

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JUNE 6, 1955

FIVE CENTS

SPOT-LIGHT

## A Suspicious Analysis

The losses suffered by the British Labor Party in the election just held, although everyone expected them, are bound to have an impact on the party's internal life as the usual post-mortems are made. That impact will not be without a positive value in shaking up the thinking of the party's ranks as well as its leadership.

It is of course easy for anyone to ascribe the party's setback to whatever he has previously thought was wrong with it. No doubt the consistent right wing of the party, which would like to see Attlee out and Hugh Gaitskell in as leader, will take advantage of the slump to explain the drop in terms which lead to its own favored conclusions, even though it surely takes some vivid imagination to claim that Gaitskell would have had more appeal to the electorate.

So too we should perhaps be duly suspicious of our own natural tendency to link up the falling-off of Labor's vote with the fact that its leadership presented less of a militant and socialist face to the people than at any time since the end of the war.

In a country where the two major parties present basically different class movements (unlike the U. S.), the Labor Party leadership did its seeming best this year to behave as if there were no sharp dividing lines. The Bevanite left wing will have much ground for saying, as it has explained in advance, that the party can never hope to win the people except by stressing its basic social solutions, and not merely by claiming to hold the patent on the welfare-state policies which the Tories have adopted.

In fact, if we could assign some numerical value to the degree of socialist militancy which the Labor Party has displayed in elections since 1945, there is little doubt that a graph would show the high degree of correlation between this factor and the size of the Labor vote: the more militant, the higher the vote.

Does this mean, therefore, that one has a right to say that if only Labor had put on a more socialist campaign this year, the party could have won? Or was it in the cards—that is, in the objective situation—anyway?

Since we have agreed to be suspicious, let us agree at least for the sake of inquiry that, of the two factors in the above-mentioned graph, it is not always easy to say which is cause and which effect. That is, in election years when the BLP leadership expected more resistance from the voters, when the sledding was harder, the party leaders concomitantly watered down their program and tried to make themselves (as they think) less offensive to the undecided. This too would account for the correlation in the graph.

But then, in this case another conclusion flows. Not that the party would have won if only, etc. What follows is that the right wing's expedient of watering down the program and propaganda does not succeed in winning the undecided voters anyway.

All that happens is that the party gets neither the victory nor the advantages of a real socialist campaign. No socialist movement has ever been able to inspire

(Continued on page 4)

## Sarnoff Scheme Shows U.S. 'Gimmick' View of Politics

By HAL DRAPER

"Moscow has brought one-third of the human race under its iron control by means short of a Hot War. . . . These political and psychological methods—the Cold War—have paid off, at smaller risk and infinitely lower cost than a Hot War would entail. . . . For world Communism, with its high command in the Kremlin in Moscow, the Cold War is not a temporary or holding operation, nor a prelude to a Hot War. It is the main bout, the decisive offensive, conducted on an unlimited scale, with total victory as its goal. . . .

*"The primary threat today is political and psychological. That is the active front on which we are losing and on which, unless we re-*

*verse the trend, we shall be defeated."*

Elementary truths like the above constitute the real contribution that has been made by General Sarnoff's "New Plan to Defeat Communism," a proposal for political warfare against Stalinism. This contribution is simply its vigorous emphasis on the fact that there is a political-warfare alternative to military "massive retaliation" and the like; that this political-warfare alternative is the main and decisive field on which the struggle for the world will turn; and that the U. S. is losing all along the line in this real war which is going on, while it frantically prepares its military alliances for the Hot War which it looks forward to.

It is a contribution because it bears so little relation to what the U. S. is actually doing, even though various VIPs including Eisenhower have formally hailed the Sarnoff plan with enthusiasm.

That much said, it must be immediately added that, precisely because it sets so much forward so clearly, there is no document which shows as plainly as the Sarnoff plan does how unlikely it is that the U. S. can carry on any kind of effective

(Turn to last page)

## The Sociological Experts' Stock Falls . . . Ford's Counter-Plan Is a Dud in Detroit

By JACK WILSON

DETROIT, May 30—In all the excitement over the super-colossal production known as the "Ford prosperity package," unquestionably the best directed and managed company show in the history of labor relations in America, the most important point has been completely overlooked by all the radio, press and magazine commentators.

And the point is that the show fell flat on its face before the one audience that counted—the men and women in the auto shops. At least in the Detroit area. The reasons for this are to be found in the events of the past week, all of which force one to conclude that it is very dangerous to underestimate the stupidity and ignorance of management.

It was less than two weeks ago when John Bugas, director of labor relations at Ford and chief company negotiator, told the United Auto Workers negotiators, something like this: We know the men in the shops are in a conservative mood, they are against a strike. The dues increase is unpopular. The ranks aren't excited about the guaranteed annual wage like you are, so we are asking for some concessions in return for which we'll give you some kind of package. And we want a five-year contract.

This was discouraging to the UAW leaders for it indicated that perhaps a strike might be necessary, and there was some truth to the claims of the company

spokesman about the ranks. And one thing seemed sure: The ranks were not adequately prepared for a strike.

When General Motors offered a "secret" package, it was considered unsatisfactory by the UAW leaders, and things began to look worse. Then the Ford Motor Company announced in advance that on Thursday last week it would make public a new and sensational package to bring industrial peace and prosperity to the auto industry. The tension in Detroit mounted. What would be the offer?

The first hint that all would not be well came early Thursday when Carl Stellato, Ford Local 600 president, warned in a special editorial in *Ford Facts* against any settlement that meant taking away hard-earned shop gains, and against a five-year contract.

Thursday night the propaganda blitz fell on this area. Over the radio came special announcements: *Buy the Detroit Free Press. Read all about the new and*

(Continued on page 2)

## MILITARY 'SOCIALISM' IN THE NEAR EAST

. . . page 6

## Simone de Beauvoir's Road to Stalinism

. . . page 7

## Ford's Model-T Sociology

. . . page 2

# POLITICAL WARFARE: Stalinist Dove vs. Sarnoff Plan

## Stalinist 'Peace' Campaign Is Making Hay by Default

By GORDON HASKELL

The visit of Khrushchev and Bulganin to Belgrade and the release of four American pilots by the Chinese government have maintained the pace of the Stalinist political-warfare campaign for "peace" during the past week.

The release of the pilots is a dramatic action which has received full coverage in the American press. Rumors persist that the Chinese Stalinists plan to release an additional number of prisoners in the near future. Whether this takes place or not, there can be little doubt that this action is part of a general political strategy aimed at reducing the tension of the cold war in the Far East, and thus making the position the United States has taken in that area even less tenable than it has been in the past.

Threats by the Chinese Stalinists that they will take over Formosa by force have disappeared from the press. Even on the more limited issue of Quemoy and Matsu, the Stalinists appear prepared to delay any action pending the full development of the "peaceful" policy. All this is accompanied by repeated suggestions from Peiping that the Stalinists are prepared to negotiate with the United States for a settlement of all issues at an early date.

There can be no doubt that these actions will serve to enhance the prestige of the Chinese government throughout Asia. There already exists a widespread feeling there that the Stalinists have legal right on their side in the Quemoy-Matsu dispute. In addition, however, the fear that a fight over these islands might precipitate war with the United States has resulted in pressure on both sides for a negotiated settlement.

By taking the lead in proposing negotiations, by reducing their military pressure, and now, by release of the American pilots, the Stalinists have gone a long way in demonstrating their willingness to rely on political warfare to gain their ends in this struggle.

## WEAK U.S. RESPONSE

It is true that in all this the Chinese Stalinists have yielded nothing of importance, and have in no way indicated an inclination to do so in the course of negotiations. While releasing the American pilots, the Peiping government continues to insist that they had attacked Chinese territory under orders from their superiors. While indicating a willingness to negotiate a "reduction of tensions" in the Formosa Strait, they insist on their right to Quemoy, Matsu and Formosa. But their position is strengthened in the eyes of the peoples of the area, while that of the American government is made weaker.

The response of Washington has been to avoid the question of negotiations, while demanding more and more "deeds" from the Chinese Stalinists as earnestness of good faith. This is accompanied by

(Turn to last page)

## AN EXPERIMENT IN THE SOCIOLOGY OF CLASSES—

# Ford Banked on Pro-Capitalism, UAW on Class-Consciousness

By BEN HALL

Labor's fight for a guaranteed annual wage is reaching a critical stage. The UAW's National Ford Council (130 delegates representing 140,000 workers) voted to strike the Ford Motor Company on Thursday, June 2. The strike deadline was set after the council rejected a belated company offer. In the weeks before, Ford workers voted overwhelmingly in local membership referendums to authorize the strike call.

(At the same time, a union poll of General Motors workers was completed, with 129,000 voting to authorize a strike and only 9,000 voting in opposition. No strike date has been set at GM.)

By mutual agreement, the Ford negotiations have been held in closed session so that it is difficult to judge the tone in which bargaining has been conducted. The decision to keep the talks confidential would indicate that both sides wanted to avoid provocation and seek a peaceful agreement. But the hope for an amicable settlement has apparently failed.

The UAW now charges that Ford has failed to engage in real collective bargaining, confining itself, up to the eve of the strike decision, to simple assaults on the guaranteed wage principle. When the company counter-offer was at last made, Walter Reuther publicly charged collusion between Ford and General Motors, insisting that an almost identical scheme had already come from GM.

## PROVOCATION

Ford's offer is a provocative challenge to the union on two counts:

(1) It demands a five-year contract after the UAW International Executive Board and the recent union national convention in Cleveland flatly ruled out long-term contracts and voted to accept no more than a two-year term. Five-year contracts with the Big Three—Ford, General Motors and Chrysler—are now expiring. Experience has led union activists to reject a repetition.

(2) It rejects the guaranteed annual wage, lock, stock and barrel. Instead the company proposes to lend laid-off workers money to get along during bad times and to get paid back during good times by deducting payments from pay checks.

Through such interest-free loans, the worker is asked to mortgage his future during unemployment.

Ford's big bombshell, which will turn out to be a real dud, is its stock-purchasing plan. *It proposes to put the workers buy company stock at half price.*

Management's aim is, in part, quite simple; in other respects, crafty. If the union should accept the scheme, workers would (the company hopes) begin to feel the "loyalty" and "responsibility" that goes with ownership. The partnership of labor and capital would seem to become a reality and the company could count on a more "reasonable" attitude from its men.

At the same time, a not-so-obvious scheme is pointed out by union spokesmen: Ford is about to put its stock on the market for the first time. Huge blocks of stock will undoubtedly be parceled out to a management clique. This, it could be hoped, would be overlooked in the general commotion. The few shares dribbling into workers' hands would cover up millions of shares wolfed up by a tiny group.

## AN AMERICAN DREAM

But doubtless management brain-frustrers really imagine that their offer will embarrass the union. In this respect they are victims of their own capitalist ideology. Everything is distorted by their unshakable belief that this is the best of all social systems and everyone must agree.

Management ideologists hear that workers are generally non-socialists and they imagine that union men, like all others, glorify the "American" way, i.e., capitalism. Union leaders, especially UAW leaders, do not really represent the thinking of their members who would only be too happy to cooperate. Dream on!

This is the "American way," à la Ford. Like good, red-blooded Americans (hunting dogs, Wilson might say) workers are independent—they want to stand on their own two feet. Accept a loan? Yes. Charity? Never.

And still in line with this self-deluding portrait, all workers are sort of capitalists themselves. Or, if they are not, they will jump at a chance to become gilded, curlicue-framed stockholders.

That's it!—gloated the genius who devised the company plan—that will woo the rank and file away from the leaders!

But UAW leaders did not hesitate. They are not victims of the same idiotic miscalculation over the state of mind of their members. The UAW immediately challenged Ford to submit the union demands and the company proposals as alternatives in a worker referendum to be conducted under non-partisan auspices. If Ford had the ill-advised courage to accept, it would be swamped.

Ford's strategists are only dimly aware of the deep-rooted union-consciousness of organized workers. This pro-union loyalty is American class-consciousness in its first stages. The possibility of winning workers away from their union loyalty to a loyalty to Ford is ludicrously remote.

Union men are, it is true, for "free enterprise" in a general sort of way. But only as a negative alternative to "communism," identified in their eyes with totalitarian Russia. But this attachment to capitalism is simultaneously connected with a thoroughgoing suspicion, distrust, even hatred, of the real capitalist class, the big monopolists of which Ford is a prototype. It is this union loyalty on the one hand and this distrust of capitalists on the other that cements together the mass production unions of the CIO.

The guaranteed wage fight will not be concluded at Ford. It will only be begun. General Motors comes next, and then Chrysler. But even if the campaign is successfully concluded in the auto chains, local struggles will be necessary to put it over in the rest of the union's jurisdiction: in aircraft and agricultural implement shops.

And on September 15, contracts between General Electric and the International Union of Electrical Workers (IUE-CIO) expire. Ninety-eight per cent of the union's GE locals have already voted to endorse a no-contract—no-work policy which would mean an immediate strike of 100,000 GE workers on September 16 if no agreement is reached. A national union conference in Cincinnati endorsed a proposal for a \$15-per-member payment into a special strike fund.

powerful barrage of company propaganda. The worry was for nothing.

The Ford package and the campaign for its acceptance fell as flat as a pancake on the UAW ranks. The workers were very suspicious of any stock deal—stocks mean the stock market and stock-market crashes in the labor movement; Borrowing money from the company? Shades of the old days of slavery in the coal-mining towns when you got groceries on credit and paid off the rest of your life!

And there isn't more than one man, woman or child in the UAW circuit who is for a five-year contract.

Some of these attitudes came out in the inevitable interviews with the rank and file which the afternoon papers published on Friday. "Who's got money to buy any stock? Who wants to borrow money? I'm in debt enough. How can I buy stock if I only work ten months a year? What's happened to the GAW?" Such comments were typical.

## UAW REPLIES

Meanwhile the UAW was working hard on its public answers, and by Friday night the most concise kind of reply was given by Guy Nunn, UAW radio commentator, whose program has the highest listening audience in a long time. Using a meat ax on the newspaper, and a rapier on the Ford package, Nunn simply devastated the whole blitz campaign.

The boys had simply overdone it. By Saturday, the editorial tones had changed, and even the *Free Press* saw fit to print a full page of UAW criticism of the Ford Package—free of charge, incidentally.

The UAW, among other things, exposed the Ford package as a ten-cent deal. It ridiculed the borrow plan as a "mortgage your future plan." It informed 10,000

Ford pensioners that the small increases in benefits proposed by Ford did not include them! It blasted Ford for failing to improve shop conditions, and it criticized the idea of a five-year contract.

In a word, the Ford campaign did more to solidify the UAW leadership and ranks into one solid union block than all UAW work up to that point.

A strike approval by the national Ford council was a matter of course. Also, the International Executive Board sanctioned strike action in a brief two-minute meeting.

Walter Reuther in a few days was turned from a labor statesman into a fighting labor leader, for the Ford package and the campaign to blitz the UAW was a real insult to the intelligence of the UAW from top to bottom.

## WHAT WENT WRONG?

What puzzled Ford—and its consulting sociologists, expert industrial relations advisors from the academic field, and the journalists—was the failure of anyone in labor to act the way the surveys indicated they should. Surely the slogan of "Every Man a Capitalist" ought to appeal to a non-class-conscious working class? Surely everyone wants to own stock? Surely nobody wants a strike? What went wrong?

Unquestionably, the Ford Foundation will have to put up another big grant to make another big survey to find out, sociologically speaking, what went wrong. Maybe even make a survey of the surveys?

Actually, the situation is reminiscent of the "psychological" problems that arose in Detroit during the Square D strike, when obviously labor wouldn't back a Stalinist-controlled strike, and obviously it was to the workers' best interests to have no union rather than a

## Phila. Socialists And Pacifists Hit Militarism

Philadelphia like the rest of the country had its share of pomp and propaganda as Armed Forces Week drew to a close with martial music, freshly pressed uniforms, and rumbling carriers of death on the ground and zooming overhead. Blazoned everywhere was the slogan "POWER FOR PEACE," now in its third year of continuous running.

A coalition of ISLers and members of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, taking exception to the idea that peace can be bought by piling up cannon balls, gave vent to their opposition through a counter-committee on Armed Forces Day.

The program of the counter-committee included letter-writing to newspapers and ministers; a street meeting on Friday night; a poster-walk near the armed forces display; and leaflet distribution along the parade route on Saturday.

The street meeting was conducted on Reyburn Plaza in the heart of the city. The poster-walk took place on City Hall Plaza with about 20 participants and caught the attention of thousands as it proceeded in the shadow of an M-42 tank and a NIKE installation. A total of 3,000 leaflets were distributed.

The entire organized portion of the demonstration went off without incident. There was the usual amount of mumbling and name-calling. The police asked for a permit on Friday night but a letter from the police commissioner to the effect that permits were not required took care of that situation. The police were conspicuous by their absence at the poster-walk. The commercial press had a total blackout on news of the demonstration and smothered letters to the editor on the subject.

At an evaluation session later, the participants felt that the demonstration had been worthwhile. No miracles were expected, but a protest was made as it had to be.

## YOU'RE INVITED

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

# Ford's Counter Plan a Dud—

(Continued from page 1)

sensational proposals made by Ford to the UAW to avoid a strike. Read about the stock ownership plan. Read about the 37-cent package offered to the union.

The streets of Detroit were flooded with an extra edition of the paper. Ford proposed to allow workers to buy stock on the company up to 10 per cent of their yearly earnings and pay half the cost of the stock. It proposed to allow workers to borrow money from the company during lay-offs. It proposed to boost pensions; it would include a severance pay plan. It would raise some wages, and it would bring industrial peace through a five-year contract.

To show its objectivity, the *Detroit Free Press* also printed a special editorial warning Reuther to think it over and urging the UAW to accept a proposal that was all of two hours old and hadn't been read by anybody.

## FELL FLAT

That night the first initial reaction of the union leadership—a quiet but firm refusal to accept the package—was almost lost in the blaze of comments, announcements, pronouncements, and huckster hullabaloo. It began to appear as if the UAW would simply be blitzed into a new contract that didn't so much as mention the GAW or other UAW demands.

But the real story happened elsewhere, not in the editorial rooms or radio stations or TV programs. It happened in the shops on Friday morning, while the UAW leaders were making a detailed analysis of the Ford package and preparing a major reply.

Everywhere in Detroit, committeemen, stewards, and local union officers went to work on Friday somewhat apprehensive about the reaction of the ranks to this

totalitarian-controlled union, etc. Remember what happened: Just when the strike appeared broken, the UAW ranks interceded and forced the UAW leadership to act, and the strike was won! And the Stalinists lost influence in the victory.

Now the Ford package seemed unbeatable to anyone with middle-class mentality. Anybody making \$10,000 a year has a good deal in buying \$2000 worth of stock for \$1000, as one example. But the point is that workers don't really have middle-class incomes or middle-class outlooks.

As for the UAW demands: the workers in the shop, even the most conservative, want the UAW to get more for them than even the union is asking. The UAW GAW plan isn't real popular because it isn't good enough, not because it's too good.

As the showdown nears, these hard facts of the class struggle intrude themselves, and in one blow break through all the nonsense, illusions and myths now current about "industrial peace" and labor relations."

Orwell's personal account of the Spanish Civil War

## HOMAGE TO CATALONIA

by George Orwell

\$3.50 Order from:  
LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE,  
114 West 14 Street, New York City

LONDON LETTER

# Labor Suffers Election Casualties

By OWEN ROBERTS

LONDON, May 27—The votes in just over half of the seats in Britain's General Election have been counted and they are sufficient to give a clear indication that the final result will mean that the Tories can chalk up a victory. So it looks very much as though Britain will now have to adjust itself to being ruled—or misruled—by a Tory government until 1960.

The results which have been announced up to this moment include those of constituencies which are held by prominent members of the Labor Party—or perhaps I should be accurate and say that in some cases were held by prominent members of the Labor Party. One of the casualties in the battle to date is Michael Foot, prominent Bevanite propagandist and member of the editorial board of the Bevanite weekly *Tribune*. He was defeated in his Plymouth constituency of Devonport by a mere 100 votes in a constituency of over 68,000. His defeat, like many others yet expected, was produced by a combination of the swing in favor of the Tories and changes in the electoral boundaries of his constituency.

Altogether some 215 constituencies have had their boundaries altered and have voted for the first time under the new set-up; this makes strict comparison with previous results impossible. But, whatever the reasons, there is no doubt that the loss of Michael Foot is serious for the Labor Party as a whole and the left wing in particular. With the Labor Party in opposition against the stronger Tory government, men such as Foot, who can really hammer the Tories, will be in great demand.

Other Bevanite left-wingers have been more fortunate than Foot. Ian Mikardo, whose position was very doubtful due to boundary changes, managed to hold his Reading seat with a majority of 238; the electorate in this case being just under 60,000. Barbara Castle, another Bevanite and member of the Party National Executive, scraped through with a majority, slightly larger than Mikardo's, of 489.

## SOME RESULTS

Harold Wilson, one of the ministers who resigned along with Bevan, turned the general picture by holding his seat with an increased majority of 2,558. Dick Crossman, another prominent Bevanite, also held his seat comfortably with a majority of over 6000. J. P. W. Mallalieu, member of the editorial board of *Tribune*, will also be back in the new Parliament.

Aneurin Bevan himself romped home in his Welsh mining seat of Ebbw Vale with a majority of 19,236 in an electorate of just under 40,000; although even in this strong Labor area there was a swing over to the Tories and Bevan's majority, in an unchanged constituency, was down 2000 on the last election.

Other left-wingers who have held their seats include Fenner Brockway, Leslie Hale, Sidney Silverman and Anthony Greenwood. In Greenwood's constituency the national trend in favor of the Tories was turned the other way round with a swing of nearly 2 per cent to Labor.

One of the seats lost by the Labor Party is that of Gravesend. Here the Tory candidate gained the seat with a majority of nearly 3000 because of split in the Labor vote. The member who previously held Gravesend for Labor, Sir Richard Acland, resigned from the party because of his opposition to the H-bomb and fought the seat as an independent candidate. He polled six and a half thousand votes which, if they had gone to the official Labor candidate, would have meant a defeat for the Tory.

Acland's political career has been marked by his constant change of party labels. He was first a Liberal and then, during the war, he formed the Commonwealth Party; later—after being defeated as a Commonwealth candidate he joined the Labor Party and held Gravesend for Labor in a by-election. No one doubts the sincerity of Acland but it is tragic that he did not stay in the Labor Party and—like many others—endeavor to shift the official party position on the H-bomb. His inability to adapt himself to serious political work within the Labor Party has provided the Tories with an unnecessary win as well as depriving the Labor left wing of his support.

The election has been marked by a reluctance of the people to cast their votes.

The poll so far is 76 per cent of total possible, which compares with an 82 per cent poll in the 1951 general election. It is a feature of British elections that the Labor Party always suffers from a low poll and the present election has been no exception. In nearly every area the Tories managed to get their supporters to the polling booths while the Labor Party was apparently incapable of doing so. The reason for the failure will now be discussed at endless post-mortems on the election but the important thing is what the result of this failure will be for socialists.

## VITAL PERIOD AHEAD

With a much increased majority the Tories will be in a very comfortable position and will not have to be so careful of offending the people. They will be able to pursue a policy more in keeping with the traditions of the Tory party than they have during the past three and a half years. If the expected economic troubles, which were a contributory factor in the timing of this election, continue to pile up, there is little doubt that the Tories will meet them by fresh attacks against the social structure of the so-called "Welfare State" built up by the Labor governments since the war.

This means that the Labor Party must become increasingly militant in its opposition to the Tories which, in turn, means that the struggle between the right and left forces within the party can be expected to deepen in the immediate future.

The coming period is a vital one for British Labor and the British working class. If the parliamentary defeat of the Labor Party is made the basis of a new left-wing orientation of the party, the Tory government can expect a rough time during its term of office. More than ever before, the future of Britain depends upon what happens in the Labor Party rather than what happens in the broader arena of Parliament itself.

## Spanish Aid Reports

A report by Spanish Refugee Aid on its second year of operations shows that its work has been even more successful this year than last year. Executive Secretary Nancy Macdonald writes that cash contributions of \$22,600 were raised plus clothes and other gifts worth \$5700, as against \$19,100 and \$3900 respectively.

SRA is headed by James T. Farrell as chairman; honorary chairmen are Gen. Cardenas and Pablo Casals. The organization helps Spanish Civil War refugees who are in need. During the past year its most important work has been on behalf of tuberculars and old people among them, in addition to its program of providing food and clothing for families.

Also successful has been its program of getting American families to "adopt" a Spanish family for direct aid. The report mentions 163 adopters.

Farrell has written to all newspapers: "I want to call your attention and that of your readers to the story which appeared in the May 20th issue of the *Daily Worker*, newspaper of the Communist Party in America. It stated that 'Pablo Casals, the world famous cellist now living in Prades, France, sends this urgent letter to the *Daily Worker* which we pass on to our readers and supporters.' The letter which followed was an appeal for funds for Spanish Refugee Aid to help Spanish Republican refugees. The *Daily Worker* did not state that it was a form letter recently mailed to some 14,000 individuals by Spanish Refugee Aid, a committee located at 80 East 11th St. in New York City, of which Casals is an honorary chairman and I am chairman. It also, significantly, failed to give our address.

"In calling attention to the *Daily Worker's* use of Pablo Casals' letter, I wish to point out that Casals is in no way responsible for the use to which the *Daily Worker* has put our form letter and that our organization has nothing to do with the Communist Party here or abroad and wants no aid from them."

# Harry Cain's Attack On the 'Subversive List'

The speech by former Senator Harry P. Cain attacking the attorney general's Subversive List deserves extensive quotation. Cain, who is a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board (which was set up by the McCarran Act and is charged with making up its own "subversive list"), has turned out to be a maverick from the point of view of the witchhunters. As the text below shows, he is one of the few personages in the "loyalty" and "security" apparatus who permit themselves to let out some home-truths about the Department of Justice's "list."

In case it needs pointing out, it is also clear from the text that Cain's own point of view is far from that of a principled civil-liberties advocate. The reader will note the qualifications he makes in his criticism of the list, as well as his own practice on the SACB. But this is worth mentioning only as a deterrent to going overboard and hailing Cain as a paladin of democracy, as Murray Kempton has done.

Concretely, with relation to actual government practice, Cain's attack on the list is a challenge to its whole rationale, whatever the speaker's own conclusions may be. The attorney general has not answered him, and cannot possibly answer effectively.

Cain's speech was given on May 23 to the B'nai B'rith. The text following is from the current *I. F. Stone's Weekly*, a newsletter whose coverage of the civil-liberties front is outstanding.

## From Text of Speech

The attorney general's list was authorized by Executive Order of the President in 1947. The attorney general was directed to compile a list of organizations which he considered to be Fascist, totalitarian, Communist or subversive in their purposes. The resulting list was to be employed by the Civil Service Commission in checking the loyalty of civil servants and applications for the federal establishment.

The attorney general did not provide nor was he required to grant a hearing to any organization which he saw fit to place on the list. It becomes important to remember that organizations listed before 1953 were never permitted to be heard in their own defense.

Since 1953, the attorney general has offered organizations previously listed an opportunity to be heard and provided that no organization would be added to the list without an opportunity for a hearing. The reasons have been several and the administrative difficulties have been apparent but no organization to my knowledge has ever actually had a hearing, which might result in de-listing the organization, nor has any hearing actually been given to an organization before it was listed.

Unless we assume that an attorney general, either Republican or Democrat, is infallible, as no human being ever is, we should not take for granted that every single proscribed organization has been listed for complete and sufficient cause. This is said without prejudice to any attorney general. We must look for a better way to establish as being conclusively true that listed organizations have been found factually to be actually totalitarian or subversive.

Between 1947 and the last change of national administrations in 1952, 192 organizations were listed. Since 1952, 83 organizations have been added to the list and its published total is now 275. We can reasonably expect that other organizations are intended for listing. I will not hazard a guess as to the eventual number of organizations which may be proscribed in this free society of ours. I simply note that millions of citizens are now members of or were previously members in the listed organizations and these associations become an important factor in determining whether an individual is eligible for employment by the federal government and many other private employment areas.

## "CRY OF ALARM"

These memberships, past or present, are being exercised by states and municipalities in scores of different fashions to ostracize free citizens, to denounce and condemn them; to prohibit legitimate activities of individuals and to place other citizens outside the law. Much of what I charge has been unin-

tended but my cry of alarm and warning is undeniably justified.

The attorney general has never suggested nor does he believe that mere membership in a listed organization is necessarily evil, bad or dangerous but many people in authority, both in and beyond the federal establishment, do so believe. In his own public words, the attorney general states that "membership is a red flag; it is a warning sign and gives an agency head something to go on so that he can examine the individual to find out more about the nature and extent of his contact with that organization." The logic in this approach is that a member of a listed subversive organization may be anything but subversive in his own conduct. The attorney general recommends only that unexplained or unsatisfactorily explained membership in a listed organization is a factor to be considered in security evaluations of employees and applicants for the federal service.

Do you know that an applicant for a defense industry job requiring a clearance, and many plants are entirely classified, is denied employment if his application includes any derogatory information or if any derogatory information is filed against him by someone else? There is no pre-employment examination system within the Industrial Personnel Security Program. Derogatory information includes membership in any of the organizations listed by the attorney general. In such cases, the greater loss is that of the government because on a simply unexamined charge, the government may have lost the services of the finest workers. Unless we find a way, and do it soon, to permit an applicant to face up to any allegations, we shall endanger and weaken our national security and we shall accelerate the spreading of the poison of distrust and suspicion and a lack of faith by the individual in his government everywhere. If this isn't an expression of common sense, of what does common sense consist?

## "VASTLY MISLEADING"

The attorney general's list should be understood to represent nothing more than an attorney's advice to his client who started out to be the government but has become anybody and everybody else who makes use of the list. As a citizen, I object to the advice because in its present form, the advice is unintelligible, misleading and a threat to a continuing vitality and strength of your nation's internal security. . . .

When the average citizen is confronted with the attorney general's list of 275 subversive organizations, he quite naturally can be expected to assume that all of the listed organizations are working daily and nightly, too, against our common good.

I tell you that the attorney general's list is vastly misleading because it indicates that the United States is confronted by a far larger assault against our security by organized groups of Communists or fellow-travelers than is the fact.

Permit me to tell you what I believe the facts to be which I can do without violating security in any manner.

Of the 275 listed organizations, approximately 150 of them have long since gone out of business. I derive some solid satisfaction from this knowledge that the list includes so many organizations which today offer no threat or danger of any kind to our Republic.

The Internal Security Act of 1950 defined by statute what a Communist Front is. A Communist Front is dominated, directed and controlled by the Communist Party, U.S.A., or by International Communism. When a Front does exist, it can be a menace to the security of this country and we ought to impose upon every Front which exists the onerous sanctions provided by the law and require the front to register so that you citizens know what it is, where it is, how it came into being and what it is doing.

Of the approximately 125 organizations which are currently operating in one manner or another, how many would you guess can be established to be in fact an organization which as a front is part and parcel of the Communist conspiracy? To the best of my knowledge, I can reasonably assume that as many as twenty but not more than thirty are in this category.

ON THE JIM CROW FRONT

## Ku-Kluxism Is Still Riding

By SCOTT ARDEN

Terming the recent murder of Rev. George W. Lee, in Belzoni, Mississippi, a penalty for the minister's militant fight for the right of Negroes to vote, Roy Wilkins, NAACP executive secretary, called upon all Negroes in Mississippi to protest the racist murder by registering and voting.

Wilkins addressed a protest rally of thousands in a hall only three blocks from the spot where Rev. Lee was shot down on May 8.

According to the Chicago *Defender's* report, despite the large attendance, which included representatives from just about every one of the state's 32 NAACP branches, the meeting was throughout a show of calm determination.

**This bore out the remarks of two other NAACP spokesmen present. Dr. A. H. McCoy, president of the NAA's state conference, commented after the meeting that "instead of frightening the people, this thing has served as a stimulus." Mrs. R. Hurley, regional director, agreed that Lee's death "is not running people away from the NAACP," and added "this could be the straw" that would break the back of the "Citizens Councils."**

A little earlier Dr. McCoy told the rally that Sheriff I. J. Shelton, who termed the death "accidental" before FBI lab tests proved otherwise, might well be investigating the murder rather than taking his "little tin bucket with some bait in it and going fishing."

Wilkins had asserted that Olezia White, a substitute school teacher who had been considered an important witness, had been ordered to "get out of town."

Commenting on this charge, the Pittsburgh *Courier* reports, Sheriff Shelton asked, "What witness? We know of no witness disappearing." It should be noted that Shelton is the same sheriff that Rev. Lee helped haul into federal court two years ago on charges of refusing to accept poll taxes from Negroes. (Shortly after the rally the Justice Department announced that it has asked the FBI to investigate the murder.)

Whether further investigation will succeed in establishing definite links between Sheriff Shelton or the "Citizens Councils" and the unknown slayer, two things are clear. Rev. Lee was shot down in an attempt to intimidate other Negro militants; but rather than leading to fear and intimidation, the murder seems to have provoked exactly the opposite response.

We hope, along with the NAACP, that the militant reaction to this terrorist assassination will demonstrate to the would-be present-day night-riders of the South that their day is past.

### EX-KLANSMAN WOOD

Speaking of soiled bed-sheets, the case of former Congressman John S. Wood of Georgia must be noted.

Wood is a former chairman of the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives, which, as every one knows, is an unusually able body when it comes to "ferreting out" individuals and groups, which it considers require "ferreting." (Lexicographers note: Merriam-Webster's Unabridged Dictionary, Second Edition, defines the ferret as "An animal of the weasel family . . . closely related to, and usually

assumed to be a domesticated variety of, the polecat.")

Surprisingly enough, at least to those easily surprised, the Un-American Committee managed, somehow or other, to pretty well shy clear of such groups as the Ku Klux Klan (which along with certain other organizations is cited by a certain attorney general on a certain list) in its ferreting activities.

But to the Wood affair. Former Congressman Wood has been nominated for a position on the Subversive Activities Control Board. Since his nomination, however, the Senate Judiciary Committee has been presented with charges that Wood is guilty of "un-American associations, leanings and membership." Hmm!

Seems that witchhunter Wood might be (note our fair-mindedness) a former member of the KKK.

**Wood's story, according to the Courier, is that he was approached after the First World War and asked to join the Klan. He agreed to do so, signed an application blank and gave his check for \$15. He was told to report to a certain place for initiation. He did so and found many of the important citizens of the town present.**

He was told, his story continues, that he would have to take an oath binding him to obey the Klan leader when ordered to cover his face and join with others in administering beatings to certain other citizens (Catholics, Negroes and Jews) selected by the Klan.

According to Wood, he balked at that. He claims he told the assembled gentlemen of the Old South that he had never done anything for which he had to hide his face and he didn't propose to start then.

At this point, he claims, his association with the Klan ended. It is interesting to note that other Georgians who know Wood tell a different story, and even more interesting to note that his stated objections to the Klan (assuming his story to be gospel-truth) seems to have been that he would have had to cover his face while out "night-riding" with his fellow prominent citizens, but we will restrain ourselves both on the question of his truthfulness and his bargain basement morality.

**We can only wonder where this fearless ferret would stand today if he had been accused, say, of being a member of the Communist Party, and admitted attending a meeting, signing an application blank and making a financial contribution. . . .**

We are further tempted to wonder (not that we approve of the prospect) if and when he will be called up before the Un-American Committee and asked to name the "important citizens" he recognized at the Klan meeting, and whether or not he would be cited for contempt if he refused to give such information. . . .

## Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

### Negro Nationalism

To the Editor:

In view of the fact that *LA* and the ISL take such a correct line on the principal issues I do not wish to engage in a protracted struggle with it and its spokesmen. However, I deem it most unfortunate if the ISL accepts the line of Negro nationalism, or any other kind of nationalism, except in certain situations involving colonial peoples. The Negro-nationalism line was born out of the insanity of 3rd-period Stalinism, 1928-35, then abandoned during the popular front, 1935-39, revived during the Hitler pact, buried during the pro-war period, and revived after the war. It is the line of the CP today. I refer readers to the pamphlet by Pettis Perry, *Negro Representation—A Step Toward Negro Freedom* (New Century, 1952), as one example. In the introduction, Betty Gannet writes: "For the realization of full nationhood, the rightful position of the Negro people in the Black Belt of full equality as a nation, can today best be advanced in the struggle to achieve Negro representation."

A few years ago the Stalinists were demanding "Negro representation" on the executive boards of the UAW and other unions. At the time *LA* correctly denounced this as opportunist demagoguery and white chauvinism in reverse. The question I ask now is, how can *LA* oppose the slogan of "Negro representation" in the unions, and accept it in municipal elections?

Supporting Negroes because they are Negroes means supporting Negro capi-

# SPOTLIGHT

(Continued from page 1)

**mass support by trying to convince in-betweeners that it itself is in-between! When a radical party edges over toward its enemy and tries to adopt its protective coloration, that usually convinces the floaters that the other fellow must have something.**

The famous "middle of the road" is probably the world's most unfortunate metaphor, for everyone knows that taking the middle of the road is virtual suicide for either a driver or pedestrian. While the BLP's campaign had little drive, it was surely pedestrian enough to convince British socialists to stay on their own side of the road—namely, on the left.

### Victory in Court

In a welcome blow on behalf of civil liberties the Supreme Court has reversed the decisions of lower courts in the cases of Quinn, Emspak and Bart. All three had been convicted of contempt for refusing to answer certain questions of the House Un-American Committee. The decisions shored up the protective virtue of the self-incrimination clause of the Fifth Amendment.

A significant remark appears in the dissent of Justice Harlan, the new member of the court who took an anti-democratic stand against the majority, in the case of Emspak. Harlan wrote: "The inference most readily drawn from the record is that Emspak did not want to 'stoolpigeon' against his associates. While such a motive would not, in my opinion, vitiate an otherwise valid claim of the privilege, it certainly furnishes no legal excuse for refusing to answer non-incriminatory questions."

The court majority, of course, argued that the questions at issue were or could be incriminatory, and, to be sure, this is the legal justification for "taking the Fifth." But it is interesting to note that, from his own witchhunting viewpoint, Harlan is in his own way pointing to the connection between the Fifth and what we have called "the right to refuse to be a stoolpigeon." There are too many would-be liberal defenders of the Fifth who have done their best to avoid looking this issue in the face.

### Guilt by Inheritance

Now the military has served notice that subversion via association, or what amounts to "guilt by inheritance," is its criterion for deciding the loyalty of its members. Now the sweep of the "loyalty" program of the military may be seen from the case of a Washington reservist who faces an undesirable discharge be-

cause his father is accused of being a Communist.

Unlike other so-called loyalty cases which have involved individuals whose own previous actions or associations were questioned, here is an instance where the government apparently acknowledges the "innocence" of the man accused, yet shamelessly directs him to appear before a board of officers to answer for the actions of a member of his immediate family. And it gives him the incredible alternative of disproving the charges made against his father, or quietly accepting an undesirable discharge.

Cpl. Walter W. Kulich, a 22-year-old army reservist who lives in Aberdeen, Washington, has been notified that he is to appear before an Army Field Board and show "sufficient evidence" that his father has not been a "member of the Communist Party and attended Communist Party meetings." Otherwise, according to the *army Times*, unofficial publication on army events and trends, he must accept an undesirable discharge, which in the military is one slim category below that of a dishonorable discharge.

Department of army regulations specify a General Discharge for most "security" cases, which is usually given under formally honorable conditions.

### Love That Tiger!

The annual dinner of the Liberal Party of New York, held on May 25 at the Hotel Commodore, was a veritable love-fest, with much ardent wooing on the part of the Democratic Party leaders. The dais and dinner were dominated by the Democrats, whose speakers kept reminding the 1800 Liberals present that really they are on the same side and belong together.

The tone of the affair was overwhelmingly Democratic. The chief speakers were New York State Governor Averell Harriman, and New York City's Mayor Robert Wagner, who generously stated that he had "forgotten the details" of the 1953 campaign when the Liberals ran their independent candidate Rudolph Halley against him.

Halley, incidentally, was relegated to a back seat at this banquet while his opponent, against whom the Liberal leaders had thundered heavily just two years ago, graciously occupied the limelight. To add insult to injury, Harriman was flanked by his Secretary of State—Carmine DeSapio, more widely known as the sarchem of Tammany.

Instead of the customary attacks on corrupt Tammany, always the whipping boy of the Liberal leaders and cited as their reason for existence, Liberal Party State Chairman Adolf A. Berle Jr. made a sickeningly apologetic speech about "our ally" who shows promise of change and growth. Berle's attempt to paint a "new look" DeSapio was an affront to the policies and principles of the Liberal Party in their eleven years of existence as an independent force in New York State. Can it be considered a carefully calculated step to prepare the Liberal Party membership for dissolution into the ranks of the Democrats?

How else can one interpret the advice given verbally by the party leadership to party stalwarts to "spontaneously" applaud and shout hurrah at the entrance of DeSapio? Harriman's entrance was enthusiastically greeted, but there was a noticeable drop in applause when DeSapio followed him.

After eleven years of savage assault on Tammany, after a campaign like Halley's against the Tammany selection in 1953, the leader of Tammany walks onto the dais of the Liberal Party dinner and calmly assumes his seat without a rank-and-file uproar. Grumbings were sounded, and there were many expressions of disgust and dismay, but already the rationalizations begin: *If you want a Harriman, you have to take a DeSapio. . . . who knows, Harriman may be running for the presidency next year, and politics is a dirty business anyway. . . .*

This type of affair, coming after months of hints and rumors that the Liberal Party was getting ready to fold up and disappear into the Democratic Party, could unfortunately only confirm this feeling in the Liberal ranks, especially when coupled with the purely perfunctory remarks about the need for a party like the Liberal Party. What was needed was a spirited affirmation of the party, rather than a battery of Democratic Party leaders.

(Turn to last page)

**LABOR ACTION**

June 6, 1955

Vol. 19, No. 23

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

Editor: HAL DRAPER

Associate Editors:

GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL

Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

## Opposition to New ROTC Oath Continues

### The Issue Is Compulsory ROTC

On May 16, *Challenge* carried a press release from the American Civil Liberties Union announcing that the Defense Department had withdrawn its loyalty oath (based on the "subversive" list) for students in basic ROTC. Many colleges and universities require male students to take two years of ROTC as part of their college careers; for such students there was posed the dilemma of taking a loyalty oath based on their political associations and activities or facing possible expulsion from school. In most places the "compromise" of a discriminatory "informal ROTC" was worked out for students who refused to sign.

Under the new regulations students will be required to sign a positive oath instead, one which pledges them to "support and defend the Constitution . . . against all enemies" and to "bear true faith and allegiance" to it. The old oath, which is the same as that administered to members of the Armed Forces, remains in effect for those students voluntarily registering for upper-class ROTC courses.

The change of oath is a real and meaningful victory for civil liberties and academic freedom. As we wrote in the editorial note accompanying the ACLU release, "the government's retreat on the ROTC loyalty oath underlines the old truism that *it pays to fight*." The ACLU and other organizations which opposed this oath deserve the congratulations of all defenders of freedom. The various student groups who fought against it, such as SCLU at Berkeley, and the individual students who refused to sign the oath, should be honored, above all.

**The matter, however, does not end here. For even the new oath, unobjectionable as it appears to be, presents a certain amount of danger. The very idea of imposing any oath upon students, prerequisite to their attending school, is objectionable. Moreover, in the context of the present witchhunt atmosphere, its effects cannot be to lessen the anti-democratic trends in the nation. On the contrary, as *The Observer* mildly put it (see article elsewhere on this page): "it has an adverse psychological effect on students."**

According to all indications, those students who refuse to take this oath will face the same discriminatory practices as the students who refused to sign the old oath. They will have to enroll in "informal ROTC" courses and to participate in ROTC activities without uniforms or necessary textbooks and equipment. Such a situation singles these stu-

dents out, creates difficulties for them in performing the work for their ROTC courses, and makes them subject to pressure and harassment.

It is the duty of all students who believe in academic freedom and of all democratic student groups, especially ACLU and SCLU organizations, to defend the non-signers of the new oath and to insist that they be treated like all other students. The rights of students who do not wish to take any loyalty oaths in order to go to school should be protected.

**Above all, these new developments raise the whole question of compulsory ROTC once again. The cold war has brought in its train the militarization of many spheres of life, including the campus, with its consequent threats to democracy. Campus after campus has instituted voluntary ROTC programs, which are bad enough, but in addition there has been a growth in the number of schools requiring compulsory ROTC.**

The existence of ROTC programs in educational institutions produces many grave results. The growth of military thinking and attitudes among students and the increase in weight for the military in society as a whole are obvious ones. Furthermore the existence of ROTC adds to the witchhunt atmosphere; it introduces military "security" standards onto the campus and provides a rationale for increased repression. Witness the ROTC loyalty oath.

Compulsory ROTC has no place on the campus and should be done away with. It is the task of socialist and liberal students to fight against the imposition of compulsory ROTC at those schools in which it does not now exist and for its elimination from those where it is present.

As was pointed out in a letter to the editor in *Challenge* for May 31, students can conduct successful struggles against this anti-democratic practice. The regulations governing the administration of land-grant funds given to schools require that ROTC be offered, not that it be mandatory. In some schools, campaigns by the student body and liberal community organizations have resulted in the removal of the compulsory feature of ROTC.

These struggles should be emulated by all students everywhere as one element in the fight for the democratic rights of students and teachers, as part of the struggle to maintain and advance democracy.

### Non-Signers of U. of Cal. Helped Win A Victory, but More Fight Still Needed

By JACK WALKER

BERKELEY, May 24—*The Observer*, UCLA's off-campus paper, in noting prospective changes in the ROTC oath for lower division ROTC students outlined in the *Daily Californian*, still opposes the new oath as being unnecessary and "adverse psychological(ly)." In its analysis of the news article the *Observer* says:

"Such groups as the Land-Grant College Association (all land-grant colleges must offer ROTC [my emphasis—J.W.]) and the American Civil Liberties Union have pressured the Defense Department and may deserve credit for removal of the certificate."

The *Observer* should also give some weight to the resistance of the non-signers, especially at Cal, who while they might not have been a sufficient force were nevertheless a crucial element in moving larger community institutions such as the Land Grant Colleges Association, to action.

"The change is definitely for the bet-

ter. It is an oath of loyalty without the former tendency to restrict political associations.

"We feel, however, that an oath for basic ROTC is meaningless for security purposes and we think it has an adverse psychological effect on students.

"Since the federal legislation establishing the requirement expires June 30, it is conceivable that the new oath may never be used."

While I would like to agree with *The Observer* regarding the dropping of the oath next fall, it is extremely unlikely. Much more likely is *The Observer's* quotation from Clark Kerr (UC Chancellor at Berkeley) that "all entering RO students [must] take the new oath as a prerequisite to formal enrollment. . . ." Thus "informal ROTC" will still continue with all its concomitant pressure upon the dissenter opposed to signing any oaths as a prerequisite to attending a state college. *The Observer* can be a great moral aid in supporting this opposition of continued non-signers, plus that of new enrollees in the fall semester.

## UC in Another Blow at Free Expression on Campus

By JACK WALKER

BERKELEY, May 24—The following is a full reproduction of an article in the May 18 issue of *The Observer*, UCLA off-campus paper, under the headline: "CHATTERBOX STAFF RESIGNS—EDITOR PROTESTS CONTROL"

"The staff of *The Chatterbox*, official publication of the University Cooperative Housing Association, resigned last week.

"Two weeks ago, the UCHA Board of Directors received a letter from Asst. Dean of Students Byron Atkinson stating *The Chatterbox* must have permission from the Administration to be published.

"The UCHA board, threatened by loss of University recognition, answered the Administration by requesting permission to publish the paper.

"Chatterbox editor, Fredy Perlman, stated in an interview with *The Observer*, 'By asking for the Dean's permission to publish *The Chatterbox*, the paper was put under direct control of the University Administration.'

"According to Perlman, '*The Chatterbox* had been a great headache to Dean Hahn and his regime. It was a free newspaper in a University-recognized organization.'

"*The Chatterbox* was a mimeographed publication of the cooperative group ranging from four to ten pages weekly, dealing primarily with co-op matters.

"The only restrictions on material for the paper were good taste and space limitations,' said the former editor.

"The frightening truth that the Administration is systematically eliminating controversy and its concomitant of free expression is more apparent than ever after this incident with *The Chatterbox*.

"If the Administration were sincerely interested in seeing that all publications of University-recognized groups were conforming to University regulations, then they would long ago have approached the publishers of *Soph Brewin's* and the *Commuters' Corner*, two publications (non-controversial) which are circulated on campus without University permission.

"Clearly, these papers do not represent the dangerous 'free expression' ele-

ment which, apparently, had been the Administration's 'bête noir.'

Apparently Dean Hahn's extension of Rule No. 17, regulating UCLA-recognized institutions permitted to use the University name, have already gone into operation. The editors of *The Chatterbox* have made the difficult decision of not becoming a "house organ" of the UCLA Administration—with suitable self-apologies and self-justification to others; instead they have chosen to publicize the absence of freedom by withdrawing, thereby calling the attention of the community to this new encroachment on student rights.

**Given UCLA's insistence on riding roughshod over student opposition, such fighting back is an indispensable part of mobilizing mass opposition to this Administration. It also makes the shameful silence of U.C. at Berkeley's Administration precisely that—a shameful silence.**

Perhaps the old editorial board of *The Chatterbox* will cooperate more closely with *The Observer* now and next term, so that the possible untimely demise of *The Observer* after a very important and excellent first semester might be avoided. The need for a "non-coordinated" press (i.e., non-censored) becomes even more urgent in the face of the silence and bias of the University Administration that will be reflected in their "coordinated" press.

## NOTES FROM BERKELEY

The Berkeley YSL challenged the Berkeley Labor Youth League (Stalinist youth group) to a debate on "The Yalta Agreement" through a letter to the *Daily Californian* but has never received a reply. The LYL has shown signs of some membership gains and increased activity lately, including distribution of *Campus Sense*, its new monthly. This CP youth organ is on the style of the West Coast Stalinist daily, the *People's World*.

Academic Freedom Week was desultorily celebrated at the University of California at Berkeley by a series of forums on its meaning and on the question of the loss of academic freedom. Platitudinous defense of Cal's denial of teaching positions to Stalinists and support to the official views of the university were offered by Academic Senate members, a lawyer, and a Hubert-Humphrey-type "liberal." A YSL spokesman's question on the panicky attitude that excludes Stalinists from civil liber-

ties, while still allowing other non-orthodoxies, was sloughed off at the tail of the meeting.

Meanwhile the administration continues to purge its "embarrassments" who hold too firm and too public a liberal position, by denying them tenure and dismissing them for "not publishing enough" or through "budget cuts." Academic freedom, however, like the grin of the Cheshire cat, lingers on in a disembodied fashion somewhere in the stone buildings on campus . . . perhaps in the files of the Security Office.

Two YSL classes are currently being given. One on May 22, at 7 p.m., is on "The National Question"—a look at the historical significance of national independence in a time of world wars, with emphasis on Formosa and the off-shore islands. The second, on May 29, at 6 p.m., is a debate: "Is Stalinism a Stage of Capitalism?" It will examine the historical perspective and nature of Stalinism in Russia and China, in particular.

New York YSL's

BIG BOOK BAZAAR

Bizarre bargains on books of every breed—political, fiction, non-fiction, semi-fiction, etc.

FRIDAY ONLY—9 p.m.-on

JUNE 10

114 West 14 Street, N.Y.C.

## A Study of New Social Forces In Egypt and the Arab States

# MILITARY 'SOCIALISM' IN THE NEAR EAST

By CLOVIS MAKSOUD

Recent developments in West Asia indicate a growth of social and political consciousness. Simultaneously, imperialist and reactionary forces are increasing their pressure. What will be the outcome of this conflict depends largely on the direction the revolutionary situation takes.

That there is a will to change the foundations of the policy will not be questioned. The nature of the change is what matters for all concerned. The answer will be provided by those who shall ultimately act as the vanguard and spokesmen for this Arab "general staff."

There are several responses to the challenge that political, economic and psychological dislocations present. Each claims to provide the answer that will resolve Arab frustrations. Groping for adequate leadership, the people listen attentively to the relatively new voices that are being raised.

The intensity of political ferment that Western observers call "confused politics" is but a reflection of an intrinsic realization that their choice of direction has a sense of finality. Their committal, the Arabs rightly believe, will set the course for their departmental energies to be channeled in a way they hope will bring about their salvation. Their committal is, in itself, a fundamental break from their present pattern of life, and its reconstruction will, in the light of rapid historical movement, be impossible.

The break their committal to a revolutionary direction will constitute is of far-reaching consequences as in reality it is a political mutation—a leap—and not a slow evolutionary process. There is a conviction that the step they will take is a point of no return.

This explains the caution that many mistakenly consider as the Arab's unwillingness to change. This caution is, in my opinion, a bid for time to examine the substance of the direction they will follow rather than reluctance to abandon what exists.

This hesitancy, though it does not suit my revolutionary temperament, is useful and necessary. It prevents romantic adventurism and utopian escapades. It enables the doctrinal formulas to diffuse their conceptual schemes on a broader scale. In view of the recent crisis in all the major competing ideologies, revolutionary skepticism seems to be, temporarily at least, a healthy practice for the Arabs.

It might provide them with a disposition for eclectic solutions, it is true, but it might pave the way for socialist pluralism that seems to offer the reasonable synthesis of eclectic attitudes and the desirability of socialism. I confess, though I shall not say that socialist pluralism should become the creed of Arab direction, I am ready to give it a theoretical test as to its application to our conditions in the Arab world.

### "WELFARE STATE" FAILURE

The reason for the "readiness" lies, partially, in the failure of the Democratic Socialist movement to provide the necessary guarantees for building a classless society or the proofs of its genuine interest in fighting the new versions of imperialist endeavors. Democratic Socialism—better known as Social-Democracy—has become identified with the "Welfare State" and not with the struggle for the social ownership of the means of production.

By its conversion to the "Welfare State," it has accepted the basis of capitalist organization of society. For capitalism has in recent years made many strides toward broadening the basis of economic opportunities. But this introduction of social benefits will lead, in the long run, to the consecration of class differentiation.

In underdeveloped areas, such as ours, the "Welfare State" notion militates against the emergence of any over-all changes in the social and economic system. Thus, social-democracy, being infused with political opportunism and becoming the vehicle of trade-union bureaucrats, achieves an arrangement whereby the structural aspects and fundamental interests of capitalism are preserved and the working class is provided with some privileges which accommodates the capitalist economy with another lease of extension. This brings forth the emergence of a managerial class from within the ranks of the trade unions which, seeks, by frustrating workers' activism, to find a formula where capitalism and workers' interest can coexist in the same economic unit.

Such coexistence is the definition of the "Welfare State." But it is not socialism. It is not even democratic when the preservation of its status necessitates the preservation of marketing privileges abroad and the maintenance of a semi-imperial control.

By accepting the role of accommodating the basic premises of the capitalist system, social-democrats in Western Europe lost the bulk of the proletariat and confined their appeal to white-collar workers and the liberal bourgeois elements of society. This is a fact in France and Italy, and a trend in Britain. If social-democracy becomes the direction in our struggle, revolutionary fulfillment will never be achieved and the

march for an equalitarian society will definitely be halted.

### The Case of the Ahali Group

Social-Democracy became an attraction to some segments of the Arab intelligentsia and the nascent petty bourgeoisie. It took the form of a progressive program advocated by military dictatorships in Syria and Egypt.

Many progressive Arabs still consider such dictatorships as a "necessary stage of democratic development." In this respect, such an attitude has historical roots.

In 1882 the army in Egypt, in alliance with the anti-imperialist nationalists, staged the abortive revolt against British occupation. The alliance between the military and the progressive civilian revolutionaries took place and acted as the precedent that was to prove fatal in subsequent revolts to the radical forces. The failure of the revolt made the ineptness of such alliance less evident as the army group did not have the opportunity to abandon their progressive counterpart in the aftermath of the revolt. This precedent—the alliance—which never matured to the extent of proving its futility, remained a temptation for many to repeat.

Actually, in the Arab world, it was repeated in 1936 in Iraq.

The Ahali Group, which included the various shades of Iraq's progressive opinion, started its attack on the government and the inequities of the social system. It could not implement its demands as it lacked political power necessary for its control over the government's machinery. Though the group had little electoral strength, its leaders were convinced that they would not be opposed by the people.

But the forces of reaction had certain advantages that made any attempt to overthrow the government suicidal, unless such an attempt was executed by one of the governmental constituent components. The government's authority rested not on popular consent but on (a) political disintegration through the tribal system and other related factors; (b) the British rule; (c) the army and the police.

The Ahali Group, new in its leftist training, inexperienced in party organization, sincere and enthusiastic in its desire for social justice but with no coherent ideology, calculated that if one of the components of the government's authority is brought against the government itself, the latter will disintegrate and a progressive program will have a real chance to materialize.

The British, seeking to maintain their economic and political privileges, would not support such a group whose first item was the nationalization of the oil resources. Besides, a foreign imperialist power cannot continue its preponderant position except through an acquiescent regime which relies on the outside as a source of power.

The tribal system provided the government with a source of strength as the tribal chieftains, relatively few in number, could be easily satisfied. The regeneration of the Bedouins required an overhauling of the whole political and social set-up and a simultaneous process of re-education. This meant time—a long time.

### NO SHORTCUT!

The Ahali Group concluded then that the army was the only hope to effectuate a coup d'état and remove the ruling class as an obstacle to social progress. They relied on reports—which were true—that some commanders were anxious to realize political ambitions. There were reports of friction between the officer corps and the cabinet and, to some extent, there were liberal and nationalist officers who resented the total subservience of the government to British designs.

To make the story short: The coup d'état succeeded and a cabinet was formed with the liberal Hikmat Suleiman as premier and the socialist Kamel Chadurchi as member of the cabinet. Bakr Sudky, the commander-in-chief, and his officers, exercised the real power. For a while, the alliance worked; but gradually socialist and progressive elements were eased out and many of the officers accused the Ahali Group of Communist leanings.

The truth of the matter was that the army was not as interested in social justice as in settling political accounts. However, they were not to blame. The Ahali Group realized, too late, that putschism is not a means for socialism to acquire power. In addition, patience in preparing social revolution is an investment in providing it with firm and sound foundations.

Their greatest mistake, one which is often being repeated in Arab progressive circles, is that they treated the army as an institutional component rather than a human one (made up of peasants, workers, petty bourgeoisie) in the body politic. Treatment of an army in non-socialist circumstances as institutional rather than human, enables the army as such to play alternate roles, depending on the leadership. The leadership of the armed forces can be controlled in most cases and, therefore, it is a grave mistake to calculate the army in its institutional form as a fait accompli.

The Ahali Group, in more recent developments, be-

Readers of LABOR ACTION will remember Clovis Maksoud as the Arab socialist who contributed a number of articles last year on the problems of the Arab world, its socialist movements, Israeli policy, etc. He is a leading figure in the Progressive Socialist Party of Lebanon.

In the present article—after the general introduction with its interesting discussion of how the "Welfare State" approach of the reformist social-democracies looks as applied to undeveloped countries—Comrade Maksoud presents an important contribution to a question on which there has been little or no socialist analysis available.

This is the question of a variant of "bureaucratic revolution," to be imposed from above by military dictatorship, in the Near East, and by implication in other undeveloped countries. Political events in Egypt have raised this problem most strikingly in the Near East. We think it should also be borne in mind that the appeal of military "socialism" which Maksoud discusses has, as its ideological cousin in much of Asia, the somewhat similar appeal of Stalinism as a method of forced modernization.

Maksoud's article appeared in Socialist Asia, the monthly magazine of the Asian Socialist Conference, January-February 1955, under the title "Revolution in West Asia." All headings, sub-heads and article divisions as here published have been added by us.—Ed.

came aware of a basic and much forgotten assumption—there is no shortcut to progress! This, unfortunately, was not realized in many other parts of the Arab world.

### Coup d'Etat in Syria

The war in Palestine brought about a general articulation of the Arab will for a change. The Arab failure, it was generally felt, was not due to a lack of popular support to the war or to the lack of arms. It was primarily due to the subservience of the Arab governments to Western designs. The defeat of the Arabs brought forth strong protestations against the mismanagement of the ruling circles.

The first to feel the shame of defeat were the armies. A political account arose and needed settlement. In the midst of this psychological and political confusion in the aftermath of the Palestine war, the people's discontent, though strong and fearless, was not organized. It rallied instead behind the Zaim coup d'état in Syria in March 31, 1949.

Damascus became the new Mecca for the liberals. Public dissatisfaction, the army's indignation and the obvious corruption of the governing classes made the coup possible. Great changes were promised. Radicals who doubted the validity of such spontaneous programs evolved on the spur of the moment were isolated from the less profound radical opinion. In fact, men like Michel Aflak and Salah el Bitaar, leaders of the Socialist Baath, were put in prison while others, like Akram Hourani, became cabinet members.

This goes to show how the radical movement was split insofar as some regarded a military dictatorship as desirable and necessary, while others considered it as undesirable.

Such regimes as we have seen in Iraq, Syria, and present-day Egypt were in reality a by-product of a blend between fascist and autocratic notions and nebulous socialist slogans and attitudes. But both convergent tendencies in their anti-feudal color attracted to their ranks the big bourgeoisie which hopes to replace the feudal system, and the un-ideological progressive who sees in every change a step forward.

The regime which does not have its roots in the people's struggle and does not depend on a constant growth of mass consciousness begins to undergo a crisis through its own contradictions. The dictator surrounds himself with "yes men," then conceives of himself as a "historical figure" in the Hegelian tradition and moves toward conferring upon himself titles of grandeur and perverting democratic institutions to serve his own ambitions. In this manner, Colonel Husin el-Zaim became a marshal and then president (getting 99 per cent of the so-called votes) and Colonel Shishakly became a president in the same way.

But that is not all. They start by an apologia for dictatorship, disclaiming any ambitions, insisting that their roles "were thrust" upon them by "circumstances" and when they have guaranteed the country against "reaction" they will "voluntarily" transfer power to the people through their freely elected representatives. "This is just a phase," they will insist. This fraudulent disclaimer of any desire to rule impresses the naive, Western diplomats and correspondents.

The most skeptical have urged us to "give the man a chance" notwithstanding that such regimes have had as their first victims the progressive and liberal elements. In Egypt, the first victims were not King Farouk (he was banished) nor the corrupt feudal lords. Most were put in forced residence. The most severe punishment—imprisonment—was imposed on the king's cronies. But who got the death sentence? Mostapha Khamis, the trade-union leader in Alexandria.

### ANTI-SOCIALIST CONSEQUENCES

In Syria, which party was persecuted and its members put in concentration camps by the hundreds? Not the big capitalists. The Company of the Five (the largest holding company in Syria known as Shirici el-Khomasieh) controlled the economy of Syria, impeded economic unity with Lebanon and co-opted Shishakly's brother as a partner. The feudal lords were not the victims. In fact, the police force was in the reality the instrument of the feudal overlord, who in alliance with the military governor kept the peasants in bondage. Stories of peasants homes being ravaged and men

(Continued bottom of next page)

# MANDARINS AND COOLIES: Her Latest Novel Explains Simone de Beauvoir's Road to Stalinism

By A. GIACOMETTI

At the end of last year, Simone de Beauvoir published a novel called *Les Mandarins*, which won the Goncourt Prize and received immediate and widespread publicity. In it, she tells the personal and political story of a group of left-wing intellectuals in post-war Paris.

The main characters in this group are Debreuilh, who resembles Sartre, Anne Debreuilh, who resembles Simone de Beauvoir, and Henri Perron, who resembles Camus. They organize a political movement called the SRL, which resembles the RDR, and publish a paper called *L'Espoir*, which combines elements of *Combat*, *Franc-Tireur* and *Les Temps Modernes*. It is therefore not surprising that the publication of *Les Mandarins* was more a political than a literary event.

In fact, it became a major political event in intellectual circles. Such must inevitably be the case when a brilliant writer, who has won the respect of the world by her ability and by her passionate defense of truth and justice, reverses herself in spectacular fashion, declares her readiness to defend every falsehood in the services of a powerful tyranny, and strikingly reveals her political ignorance.

For *Les Mandarins* is at the same time the story, the explanation and the justification of Simone de Beauvoir's capitulation to Stalinism. It completes the task Sartre undertook in his articles in *Les Temps Modernes*, and is placed in its proper context by the author's exclusive interview to *Humanité-Dimanche*, where she stated that the intellectuals of the Left had to align themselves with the CP lest they become tools of reaction.

But Simone de Beauvoir tries so hard that her book defeats its purpose. The experience of the RDR was no doubt a failure, but it did not "prove" that there is no need for an independent socialist organization in France, nor did it compromise the validity of independent and revolutionary socialism as an idea. In *Les Mandarins* Simone de Beauvoir tries

to do both of these things, and only shows that it cannot even be attempted without considerable dishonesty and ignorance. At the end, she has only succeeded in discrediting herself and her group.

Much adulatory nonsense was written about the book in the Stalinist and in the bourgeois press. Two reviews, however, stand out from the rest because they show a regard for historical truth that has been lost in more sophisticated circles. One appeared in *La Vérité*, the other in *Le Libérateur*. The main burden of the argument is the same in both, but the review in the latter paper, by a former member of the RDR, is particularly relevant.

Simone de Beauvoir's political novel appears at a time when conflicting tendencies within the New Left struggle for the independence of the new organization, or for its subordination to the CP. *Les Mandarins* supports the case of the latter and, when the "former member of the RDR" who reviews the book analyzes and rejects Simone de Beauvoir's argument, he also settles accounts with her political friends in the New Left, who would have the organization commit political suicide in the same way the mandarins around Sartre did.

## STALINOID PORTRAITS

Here is what the reviewer of *Le Libérateur* says:

"Let us say from the beginning that these intellectual mandarins whose story is told by Simone de Beauvoir are very lucky to be able to stroll all over Italy or Portugal, or to contemplate Maya tombs in the midst of the Mexican jungles. While their worry about social problems does them credit, they have little chance of winning sympathy and understanding from the coolies in this manner. The perpetual hesitations of these left intellectuals, suspended between the Communist Party and their respect for the individual, between the desire of be militant and the need to loaf, between the will to fight and the impulse to escape their responsi-

bilities, do not seem convincing to the militant.

"We do not reproach the author for portraying disappointing persons. Simone de Beauvoir portrays very truthfully a certain well-defined circle of intellectuals who cannot, however, pretend to represent the progressive intelligentsia as a whole. On the other hand, one could have expected that the author would choose a different outlook and that, throughout the novel, a different political position would have made itself felt.

"In fact, these mandarins of the Left are strange people. They never meet workers, and not a single wage-earner appears in the novel. These progressive intellectuals are not even in touch with organizers of working-class origin, including those of the SRL, and one wonders whether there are any workers at all in the organizations, which is only described in terms of a Directing Committee exclusively composed of writers and journalists.

"However, this peculiarity becomes clear when it appears that the SRL is merely supposed to be an auxiliary organization of the CP, which is alone supposed to represent the working class. As a matter of fact, all the heroes of Simone de Beauvoir's novel live in a constant state of anxiety wondering what the Communist leadership will think of every initiative they take. The writer Henri Perron decided only after an agonizing struggle with himself to denounce the Russian slave-labor camps. The SRL dies from the stress, as did the RDR.

"But the course of the conflict is very different in fiction than it was in reality. The existence of the slave-labor camps was known before the creation of the RDR, whose first manifesto denounced both Stalinist totalitarianism and reformist opportunism. It is not therefore a sudden revelation due to the intrigues of a former Trotskyist who has become an agent of the American secret services. Be it said in passing that to portray in such a fashion the only Trotskyist that appears in the book reminds one uncomfortably of the classic Stalinist slanders.

"In reality, the campaign against the Russian concentration camps was started by David Rousset in a right-wing journal, the *Figaro Littéraire*. In the book, the situation is completely different, and the existence of the Russian camps is denounced by Perron in a left-wing paper. Would the result have been different if reality had conformed to this latter version? Many of us believe so, in particular those of us who believe that the CP is not omnipotent if one knows how to differentiate oneself from it without seeking refuge under the wing of the bourgeoisie.

## INTELLECTUAL'S REPLY

"As to Simone de Beauvoir's mandarins, they choose, after many hesitations, the protection of the CP. In this respect, Perron makes an astounding confession when Lachaume the CP specialist in charge of intellectuals, asks him to join the party; Perron answers: 'I am much more useful to you outside of it.' This, no doubt, is a fellow traveler such as Francois Billoux would like them to be. A fellow traveler who remains impotent toward the CP because of his assumption that the latter is the party of the working class, forgetting that there are two and a half million socialist voters and about two million abstentionists of the Left, who do not vote because there is no organization to express their aspirations. Even at the time of its greatest strength, in 1946-47, the CP never monopolized the allegiance of the working class; it cannot pretend to represent it now, after a slow but steady loss of strength, which even the CP press admits.

"Fascinating as Simone de Beauvoir's book may be, it is little help for the building of a proletarian, socialist and independent New Left. It is true that the author, who is a pleasant person otherwise, lacks the experience of the life of the militant and the daily contact with the working class. Otherwise she would have discovered, besides social-democratic and communist workers, imprisoned in their traditional fallacies, numerous workers who seek an independent way to the revolution."

# Military 'Socialism' in the Near East — —

(Continued from page 6)

working under duress are well known in Syrian communities. One need only look at the record of the last free elections in September to see the peasants' reaction to feudal outrage. In the Hama and Maarat el-Naaman districts, where the Barazi and el-Haraki families ruled for generations unchallenged, their candidates suffered the most humiliating defeat by the socialists. Socialist slates were elected *in toto* and by majorities that even the most optimistic socialists did not anticipate.

But the military dictatorship banished socialist leaders—Akram Hourani, Michel Aflak and Salah Deen Bitaar, and scores of other liberals as Maarouf Dawalibi and Ali Bonzo. Despite all this evidence, many socialists in Europe refrained from supporting us—and still do as in the case of Egypt—insisting in [British] MP John Freeman's words that "military dictatorship is a short-cut to progress."

## Military Dictatorship in Egypt

In Egypt, the situation is the same, though slightly different in the manifestation of the inherent contradictions. These differences, minor in their substance, can be traced to the peculiar circumstances in which the putsch came about.

There is the same pathological desire to call the coup a "revolution." There is the particular emphasis on identifying the Junta with "land reform." There is a nauseating repetition of the Junta's interest in democracy "afterwards." There is the same tendency to represent, in a calculating manner, liberal elements as unable to cope effectively with basic problems.

There is also a systematic suppression of the intelligentsia and enlightened political activities by lumping them in a campaign against "politics" in general. This is a means to generate apathy on the part of the masses by establishing some sort of paternalistic oligarchy. There is the same pattern of advertising their sincerity to foreigners and gaining tacit support from abroad.

There is, however, a difference in the Junta's structure in Egypt from that of Syria's before the overthrow of Shishakly in February 1954.

The military regime in Egypt rules in a corporate manner. True, it is the army leadership that dominates the apparatus of the state, but unlike Syria, the army in Egypt is fragmented in its loyalties, which fragmentation reflects itself in the so-called "Revolutionary Council." The cavalry supports General Naguib; the infantry supports Gamal Abdul Nasser, etc. Thus the dictatorship is maintained by alliance of groups within the army and capacity to isolate a third component

(momentarily the cavalry). This fragmentation of loyalty was absent in Syria and conflicts tended to be more personal.

This relatively detailed exposition of military regimes is to show that, though their dramatic assumption of power has attracted supporters in the first instance, they have shown themselves insincere in claiming to be "transitory" and unable to provide a revolutionary direction to the Arab people. This is especially true as they tended to rely on social classes who are as dangerous to the Arab masses as the corrupt feudal lords are. Their danger lies in the subtlety of their machinations and the doubletalk of their utterances.

Invariably, Social-Democrats have supported such regimes and this is why it cannot serve as a creed to direct our will to change. In its well-developed formula it has shown itself incapable of understanding conditions in areas such as ours and uninspiring in its utilitarian politics on its domestic level; and this explains why it should not serve as a creed—and it will not, as it lacks the necessary ingredients to succeed in the Arab world.

## Roads Before the Arab Peoples

A revolution, without direction, leads however to anarchy, absolutism or its own negation. It is exposed and easily suppressed. It raises false hopes and exhausts latent revolutionary vitality. It is immature, hasty and emotional. It is devoid of any sense of planning, any appreciation for the value of theory, incomprehensive of the need for positive content.

It is therefore necessary that disillusionment in Social-Democracy should not lead us to abandon the search. More important, it should not lead us to naked existential dispositions that are caused by a mood of despair and indifference.

Here again the Arabs, confronted with such cross-currents of ideals, refrain from taking a definite position. Whenever an election is held, the will for change expresses a desire for a certain form of socialism.

It invariably gives socialist parties in respective Arab states an advantageous position. An analysis of Arab electorate reactions in recent elections—where the secrecy of the ballot was guaranteed—indicates that (a) traditional parties are discredited and their policies rejected. This is shown by the failure of the former ruling parties in Syria, the National Bloc and the People's Party, to get between themselves a working majority; (b) the number of "independents" elected constituting the largest single bloc of deputies and parenthetically representing this mood of hesitancy described above; and (c) the near phenomenal growth of

the socialist strength as compared with earlier elections and in relation to their newness on the political scene.

This pattern was the same in Iraq where the Independent and the National Democratic Party won enough seats not to allow the reactionary pro-British Nuri el-Said to form a government and thus led to the dissolution of the parties and the parliament, the suppression of constitutional rights, and the holding of a pre-arranged "election" whereby 125 candidates—Nuri's followers—ran "unopposed." In Jordan, elections were preceded with a similar prelude as occurred in Iraq. Where free elections were held, a general trend was detected. Besides, Syria has always been the most concrete indicator of Arab opinion.

The favorable position of socialism does not at all mean that its victory is inevitable. On the contrary, such position raises the expectations of the masses and activates the enemies of socialism. The strides that we have made in the Arab world will provoke far cleverer schemes on the part of the imperialists to frustrate our development.

It will, as in Iraq and Jordan, bring about a totalitarian regime. It will, as in Lebanon, arouse ancient prejudices—religious and local—and draw forgotten hatreds to the forefront. Reaction will fight its battle for survival and the last battle is usually the noisiest. But with vigilance, determination, organizational democracy and the theoretical clarification, socialism will remain the instrument of human progress.

Attempts to frustrate socialist advance will not be exclusively imperialist and reactionary attempts. Communists, religious political groupings, and *declassé* liberals will all try to stem the tide of socialism. Their reason usually is not the preservation of the status quo, but the belief that they are better equipped to provide a response to the challenge.

The answer is known as far as I, as a socialist, am concerned. But it is sheer complacency on my part to affirm that the tide cannot be stemmed. I can, however, maintain that Arab consciousness has reached a certain conclusion concerning imperialism, reaction and military dictatorship, as blueprints for living. They definitely reject them as creeds for their revolution. They know in the first two the causes of their maladjustments. They found in the third, after an initial trial, a mere extension of the first two. As to communism, political religion in the form of a creed, transplanted liberalism and nationalism in its absolutist expression, the rejection is not final. The future consistency of socialist development will decide whether the Arabs will break with the above-mentioned revolutionary perversions of reaction, as they already broke with the status quo.

# Sarnoff Scheme & Politics — —

*(Continued from page 1)*

**political warfare against Stalinism—in fact, what it shows first of all is that even General Sarnoff himself does not understand the first thing about what political warfare is!**

This must sound like quite an extreme statement, and indeed the Sarnoff plan is quite an extreme example of the American Party Line mind when it tries to grapple with political warfare. Yet any reader can check it against one simple fact, as it emerges from the complete text of the plan printed in the May 27 issue of *U. S. News & World Report*.

The 40 pages of the plan—10 large printed magazine pages—have a great deal to say about the necessity of political warfare, its techniques, costs, organization, etc. There is one aspect of political warfare which it glances at only in passing, sometimes only in accidental mentions—

And that is: the idea-content of political warfare!

Namely, with what program, with what ideological weapons, is the U. S. to carry on this massive scheme?

## EVERYTHING BUT POLITICS

Anyone who thinks that a literate political person, such as General Sarnoff presumably is, could not possibly produce a document of this description need only turn to his Section IV (page 138 in the *U. S. News* reprint). It is entitled "The Message of Freedom." It begins indeed with a vigorous statement of the primary importance of "message":

"In Hot War, you need a *weapon* and means of *delivering* it to the target. The same is true of Cold War. The weapon is the *message*; after it has been worked

out, we can develop the facilities for *delivering* it to the world at large and to the Communist-captive nations in particular."

Well, what is the "message" to be delivered? Sarnoff tells us right away:

"The essence of that message (and its formulation is the critical first step) is that America has decided, irrevocably, to win the Cold War; that its ultimate aim is, in concert with all peoples, to cancel out the destructive power of Soviet-based Communism."

That's it. The "message" is that we are determined to win!

It is not strange that, at such a crucial point in his exposition, Sarnoff can descend to such a depth of silliness. For even in his discussion of Stalinism's political cold war, whose danger he grasps so vividly, at no point does he show the least awareness of the real political character of Stalinism's appeal, the political character of Stalinism's cold-war weapons.

It would be enough to point out that he never gets within a mile of understanding that at the heart of Stalinism's political appeal is its *anti-capitalism*. But in case this concept is considered too sophisticated for an RCA general, we can add that he never gets within a mile even of realizing Stalinism's appeal on grounds of anti-colonialism, against the crimes of its rival Western imperialisms, on grounds of the world's revulsion against H-bomb flaunting—in fact, on any really political grounds at all.

It is evident that this same Sarnoff who writes a whole document about political warfare labors under the typical "American" delusion that Stalinism is primarily a slick conspiracy of highly

skilled infiltrators, spies, saboteurs, etc.

The "political warfare" he recommends in response is likewise conceived primarily in terms of conspiratorial gadgets and gimmicks—NOT POLITICS, except for some incidental remarks here and there of a hortatory nature.

## GADGET SCHEME

What has gained most publicity, therefore, is his scheme to spend money on mass-producing cheap, light radios to pick up U. S. broadcast programs, these radios to be spread behind the Iron Curtain. (What are the programs to say? We have seen the "message." But apropos of radio we should note that one proposal that Sarnoff makes really prominent is that the Voice of America be renamed "the Voice of America—for Freedom and Peace." He thinks this idea is so important that he repeats it again at the end of his document.)

He proposes that the U. S. manufacture and distribute behind the Iron Curtain millions of simple phonographs and cardboard propaganda records to be dropped by parachute like leaflets. (What are the records to say? See Section IV.)

"No means of communication should be ignored: the spoken word and the written word; radio and television; films, balloons and missiles to distribute leaflets; secret printing and mimeographing presses on Soviet-controlled soil; scrawls on walls to give isolated friends a sense of community."

Nothing should be ignored, indeed—except the ideological content of this great "political" offensive.

Here and there, under other heads, Sarnoff does make the usual references

to exposing Moscow's totalitarianism, appealing to "the simple personal yearnings of those under the Communist yoke," and to trying to take advantage of potential rebellious forces within Stalinland, etc. In no way does he try to deal politically with the political problems involved in these recommendations.

## CARICATURE

For example, there is now quite a history of the attempts by Americans to organize Russian émigrés into anti-Communist leagues. There has been the problem of trying to get Russian Mensheviks to work with Russian émigré fascists and semi-fascists (like NTS) simply because they are all subsumed under the head of "Russian émigrés." There has been the problem of trying to get Ukrainian nationalist émigrés working with Great-Russian imperialists like Kerensky. The results have been inversely proportionate to the ignorance that has gone into the effort. Nothing about all this politics exists for Sarnoff.

The Sarnoff plan is the crudest possible commentary on the empty-headedness of American international policy. With its talk of political warfare WITHOUT POLITICS, it caricatures the typical Washington incapacity to understand what is going on in the world.

What it proposes, in effect, is an American effort to duplicate the kind of movement which Stalinism appears to be in official-American eyes—i.e., *simply* a movement of infiltration, espionage, sabotage, subversion, duplicity, blackmail, etc. Sarnoff would do the same unto them. This in spite of standard-type homilies on the horrors of Communist morality.

What he does not know how to duplicate is any American version of the kind of dynamic appeal which Stalinism makes to the anti-capitalist masses of the world. For this purpose, his experience as head of RCA and as brigadier general tells him nothing. For this purpose, only a democratic anti-capitalism—democratic socialism—can meet the challenge which is posed by the Stalinist menace.

# Stalinist 'Peace' Campaign — —

*(Continued from page 1)*

claims that the Chinese gestures have been forced from them by the development of American power in the area (negotiation from strength).

But to the peoples of Asia such a response can only demonstrate that American strength in the area is not designed as a counterweight to Stalinist military expansionism, but rather is a means of imposing an American solution to all problems in Asia. Two hundred years of Western colonialism in that area have made its people all too familiar with this kind of "negotiations from strength."

## KHRUSHCHEV'S BEARHUG

On the other side of the world, the Russian Stalinist visit to Yugoslavia gives the State Department something more to worry about. Here again, the effectiveness of the Russian move lies precisely in its image of peaceful reasonableness.

In the past, the American government has been able to obtain congressional appropriations for economic and military aid to Tito's government on the claim that this government is resisting political and economic pressure from the Stalinist bloc, and that it is prepared to stand together with the American bloc to resist military invasion from the East. The menacing posture of the Russians and their satellites has been an argument strong enough to overcome the objections of those in this country who have pointed out that the social and economic system in Yugoslavia is similar to

that which prevails in Russia and not in the capitalist world, and that Tito's totalitarian political regime makes a mockery of any claim that the issue in the cold war is between "freedom" on the one side and totalitarianism on the other.

But Yugoslavia's position as a military bulwark against the Russian bloc is now menaced not by invasion, or by conquest through a coup engineered by Cominform agents, but by an offer of friendly and even "comradely" relations between the governments and the political machines which control them.

The boldness with which the Russian leaders have embarked on this phase of their campaign was made clear by the public speech made by Khrushchev when he landed at the Belgrade airport. Before the whole world he admitted Russian responsibility for the break between Yugoslavia and the Russian empire.

The fact that he blamed the break on the "machinations" of Beria and other liquidated leaders of the Russian government, though a source of amusement to all informed persons inside and outside Yugoslavia, detracts but little from the impact of this announcement. After all, this is the standard formula of the Russian Stalinists for the repudiation of a past policy and the announcement of a new one, and is recognized as such by everyone who has the slightest acquaintanceship with the peculiar methods of the Russian ruling class.

The boldness of the announcement lies in the fact that it was made publicly rather than in closed sessions, and that the Russians do not appear to have had any advance assurances on how it would be received. Tito's failure to reply, even with some noncommittal diplomatic phrase, is sufficient proof of this. Since the Russian rulers are the last ones to lay themselves open to public humiliation (except when they are on their way out of power), it is clear that their approach to the Yugoslav negotiations is one of a public, open maneuver, designed as much or more for its effect on the peoples of the world than for any immediate, concrete change of relations with the Yugoslav dictator.

Khrushchev has publicly called on the Yugoslav Stalinists to return to the world Stalinist camp. He has publicly offered to accept any such return, or even any movement in the direction of such a return on Tito's terms. He has appealed to the Yugoslav ruling class on the basis of the socio-economic system which Russia and Yugoslavia have in common. There can be no doubt that in the private sessions with the Tito leadership, concrete guarantees against a resumption of the Russian imperialist policy with regard to Yugoslavia have been offered, as well as tempting economic ad-

vantages if the Yugoslavs will move further away from the American bloc.

## OBJECTIVES

The maximum objective the Russian Stalinists have in mind no doubt is some form of reintegration of Yugoslavia into their war bloc. In the short run, they would be quite satisfied with a loosening of Tito's military ties and commitments to the Balkan Alliance and the NATO powers.

Even if they should fail in either of these objectives at the moment, their pilgrimage to Belgrade has already achieved the purpose of raising all kinds of doubts about the reliability of Yugoslavia in the American camp, and has strengthened the neutralist and pro-Russian sentiment among the peoples of Europe.

The position in which the Tito regime has been placed by this Russian maneuver is not altogether an enviable one. American economic and military aid has been a major prop of the bureaucratic regime in Yugoslavia. Tito knows very well that if he should cut himself off from this source of support by flirting too warmly with the Kremlin, he would soon find himself at the mercy of his present suitors. Whatever others may think of the quality of that mercy in the midst of the Stalinist "peace" campaign, Tito at least knows his Stalinist world far too well to have any illusions about it.

On the other hand, to reject and rebuff the advances now being made to him too crudely and openly might create grave difficulties for him from sections of the Yugoslav bureaucracy who have never been too happy with the American tie-up, and also with "Titoist" strata in Western Europe and Asia. Although the latter have never been in a position to render concrete services to the Yugoslav regime, they have represented a public support for Yugoslavia in many countries which was of political significance and weight.

These two moves in the political war of the moment are not central campaigns in which total victory or defeat are involved. They are peripheral to the struggle over Germany as the key to Europe and the struggle for the allegiance of the countries of Southeast Asia which will determine the outcome of the world conflict in that area.

But every maneuver and every battle in the political phase of the cold war counts. And the Russian maneuver at Belgrade and the Chinese maneuver with the flyers and over the Formosa Strait indicate how effective are the political weapons in the Stalinist arsenal—how effective they are, that is, given the political ineffectuality of the American bloc.

## READERS TAKE THE FLOOR

*(Continued from page 4)*

fundamental fact, but also forces one ultimately to the fallacious Stalinist position that the Negroes constitute a nation. While Comrade Arden avoids the use of the term "nation," his policy is really drawn from such incorrect premises.

Victor HOWARD

Chicago, May 2.

Since Comrade Howard has obviously failed to read my fairly lengthy reply to his previous letter (April 25), I can only doubt the value of going over the whole question again.

Suffice it to say for the record that nothing that has appeared in LA bears any resemblance to the Stalinist line of Negro-nationalism, which Howard devotes his letter to denouncing, or any resemblance to a demand for "Negro representation," which he accused me of making, or any resemblance to "supporting Negroes because they are Negroes," etc.

The fact that I specifically repudiated these notions, attacked them and counterposed my views to them seems to have eluded Comrade Howard. Since Howard continues to attack me for holding views I obviously oppose (unless Comrade Howard believes that I secretly hold such views—which seems to be a reasonable conclusion, but not one on which a fruitful discussion can be based), and since he doesn't even acknowledge the existence of the viewpoint I presented, much less attempt to discuss it, I can only suggest that any interested reader (including Howard) check the matter for himself. Copies of LA containing the article that touched off this controversy (March 28) are still available, as is the issue carrying his first letter and my reply.

Comrade Howard is not only engaged in breaking down an open door, with a dull axe, but has the wrong address as well.

One last point: The particular question (an electoral "reform" move in Chicago) on which I expressed my views is certainly a discussable one, and I would not be surprised to find disagreement with my opinions among ISLers or others. I mention this only because Howard seems to regard my article as an expression of an ISL "party line," which it is not. The ISL has taken no position on the matter in question.

Scott ARDEN

Subscribe to LABOR ACTION — \$2 a year does it!

### The CASE of COMRADE TULAYEV

A Novel of Modern Russia by Victor Serge

Formerly \$3 . . . now while our special stock lasts

\$1.50

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