below to the Arab masses. And from a distance this is no doubt enough.

WHAT WASN'T DONE

Being right on the spot, however, Liebling goes into some detail on two very immediate things that the Israelis could have done during their occupation if they had really wanted to use Gaza as a model to show that Israel intended justice and friendship to the Arab people, as against the Arab kings, colonels and dictators.

He explains how Israel could have helped the Gazans save their orange crop this year—true, at some expense of generosity on their part but not really very much. And secondly, there had been a plan to rebuild the jetty at Gaza's fishing port, which was a wreck when Liebling saw it after four months of Israeli occupation. Nothing was done, for: "I fear that the Israeli occupation authorities wanted to put nothing into Gaza that they couldn't take out with them."

These are only two examples; but they open a door; for otherwise how can one, in New York, possibly detail all the things it would mean if Israel were to come to the Arab people not as conquerors or threats but as friends and allies of theirs against their Arab overlords?—that is, if Israel were really to be that "bastion of democracy" in the Middle East that its admirers pretend?

Of course, this is not just a question of Gaza; this applies to the whole gamut of Israel's relations to the Arab peoples in the surrounding states, to the Palestinian Arab refugees outside the borders, to the Israeli Arab minority inside the borders. In Gaza, the Israel-Arab problem is only synopsized and heightened in dramatic quality.

"I FELT ASHAMED"

Are there people in Israel who see the problem this way, who can see through the miasma of chauvinist feeling which lies over that country like a chilling fog? Liebling has shown that he is quite sensitive to this aspect of the ideological climate of Israel; so he has no illusions. But he sees at least one chink of hope.

If the Israeli occupation had remained, he thinks, maybe personal contact with the people of the Strip would have influenced Israelis' thinking. Maybe. In any case, he takes heart in meeting a young Israeli paratrooper, who is also a writer of sorts, a *sabra* (native-born) though his parents had come from Europe.

"I looked at those people sitting there so sad," the young soldier-intellectual told him. "Having been born here, I speak Arabic, of course, and I talked to some. I thought, they are Palestinians like me. I felt ashamed. I thought, we have driven our neighbors from their land and we are giving it to Europeans—we are begging Europeans to come here and take our neighbors' land. But we must live with our neighbors if we are to stay here. The old men who run the government don't understand this, because they are Europeans, too."

Liebling adds, as his final word: "I wonder how broad and deep this current runs."

It is a good question, and a moot one. The current represented by the young soldier has often been noted among the youth, but no one really knows. It is good, however, to understand first what this current means.

In the first place, it sounds like a counterposition of "Palestinian" to "European." There are other elements woven into this counterposition. One of the most prominent is the question of Zionism and its fate in Israel.

For it is not really true that the "Europeans" who still run Israel don't understand the importance of living with their neighbors the Arabs. They have made countless speeches and written innumerable words about it. The robbing of the Palestinian Arabs was not a pleasure but a guilty burden on their conscience. The ferocity of chauvinism that greeted the recent aggression on Egypt was in part at least a ferocity that sought to blanket out the knowledge that virtually only the day before they had still been making speeches exposing the suicidal, reactionary and criminal character of "preventive war."

The "old men" understand this. That's not their trouble. What the young soldier may not understand, however, is why the old men act the way they do in spite of the understanding.

WHO ARE THE NATION?

For them, as Ben-Gurion patiently explains at every opportunity, Israel exists only or primarily to bring about the "Ingathering of the Exiles," to abolish the Diaspora and bring all Jews to Palestine. This is the Zionist "fulfillment." For the "old men," the present state of Israel is only an instrument—and not the final one—to bring about this Zionist fulfillment. For the *sabra*, Israel is a land for its people, like any other land.

For the current which is being born as the new generations of *sabras* grow up into the political world, Zionism appears as an alien's dream. Although the Zionists looked forward to their own state so that the Jewish "nation" might have its own territorial base, the new Israelis do not feel as "Jews" but as a new nation which is distinct from those "Jews" of whom the Zionists talk.

They do not necessarily feel that they have something specially "national" in common with (say) the beaming American Zionist tourists who come to see what their charity-money has been doing, and who, they are told, are also "Jews"—Jews who would consider it a personal calamity if they were ever "ingathered" in accordance with their creed. *These aliens are of our "nation," and not our fellow Palestinians who have lived on this land for over a millenium? . . .*

Here we have one possible element in that "de-Zionization" of Israel—in this case, from within—which is central to the healthy solution of the Middle East impasse. The young soldier whom Liebling quotes is basically counterposing Israeli nationhood to Zionism, not Palestinians to Europeans.

This leaves, for separate consideration next week, the second issue that emerges from Liebling's report: the role of the *fedayeen* in the Middle East scrap, and its overinflation by Israel. To Liebling's we will also add other material on this question which rarely sees the light of print.

It's going to be on Friday, May 3, in New York

Celebrate May Day

with the Independent Socialist League and YSL

Entertainment . . . Dancing . . . Late buffet

At ADELPHI HALL, 74 Fifth Avenue, near 13 Street

The Ideas of the Harich Group in East Germany

Snapshot of a Communist Opposition

By PHILIP COBEN

Last week *LA* published excerpts from a manifesto put out by a Communist opposition group in East Germany led by Prof. Harich, who was recently sentenced to 10 years by the Stalinist court. We reproduced this document as quoted by Rainer Hildebrandt in the *New Leader*. Hildebrandt said there that it had been distributed as a leaflet to "Communist offices throughout East Germany" on the day the accusations against the Harich group were printed in the newspapers.

We now discover that the whole of this document by the Harich group appeared in the March 17 issue of the *London Observer*, and it contains much interesting material not included by Hildebrandt.

(However, according to the *Observer's* note, the document is a memorandum written by Harich "in the last days before arrest, and passed to Social-Democrats in West Berlin. It shows signs of hurried composition and, in its emphasis and in some special pleading, is probably colored by being addressed mainly to Social-Democrats." The *Observer* does not mention any distribution via leaflet.)

The complete text makes even more obvious what was already clear from the excerpts: the Harich group, in the course of painfully thinking its way out of its Stalinist past, had arrived at a point quite similar to that of many critical fellow-travelers, but for the Harich group this represented a notable progress. Taken statically, Harich seems to be at about the same way-station as (say) Isaac Deutscher, but they are moving in opposite directions.

The document has six sections. The first introduces the group as such: "We are a group of functionaries of the Socialist Unity Party [SED, the ruling party]..." etc.

Harich says that the "broad following" of the group "has grown particularly in the cultural institutions of the German Democratic Republic [East Germany]—universities, technical and other colleges, newspaper offices, publishing houses."

In the next passage, in addition to ascribing influence to "personal discussions with Polish, Hungarian and Yugoslav comrades," Harich says, "Our ideological development owes most to Comrade Georg Lukacs," the Hungarian Communist philosopher who went with Nagy in the revolution and who played an important intellectual role in the pre-revolutionary ferment in Budapest among the intellectuals and students particularly.

A LONG IDEOLOGICAL PROCESS

If Harich's ideas, as expressed in this document, really do reflect Lukacs' conceptions in those pre-October days, then one can see how right was the analysis made by "Hungaricus" (see *LA* March 11) when he probed the reasons for the political weakness of the opposition inside the Hungarian CP. More to illustrate this below.

Of Bertolt Brecht, whom Harich claims as a supporter up to the writer's death, the document says: "in our frequent discussions with him we learned of the bitterness and disappointment with which he viewed present conditions in the GDR."

"We have gone through a long process of ideological clarification," writes Harich, beginning with the death of Stalin. "Strong impulses" came from the June 1953 days. Then after the 20th Congress the group worked out a definite platform for party discussion.

Here follows a passage which, in its naiveté, underlines the political immaturity of this group as it sought to emerge from Stalinism. The party leaders, relates Harich, refused even to look at the platform, let alone organize a party discussion on it. "Hence," writes Harich, "we felt compelled to hand our 'platform' to the Soviet ambassador, Comrade Pushkin, in order to reach our party leaders through his good offices."

Since this is all that is said on this weird episode, one wonders whether Harich appreciated the irony: this group, which proposed seriously to reform the party in the direction of national sovereignty among other nice things, had to go to the Russian gauleiter to try to get a hearing for its thesis in their own party.

In fact it is at this point that Harich volubly expounds his determination to keep his fight on the legal, internal level in the party. "It is not our intention to break with the party and become renegades in the manner, of, say, Arthur Koestler." He wants to "liberate Marxism-Leninism from Stalinism and dogmatism."

But after all, this is being written in anticipation of arrest. "Our legality, however," concedes Harich, "finds its limits when the present party leadership itself acts illegally. This is, in our opinion, happening now." So it

is at this point that Harich invokes the example of "Karl Liebknecht, who in 1914 and again in 1918 violated party discipline so as to save the party." The language is still that of party loyalism. In fact, Harich protests his continuing loyalty to the party (as distinct from the party leadership) and to the "German Democratic Republic."

STALIN OR TROTSKY?

In the second section, "Our Ideological Conception," the basic ideas are completely reformist, with regard to both capitalism and Stalinism: the two systems, in coexistence, will reform each other through a process of mutual interpenetration of influence, democratizing the latter and socializing the former. It is categorically laid down that the USSR is a socialist state, though not a model for others.

Here Harich tries to grapple with the question why this "socialist state" degenerated. The process was "historically conditioned":

"Apart from Russian backwardness and lack of democratic traditions, the overgrowth of the party and state apparatus which marks it resulted from the need rapidly to catch up with the West in industrial development. This first industrialization of the USSR was necessary; to this extent Stalin was right and Trotsky was wrong.

"But the methods and forms by which it was achieved implied a political degeneration of the Bolshevik party and the Soviet state and in seeing this Trotsky was right, while Stalin, in denying it, was wrong."

Note that Harich here clings to the justification of Stalin's course as "necessary" except for "the methods and forms," which were bad, unnecessary, and wrong. But this same passage continues on as follows right into a blatant contradiction:

"It is this degeneration of party and state which has led the 20th Party Congress to criticize the methods and forms of Stalinism. However, such criticism of Stalin was not a Marxist analysis: it did not even touch the basic reasons of the degeneration of the Soviet system."

The breakdown in thinking is striking, and gives an insight into the torn minds (and souls) of Communists trying to think out what was happening to them. On the one hand Harich specifically approves Stalin's course except for "methods and forms." But when Khrushchev does exactly that, he complains about the lack of a "basic" analysis.

Obviously this is a document which is like a snapshot, in that the picture it gives is that of a process of rethinking caught in a moment of turbulent change.

It is a part of this pattern that the Russian regime is discussed in terms of "progressive on the one hand" and "reactionary on the other." This is a typical formula of people who are in the process of revising their illusions about Russia. It may well have been picked up by Harich straight from Fritz Sternberg, whose books are mentioned in the document as one of his ideological influences, and who also exemplifies the characteristic combination of reformism wedded to some pro-Stalinist illusions (see *LA*, Apr. 14-28, 1952).

"FASCIST METHODS"

In foreign relations, the unity of the "socialist camp" is the stated objective; the way in which Russia exploits the "People's Democracies" and disregards their sovereignty is rejected as being a threat to this unity. There is no concession to Nagy-type "neutrality."

In passing, the point is made that "The 20th Party Congress was an attempt to anticipate threatening revolution from below by revision from above, and to keep control in the hands of the apparatus." The nature of this threatened revolution against a "socialist state" is not discussed, but the Moscow leadership is accused of using even "fascist methods" in the satellites.

"Fascist methods" is a strong phrase. It is therefore revealingly anticlimactic when Harich immediately adds: "The only possible comment on this relapse of the Soviet Union into Stalinism is that it deprives of all justification the claim of the USSR to a leading role in the socialist camp..."

So a country that uses nothing less than "fascist methods"... cannot be the leader of the socialist camp! Again it is striking to see in such bold relief the contrast between the conclusions to which these reflective Communists feel themselves pushed, and the conclusions which they permit themselves to accept at this point in their "long process of ideological clarification."

The third section, "Our Plan," lists planks in their program to reform the party. This was given in detail in the excerpts last week. In general, it is a program for democratization and concessions to the masses all down the line.

There is one jarring note, however, which was not

clear in last week's material. Harich specifically calls for the maintenance of the single-list election system, modified only to the extent that there shall be more candidates than seats "so as to give the elector a real choice." He also calls for "maintenance of the bloc system" whereby all the shadow-parties function only in a coalition "under the leadership of the reformed Socialist Unity Party." At no point does he raise the question of free political organization and opposition.

He is far behind the vanguard left of Poland. The system he calls for accepts the forms of the rigged Gomulka election of January 20.

TOWARD GERMAN UNITY

Section 4, "All-German Unity," and the next one on "Unity of the Workers," sharply raise the question of attitude toward the West German Social-Democratic Party. The document had earlier already advocated "a change in our attitude toward the Social-Democratic Party, which is the strongest working-class party in Germany and has made working-class unity in West Germany a reality." The merit of that party lies in its mass base and "fundamental" socialist character, in spite of "bourgeois-democratic and opportunist tendencies within it." So in West Germany only the Social-Democratic Party can bring about the transformation to socialism; the CP is too discredited.

Now Section 4 raises the perspective of a united Germany. The principle is that reunification must not mean capitalist restoration. But Harich does not come out unconditionally in favor of free all-German elections to organize such a united Germany, as is rightly proposed by the socialists.

He demands, as his preconditions for such all-German elections, that a S.D.-majority government in West Germany first carry out a number of acts: reversal of remilitarization; withdrawal from NATO; nationalization of key industries; land reform; etc.

Although he concedes in advance that an all-German election would give a majority of the united country to the Social-Democrats, he advocates that this result must be accepted by the Communists.

TOWARD SOCIALIST UNITY

In Section 5 Harich advocates unity with the SDP, but first, he stresses, the Communists must reform their own party so that it is "simply a left-wing Marxist party," freed of all Stalinism. The united party, he expects, would be predominantly colored by the SDs, but it would have a stronger left wing. First let us purge ourselves of Stalinism, he says, and then we will have a right to criticize the SDP for its "bourgeois-democratic illusions and opportunist tendencies," but even then "no defamation of the SDs as agents of capitalism."

He makes a most unusual proposal for a "first step" now in cooperation with the Social-Democrats: "conspiratorial cooperation of oppositional comrades from the Socialist Unity Party with Social-Democrats in combating Stalinism in the German Democratic Republic."

In the last section, "Our Present Tactics," Harich puts more stress than in the opening section on being "ready also to use the method of faction and conspiracy" even though "we intend to conduct an open and legal opposition."

"We are taking up contact with oppositional forces in the People's Democracies and comparing notes," he writes.

"The oppositional comrades must seek close contact with the people, criticize the policy of the party leadership among them, deepen the gulf between the population and the present leadership, but at the same time prevent a popular rising."

It is the continuation in power of the Stalinist leadership which brings "the danger of a popular rising," he argues. Then he closes as quoted last week.

MIRROR OF A TREND

At the risk of over-generalizing the document, we venture to say that it should be seen as an articulation of one stage in the development of Communist oppositions out of the totalitarian regimes themselves.

It sounds like the Nagy opposition in Hungary before October (not after). It sounds like the thinking of a stratum of Polish Communist intellectuals wondering how far ahead of Gomulka they can go. We do not have any systematic documentation of the Nagy state of mind; we do have Harich's document.

Because of the German situation, one distinctive element is the approach to the mass Social-Democratic movement. Indeed a conservative West German paper has claimed that the document is fraudulent on the basis, reportedly, that its remarks about the Social-Democracy do not ring true. This is not so. This writer can state positively: if the document is a fake, it is a 100% expert one—even, perhaps especially, where it is internally contradictory.

It mirrors a whole political state of mind, and in Germany (unlike Hungary or Poland) the Social-Democratic Party must play a role in this process from the beginning. On the other hand, a conservative West German paper would not at all like the idea that, here in a document right out of the East, the Social-Democratic Party is authoritatively assigned a key role in achieving the goal of German unity that the whole people so ardently desires.

More broadly viewed, what it shows once again is that the brewing revolution against Stalinism in East Europe looks to socialism, and only to socialism, for its inspiration and its hope.

British Decision Shatters — —

(Continued from page 11)

weapons, though it does not rule out war as a means of achieving political objectives, makes it such a dangerous means that only the most extreme crisis in world affairs could lead any government in the world to risk the launching of the atomic war.

For the British government, it appears that what decisively led to the adoption of this new policy is a realization that (a) Britain could not be successfully defended in a nuclear war; (b) the British economy requires major retrenchment in military expenditures; (c) the United States must be induced to take the overwhelming burden of economic and military responsibility for sustaining and defending the capitalist portion of the world as a function of its overlordship.

Side by side with these considerations, however, the White Paper indicates that the British government intends to hang on to those colonies and spheres of economic and political influence which it can still hope to control. Although the government recognizes the fact of the extension of American power and control into areas which have been "British" for the past century or two, it does not propose to give up the vestige of its empire unless it is forced to.

DEFEATISM?

The British White Paper has produced a good deal of consternation in top circles in Washington. The reason for this appears to be not so much that this paper signifies a major shift in British policy, or that it confronts the American government with new problems, out of the blue, as it were. What is involved, rather, is that the British policy places the real problems which have accumulated over a period of time into much too stark relief

for political comfort in Washington.

For instance: There have been charges of "defeatism" at the London declaration that Britain cannot be defended against nuclear attack. But anyone who has been willing to look the facts of life frankly in the face knows that the only "defense" the United States has been able to devise has been based on the idea that in the vast territory of this country, even if a number of the large cities were atomized, there would be enough left with which to finish the war and hope to start rebuilding American civilization afterward.

Britain's size and population density preclude such a concept of "defense," and hence the reality is much more starkly revealed.

For instance: For some time the American military forces have been in a process of reorganization based on the idea of "a bigger bang for a buck." But such is the wealth of this country that it is possible to maintain huge conventional military forces while adding the new weapons to them. Thus the present missiles research and development program calls for an expenditure of over four billion dollars.

But since the British economy is already badly strained by the present military expenditures, the London government is forced to choose between two radically different military concepts, rather than maintain "balanced forces" based on both. This choice, however, removes the degree of ambiguity about the kind of war the world would face in an all-out military conflict between the two main war camps which was made possible by the American half-and-half commitment to a nuclear army.

For instance: While America's overlord role in the capitalist camp has been ap-

parent for a long time, it is politically dangerous for this role to be emphasized too nakedly. To gain any degree of adherence and acceptance by the peoples of America's allies, pawns and vassals, it is necessary to give as much weight to the idea of a partnership as the traffic will bear.

France has already withdrawn just about all effective military forces from Europe to fight its colonial war in North Africa. Now Britain proposes to reduce its forces in Europe. Political relations in West Germany make the size and weight of future German military forces a continuing question-mark. If the rest of the West European governments decide to follow Britain's lead, the military forces of NATO might well be reduced to American troops plus some token honor guards and officers of the other powers.

From a political standpoint this would be a very dangerous development. Governments which can still get support for their policies on the basis of the idea of a partnership for mutual defense from Russian invasion might have much greater difficulty in getting support for policies based on a concept of pure reliance on the American government for their defense.

TODAY'S PROBLEM

Further, it is quite clear that, as the months go by, the problems which have been so sharply highlighted by the British action with regard to Europe will continue to ramify throughout the rest of the world. If Communist military aggression has been ruled out for all practical purposes for the coming period in Europe, what reason is there to believe that it will continue as a serious threat in the rest of the world?

Obviously, there is no rigid correspondence between Europe and Asia in this respect. The most striking reason for this is that while it is clear that any Russian attack in Western Europe would mean nuclear war, this is not nearly as clear for such areas as Formosa, South Vietnam and other Asian territories.

In the case of Formosa, the United States would have to bear the responsibility for launching a nuclear war over a territory which only remotely can be regarded as vital to the defense of the United States, or even of the capitalist world as such. In other areas, war could come as a result of political victories by Communist movements in which all kinds of factors could lead to its confinement in extent and weapons, as happened in Korea and Indochina.

But all that this points to is that the chief problem which confronts American foreign policy is not to mobilize military alliances to resist aggression, but to adopt an attitude which can support the aspirations of the peoples of these areas for freedom and economic development and thus render them impervious to Communist political penetration. That, however, is a very old problem, and one which successive American administrations have shown themselves incapable of dealing with effectively.

In this respect, the British White Paper simply emphasizes the continuing imperialist intention of British policy, while recognizing that limited means dictate the implementation of such policy on a reduced scale. Britain proposes to maintain a Central Reserve of highly mobile troops which can be rushed to any area in which they are needed to keep colonial struggles under control. Although the United States may oppose the employment of British forces in such delicate situations as the recent attack

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!

No Thanks to Lovestone — —

(Continued from page 41)

in American aid if the law on the check-off was repealed. In any case, the law still stands.

The rise to power of men like Makris is a striking instance of that kind of "labor statesmanship" which does not hesitate to put crooks in office in European trade-union movements as long as they are "anti-Communist." If the unification of AFL and CIO foreign policy will put an end to these activities, it will have removed a tremendous obstacle to free trade-unionism in Europe.

At present, several unions where independent socialist influence is strong have succeeded in escaping the control of the

Greek Federation of Labor in spite of the difficulties. Prominent among these unions is the Greek Federation of Miners, which has been able to maintain its independence thanks to the special characteristics of the industry, which fosters a strong feeling of solidarity and community life among the workers.

The present aim of the independent unions is to break the stranglehold of Makris' machine over the rest of the trade-union movement. Ironically, the Stalinist opposition, which is rapidly declining as a result of the events in Eastern Europe, is compelled to support Makris within the framework of the "relaxation policy."

Anti-Colonial League in Athens Is Socialist-Led

By LUCIEN WEITZ

In June 1956 the Greek Anti-Colonial League was founded in Athens. It unites political persons from many origins, but it is led mostly by socialists; its president is Nikos Paliopoulos and its vice-president Dimitri Yotopoulos. The latter is a militant of long standing in the labor movement whom we knew as an exile in France, where he participated in the activities of the revolutionary minorities.

In Greece, the problem of Cyprus has created a very favorable situation for the development of such an organization. Public opinion unanimously supports the struggle of the Cypriots, who demand the right to freely decide on the future of the island.

After a period of peaceful agitation, which started in April 1955, the struggle in Cyprus has entered a particularly violent stage. The British troops are unable to overcome the partisans. The exile of Makarios has only embittered the war. There is an increasing amount of terrorist action, while the British government tries to oppose the Turkish minority to the Greek population. British imperialism persists in its policy of "pacification" and the London government periodically announces that the rebellion is all but ended while blood continues to be shed. . . .

For the Greek people, the struggle for "enosis," although largely inspired by nationalism, enters into a progressive perspective because of its anti-colonialist and anti-imperialist character. Conse-

quently, there is a possibility that this struggle will enable the labor movement to reorganize and to overcome its present state of dismemberment, which is a sequel of the Stalinist policy of adventurism after the war.

The Greek Anti-Colonial League represents the first positive step towards a realignment, all the more so since the League has taken the initiative of convoking an International Anti-Colonial Conference for April. A preliminary conference was held in Athens at the end of January.

Besides the Greek organizers, the following were present: Joseph Murumbi, nationalist leader from Kenya, representing the World Council for Colonial Freedom, an organization with its headquarters in England which includes many members of the BLP and several important trade-unions; Lucio Luzzato, represented the Italian Socialist Party (PSI); Weitz represented the Committee for Freedom and Justice Overseas, which is the French affiliate of the WCCF. An observer from the Algerian FLN was also present. For material reasons, representatives of other movements and countries were unable to attend this preliminary conference.

It is certain, however, that the International Conference will include a larger number of representatives from the anti-colonial and national liberation movements, as well as organizations from countries which have become recently independent. Its success can have considerable consequences.

WHAT'S GOING ON?

For the only thorough account of the crisis in the American Communist movement, read the new booklet by

H. W. BENSON

The Communist Party At the Crossroads

25 cents.

Order from:

New International Pub. Co.
114 West 14 Street, N.Y.C.

(15¢ each in bundles of 10 or more.)

on Egypt; and although the United States may seek, here and there, to push Britain out of a traditionally "British" area in its own interests, the American government and certainly the American people are far from ready to openly take over the rest of the British Empire. Such a "policing" policy by the British is quite consistent with American objectives and methods.

HISTORIC FLAW

But what is the shape of American policy going to be during the next few years? The Eisenhower Doctrine for the Middle East and the practical way in which it is being implemented give an inkling.

It is going to be the old game of propping up every existing government around and outside of the Communist sphere, or where such governments refuse to come into the American camp, seeking to overthrow them or buy them out à la Guatemala or Iran.

But the more nakedly this has to be done, and the more clearly the United States appears as the sole overlord and dominant manipulator and exploiter of the capitalist world, the more political resistance is bound to build up to this kind of American policy over the years.

And this is the source of the historic flaw and long-range futility of American foreign policy, however many temporary successes it may seem to achieve. With nuclear weapons paralyzing both sides from the point of view of any major military incursion into the strength of each other, the arena is still wide open for the political struggle for the support and allegiance of the peoples of the world. Either this struggle will be decisive for the next stage of human development, or there may be no "next" stage.

In this field the British White Paper offers nothing new. But by clearly highlighting the irrelevance of the old political-military concepts on which NATO was built, and which have had the fundamental support of virtually the whole of American public opinion, the labor movement included, it may be a factor leading to a real "Great Debate" on what America is and should be doing in the world.