

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

OCTOBER 31, 1955

FIVE CENTS

SPOTLIGHT

Glaoui and Seddik

The French possibility of holding Morocco under its heel very much longer took a sudden turn for the worse this week when France's only reliable quisling, the notorious El Glaoui, pasha of Marrakesh, announced a flipflop over to the nationalist position, calling for the return of the deposed Sultan Mohammed ben Youssef. The biggest rat in Morocco has deserted the sinking ship.

He has decided that, whatever Paris can do, it cannot hold on, and that he had better make his peace with the men who are due to rule sooner or later, and most likely sooner, namely, his own countrymen whom he sold out. Otherwise, he fears, the nationalist leaders of a sovereign Morocco will not leave him in peace to exploit his economic empire, enjoy his monopolistic trading profits and carry on his prostitution racket.

In a very clear voice, this "friend of France" is telling the world that he is putting his money on the bet that France is through in North Africa. It cannot fail to have an effect also in Algeria.

The nearer an auster of the French comes into sight, the more clearly appears the looming social conflict within the na-

tionalist camp. That should be clear enough when even an El Glaoui scuttles over.

In addition, it recalls also the point made in Stewart Alsop's column of last August 31. Alsop was reporting from Rabat in Morocco after a discussion with leaders of the Istiqlal, the independence party. He describes three of the leaders. Bouabid is a lawyer; Ben-Barka is a professor. But the third, Majoub Seddik, is different, and his difference sends a premonitory chill through the journalist:

"Seddik looks, by contrast, like a professional revolutionary, which is what he is. Unlike Bouabid, and Ben-Barka, who are products of the small Moroccan middle class, Majoub Seddik was an illiterate railway worker who climbed to the top of the illegal Moroccan labor movement by sheer force and passion..."

Let us try to ignore Alsop's preoccupation with Seddik's "passion" as he continues his description and concentrate on what he is trying to say in his own philistine way. Seddik, he says, described the "bathtub method" of torture used by the French police in working over nationalists; "there was a short silence around the table." Then the two non-passionate Istiqlal leaders began talking about attitude to the French, how they had no desire to push out French interests and capital, etc.

"Majoub Seddik said nothing. Then the conversation shifted again to the economic exploitation of the country by

(Continued on page 2)

TITO AND MOSCOW

TITO'S AIMS AND MOLOTOV'S FATE
A NEW TITOIST THEORY IS BORN

Why Warsaw Rehabilitates Stalin's Victims

... page 6 and 7

BRAIN OF THE SAURIAN: A Survey of
The Social-Democratic Theoretical Press

... page 4

GAITSKELL vs. MORRISON:

The Battle in the BLP for Attlee's Mantle

... page 3

Saar Vote Is a Slap At Western Policies And All Land Grabs

By GORDON HASKELL

The vote in the Saar referendum, rejecting by about two to one the "Europeanization" ("internationalization") of their territory, has delivered another heavy blow to the foreign policy of the Adenauer government of West Germany. In doing so, it has also further undermined the structure of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and hence of the basis of American foreign policy for Europe.

In an indirect way, on the other hand, the democratic expression of the political will of the Saarlanders has also dealt a blow to Stalinist imperialism in Europe. By rejecting France's unilateral imperialist grab of the Saar, the people of this territory have cast doubt on the legitimacy of all territorial grabs which were made after World War II. Or to put it differently, whereas the Russians could, until the other day, point to the French grab of the Saar as a justification for their own grabs of Rumanian and Polish and other territory, the decisive vote of the Saarlanders now condemns all

such imperialist grabs made without consulting the will of the people of the territories involved.

The Adenauer regime is seeking to soften the effect of the Saar vote on its internal position in Germany by appearing to be just as pleased as its political opponents by the outcome. This pose can hardly serve it in the long run, however.

For Adenauer's deal with the French over the Saar was part of the whole complex policy which tied West Germany's creation and existence into NATO. The fact that one piece of

(Continued on page 2)

TONIGHT'S THE NIGHT for the ISL-YSL HALLOWEEN WITCH-HUNT at Labor Action Hall—that is, if you're reading this on Saturday, Oct. 29.

America Leads in Strikes ILO Statistics Cast a Shadow on the 'Labor Peace' Myth

By BEN HALL

As much time is lost through strikes in the United States as in the rest of the world combined.

This is the conclusion of the *International Labor Review*, official publication of the International Labor Organization.

An article in its July issue entitled "Industrial Disputes, 1937-1954" is documented with strike statistics from every country where labor is free to strike. The period 1949-53 covers 28 countries with two-thirds of the world's free labor force.

This article becomes a notable contribution to the discussion of "class peace" in America.

Strikes are not the only index of class antagonisms, of course. But they are one. It would be obviously superficial to conclude that class antagonisms in the United States are at the highest pitch of intensity in the world simply because strikes are so frequent; and we have no intention of leaving such an impression.

But the facts should be disconcerting to those who have discovered a new American era of class peace and the abolition of the class struggle. Such people often point to a temporary and relative decline in strike action, arguing in effect: few strikes, no class struggle. Thus the United States, unlike Europe, becomes a haven of class peace. But when we discover that the U. S. strike-curve shoots up among the highest in the world, this whole line of argumentation falls to the ground.

Let us examine some of the facts presented by the *International Labor Review*.

Our liberals are impressed by the trend of strikes in this country. Big strike battles were fought before and just after the war. Now, in

comparison, they see peace and harmony. But this trend corresponded to a world tendency and is not necessarily linked exclusively to American life.

"... with few exceptions the history of disputes from 1949 to 1953 in the countries covered," reports the *Review*, "was fairly similar and of a much less dramatic nature in the immediate post-war period." In other words, the trend in the U. S. parallels the tendency in countries where labor is admittedly class-conscious and where the class struggle is obviously apparent. The *Review* adds, "The trend in the United States, which contributes every year about one-half the known man-days lost in the world through disputes, was roughly the same as in other countries but more accentuated."

The basic figures for 1949-53 are as follows:

Number of workers involved in strikes: In 28 countries, 60 million. In the United States, 15 million (25 per cent).

Number of man-days lost: In 28 countries 400 million. In the United States, 200 million (50 per cent).

The United States is, of course one, of the most highly industrialized and populous nations of the world. In part, therefore, its large share of strikes and strikers can be attributed to its leading position. But not entirely.

The *Review* cites other statistics that cancel out the statistical effect of the size of the U. S. working class. It reports, for 28 nations, the number of man-days lost PER 1000 EMPLOYEES, in mining, manufacturing, construction and transportation. It concludes: "The United States was always among the three highest nations" for the period 1947-54.

(Continued on page 2)

Leads in Strikes — —

(Continued from page 1)

These figures are so important that we reprint a sampling of four nations in the accompanying table.

	No. of Days lost per 1000 employees							
	1947	'48	'49	'50	'51	'52	'53	'54
France	3350	1890	890	1500	500	250	1370	210
U. Kingdom	190	150	140	100	130	140	170	190
U. S.	1450	1450	2290	1690	920	2400	1070	850
Italy	—	—	1730	1260	800	530	1110	710

In reading this table, bear in mind that in France in 1948 the big CP-led coal strike took place, and in 1949 general strikes were called by CP-controlled unions against the Marshall Plan and the Atlantic Pact. In the United States, political demonstration strikes are a rarity. But in countries where Stalinism dominates the unions, general strikes are a regularly employed weapon. If an all-out general strike lasted three days, and not a single strike of any kind occurred in that nation for the rest of the year, the above table would report 3,000 days lost per 1000 employees.

In other words, the table gives greater weight to the political strike than to the more limited economic strike characteristic of the United States. *Nevertheless the United States tops our list in five years out of eight and is second in the remaining three years.*

World strike statistics prove that the class struggle in the United States is very much alive.

Saar Vote — —

(Continued from page 1)

the machine has fallen out and no longer can be replaced simply cannot be ignored by its builders.

The Adenauer government claimed that its policy could bring about a sovereign, independent Western Germany now, with strong allies in the West, and a united Germany some time in the future. For this the Saar had to be sacrificed to France. To give the deal an appearance of progress toward the aim of a unified Western Europe, rather than that of an old-fashioned imperialist robbery, the French and Adenauer agreed to give the Saarlanders the option of voting to "internationalize" their territory or to leave it as it is under French political and economic control. The one option not given them was to return to Germany.

FRENCH UP A TREE

In voting against "internationalization," the vast majority of the people obviously were voting for a return to Germany. The Adenauer regime cannot give them aid and comfort in any future campaign to achieve their desire. To do so would be to give the most reactionary and chauvinist elements in France the handle they seek to break off all French-German collaboration, and thus, in effect, to torpedo NATO, which is now built around the prospect of such collaboration.

What is the French government to do? The whole Saar policy is an attempt by France to hang on to a power position in Europe which corresponds in no way to the relative industrial or military might she can muster. Now that the Saarlanders have spoken with a clear voice, and that it is also clear that a large section of the West German people (probably a large majority) oppose Adenauer's concessions on this question, France has no alternative but to give up the Saar or to seek to bull it through by more or less naked force sweetened perhaps with some concessions or seeming concessions.

There is little reason to believe that France will be able to muster any but the latter policy. Her record in Indochina and North Africa indicates that the decay of French society has advanced to such a point that the country cannot even find a way of retreating to the relative safety of a position which it can hold, as Britain did after the war. The die-hard imperialist reactionaries have enough strength to paralyze the government when it shows an inclination to adjust France's position to the realities.

The most that can be expected in the near future is that German financial interests may be admitted to some form of operation in the Saar. As long as the currency and the foreign trade is tied to the French economy, however, this can have little effect beyond bribing a few German industrialists into temporary acceptance of the situation.

FRAUD

In the press comment on the effect of the Saar election, a good deal of attention is given to the consequences for the idea of European unification. Actually, the two have little to do with each other. The proposed "internationalization" of

the Saar was a fraud like the "Western European Union" whose sole political function was to have been to administer it. Both pertain to that political shadow-world in which the very real aspirations for unity which exist in Western Europe are exploited by cynical bourgeois statesmen for the purpose of covering their shabby military alliances with a cloak of "progressiveness."

In France the fiasco in the Saar can only strengthen the reactionary right. After all, the liberal bourgeois and socialist parties concurred in the policy which has now collapsed, and it is not likely that they will quickly come up with an alternative one. In Germany, on the other hand, the Saar vote can strengthen either the extreme nationalist wing of the Adenauer coalition or the Social-Democrats.

The latter opposed the Saar plebiscite. A government organized by them could put real pressure on the French to return the Saar to Germany, and could back up the political struggle of the Saarlanders for this purpose. The German Social-Democrats should certainly press this advantage for all it is worth.

But even if they should succeed, in due course, in wrenching the Saar from France and returning it to Germany, this would serve only to right an old injustice, but not necessarily to further the interests of the working class of Western Europe. For that, what the German Social-Democracy needs is a policy which could give real substance to the widespread desire for Western European unity.

The liberal N. Y. *Post* reacted to the Saar vote with a chauvinist anti-German frenzy which apparently knew no bounds. The Saarlander's overwhelming wish to be reunited with their own country was discussed almost solely as an endorsement of one pro-German leader, Heinrich Schneider, "former storm-trooper and unreconstructed Nazi rabble-rouser," whose "fanatic nationalism . . . once again triumphed . . . the campaign had all the ugly overtones of a Nazi offensive . . . German super-nationalism. . . ." Then in a frothing spurt of McCarthyite-type slander: "The Socialists in the Saar were dreary echoes of Dr. Schneider. . . ."

These liberal chauvinists nowhere mentioned that there was something called self-determination involved.

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

SPOTLIGHT

(Continued from page 1)

the French, and Majoub Seddik became passionately eloquent, and the whites of his eyes showed.

"The workers were lucky to get 65 cents a day, he said. They could not strike. They could not even join a union—he himself was not a Communist, he said, but he had first joined a Communist union because only the Communists were then doing anything for the workers. And always there were the police, searching workers as they left their work, beating them for nothing, jailing them for a word.

"There was—or so it seemed to this reporter—a bitterness and a hatred in Majoub Seddik, not only toward the French, but toward the whole economic and political system, that was not in Bouabid and ben-Barka. And this suggests the nature of the real choice that confronts the French.

"At present, the vast majority of the Nationalist leaders are of the same stripe as Bouabid and ben-Barka—products of the middle class, moderate men, revolutionaries only by force of circumstance. If such men are given positions of real authority, and a sense of pride and participation, the essential French interests in this tortured country may well be preserved.

"The alternative is the bathtub method applied country-wide—a campaign of the most ruthless suppression. In the end, this is sure to produce a whole crop of Majoub Seddiks. . . ."

U. S. in Algeria

The anti-colonialist periodical *Toward Freedom* (Chicago) catches the air force in another lie about the U. S. role in the French assault on the Algerian people. This concerns the dropping of French parachutists over Algeria by American planes, which the air force originally claimed occurred only as part of a "NATO exercise." Now the air force admits that it was part of a series of joint French-American exercises going back over 30 months.

When two congressmen inquired, the Defense Department replied: "These training missions with the French were suspended in February 1955 at the time the political situation in Algeria became unsettled. None have been conducted since."

But February was not the date when Algeria became "unsettled"; the fighting there started last November. February is only the date when the U. S. intervention in the Algerian repression was publicly exposed.

This is as good a place as any, too, to catch up on the U. S. State Department's defense of its actions in giving the French helicopters for use against the Algerian liberation fighters. Walter Reuther had officially protested for the CIO. The State Department replied with an open defense of its action, calling the French repression in Algeria "understandable."

Still catching up, we recall also that in September a Chicago *Tribune* editorial disclosed that:

"The army newspaper *Stars and Stripes* has printed a two-page editorial in its European edition which is intended to demonstrate that the French are right and the Arabs wrong in North Africa. . . . *Stars and Stripes* operates under a charter from Congress forbidding the expression of editorial opinion. . . . It is reported that the editorial expression came from a French governmental source and that it was passed on to *Stars and Stripes* as a 'must' by Gen. Alfred Gruenther, American commander of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. . . ."

(The Chicago *Tribune*, being tainted with isolationism, which is a form of right-wing non-conformism, is still willing to print such items that other defenders of the free press like to suppress.)

The United States government, as a consequence of clinging to its noble ally France, has its hands wrist-deep in the Algerian blood that is being spilled by the colonialists.

Capitalist Revolution

There has been something of a stir in some quarters about the setting-up of new corporation plans for selling stock to employees, with the usual mushheaded talk about turning all workers into "capitalists," etc. *Fortune* magazine for August did not allow itself to be stampeded by this brand of cretinism. It points out some facts.

True, in 1950 only 16 companies on the New York Stock Exchange had such plans; now almost 100 have some version. But it is still not as widespread as it was in the 1920s when the total was about 200 and stock-purchase plans were being hailed "as the means of shaping a new industrial utopia"—the "Twentieth Century American Capitalist Revolution" of its day.

Of the plans in these 1920s, by 1944 three-quarters had been discontinued. One of the first in the field, U. S. Steel (1903) discontinued its plan in 1935 and has no intention of renewing it.

And not all companies report happy experiences, says *Fortune*. Westinghouse, for example, discontinued its 1948 plan because less than a quarter of the workers went for it.

Some companies have instituted such plans because they think stock purchases by employees will make the latter more "loyal" to the company and less amenable to unionization or union loyalty. But, says *Fortune*, in no large company has it reduced union loyalty or made the workers more "pliant."

Some further deterrents to the widespread adoption of such plans include, (1) the recent NLRB finding ordering a company to bargain with a union about company stock plans, and (2) the financial position and inexperience of most workers. On the second point, it is well to remember that few workers have enough savings to permit much investment of this sort, and moreover, fluctuations in market prices easily frighten them into panic selling with consequent resentment against the company.

Finally, suggests *Fortune*, as a way to reduce union loyalty it is doomed to disappointment. Employers who see union members as unwilling captives of powerful leaders are deceiving themselves. "The American worker prefers unions."

Traitors: the Contrast

The freeing of Provoo, a convicted traitor, by the courts—confirmed by the Supreme Court week before last—sends one's thoughts back to the Rosenberg case.

Let us assume for present purposes that in both cases the conviction was justified by the evidence: In one case, a convicted traitor goes scot-free. In the other case, convicted traitors were put to death in an unprecedentedly harsh judgment in peacetime.

In presenting this antithesis, we are quite aware of the cogent motives which justify the court action on Provoo, and the last thing we want to do is impugn them. The government held Provoo too long before trial; good. It can serve as a classic example of the democratic principle that better one guilty scoundrel go free than that the processes of justice be subverted.

Such democratic principles today, however, seem to apply only to venal turncoats, rapists, murderers, and like common criminals. This perhaps overdrawn generalization would seem to be strengthened by the fact that, even today, common criminals can "plead the Fifth" without anyone turning a hair, but suspected "Communists" must be hounded out of job, reputation and livelihood for the same non-crime.

Secondly, in presenting this antithesis, we by no means present the Rosenbergs as idealistic martyrs. On the contrary, we protested the imposition of the death penalty on this pair, who were convicted as spies for the Moscow despotism, not only on humanitarian grounds but also because such draconic treatment was warranted to make martyrs out of them.

All that said and understood, it still remains that the antithesis that will stand out in a long-range view of this era's hysteria is: One convicted traitor got the full measure of respect for justice and all its forms, in spite of the fact that his treason was vilely motivated by the most sordid of motives and character.

In the other case, the sentence meted out was the full measure of a frenzied judicial vindictiveness, in the panic-stricken climate of the cold war. Both are called "justice."

WEEK BY WEEK . . .

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

A sub is only \$2 a year!

LONDON LETTER

Gaitskell versus Morrison: The Battle in the BLP over Attlee's Mantle

By OWEN ROBERTS

London, Oct. 16

The 54th annual conference of the Labor Party at Margate ended this past week. In terms of resolutions passed and speeches made, it settled little or nothing; but it did throw the spotlight onto the fierce struggle which is now taking place within the party for the role of the official leader of the Parliamentary Labor Party, which in effect means the leader of the party as a whole.

Soon after the defeat of the Labor Party in the general election the present leader—Clement Attlee—came under strong pressure to step down and make way for someone else. This pressure came from a variety of sources. Certain sections of the press—notably the *Daily Mirror* which deals primarily in comic strips and beefcake—began howling that Attlee was responsible for Labor's defeat and that he should stand down and allow a younger man to take his place. This cry was taken up by some members of the Parliamentary Party and others outside of Parliament.

None of those seeking Attlee's removal said that what they wanted was not so much a younger man but, more accurately, a more virile and energetic right-winger; this however was what they were in fact seeking. They wanted to push out the slightly-right-of-center Attlee and substitute in his place one of the more extreme right-wingers who would take a tougher line with the party left wing.

After a great deal of behind-the-scenes maneuvering, a compromise solution was reached: Attlee would remain the titular leader of the party until the situation had become more stable.

From this it was clear that none of the contestants for the mantle felt that he was in a strong enough position to take over the leadership of the party and carry the mass membership with them at that moment of time. So for a while the struggle for leadership slipped into the background while the rivals endeavored to build up an advantage for the future.

At Margate last week it became obvious that the period of truce has now ended and that the question of leadership now tops the agenda of the party's higher stratum. The conference thus became a political fashion parade with the contestants displaying their wares before the public gaze in an attempt to gain support.

This operation was primarily intended to influence the rank-and-file delegates at the conference for, although it is formally the task of the Parliamentary Party to elect the leader, rank-and-file reaction is important. Strictly speaking the leader is only the leader of the Parliamentary Party, but over the fifty-odd years of the party's history this position has undergone a transformation. What was once merely the chairmanship of the group of Labor members in Parliament has now become the most important post in the whole of the Labor movement. Hence, at this important phase in Labor's existence, the future of the party will be considerably dependent upon the person who fills the position of leader.

HACKNEY TO HACK

The two men who dominated the battle of succession at Margate were Hugh Gaitskell and Herbert Morrison—both right-wingers but men of a very different character.

Morrison has behind him years of experience in the working-class movement coupled with a background of working-class upbringing in London. Receiving only an elementary education and beginning his working life as a shop assistant, Morrison soon found his way into the old Social Democratic Federation where, it is alleged, he studied most thoroughly the works of Marx and Engels.

He was frequently in attendance at street-corner propaganda meetings—both as a spectator and a speaker—and habitually carried a copy of *Capital* under his arm. Recounting this story a few years ago T. A. Jackson (one of the old propagandists of the SDF who subsequently joined the Stalinists) remarked that Morrison is a perfect example of how little Marxism it is possible to soak up through the armpits!

In 1915 Morrison became part-time secretary of the London Labor Party and the record of the rise of Labor in London is inseparably linked with the personal record of Morrison himself. In 1923 he won the London constituency of Hackney for Labor and began a parliamentary career which has led him to oc-



CLEMENT ATLEE

cupy many leading posts in the Labor governments of both pre- and post-war years.

Although once he had advocated that the SDF enter the Labor Party in order to permeate it with Marxism, Morrison has for long waged a battle against the left wing of the party; since 1951 he has been one of the most outspoken and bitter opponents of Aneurin Bevan and the Bevanites.

HUGH-COME-LATELY

Gaitskell has a very different background, both politically and personally. He comes from a higher middle-class family—his father was in the Indian Civil Service and his mother was the daughter of a former consul general in Shanghai—and he went through the traditional educational machine of a bright middle-class youngster, Winchester and Oxford.

After graduation he followed an academic career with no small success. His introduction to the Labor movement came through the Fabian Society. He was first adopted to contest a parliamentary seat for Labor in 1935, but it was not until ten years later that he first entered the House of Commons.

During the war his work brought him into close contact with Hugh Dalton, a Laborite of many years standing who was then Minister of Economic Warfare. It was Dalton who, just prior to the 1945 election, persuaded Gaitskell to follow a political career rather than one in the Civil Service.

Two years later Dalton, then Chancellor of the Exchequer, allowed budget secrets to leak before they had been presented to the House of Commons and was forced to resign. He was followed by Sir Stafford Cripps, who handed over to Gaitskell when ill health forced his retirement. It was as Chancellor of the Exchequer that Gaitskell introduced the Budget in 1951 which caused the resignation of Bevan and marked the beginning of the development of the Bevanite left wing within the party.

Since 1951 Gaitskell has consistently opposed Bevan and the left wing and as a consequence his stock with the right wing has risen considerably, particularly among the right-wing trade-union leaders who are usually distrustful of the party "intellectuals." In Gaitskell's case they seem to have been able to overcome this distrust and have provided him with powerful backing in his fight against the left wing.

It was these two sharply contrasting characters who emerged as the strongest contenders for Attlee's position of leader at last week's conference. The whole party is now debating whether it will be Gaitskell or Morrison who appears at next year's conference as the party leader, for it now seems certain that Attlee has made his last bow in that role at a Labor conference.

The first indication that the battle for leadership was on once again came at the eve of conference rally last Sunday evening in a speech made by George Brinham, chairman of the Amalgamated Society of Woodworkers and trade-union member of the party Executive Commit-

tee. He said that he was pleased that Attlee had recovered from his illness and was now well enough to take part in the conference but (and this he emphasized) the movement must "face up to the fact of a change of leadership."

The fact that this came from a trade-union leader was taken by many to indicate that the unions had decided the time had arrived when the whole business should be settled, and that the leading right-wing unionists had used Brinham, who is only a minor character in the trade-union hierarchy, to deliver their message.

In any event, from that time onward it was obvious that every word spoken by Gaitskell and Morrison had been carefully weighed beforehand in order to give the maximum impression. No outward reference was made by either of the two, but they both kept up a determined and sustained effort which left no doubt as to their intentions.

APPRENTICE DEMAGOGUE

The climax was reached on Wednesday when, by arrangement or design, both Morrison and Gaitskell made major speeches from the platform on behalf of the Executive Committee within a few hours of one another.

Their techniques were similar: both tried to prove what sincere socialists they were; both avoided a head-on clash with the left wing and chose instead to make oblique references; both tried to prove that the left was in reality the conservative element in the party while those usually labeled right wing were in fact the most progressive elements. By using such methods Morrison and Gaitskell were doubtless hoping to negate some of their more outspoken right-wing utterances of the recent past in the minds of the party membership.

Gaitskell seemed to have impressed the delegates more than did his rival. He stoutly and lucidly defended the nationalization projects which the Labor government had undertaken while in office with an array of facts and figures. But his enthusiasm had strict limits, as evidenced when he said that the electorate accepted the party program of nationalization in 1945 because the voters could see the necessity for injecting new life into these decayed industries: "It was because we had convinced them that in these particular industries nationalization was the right course." The whole emphasis was upon the word "particular."

Gaitskell ended his speech with an emotional outline of his reasons for becoming a socialist and his reasons for still considering himself one. It is most unusual for Gaitskell to use emotion in oratory and he did so at the conference in an apparent endeavor to answer the allegation, made by Bevan last year, that he is a "desiccated calculating machine."

A newspaper correspondent, writing in an anti-Labor paper, described Gaitskell's speech by saying: "a speech that began as a defense of the nationalized industries turned into a common-sense exposition of the case for making haste slowly." Rumor has it that Bevan described it much more accurately with a single word, "demagogic."

Next?



HERBERT MORRISON

Morrison's speech did not seem to click quite so well as that made by Gaitskell although its content and style were very similar. He said that he was sick of the idea that the party could be divided into those who are socialists and those who are not; he then reeled off a list of industries which had been nationalized by the Labor government. The conclusions which Morrison wanted drawn from this little turn of oratory was that those who were now tagged as right wing and non-socialist could point to the achievements carried out under their leadership during the term of office of the Labor government. Morrison too proclaimed his faith in socialism and said he was tired of the constant references to Keir Hardie, for if he were alive today Hardie would be amazed at the revolution which had taken place.

WITH A HOSE

This outspoken profession of socialism from two prominent right-wing leaders was the subject of considerable comment by the press; significantly enough not one of the newspapers seemed worried by it and they all treated it as rather a joke. Even Sir Robert Boothby, a Tory MP and journalist and broadcaster, was moved to comment that the thing which impressed him most at the Labor conference was the mass conversion which took place on the platform.

Mike Foot, one of the leading Bevanite propagandists, said at a mass rally organized by the Bevanite weekly paper *Tribune* that "Conversions on such a scale have not been known since a Chinese general baptized his troops with a hose."

Another Bevanite, Ian Mikardo, referred to those social-democrats who "taked left and acted right." He said, "For my money, I would not balance one ton of sentimental socialist perorations against the single act of putting charges on the Health Service to pay for the rearmament program that was so stupid it couldn't be carried out."

But, these quips apart, the Bevanites do not seem in agreement concerning tactics in the leadership struggle.

At the Sunday evening rally Barbara Castle spoke after George Brinham had launched the subject and she took the point of view that Attlee must stay. She said: "Don't let us rush Clem Attlee off the political scene at the dictation of Fleet Street. . . . There is a call in some places for youth at the helm, but youth is not merely a matter of years. Young leaders with middle-aged policies are no good."

BEVANITES DIVIDED

In saying this Barbara Castle was expressing a point of view held by some of the Bevanites that centrist Attlee should be supported against the machinations of the extreme right wing who—if successful in ousting Attlee and placing one of their own choice as leader—will crack down upon the left in the party.

In contrast to this view another section of the Bevanites believe that, whatever action they may take, the right wing has now decided that Attlee must soon retire, and that nothing the Bevanites can do will stop Attlee from retiring. Dick Crossman, in television interviews and newspaper articles, has advanced this idea, although not quite so outspokenly.

Some of those who believe that Attlee's days as leader are strictly numbered are of the opinion that the left wing should support Morrison against Gaitskell; not because Morrison's ideas are any more advanced than Gaitskell's but solely due to Morrison's advancing years.

If, they say, Morrison is elected as leader he cannot retain the position for much more than three years because of his age; then the whole question of leader will come up again and by this time the left may have developed sufficiently for Bevan to present a serious challenge. If, on the other hand, Gaitskell is elected, it will mean a considerable strengthening of the right wing, and Gaitskell is young enough to maintain the leader's position for another 20 years. Hence, they say, the left should support Morrison against Gaitskell in order to gain a breathing-space of a few years during which to build up the forces of the left and challenge Gaitskell's claim to leadership when the matter once again comes up on the agenda.

SAURIAN BRAIN: Surveying Europe's Theoretical Press of the Social-Democracy

By DANIEL FABER

If one considers the policies and the behavior of European social-democratic parties, the image that forces itself on the mind is that of the saurians of by-gone ages, as big as houses but with brains about the size of an orange, large animals that flounder around helplessly because some in-built handicap keeps them from seeing where they are going.

Whether it is the British elections, or German reunification, or EDC and European unity, or colonialism, there is hardly an occasion the social-democratic parties did not miss or a trap they did not fall into.

To explain this state of affairs, one would have to proceed to an anatomical examination of these helpless giants. Here we shall only draw up a brief inventory of the theoretical press, the brains and eyes of social-democracy.

Most obvious and most surprising is the fact that the two biggest parties, the British Labor Party and the German Social-Democratic Party (SPD), have no theoretical press at all.

The absence of a British theoretical review may be explained by the well-known empirical tradition of British socialism, which has always been greatly admired by its enemies while driving its friends to despair. In the case of the German party, the absence of a theoretical review is more difficult to account for.

There is hardly a country more closely connected with the tradition of Marxist thought than Germany, and the old review of German social-democracy, *Die Neue Zeit*, was in many ways the representative review of international socialism. Today the SPD has no review of its own.

In 1954 a group of social-democratic intellectuals founded *Die Neue Gesellschaft*, a pedantic, professorial shadow of what it should be. It is significant that the only lively and important article in its first issue was written by Walter Dirks, a left-Catholic who does not belong to the SPD, and that another article in the first issue was censored by the editors.

An appropriate comment on the new review appeared in *Funken*, a left-wing socialist organ:

"Social-democracy has decided to publish a theoretical review only now—nine years after its resurrection. This belatedness unfortunately shows all too clearly how little the need for the intellectual foundation of socialist action is understood in the leading circles of the party. It remains doubtful even now whether the view has been overcome according to which the conquest of a majority in the people is only a question of electoral slogans, and that a list of certain social demands is sufficient to legitimize the right of Social-democracy to exist and to take power. The task of a socialist theoretical review in Germany is greater than it has ever been. The socialist tradition has been almost completely buried by events. It should be the first concern of all socialist literature to reawaken socialist knowledge and socialist consciousness in the party, and not only in the ranks. According to the first issue of the review *Die Neue Gesell-*

schaft, this great, decisive task is not even recognized."

Sad to say, the subsequent issues of the review have only confirmed this judgment.

FRANCE TO SCANDINAVIA

The situation improves a little as the socialist parties get smaller. The French Socialist Party publishes the *Revue Socialiste*, which occasionally makes a theoretical effort thanks to the influence of the left wing on the board, in particular Marceau Pivert.

Die Zukunft, of Vienna, has maintained a certain cohesion and firmness in the tradition of Austro-Marxism. It is surpassed in its own country by *Arbeit und Wirtschaft*, published by the Austrian Federation of Trade Unions, and probably the most informed, thorough and intelligent review in the intellectual sphere of social-democracy.

In Italy, *Critica Sociale*, which is published by the rebellious left wing of Saragat's PSDI, maintains a high standard but unfortunately lacks the means to become a review of international importance.

The *Rote Revue* of Switzerland could have been counted with the above two years ago. Since then, its editor has been fired by the party leadership for being too far left, and the review is now one of the dullest in Europe.

The monthly of the Norwegian Labor Party, *Kontakt*, met with a comparable fate. For eight years it was a center of lively and intelligent discussion in Scandinavia, thanks to the editorship of Torolf Elster, who is close to the NLP left wing. At the end of 1954 *Kontakt* folded because the party would not support it.

In *Orientering* Sigurd Evensmo suggested that *Kontakt's* demise was symptomatic of the stagnation in the Norwegian labor movement, and that its drop in circulation (from 12,000 to 4,000) reflected the passivity of the ranks which had given up hope of influencing events by their own action. Yet *Orientering* itself has a circulation of 10,000. Its politics are far more confused than those of *Kontakt*, being a compromise on the lowest common denominator between Bevanites, neutralists, pacifists and veteran Stalinist apologists such as Jacob Friis; but it stands alone in offering militant criticism of the NLP leadership, and is mainly read by members of the NLP.

Tiden of Stockholm, *Verdens Gang* of Copenhagen, *Socialisme* of Brussels and *Socialisme en Democratie* of Amsterdam only differ in journalistic make-up: one is old-fashioned, the other has a lot of pictures, one is stuffy, the other is modern. The political outlook is similar, and barely distinguishable from liberal bourgeois reviews. If an important issue is tackled, it is done on the most superficial level: one would seek in vain a reflection of the fundamental discussions, or of the solid sociological research that characterized the socialist press before the First World War.

RESPONSIBILITY OF THE LEFT

There are a small number of theoretical reviews revealing an almost complete ignorance of the socialist theory which their editors purport to renew: a lot of vulgar-democratic illusions about class-collaboration; a "classless" outlook of managers, technicians, bureaucrats, to whom socialism means more and better administration in certain spheres of public life; meaningless talk in the UN manner about world affairs and underdeveloped countries.

How one misses even a "renegade Kautsky" among these dwarfs! What a relief even the opportunist Otto Bauer would be in these pages! How one wishes that the present-day revisions of Marxism were launched by a Bernstein instead of a Carlo Schmid, and that the social-patriots of today were called Jules Guesde instead of Guy Mollet! One is tempted to forget that the former were the starting points of a devolution that ended with the latter.

It has been noted in passing that some

of the better reviews were put out under the influence of the left wing. This is true especially in Italy, to a lesser extent in France, and was also true in Switzerland and in Norway. In some ways, we have here a dangerous division of labor: the left wing does the thinking, and the right wing determines policy regardless.

Yet it still reflects the simple fact that the left wing alone feels the need to think. Or better, the left wing alone feels the need to maintain and elaborate an independent policy, based on the real needs of the working class. The right wing, on the contrary, has its thinking done by other papers, such as *The Economist*, *Le Monde* and their equivalents in other countries, which are sometimes mistakenly considered as liberal, because they tell the truth to their own class.

AN OPPORTUNITY

For the same reasons, there is no such thing as a review of the Socialist International as a whole. The right-wing leadership, which dominates the different national parties and the International as a whole, is much too closely connected with the bourgeoisie of its own country to feel the need for coordinating its policies with other socialist parties abroad, and it is doubtful that it would be free to do so even if it wanted to.

Thus, on the question of EDC, the German SPD was supported by the left wings only in the other European parties. Even the Swiss party, which had no direct stake in the matter, refused to support it and abstained, invoking the traditional neutrality of Switzerland! The Socialist International has no theoretical review because it has no policy and no theory.

The left wing, on the other hand, cannot content itself with a more efficient administration of the capitalist society. For the same reasons that the left wing alone

feels the need for thinking, it is the only one that feels the need for an international socialist policy.

The only attempt in recent years to create a representative international review was made in 1954 by the Bevanite left. *La Tribune des Peuples* of Paris published mainly contributions from British Bevanites and from the French New Left, but ceased publication after four issues. As a whole, it was a frustrating experience which only pointed up the need for an international socialist magazine.

What could such a magazine be like? Politically speaking, it could only be created by the independent socialists. If it is true that the left wing alone feels the need for an international policy that would unify the socialist movement on an internationally valid program, it is also true that today only the revolutionary socialist Left actually has such a policy.

The condition for fruitful theoretical thinking is the ability to approach fundamental political problems uninhibited by considerations of "national interest" or of international diplomacy. This freedom of thought is only possible for those socialists who base their political thinking on no other consideration than the interests of the international working class and are ready to defend it against all political opponents, whether they be liberal or conservative, Eastern or Western, in one's own country or abroad. This neither the Bevanites have been able to do, nor the neutralists, nor the Titoists. In effect, there is but one international socialist policy today: the policy of the Third Camp.

It is necessary and natural that this policy should be expressed by an international review, unifying, on the political basis of the Third Camp, the independent socialists of Europe and America, the socialist movements of Asia, the revolutionary nationalists of Africa. There is no other kind of review that would be in a position to continue the great theoretical and political traditions of the socialist movement, against the shallow and ignorant morass of social-democracy, the falsification of Stalinism, and the ingrown, distorted politics of the various sects. The need has never been greater, and the time is favorable.

BRAZIL Repercussions of Kubitschek's Scant Victory

By JUAN REY

Santiago, Oct. 14

The result of the Brazilian presidential election seems fairly well established now. More than 7 million votes have been counted so far, at this writing. Juscelino Kubitschek, the banner-bearer of "Getulismo," has won 2,640,000 of them; Juarez Tavora has 2,220,000; Adhemar de Barros 2,080,000; and the candidate of the Integralists (fascists) Salgado, over 600,000. These rough proportions are not likely to change much by the end of the ballot count, and Kubitschek can be considered as in the presidency.

But he wins with a relatively small plurality of the vote over Tavora. Only about a third of the voters cast their ballots for him; two-thirds against. His margin moreover is just about the size of the vote given to him by the support which was thrown to him by the Communist Party.

The immediate repercussion of Kubitschek's victory was a crisis in the cabinet and the suspension of the projected currency reform, which had been drawn up by the liberal minister Whitaker with the object of lowering coffee prices in dollars, reducing the value of the national currency and undertaking the liberal policy of conquering the world market with cheap coffee. Now it will wait for the new Kubitschek regime. There has also been a crisis in the important state of Sao Paulo, as a consequence of the resignation of Whitaker and the electoral defeat of Janio Quadros.

Another repercussion: In the rightist UDN (National Democratic Union), it seems there are two tendencies, one in favor of a coup against Kubitschek and one in favor of reaching an understanding with him. In all probability there is a similar division among the generals—we are not sufficiently well informed to know; very likely, a majority is for a coup.

Kubitschek's scanty plurality is evidence that Getulist tendencies have lost the ascendancy they used to have over the majority of the Brazilian masses, and that his coming government cannot be simply a new edition of the old Getulism (of Getulio Vargas' regime). Of course, we do not yet know how aggres-

sive and impatient the Getulist camp is. Its CP section, to be sure, wants civil war and a violent solution of the crisis.

The probability is that Kubitschek will inaugurate his presidency with opportunist tactics and compromises. But if he long continues this tactic, he will be the gravedigger of Getulism. On the other hand, if he tries to push a full-fledged Getulist restoration, he is not likely to finish his term.

As for the socialist left, it suffered a defeat in its "practical" policy of coalescing with the bourgeois right to back Juarez Tavora. Now the theoretician of the left wing is consoling the party with the thought that Brazil has lost a good president but gained a "great leader" (General Tavora), and that the workers voted for Tavora. Poor Brazilian workers, divided between a Kubitschek and a Tavora; and poor Brazilian left, incapable as it is of its own political independence when even the Integralist-fascists are able to make their own political fight.

The Stalinists are backing a Getulist restoration while the SP unsuccessfully recommends the "great national leader" Juarez Tavora to the revolutionary workers. Surely this situation is proof of the deep political crisis and backwardness of the Brazilian left. Clearly it is high time to break with the bourgeoisie and return to an independent socialist policy.

NEXT WEEK IN L.A.

Special section on

EUGENE V. DEBS.

in celebration of his

100th birthday



LABOR ACTION

October 31, 1955 Vol. 19, No. 44

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

UNIV. OF CALIF. • BERKELEY

Stop Drive to Use UC Students as Scabs

By A. THORSTEIN

Berkeley, Oct. 21

In response to an attempt to recruit student scabs to break a phone strike, the University of California campus here has seen a noteworthy drive toward student-labor cooperation.

On October 10, the Communications Workers of America went on strike against Pacific Tel. & Tel. The company had insisted on dealing with four different divisions separately, and had tried to make wage raises dependent on clauses involving a strike ban, anti-seniority clauses, and pay differentials.

On Wednesday the *Daily Californian*, the campus newspaper, carved a statement by a telephone executive admitting that the company was employing students as strikebreakers. They claimed that they were not recruiting on the campus, but that students came down and volunteered to work during the strike. The university officials stated that the campus employment agency was not being used to recruit strikebreakers.

On Thursday morning the Berkeley Unit of the Young Socialist League distributed about 900 copies of a leaflet with the headline: "STUDENTS: DON'T SCAB!" The text of the leaflet follows:

"Webster Collegiate Dictionary defines a scab as 'one who takes the place of a striker.' According to admissions of the company, some university students have assumed this role in the present Pacific

Telephone and Telegraph strike. A few students have been willing to cross the employees' picket line maintained by the Communications Workers of America, CIO, against the phone company.

"As the P. T. & T. strike goes into its fourth day, phone company officials are happy to announce that the company has 'maintained phone service at 85.5 per cent of normal.' Such service could not be maintained if all students refused to compromise themselves and injure the strikers' cause by crossing the picket line.

"That picket line means the workers are on strike. They're fighting for better wages and improved working conditions.

"DON'T TRY TO EARN POCKET MONEY BY TAKING AWAY A STRIKER'S JOB!"

"Labor fought for public education for us.

"Labor is responsible for higher living standards.

"DON'T CROSS THEIR PICKET LINE!"

On Friday morning a poll of students on the question of whether or not students should scab appeared in the *Daily Californian*. The only moral issue mentioned by the 10 students polled was "maintaining public service." Only one was opposed to students' scabbing. The rest just looked at it as a chance to earn pocket money.

ANTI-SCAB PICKETS

Fortunately the political primitivism of these students is not universal at the university. On Friday the union started receiving offers of help from individual students, by phone and personally. Some students distributed union leaflets to their fellow students on Friday afternoon, and a headquarters for student pickets was set up at the home of Arthur Stinchcombe, a student in the sociology department. Picketing by students started on Friday night, and continued during the daylight hours on Saturday and Sunday.

The student pickets carried signs reading: "DON'T BE ASSES, GO BACK TO YOUR CLASSES!" and "STUDENT SCABS, GO HOME!" and quotations from Jack London's description of "The Scab." On three exchanges, two in Oakland and one in Berkeley, student pickets were maintained most of Saturday and Sunday. In one case a student picket was threatened, unsuccessfully.

On Monday morning of the following week a new union leaflet was distributed by a group of students to about 1700 people as they left or entered the university campus. It explained the purpose of the strike and gave evidence that the union was democratically organized and the strike popular. It appealed to students to stop and think about the moral

issue involved in scabbing, and stay out.

Also on Monday morning a signed editorial appeared in the *Daily Californian* (apparently the editorial board did not wish to take a stand) entitled "Student's Scabbing." The author pointed out that the action of student scabbing actually prolonged the strike and the disruption of public service resulting from it. He went on to say that the attitude of the strikers could not be expected to be favorable to students who prolonged the strike, and suggested that violence toward scabs generally results from the hatred built up during a long strike.

SOLDIERS TOO

Sporadic picketing after classes and during free time continued during the week by students. The morale of the strikers remained high and was much improved by the knowledge that not all students at the university were without consciences. The union reported that there were fewer students crossing the picket lines. They also reported that "less than one-half of one per cent" of union members were crossing the picket line.

The desperation of the company at the success of the strikers in keeping out scabs and maintaining strong, high-spirited picket lines was shown by the fact that they started employing soldiers from the local military bases as strikebreakers. The army stoutly denied that they were sending in strikebreakers and stated that army policy was, opposed to soldiers seeking employment during "labor disputes." The company in its turn maintained that the soldiers came in individually to ask for work, and that there were "only a few" of them working anyway. Such are the exigencies of union-busting.

'A THIRST FOR JUSTICE'

The efforts of French capitalism to use the youth of France as the executioners of the North African liberation movements have been met with widespread and vigorous resistance by large numbers of young Frenchmen. Many of these clashes have been reported in *Challenge and Labor Action* during the past weeks. We here reproduce the appeal drawn up by over 300 members of the 401st Anti-Aircraft Artillery Regiment, who were about to be sent to North Africa. It was issued at the close of a mass for peace celebrated in the Parisian church of Saint Savarin. The mass itself took place at the insistence of the young soldiers, in defiance of the orders of the military chaplain of the regiment.

This appeal is notable for the divergent backgrounds of its signers, ordinary young people of Paris, who nevertheless speak with an eloquent internationalism that can serve as a model for militant radical youth in all countries. Its authors represent all that is healthy and democratic in France—and the French government has treated them accordingly. Many have been imprisoned, and the regiment was told that it would be put in the most perilous sectors of the front.

We are soldiers of all classes—some of us have just been called up, others are being kept beyond their enlistment, still others have been recalled—who are soon to embark for North Africa.

Believers and non-believers, Christians and Communists, Jews and Protestants, we wish to make known our sentiments for peace and for brotherhood in North Africa.

We come from many stations in life, from various professions, we have different attitudes on many things, but we are here together to testify solemnly in the name of all our comrades, to testify to the agony and shame which we feel in being forced to serve, by violence, a cause which is not really France's.

Our conscience tells us that the war

which we are making against our Muslim brothers—many of whom have died in defense of our country—is a war contrary to all Christian principles, contrary to the principles of the French Constitution, contrary to the right of peoples to self-determination—contrary to all the values of which this nation is so justly proud.

It is because this war is opposed to all that we have been taught during our youth, a youth that took place under a foreign occupation, that we are so disgusted with foreign troops setting themselves over a people.

We have learned courage and dignity from our older brothers of the Resistance. It is they who have given us passion for the cause of justice and the will to defend ourselves without being weak.

We would be ready, tomorrow, to take up arms against any army which would come here to play the kind of role which they want us to play in North Africa. We are not conscientious objectors, but if our arms should waver in firing upon our Muslim brothers, then all France must know that it is because our conscience is profoundly revolted.

We do not call upon soldiers to refuse as individuals to obey the orders of the government, but the French people must know that if we obey, it is with a death in our hearts; it is for France to know its duty to its children and stop this war which dishonors it.

If those among the French people who charge us with defeatism or cowardice would go into the barracks and talk freely and honestly to the soldiers about their readiness to defend France, they will learn that we are neither defeatists nor cowards, that there is among us a tremendous thirst for justice, justice for all men, a thirst which makes it imperative for us to know what we defend and whom we defend, without contradictions, without remorse.

(Translated from
France-Observateur, Oct. 6)

SCLU Faction Attacks Socialists

Berkeley, Oct. 22

At a Student Civil Liberties Union membership meeting held last night, a resolution was introduced by the executive committee, and approved in modified form by SCLU, criticizing SCLU members who were also members of the local Young Socialist League and taking exception to the reference to SCLU in an article in *Challenge* of Oct. 3 on civil liberties written by Michael Harrington.

The resolution, unfortunately, is not available at this time for discussion because (a) the original resolution, proposed and written by SCLU President Johnny Pierce, was kept within the SCLU executive committee prior to the membership meeting and did not get circulated at the meeting (there were only two copies), and (b) the similar substitute resolution adopted by the membership, with a third of the members present dissenting, was available only in one handwritten copy at the end of the meeting.

Peter Frang, the SCLU vice-president and highest ranking official available, refused on the next day to give a copy of the resolution to SCLU members who were Young Socialists, claiming that

this might be contrary to official policy. In other words, it is appropriate to criticize fellow SCLU members and then refuse to give them a copy of the text of these charges—this out of fear of violating "constitutional procedure" in SCLU, a civil-libertarian organization.

We trust that the SCLU vice-president or Executive Committee can be persuaded or compelled to disclose to the members of SCLU the content of the resolution. In any other group this suppression of a policy statement would be considered an undemocratic, even bureaucratic, act. We expect that the officials of SCLU will come to realize the implications of concealing from the members official resolutions passed, however ill-advisedly, by the members. We hope that by the next issue of *Challenge* the resolution will be available and that it will be possible to discuss intelligibly the factional flare-up in SCLU.

THE AIM OF THE YSL

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

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

—From the Constitution of the YSL

Young Socialist CHALLENGE

organ of the Young Socialist League, is published as a weekly section of *Labor Action* but is under the sole editorship of the YSL. Opinions expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of the *Challenge* or the YSL.

TITO'S AIMS and MOLOTOV'S FATE

By A. STEIN

Lenin once described Vyacheslav Molotov as a "filing clerk," meaning thereby to note his orderly if unimaginative habits of mind. It may therefore come as a surprise to some readers to learn that in the fictional world of Stalinist "socialism" Molotov has every right to be considered an outstanding "theoretician." While Khrushchev and Bulganin, the leading members of the Kremlin clique, are "practical" men, Molotov is the author of a modest number of "theoretical" works, among them the collection of articles *In the Struggle for Socialism*.

To accuse him, therefore, as the leading editorial of the current issue of the official party magazine *Kommunist* does, of falling into theoretical error on the "stage of socialism" which Russia supposedly has reached, has something of the comic in it.

And that it should have taken eight months before the other theoreticians in the Kremlin realized Molotov's error of commission, in the speech he delivered before the Supreme Soviet on February 8, reveals a lamentable weakness in their political education. Besides, what are we to say of the fact that the report of the proceedings that day reveals that the entire audience, presidium and deputies, all rose and applauded Molotov's theoretically harmful report?

That Molotov's deviationism has been invented out of the whole cloth is clear enough. And yet it has not prevented certain commentators from trying to find the reasons for Molotov's disgrace embedded in the text of his letter of confession.

Writing in the October 11 issue of the *Christian Science Monitor*, Paul Wohl attempts to link the difference in formulations to the struggle between the "old, Stalinist Guard," represented by Molotov, and the new, practical generation represented by Malenkov. According to Wohl, Molotov's confession of error represents a victory for the Malenkov generation of younger, practical people. If Russia has reached the stage of socialism and is on the way to communism, then the rulers in the Kremlin can afford to go slow. Neither accelerated rearmament nor the tough policy advocated by Molotov in his speech before the Supreme Soviet on February 8 are indicated.

Clues

Although Wohl's speculations are ingenious and as good as the next man's, they raise as many questions as they answer. Are Khrushchev and Bulganin to be considered as members of the younger, practical Malenkov generation, or are they acting the role of conciliators between the extreme hard, Stalinist group and the aforementioned Malenkov generation? In what sense is the policy now being followed by Khrushchev and Bulganin on Germany different from that pursued by Molotov?

The fact is that the Kremlin has become tougher, not easier on the question of German unification. And as for rearmament, although the Kremlin is eager to reduce the size of its armed forces in order to supply industry and agriculture with labor power, the emphasis on heavy industry is inextricably linked with the continued build-up and modernization of the war machine. This has been emphasized time and time again by Bulganin.

Molotov being a leading and elder member of the "old, Stalinist Guard," there can certainly be no quarrel between him and the Khrushchev-Bulganin leadership on two changes in policy which followed Malenkov's downfall:

the turn toward heavy industry at home and a more intransigent line on Germany.

I would suggest that to find a clue to the dispute which obviously exists in the Kremlin hierarchy, we must connect Molotov's present humiliation with another blow struck against his prestige several months ago.

Tito's Pressure

On March 7 of this year, Tito of Yugoslavia attacked Molotov for a section of the latter's February 8 report to the Supreme Soviet which attempted to place equal blame on Tito for the 1948 break. The section to which Tito violently objected said, "As is evident in recent years, Yugoslavia has to a certain degree gone away from those positions to which she had arisen in the first years after the ending of World War II."

In his reply, Tito gave the Kremlin clear warning that a rapprochement of any kind was impossible unless Yugoslavia's right to go her own way was affirmed, and that in retrospect this meant acknowledging Russian error in 1948. Referring to Molotov's remarks, Tito said, "This is nonsense, and naturally this may make us doubt the sincerity of the statements that have been made during direct contacts by the most responsible persons of those countries concerning the unjust charges brought against Yugoslavia in 1948."

The Kremlin response to Tito's demand was not long in forthcoming. On March 10 both *Izvestia* and *Pravda* reprinted Tito's attack on Molotov without comment.

In my opinion, therefore, the decline in Molotov's star is linked to a dispute in the Kremlin on policy toward Tito and the satellite countries.

And the editorial in the current issue of *Kommunist* which takes Molotov to task hints at this when it says that Communists "combine respect for all that concerns the basic questions of Marxist-Leninist principles or that concerns the basic interest of the working class in the struggle for communism's victory with the greatest respect and tact in relation to the national feelings of peoples." This suggests that Molotov and the group we may assume he represents have resisted the reconciliation with Tito and were reluctant to pay part of the price the latter demanded: recantation of Russian error and recognition of Tito's "independent road to socialism."

Struggle for the Satellites

The resolution of the German question to its satisfaction is the pivot of Moscow's policy in Europe. And some writers have seen in the withdrawal from Austria, the rapprochement with Tito and the return of the Porkkala naval base to Finland, the first outlines of a new policy aimed at convincing the German bourgeoisie and the masses that a neutral Germany would be permitted to flourish without undue pressure from Moscow.

According to these speculations, what Moscow wants to create is a bloc of "neutral" countries stretching from Finland and Sweden in the north, through Germany in the center, and with Yugoslavia as the southern anchor. To give greater credibility to this plan, a number of the satellite countries, freed from Russian troops, would be permitted to follow an "independent foreign policy" and join in this neutral bloc.

Tito, who has his own iron in the fire when it comes to a policy of this kind, has been propa-

gating the idea far and wide that in the near future not only will the Cominform be dissolved but the satellite countries will be given greater freedom of action.

In May of this year, a short time before Khrushchev and Bulganin took the road of repentance to Belgrade, Tito's ambassador in Washington, Leo Mates, was interviewed on the NBC radio program "Meet The Press." In the course of the interview Mates said that the coming visit of the Russian leaders would stimulate the satellites to "strive for increasing independence and freedom of action."

Tito himself, after the Kremlin visit, voiced the same views. In a meeting with Congressman Celler in Belgrade on September 2, he declared that "the Balkans will be independent of Russia in the foreseeable future."

Is Tito speaking on the basis of promises made to him by Khrushchev and Bulganin during their visit to Belgrade or is the Yugoslav dictator exerting pressure on Moscow in behalf of a policy which would redound to his own grandiose schemes?

Wants Balkan Federation

One of the first real signs that the Kremlin is seriously following such a policy would be the withdrawal of Russian troops from Rumania and Hungary. And indeed the Russian "expert" of the London weekly *The Observer* was convinced that this was the case and was about to happen. In the July 31 issue of the paper he wrote that Hegedus, the Hungarian premier, had been promised the withdrawal of Russian troops by October when he visited Moscow in June. The *Observer's* commentator also predicted that Russian troops would be withdrawn from Rumania.

However, on August 12 the head of the Rumanian CP who was also premier at the time, Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej, announced that Russian troops would stay in Rumania till NATO was dissolved. Presumably Russian occupation forces will remain in Hungary for exactly the same reasons. And so long as Russian troops remain in any of the satellite countries, it is impossible to create even the appearance that they are "independent" and can follow their own foreign policy.

From Tito's point of view, the continued presence of Russian troops in the neighboring satellite countries not only makes the creation of a neutral bloc in central Europe impossible, it also stands as the great barrier to his own policy. That policy can be summed up in a phrase: the creation of a Balkan federation with a Yugoslav-Bulgarian tie as the axis.

A Warning

Politically and economically, Tito's ability to play Moscow off against Washington is not enough. To give a firm foundation to his "active neutralism" he must base himself on a secure foundation which only a Balkan federation would supply. And so long as he does not achieve this end, his independence remains precarious and his ideological victory over the Kremlin questionable.

Although not too much has been written about the question, the fact remains that the Stalinist parties in Western Europe have not admitted Moscow's crime in breaking with Tito. This is a matter of ideology, but behind it lies the fact that the Kremlin has not and is not yielding everything Tito wants. Even more to the point are Tito's relations with the neighboring satellite regimes, above all Hungary and Rumania.

Evidently Tito demanded Molotov's head and did succeed in getting a rebuke administered to him. But Tito, who is an old hand at the game of Stalinist politics, also wants the heads of Rakosi in Hungary, Gheorghiu-Dej in Rumania, and Chervenkov in Bulgaria. So far Tito has failed in his attempts to force recantations from them and to have them ousted from power.

In a bitter speech delivered on July 27 in Karlovaac, Tito lashed out at Moscow's puppets. "We only regret that there are still men in the East, in certain of our neighboring countries, who are not pleased with this normalization. They do not dare to speak openly, because for years they learned from Stalin and they think that even now they are not permit-

(Continued on page 71)

A NEW TITOIST THEORY

Belgrade Manufactures It to Suit

By HAL DRAPER

Like their other Stalinist cousins, the Yugoslav Titoists manufacture "Marxist" theories to suit their state and party interests. It does not matter to them how absurdly at variance with Marxism their theoretical constructions may be at any given turn.

When tension with Moscow was at its height and Djilas was still a leader in Belgrade, that unfortunate person was allowed to promulgate as official the theory that Russia was not "socialist" but "state-capitalist," in a document that was pitiful in its theoretical incompetence. But such a criticism was irrelevant because the function of

the theory was not to explain Stalinism (which couldn't be done in Belgrade because the Titoist form would have had to be dissected at the same time). Its function was to mobilize sentiment against the immediate enemy in the Kremlin.

With the switch in the Kremlin's strategy on Tito, and even before Khrushchev and Bulganin came to Belgrade, the Titoists silently dumped the "state-capitalist" theory and reinstated Russia among the "socialist" countries, as we reported.

But this could not and did not mean a return to the theoretical status quo ante, of course, any more than Tito's relations with Moscow returned to status quo ante. Belgrade still retained, and was anxious to retain, profitable economic and political relations with the Western capitalists; it looks to a lucrative position of balance between the blocs, and seeks to play this game for all that it is worth and for as long as it is possible.

Its current theoretic on the nature of "socialism" are virtually in one-to-one correspondence with this current diplomatic posture. (It seems a very, very long time ago that dewy-eyed pro-Titoists were explaining that the Yugoslavs had fundamentally abandoned the Stalinist attitude toward ideology, because after all they had sloughed off the Russian-style Lysenkoist nonsense.)

RED PAINT ON NEHRU

The new set of theoretical formulas gained most attention recently in the form of the Yugoslav trial-balloon proposing a single International for socialist and Stalinist parties, in the name of "socialist unity" naturally. A speech by V. Vlachovic (published in *Nouvelles Yugoslaves*, Sept. 5) spells out the line.

Vlachovic did not bother to explain how Russia suddenly became "socialist" again, but this is not what was new about his new formulary.

Neither was it at all new that the social-democratic parties are accepted as sister socialist parties by the Titoists. In the period of cold war with Moscow, the Titoists were in fact pressing that their "Socialist Alliance" (the broad political front which is run by their CP) be admitted to the Socialist International, and they have long been furious that their state-controlled "trade unions" are excluded from the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions.

What was new about Vlachovic's theoretical formulary was that the boundaries of "socialism" were extended not only to re-include Russia but also 'way into capitalism.

It is newly proclaimed, in the first place, that India under Nehru is "building socialism."

Officially, apparently, this is pegged to the fact that Nehru's party, this year at its Avadi congress, put some verbiage about "a socialist pattern of society" into its platform, but this scarcely can account for the brash assertion that India (like China) is "entering into the process of socialist construction."

CONVENIENT THEORY

In point of fact, this discovery that Nehru is "building socialism" has less to do with any Marxistical lubrication and much more to do with the fact that Tito and Nehru are working along similar neutralist lines in diplomatic activity. The Titoists pin the label "builder of socialism" on Nehru and his bourgeois party in order to signify the induction of the Indians into "their" bloc—the cold-war balancers.

But it is not only in the former colonial world that "socialism" marches on. In the following bit of doubletalk, Vlachovic wraps Nehru, capitalism and socialism all up in one package:

"As in the past, the development of the socialist forces will remain uneven. That has become a law of socialist development. This unevenness is also reflected in the differences in the forms and road which various countries take toward socialism. In certain countries, such as the former colonial countries, the national

bourgeoisie is forced, in building up the economy, and combating historic backwardness, to create an economic base on which socialist relations will form. At the same time, in the advanced countries, the role of the state, which has been more and more important in the course of these last 15 years, inaugurates the process of the socialization of capital, although this process retains all the elements (albeit in modified form) of capitalist exploitation. But this process signifies at the same time the reinforcement of the base on which there will inevitably develop the process of reinforcement and development of the socialist forces."

At this point the trend of thought is merely ambiguous, but Vlachovic adds the kicker immediately to make clear what he is getting at: "The incontestable unevenness of socialist development contradicts the theories on the two blocs: the socialist bloc and the capitalist bloc, with clearly delimited boundaries."

That is, since the capitalist world is full of socialist elements "in process," the two blocs (capitalist and Stalinist "socialist") interpenetrate and shade together; hence the "theory" of two blocs is false; hence the Yugoslav foreign policy.

HONEST BROKERS

As mentioned before, it would be quite irrelevant to point out that this trend of thought, insofar as it resembles anything in the Marxist movement, is a crude version of Eduard Bernstein's theories of how capitalism gradually grows into socialism. That would be to take it more seriously than the Yugoslavs do themselves.

POLAND

Behind the Rehabilitation Of the Old CP Leaders

By A. RUDZIENSKI

What is behind the recent development in Poland whereby the Stalinist regime has been rehabilitating the reputation of a number of former CP leaders who had been liquidated by Stalin?

After he had crushed opposition in Russia, Stalin had proceeded to destroy the Polish revolutionary cadres. These latter were very dangerous to his totalitarian rule because the Polish revolutionaries had been friends and disciples of Rosa Luxemburg, Lenin and Trotsky, and had participated in the creation of the Russian social-democracy and in three Russian revolutions.

The Polish revolutionary socialist movement was older than the Russian; it had begun as utopian socialism right after the defeated national revolution of 1832, and it had developed after 1848 under the direct influence of Marx and Engels, fighting on all the barricades of Europe against autocracy. Finally, in Poland itself, it had given rise to the first revolutionary workers party under the leadership of Ludwik Warynski and, after this was destroyed by the tsarist police, to the Polish Socialist Party (PPS) and Rosa Luxemburg's party, the Social-Democracy of Poland and Lithuania.

This historical record gave great authority to the Polish movement, not only in the time of Plekhanov, Lenin and Trotsky, but also afterward, in the period of Stalin's struggle for power. Therefore the Communist Party of Poland was most closely controlled and watched by the GPU, as it was also by the Polish police. Under cover of the so-called "bolshhevization," the line of the CPP was bent to the mold of the Stalinist reaction and of Russian imperialist interests.

In the interests of this job of destroying the indigenous Polish movement, the leaders of both the majority and minority groups of the CPP were used as puppets. This course of liquidation began in 1929, with direct intervention by the Russian Politburo against the Central Committee of the CPP; the sinister task was finished with the massacre of the old Polish revolutionaries in 1937 and with the dissolution of the party on the claim that it was a nest of police agents and provocateurs. In this purge-massacre, murder struck

its governmental convenience is obvious, however. Tito extends the "socialist" umbrella to whatever state or movement is willing to play ball, if only for internal consumption. It reminds one forcibly of the Nazi theoretic which made "Aryans" of the Japanese as a reward for political alliance.

In line with their present position, the Titoists are therefore no longer pounding on the doors of the Socialist International but raise their cry for a new International of socialist-Communist unity. For that matter, the door is wide open for Nehru-type "process socialists" too: "The future collaboration of the socialist forces will take place in the direction of all-inclusiveness [lit., universality] and of as wide as possible a link-up of all organizations, all parties and all movements that struggle for socialism. Thus little by little there will be created the situation that Engels had in sight at the time of the formation of the First International: 'when socialists of all shades found themselves in the International Association.'"

This citation of the all-inclusive First International (which included trade-unionists, anarchists, and other ists as well as socialists) as the model for the Titoists' new International would be hilarious if one took it as a serious theoretical flight; for Engels regarded this kind of all-inclusiveness as a consequence of the primitiveness of the movement, as against the higher stage represented by the directly Marxist International that followed. But it is thrown in only to provide a Marxist-sounding precedent for the ignorant.

In the international free-for-all International that they envisage, the Titoists of course could hope to play a big role as the honest brokers with a foot in both blocs (something like the stranglehold that Scandinavian social-democracy has on the general-secretaryship of the UN). It reflects the kind of role they would like to play in the wider international arena.

Tito's Aims—

(Continued from page 6)

ted to speak. However, they intrigue in secret and will not admit what the Soviet leaders have told us and, wherever they can, they are throwing monkey-wrenches into the works in their own countries. They still jail people who favor friendship and cooperation with Yugoslavia, people who express their opinions freely and approve the statements of Khrushchev and other Soviet leaders. They still arrest such men, and they still say that all this [the rapprochement] is only a maneuver, since the Soviet Union ostensibly conducts such an ingenious policy that she knows how to deceive."

From the quoted text it will be seen that the clever Stalinist Tito is indirectly delivering a warning to the Kremlin to execute punishment on Rakosi and the others.

And his accusations have been borne out by actual events. According to a Reuters despatch from Vienna dated September 12, about 50 Bulgarian army officers were reported to have been arrested because they advocated a close military alliance with Yugoslavia. The reports said that in launching a campaign for a military alliance with Yugoslavia, they acted under the influence of "the age-old dream of Bulgarian and Yugoslav revolutionaries—the creation of a Balkan federation."

MOSCOW HOLDS BACK

What is decisive, however, is that the Kremlin has not surrendered up these satellite leaders to Tito's mercies. They remain in power despite all the attacks delivered by the Yugoslav dictator, and this is a clear sign that the Kremlin is not yet ready to deliver domination of the Balkin area to Tito.

On the economic side, relations between Yugoslavia and the satellite countries have not at all improved. We find Belgrade voicing the same complaint that was part of her indictment of Moscow in 1948—that Yugoslavia was being held to the role of a supplier of raw materials to Russia and the other satellite countries. Speaking of trade relations with Czechoslovakia, Radio Belgrade declared on August 4 that "Czechoslovakia almost completely suspended her purchases in Yugoslavia about a month and a half ago. . . Yugoslavia economic circles are of the opinion that Czechoslovak enterprises insist on exporting fittings and finished goods to Yugoslavia instead of machinery and semi-finished goods which are what Yugoslavia's industries need."

Returning to our original point of departure, we can now raise the following pertinent question: Are the differences between the group represented by Molotov and the Khrushchev-Bulganin leadership connected only with the measures, considerable in themselves, already taken in the realm of foreign policy, or do they also revolve around future plans?

On the basis of the present triangular relationship between the Kremlin, Tito and the satellites, we can say that if further moves along the line of creating a "neutral bloc" in central Europe are contemplated, then there will be even more serious disruptions in the Kremlin than the gentle ouster of Malenkov and the mild rebuke administered to Molotov.

The removal of Rakosi, Chervenkov and Gheorghe-Dej, which is really what Tito is demanding, and the withdrawal of Russian troops from Rumania and Hungary, are major political moves which would shake up the Stalinist apparatus in Russia and the satellite countries in a very serious way. It is our opinion that no such moves are being contemplated.

BLOOD-VICTIMS

In the course of this bloodletting, there were murdered: Adolf Warski, a founder of the Social-Democracy of Poland and Lithuania and a friend of Rosa Luxemburg; Vera Kostorzewa, the theoretician of the CPP majority; Julian Lenski-Leszyński, the leader of the party minority and opponent of the preceding two; Edward Prochniak of the majority, the workers' leader; Slawa Groszer, a member of the Secretariat and the Central Committee; J. Ryng of the minority; Krajewski of the majority; Walecki, Rylski and Ciszewski of the majority; Bruno Jasienski, the well-known writer, author of *Burning Paris*, of the minority; the poet Ryszard Stander, of the minority; Domski, the old Trotskyist leader; Rwal, Brun-Bronowicz, Malecki, Boninski, Dolecki, Huberman (brother of the famous musician) and hundreds of others.

The role of "Comrade" Bierut in this blood-purge as the spy of Stalin and the Polish section of the GPU was notorious. The annihilation of a generation of Polish revolutionary leaders was part of the preparation for the new partition of Poland with Hitler in 1939 and the Molotov-Ribbentrop-Stalin-Hitler pact, because Stalin feared that the Poles would combat his policy of dividing up Poland for the Hitler alliance.

With the end of the war and the occupation of Poland, the new "troika" of the reconstructed Stalinist party—Bierut, Berman, Minc—demanded the repatriation of the remnants of the Polish Communists. Instead of the thousands called for, the NKVD delivered scarcely a hun-

(Turn to last page)

PORTUGAL

Salazar's Forgotten Fascism

The following are excerpts from an article on "Portugal in 1955" from Iberica for September 15, by George Dennis. Iberica is an anti-Franco magazine published in New York by a board headed by Norman Thomas and Salvador de Madariaga.

By GEORGE DENNIS

In a hotel in a Portuguese provincial town there hangs a notice which is reminiscent of Fascist Italy: "Guests are requested to refrain from talking politics." And traveling from Franco's Spain into Salazar's Portugal is indeed not unlike going from Hitler's Germany into Mussolini's Italy.

The first thing one notices is the apparent absence of that constant tension which, in Spain, may never quite reach the boiling point, but which is always there. Portugal appears to be a more easy going country.

This first impression, however, is as misleading as first impressions often are. The tension is there, but it has been driven underground by almost thirty years of a dictatorial regime and by the fantastic resignation which years of fruitless efforts have imposed upon the opposition. There was a moment, after the death of Marshal Carmona, when it seemed as though the opposition would be permitted to come into the open. The regime announced that the election of Carmona's successor would be free and that opposition candidates would be allowed. But this liberal mood soon passed—the government became alarmed not so much by the strength of the opposition but by the very fact that it still existed—and the authoritarian pattern was resumed. The opposition's freedom of expression was first curtailed and then abolished, and the "free" presidential elections became a farce, ending in the expected victory of the official candidate.

The opposition is scattered and disunited. Its ideological inspirations range all the way from monarchy to communism. The leading parties are the monarchists, the liberal republicans, the socialists, and the communists who masquerade as the "Movement for Democratic Unity." Each remains in contact with

groups of exiles sharing their political faith.

Except for the communists, they all share a common inability to attract the country's youth. The opposition is largely composed of middle-aged men who still remember Portugal's democratic days. Many of them were defendants at the trials which marked the beginning of the present regime. The young men, if they are politically inclined, tend to accept whatever posts the regime offers them. If they are not, then football provides a ready outlet for their passions and energies. ("Football is important," a young Spanish actor told me, "because as long as people think about football they don't think about politics." This is equally true for Portugal, if not more so.) One of the strongest counts against the Salazar regime is this corruption of youth, with the result that communism appears to many idealistic young Portuguese, especially to students, not as what it really is but as the only antidote to Salazarism.

WHY LESS HARSH

One interesting feature of Portuguese opposition is that its motives are ideological rather than economic. Its personnel is recruited almost exclusively from the bourgeoisie, a class which certainly "never had it so good" as under Salazar.

Nor is it any secret in Portugal that the opposition centers in Oporto and Coimbra. Oporto is to Lisbon what Barcelona is to Madrid, except that it does not go in for regionalism. Thirty years of authoritarianism have not been able to wean Oporto from her traditional love of freedom.

It is Portugal's history which largely explains why her present dictatorship is less harsh than that of her neighbor to the east. In Spain, Franco established himself after a civil war of three years duration which cost over a million dead and left a legacy of hatred and resentment which even today shows no sign of subsiding. Salazar, on the other hand, came to power almost by stealth, after a mild military pronunciamiento which appeared to be merely one of many. Portugal has had many changes of regime but no large-

scale bloodshed since Pedro IV won his war against the absolutist claimant, Dom Miguel, well over a century ago. So the present regime can well afford to be less crude.

Its censorship is certainly more lax. All kinds of books are openly published and sold in Portugal which would be banned in Spain on political or religious grounds. Marx is not on sale in Lisbon, but the works of the Brazilian communist novelist Jorge Amado are. And so is *The Great Conspiracy against Peace* by Albert Kahn and Michael Sayers. Bernanos' *Les Grands Cimetières sous la Lune* can be had in Portuguese translation, and so can Stendhal's *Le Rouge et le Noir*, and Papini's *The Devil*.

CHURCH AND POVERTY

It would seem that, for all the friendship between Salazar and the Patriarch of Lisbon, the Portuguese Church does not quite enjoy the same political power as the Spanish Church. It is not for nothing that the Salazarist regime is said to "have the face of a *beata* (a pious old lady) but to carry a lay stick." The Spanish Church has two representatives on the Censorship Board; the Portuguese Church has none. In both countries, Catholic Action exercises a supplementary "moral" censorship over and above the official one.

Now the number one economic problem of Portugal is simply the grinding poverty of the majority of her inhabitants contrasted with great wealth in very few hands. One need not be a professional economist to reach this conclusion; it is sufficient to use one's eyes and see, for example, the tragic number of children and adults who go barefoot, not only in the country but also in the poorer quarters of a city like Oporto.

The government makes a good deal of propaganda for its anti-illiteracy campaign, and 300,000 Portuguese are said to have learned to read and write during the last two or three years. But what the government naturally does not mention is the appalling sterility of Portuguese cultural life today. While the tortured nineteenth century (which in Portugal lasted until 1926) produced men of European stature like Herculano and Eca de Queiroz, there is no one of that class in the country today.

The great question current in Portugal is that of succession. Salazar is 67, which means that, in this age of Churchill and Adenauer, he is still, as politicians go, a comparatively young man. But he is a very tired man. One of his friends told me that Salazar aged 20 years in the months between Pearl Harbor and the decision to grant the Allies bases in the Azores. The Salazarist movement is less a political party than something resembling Primo de Rivera's Union Patriótica. I saw no sign of its existence during my stay in Portugal. And so everybody is talking about Salazar's possible successors, everybody that is except Salazar himself, who definitely discourages that kind of talk.

Behind the Rehabilitation — —

(Continued from page 7)

dred, men of third rank, for the others had all been butchered.

The new "Polish Workers Party" could scarcely explain the dissolution of the Communist Party of Poland and the disappearance of the old Communist leaders. Gomulka declared simply that "the CPP could not adapt its policy to the concrete, new reality in Poland and had to dissolve." Others parroted the GPU accusation that the CPP had been infiltrated by Polish police agents and agents of the WRN (the PPS resistance group), in spite of the fact that the WRN did not even exist at the time of the CP's liquidation. The fate of the Communist leaders was shrouded in silence for long years during the life of Stalin.

THEY ARE AFRAID

Suddenly, after the Khrushchev-Bulgarian visit to Belgrade, Warsaw's *Trybuna Ludu* published an account of Lenin's sojourn in Poland, his arrest, and the good work of Polish social-democrats in effecting his

liberation. Mentioned as "saviours" of Lenin were Adolf Warski, Vera Koszewska, Horwitz-Walecki, all of whom had been murdered by Stalin.

The same *Trybuna Ludu*, on May 1, published a big article on "Our Leaders," with 16 photos of revolutionaries who had been among Stalin's blood-victims, "sweetened" by pictures of Ludwik Warynski and Rosa Luxemburg.

Thus began the process of rehabilitation of the murdered Polish Communist leaders.

If the very fact itself made a political sensation, uncovering the weakness and crisis of the Warsaw regime, this was not so because the Bierut clique is more "revolutionary" than the Russian NKVD or Stalin. Rather, it did so because it fears for its own political future; it is seeking to wipe out its political past in the eyes of the people, and to pose before the revolutionary workers as the inheritors of the Polish revolutionary tradition, inheritors of a political "legitimacy" from the shades of Warynski and Luxemburg and not merely from Stalin's Russian ukase.

In this way the Bierut group is trying to build a dyke against the growing pressure of the anti-Stalinist workers, a pressure which manifests itself not only in Poland but also in Russia, in East Germany and in all the satellites.

But every revolutionary worker knows that the Bieruts are Stalinist scoundrels and NKVD cutthroats, murderers of the Polish Communist Party and usurpers of the Polish workers' party, traditions and country; that they were handed power not by the Polish people but by the Russian police and the Russian imperialist occupation army; that they are not the continuators of Luxemburg or Warynski but of the Moscow NKVD; that they are not the comrades and disciples of Warski Lesinski and Koszewska but their assassins and Judases.

Hence this hypocritical rehabilitation has its positive side for it reveals the crisis-ridden difficulties of the Stalinist regime.

The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Get Acquainted!

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

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

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

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.

World History—Year by Year

The bound volumes of LABOR ACTION

are an invaluable record of the social and political issues of our day, and a socialist education in themselves. Completely indexed from 1949 on.

1950-53 \$3 per vol.

Bound volumes of LA are also available back to, and including, 1942, at somewhat higher prices depending on the year. Prices on request. A complete set of bound volumes for the 11 years from 1942 to 1952 is available for \$40.

Independent Socialist Press
114 West 14 Street, New York City

HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, New York

Please enter my subscription:

- 1 year at \$2. New
- 6 months at \$1. Renewal
- Payment enclosed. Bill me.

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

A New Collection!

MARX AND ENGELS ON BRITAIN

Contains the whole of Engels' *Condition of the Working Class in England* in addition to dozens of their articles and letters. 538 pages—fully indexed—hard-cover—fine binding—but only \$2.50! All orders must be accompanied by payment.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.