

INDOCHINA AND THE WAR CRISIS-II The 1945 Revolution in Indochina .. page 3

Report on the UAW Conference . . . page **Z**

Brazil: The Army Vetoes Vargas . page 6

1954

May Day 1954 sees the world heating up to what may be the outbreak of another "small war" in Indochina, or what may even be the starting point of the third world war. That is the pattern of the whole post-war world, bequeathed to us by the famous "victory over fascism" in the last war, a "victory" which could only be a stage in the degeneration of the ruling powers because it ended with the old systems still in power: the system which led to fascism, capitalism, and the system which ensures the privileges of the Russian bureaucratic despots.

Before our eyes the big picture of what capitalism and Stalinism mean for the world is being simultaneously acted out on two stages: in Geneva and in Washington, at the conference of the imperialist powers and at the farce-tragedy in the McCarthy hearing chambers.

At Geneva, the U. S. and its Western capitalist allies cannot hide their impotence and helplessness before the onslaught of Stalinist expansion, this time in Southeast Asia. But here at home, the government has been able to win great "victories" over the Stalinists, hasn't it?

In Indochina, Washington is standing behind French colonialism and oppression over a native people. Here at home, the witchhunt has gotten so thoroughly out of hand that the U.S. army is devoting more energies to defending itself against McCarthy's troops than Washington even knows how to devote against its Stalinist enemy.

In Indochina the Stalinists demagogically can wave the carrot of independence and land reform before the peasants, to grease their road toward taking over the country under their own dic-tatorship. But Washington knows only how to wave the big stick of the H-bomb.

In Indochina, the Stalinist-dominated army of the Vietminh can mobilize tens of thousands of anti-imperialist peasants to fight its battles. In the U. S., the French are recruiting American flyers for \$25,000 a year to act as mercenaries, to supplement the German storm-troopers who now make up whole cadres of the French legions fighting for colonialism.

May Day **America's Blind Alley in Geneva:** No Policy, No Friends, No Hope

By GORDON HASKELL

As the Geneva conference on Asia opens, the three strongest powers of the capitalist world show every sign of entering it in a state of disarray, demoralization, and even panic.

The papers report: "The French delegation left for Geneva in a gloomy state of mind. Some ministers thought direct negotiations would be sought with the rebels in Indochina."

Anthony Eden, foreign secretary of what used to be the great empire of Britain, shuttled back and forth between the continent and London in a frenzied effort to work up a policy which has some chance of binding the allies together in the face of their Stalinist opponents.

Secretary of State Dulles had no reason to run back to Washington for last-minute instructions. He knew before he left for Europe that the Knowland-Nixon-McCarthy wing of

his party leaves him no room in which to maneuver, and that hence his best hope is that the conference will fall apart before too much damage can be done to the prestige, interests, and announced policy of his government.

No one, literally no one who has participated in the formation and carrying out of the policies of the capitalist world which have preceded this conference, and hence who bears responsibility for the present state of affairs, has any policy to suggest now which could save the situation in Indochina and give the capitalist bloc the political initiative during the conference, or afterward.

Commentators, analysts, experts on Asia, military leaders, diplomatic pundits-all, all are wringing their hands in despair, and either hoping for some miracle or hinting at some line of action in which they have so little confidence, or of the consequences of which they have such fear, that they do not have the courage to advocate it openly and boldly as a "way out" of the trap in Indochina.

TO DESPAIR

Three weeks ago, Dulles scared the French and British half to death by hinting that his government thinks Stalinist China is almost a military aggressor in Indochina, and that the United States may deal with it as such. After a big clamor had been raised both in this country and abroad over the idea of an American "go it alone" military policy, Dulles suggested, or rather demanded, that a number of countries "go it together" in Indochina instead.

This gave the French and British an out: they could agree to examine the possibility of some kind of Far Eastern military pact without agreeing to anything which could get the United States into the war there now.

Just as the echoes of this briliant diplomatic maneuver began to die down, Vice-President Nixon told a thousand people ("off the record") that if France (Turn to last page)

U.S. Intervention in Indochina Would Be A Stalinist Victory

By JACK WILSON

How little confidence the Eisenhower administration has in its foreign policy as a means of successfully combating Stalinism by any political program it can produce has been eloquently demonstrated by recent administration attempts to prepare the American people for full armed intervention, including infantry, in the war over there.

Perhaps the most significant indication of the real program of Eisenhower's administration is the repeated editorial comment of one of his intimates, John S. Knight, owner of the Knight chain of newspapers. Week after week he has been telling his readers that the Eisenhower administration is headed for war.

Apparently unable to stand the hypocrisy of top officials, Knight wrote this week :

"Defense Secretary Wilson said the other day that he sees no possibility that American troops may mave to fight in the jungles of Indochina and that no such plan is even under study.

"But Wilson conceded that 'my crystal ball may be clouded."

"Well, I'll clear it up for you, Mr. Secretary.

"If the president, the vice-president and Secretary Dulles are men to be believed, the United States will be messed up in an Asiatic war before the year is out."

These are rather sober words from a conservative publisher, who has long supported the Eisenhower administration but who feels, "I warn again that military victories alone will not resolve the situation in Southeast Asia."

Of course, the stakes in Southeast (Turn to last page)

NO RECONCILIATION

When May Day was founded, the picture that capitalism then presented was almost idyllic in comparison with the big picture in the world today: the accelerating downslide of the capitalist world into barbarous atomic war, into a police-state witchhunt which would have appalled the democratic sensibilities of even the men who applauded the murder of the Haymarket martyrs. .

Who are those who can bring themselves to reconciliation with this brutalized and degenerate system today, to accommodation to it, compromise with it?---TODAY?

Independent Socialism is the banner of the movement which holds the fortress of democracy and progress through a workers' world, against the beleaguering forces of both capitalism and totalitarian Stalinism. When we speak of the "Third Camp," we mean not only the alternative to the existing war blocs, but we also point to the social alternative which alone offers a road to freedom, plenty and peace-the socialist world of a free working class, which is the democratic alternative to Stalinism and the revolutionary alternative to capitalism.

McCarthy Exposing IS McCarthyism

By SAM TAYLOR

The current McCarthy-army hearings now going on in Washington will be remembéred as one of the strangest political shows of recent years. The longdelayed decision of the Eisenhower administration to rebuff the junior senator from Wisconsin, to any extent, is welcome. Their tactic of centering the attack on the veracity of McCarthy's statements in the otherwise unimportant Schine case can perhaps mean that McCarthy will be slowed down, but it certainly does not mean a serious political challenge to McCarthyism.

The hallmark of the McCarthy committee has been its reckless trampling of the rights of all but the friendliest of witnesses, and the "leaking" to the press of information. But the present hearings have cast McCarthy as the "champion" of the democratic rights of people-certain people-i.e., McCarthy and his friends. McCarthy has vigorous objections to any procedure that would hinder his defense, and it is no credit to him

Sector Annals Contact and

that on many points (like the right of the accused to cross-examine) he is formally correct.

The committee has established certain rules and procedures which (it specially notes) do not set precedents for future committee hearings. That is, when senators and high army officials are involved, there are to be more-or-less fair procedures, but an individual with less influence is to be at the tender mercy of the autocratic Senate rules.

For example, no one can give hearsay testimony without the person who is quoted being available for examination by all concerned. Certainly this would be a remarkable change in Senate and government rules on loyalty and security hearings. . . .

It also seems that standard procedures in Washington involves not only tapping the phones of other people but also monitoring phone conversations by one of the participants. When it was brought out that Secretary of the Army Stevens had monitored McCarthy's conversations,

N. C

the senator denounced this as "indecent and dishonest." There was never a more indecent display of fake indignation. If Stevens' procedure is as reprehensible as McCarthy claims, how much worse is wiretapping by a third party-and a cop at that?

いなが、

1

McCarthy also demands that the transcripts of these monitored phone calls be introduced in full in the order they took place. He protested against selecting passages possibly taken out of context and culled to fit the army's needs.

Likewise he demands the right to challenge statements made by a witness in a reasonably short time after they are made. Otherwise, it was explained, the charges would be widely circulated before they could be rebutted.

In all of these points, then, one byproduct of the hearing is to provide a measuring-rod for the outrageous procedures and star-chamber methods ordinarily used not only by McCarthy but by the non-McCarthyite inquisitors of Congress as well.

REPORT ON THE UAW CONFERENCE They Didn't Plan to Discuss Indochina . .

By BEN HALL

Page Two

Two thousand delegates attended the sixth educational conference of the United Auto Workers (CIO) in Chicago, April 8-11. Preparations as usual were meticulous; the agenda was planned in careful detail; schedules were strictly maintained; a complicated series of meetings and speeches, secular and religious, ticked off in the proper rooms at the proper time. But out of all the tidy arrangements, the most significant event of the conference came unscheduled, unprepared, unanticipated.

Here, for the first time, a changing mood toward war and war preparations became evident among thousands of union activists. Not that they were *antiwar* or even that they were clearly against the provocative, atom-bomb-rattling policy of Dulles-Eisenhower. The change in mood was this:

In the past, UAW gatherings accepted without qualification the validity and necessity of war in Korea; the union was gripped by pro-war sentiment, even if unenthusiastically. At one convention, delegates spontaneously applauded a speaker who called for dropping atom bombs on China. But the delegates to this conference faced the possibility of a new U. S. intervention in Indochina. They wanted to know the facts: Is this war really necessary?

From simple pro-war sentiment, they shift to a questioning attitude of uneasiness and vague dissatisfaction.

It came spontaneously, without prompting from leaders above and without special stimulation by conscious political groups below.

CONFERENCE AIM

We must explain that UAW educational conferences are not conventions; there are no debates, no discussion from the floor at full sessions, no resolutions. Invited speakers hold forth mornings and evenings. In-between, in the afternoons, the conference splits up into 20-odd discussions groups (and many more sub-groups) each of which prepares questions to be answered by the main speakers at full conference sessions.

The main events are fully controlled by the leadership; and there we get a clue to what *they* think of the main issues of the days. The small group discussions are channelled but not controlled; and there we can find out to some extent what the ranks are thinking.

The Reuther leadership comes to these conferences with one continuing aim: it seeks to implant more deeply into the minds of union members that amorphous leftist, laborite ideology which "Reutherism" represents more fully than any other tendency in the labor movement. President Reuther fashions his speeches to this end, speeches which seem stamped from one master stencil as the years pass. (Invited guest speakers contribute odds and ends.) Noble ideals and lofty goals are invoked with only a tenuous connection to the practical tasks of the day.

The tiny minority which has heard the same speeches year after year are less impressed with time, even slightly bored. But for the vast majority, who are listening for the first time, it comes as a stirring revelation.

Such is the general aim; but this conference, like the others, was designed to serve more immediate tasks. In particular, the conference organizers seemed eager to emphasize three subjects: (1) the guaranteed annual wage demand; (2) the 1954 congressional elections; (3) McCarthy and McCarthyism.

These made up the content of the *planned* agenda. Foreign policy and Indochina, conceived as a mere adjunct to other discussions, intruded unplanned as the biggest issue of the day, and we will report this last.

THE GUARANTEED WAGE

First, with regard to the union's economic platform:

It remains to be seen whether the union will have to strike; if so, under what conditions and for how long; above all, if it is compelled to strike, what support will it get from its "friends" in Congress? But such matters are never faced squarely, before the membership.

POLITICAL ACTION

Politics was discussed on Saturday, April 10, when Paul Douglas, Illinois senator running for re-election this year, was interviewed by a panel of reporters who succeeded despite Douglas in raising the conference above the level of bureaucratic routine. They were: James Wechsler, editor of the New York Post; Robert Allen and Edwin A. Lahey, columnists; Herb Block, cartoonist; and Anthony Leviero, New York Times correspondent.

This conference was the most important gathering of UAW militants before the elections; they had to be inspired to go back into the shops and rouse the membership in turn, so that the UAW might do its share in overturning the Republican congressional majority and turning it back to the Democrats. The UAW leaders had to raise the banner; to issue the call to battle; etc.

Douglas and Homer Ferguson of Michigan had been invited to face the reporters; Ferguson, advisedly cautious, refused the kind invitation. Douglas was a soggy failure. (It remained for Senator Humphrey to rescue the conference organizers at the last minute.)

Douglas summed up his own program in three planks: (1) raise personal tax exemptions to \$800; (2) vague hopes of unstated improvements in unemployment compensation; (3) amendments to the Taft-Hartley law which fall far short of what even former Secretary Durkin had demanded of Eisenhower.

The senator succeeded in making this program seem even more pitiful than it actually was; a not unimpressive accomplishment. Wechsler, after failing to elicit any more than an intellectual tap dance from the squirming senator, summed it up simply: "The senator seems reluctant to think of the problems of our times."

Here are some scattered samples from the interview and from the conference question period which followed.

On the trickle-down theory: Douglas pointed out that the administration believed in pumping in money at the top, to bankers and employers, to stimulate investment and employment, in the hope that a few crumbs might trickle down to the people. There is a lot to be said for this theory, he conceded, still he doesn't quite agree with it.

On Eisenhower: Eisenhower is a man of good will, a gentleman, a great general. In fact, Douglas remembered he'd wanted to nominate him on the Democratic ticket in 1948 and on both tickets in 1952. Trouble is, he got in with the wrong crowd.

On Diviecrats: How long can the Democratic Party remain half liberal and half-reactionary, he was asked. *Reply:* It is three quarters liberal and one quarter conservative. (But when one reporter asked him to list some liberals he squeezed out only a few names). Mill owners, planters, and utility interests are in the party in the South and are entitled to representation. If the Democratic Party became a party of labor, then the Republican Party would become completely the party of employers (embarrassedly: "even more than today," he added) and that would create class antagonisms. It's all right for Britain where they have more decorum; even there, it gets them into trouble sometimes....

FORGOTTEN WORDS

In the person of Douglas, the delegates were introduced to contemporary Democratic "liberalism" stripped of its radical ornamentation, personified by a man determined to remain respectable and inoffensive. It was hardly enough to manufacture the prescribed routine excitement.

At the Sunday closing conference session, Hubert Humphrey, running for re-election to the Senate from Minnesota, sounded the first fighting note. His program was no different from Douglas'; only his demeanor was. His great faculty lies in an ability to sound as if he is sounding a clarion call, to bring forth applause and enthusiasm where others arouse only a yawn. Just that job had to be done, and he did it. Nothing was heard at this conference of the UAW call for a "new political realignment," not from Reuther, not from any UAW leader, and not from any of the small group discussions. Nor was anyone reminded that the labor movement had its own independent role to play in politics; that its PAC was independent of all parties, of all politicians. of their way to join in the fun. (Only Senator Douglas was reluctant to open up against McCarthy.) Bishop Bernard J. Sheil, of Chicago, made the main headlines in a speech of denunciation of the "junior senator from Wisconsin." But his comments, apart from their special religious flavors, were perfectly in accord with the timid spirit of contemporary liberalism and were noteworthy only because they came from a Catholic bishop.

LABOR ACTION

McCarthy's "reckless" methods were repudiated once again, but the bishop was careful to stand firmly and categorically for the removal of "Communists" and "subversives" from government positions. Later, Douglas told the conference that "all Democrats agree that Communists have no place in government jobs."

*What was lacking in the criticism of McCarthy is what is lacking in all contemporary liberalism: a forthright defense of democracy and civil liberties for all.

FAINT ECHO

At the educational conference two years ago UAW members had heard Professor Zechariah Chafee launch into a spirited defense of democracy; without beating around the bush, he excoriated the Truman administration for its loyalty purges; he attacked the Smith Act and reminded labor leaders that they had condoned its passage. He urged, in unambiguous language, the defense of the rights of all, including Communists. This year, in far more favorable circumstances, when Mc-Carthy is on the defensive, only a faint echo of Chafee's militant stand was heard.

Cartoonist Herb Block ("Herblock") was foursquare against wire-tapping. "There are arguments for wiretapping," he said, "the same arguments that can be made for forcible search and seizure, for torture, third degree, and star-chambers." But his colleague Wechsler took a more "practical" position; he granted that there might be some circumstances when it would be OK: "Maybe we have to choose between the House bill for wire-tapping and the far worse Brownell proposals."

One reporter, alone in the conference, raised unpleasant thoughts (it was Lahey or Leviero): "I didn't notice anyone out shotgunning against the Democrats when they passed the Smith Act. I didn't hear anyone gunning for Truman when the Democrats initiated a loyalty program which made it impossible for a man to confront his accusers."

THE UNINVITED: INDOCHINA

As his lengthy keynote address was winding to an end, Reuther commented, "Let us not fool ourselves, the situation in Indochina is serious and our nation is about to make a grave decision." To this generality were added others. The audience was left in a state of suspended animation: what decision is about to be made? Is it the right one? If not, what does our leader suggest? On this inconclusive note, the issue of Indochina was introduced and on this note it ended a few days later.

Nevertheless, the discussion on Indochina became the conference sensation when Robert Allen dropped his little bombshell.

Senator Douglas, facing the battery of reporters, was mumbling good-naturedly that politics stops at the water's edge; that the Eisenhower foreign policy was identical with the Truman-Acheson line, only the Republicans wouldn't admit it. Allen intruded: What do you think of Dulles' line on Indochina, senator? Douglas danced around a bit and Allen persisted: You're running for re-election, senator, you have a responsibility; Dulles is organizing a war; you may be called upon to vote for war any day; tell us something about it. But the senator evaded: I don't know about that, he said, all I know is what I read in the papers.

Allen: What! You're a senator and you don't know any more about what's going on than we simple citizens?

Douglas: Well, the administration doesn't consult us. I don't know what it may tell our Democratic leaders in Congress but it doesn't inform our party.

Allen (pouncing again): You mean to say that your own party leaders don't let you know what's hannening?

Next year the UAW begins contract negotiations with the Big Three, starting with General Motors; its main demand will be the guaranteed annual wage. This conference had to ready the members for the fight.

A panel of speakers outlined the UAW plan, which is the best scheme devised so far. Under its provisions, workers begin accumulating rights as soon as they have won their seniority (on the average, after about three months employment). The union consciously aims to avoid the defects of many plans which offer guaranteed employment to a small stable working force at the expense of a larger mass of casual workers. Its plan was outlined in a special pamphlet released to the delegates.

Everyone was for demanding a guaranteed wage. But the conference met at a time of spreading mass unemployment; and delegates wanted to know how the plan would stand up in time of depression. (For some time, Ford Local 600 has been calling for a shorter work-week demand. This issue was not raised for discussion at the conference and was hardly referred to by any of the speakers.) If the union wins, workers gain a maximum of 52 weeks of guaranteed pay. But what happens if benefits are exhausted? Will the plan end unemployment? can it be won in smaller plants?

In answering questions like these, the panel speakers, seconded by Reuther, felt impelled to explain that even the best plan would leave many problems unsettled. It is not a panacea, Reuther said, it will not usher in any utopia. It can only be one factor in winning security for the workers; the big struggles would have to go on.

The knottiest questions of all were not even posed.

All this was simply forgotten—ignored by a conference and by a union leadership which simply took for granted that all the big political problems of our time could be handled in 1954 by a Democratic victory.

The UAW was reminded, only in passing, that a different political road was possible. Hazen Argue, Canadian member of parliament, told the delegates, "I am a member of parliament, in Canada's labor party that we call the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation the CCF... As a matter of fact, the CCF in Canada is the political arm of your own United Automobile Workers, CIO."

McCARTHYISM

It was a field day for attacks on McCarthy. But this was nothing particularly new for the UAW. All the nation's evils, according to the official political analysis of the CIO, stem from the coalition of Dixiecrats and reactionary Republicans. McCarthy has always been denounced along with that coalition.

But at this conference the invited speakers went out

Douglas: We haven't had many caucus meetings lately.

Allen's sallies provoked the listeners to repeated applause. He succeeded in driving home one simple fact; that the nation was on the eve of perhaps fatal decisions that were being prepared behind the backs of the peoples and of Congress. No one, not even Allen, was ready to say that it would be wrong to go to war in Indochina, but all seemed to be horrified at the prospect of being tricked into war.

EAGER FOR AN ANSWER

When the conference broke up into little discussion groups, this subject immediately came to the fore. Later, the conference chairman allowed questions on Indochina to come from five of the 20-odd groups. Many other groups suggested questions on the same subject but the UAW conference organizers preferred to select alternative questions, not because they wanted to "suppress" a discussion of foreign policy but merely because they didn't guess that it was of pressing practical importance as a political issue.

The following questions were allowed to come to the floor: Will the Republican Party get us into war in Indochina in order to bring back prosperity? Will Eisenhower send troops to Indochina as Truman did in Korea? How do you determine what is "right" in foreign policy? What kind of aid is best for Indochina?

The precise nature of the questions was not the most important thing; certainly, the answers were even less.

(Continued on page 3)

INDOCHINA AND THE WAR CRISIS - II THE AUGUST REVOLUTION IN INDOCHINA

By A. STEIN

On August 6, 1945, the United States released the first atomic bomb over Hiroshima and brought the Japanese empire to its knees. The barbaric age of atomic warfare had begun. Ten days later the Japanese news agency Domei broadcast the text of an imperial rescript announcing that Japan had laid down its arms.

Throughout Asia, where Japan had earlier swept away the decrepit power of the old Western imperialism, a political void was suddenly created. A new force rushed in to fill this void and announced its existence to the world. Another cycle of revolution, of the struggle for national independence, had begun in Asia. And Indochina was no exception.

The independence of the Vietnam Republic was proclaimed on September 2 in the northern city of Hanoi by a provisional government constituted a few days earlier by the "Vietminh Committee of Liberation." And there is no better or more accurate expression of the revolutionary mood of the period than the declaration of independence itself. Speaking of the hated French oppressors, it says in part:

"They have deprived us of all liberties. They have imposed upon us inhuman laws. . . . They have built more prisons than schools. . . . They have despoiled our rice lands, our mines, our forests. . . .

"... Our people have broken all the chains that have held us down for almost a hundred years in order to make our Vietnam an independent country. We, members of the provisional government, representing the entire population of Vietnam, declare that we will henceforth have nothing to do with imperial France, annul all the treaties that France has signed with regard to Vietnam, abolish all the privileges which the French have arrogated to themselves on our territory. . . .

"... The entire Vietnam people, inspired by the same will, is determined to struggle to the end against every aggressive attempt on the part of the French imperialists....

"... Vietnam has the right to be free and independent and has in fact become free and independent. . . .

Whatever the Vietminh was, and whatever the role of the Indochinese Stalinists within it and the provisional government it set up in Hanoi on September 2, the one fact all honest observers confirm was that a revolution was taking place. And the Vietminh lagged behind the feverish course of events.

This was true even in Hanoi itself. Two weeks before the Vietminh proclaimed the independence of Vietnam, a mass meeting had been called on the initiative of a group of left-wing intellectuals, organized in the General Association of Students. Acting outside of and independent of the Central Committee of the Vietminh, this group invited "representatives of

all the parties and all the strata of the population" to participate in this mass meeting.

The revolutionary nature of the meeting was revealed in the resolution which was adopted by the gathering. Its main points declared it necessary-

(1) To unify all the national forces of Tonkin, Annam and Cochinchina under a government supported by the masses.

(2) To demand the abdication of the emperor of Annam (Bao Dai), establish a republican regime, and transfer power to a provisional government formed by Vietminh.

(3) To demand that the Vietminh Front immediately open negotiations with the other parties to form. a provisional government.

(4) To call on all parties, all strata of the population, the broad masses of the people, to sustain the provisional government with the aim of beginning the task of consolidating national independence.

The power of the Vietminh was strongest in the North, centered in Hanoi, and did not extend at all to Southern Indochina, where its organization and influence were at their weakest. There the revolution took an independent course.

In Saigon, the establishment of a revolutionary power was accomplished by a coalition of political groups which took the name of the United National Front. Organized on August 14, this revolutionary power consisted of the two politico-religious movements, the Cao Dai and the Hoa Hao, nationalist groupings such as the "Avant-Garde Youth," the Party of Vietnam Independence, smaller groups of intellectuals and civil servants, and the Trotskyist "Struggle" group. The first task set by this new ruling power was to arm the population to prevent any return of the French.

FORM WORKERS' GOVERNMENT

The masses of peasants and workers, meanwhile, did not wait for directives from "above" in order to take action. Everywhere throughout Indochina, popular committees sprang up. In the villages, the old officialdom, the Notables and Mandarins were arrested. The land—above all in the South, where the agrarian problem was acute—was seized and divided up, and where landlords resisted they were beaten and killed.

In the towns, the jails were thrown open and political prisoners were released. But even more important was the fact that in some industrial centers, the workers took possession of the mines and factories.

This page of the August revolution has scarcely found its place in the several documented histories of the Indochinese revolution that have recently appeared. And it is to the pages of LABOR ACTION that we must turn for a rare account of what occurred.

In the January 21, 1952 issue of LABOR ACTION, our Indochinese comrade N. Van has given us an authentic account of revolutionary initiative displayed by the working class. He writes:

"When Ho Chi Minh occupied Hanoi, the miners of Hon Gay Campelha (comprising 300,000 souls) rose up, formed workers committees, and on this basis set up a real proletarian govern-

ment. The workers took over the mines, tramways, railroads and telegraph, arrested the managers and police, and smashed the whole of the former local imperialist state apparatus. The Japanese troops, who had surrendered, remained indifferent in the situation. All the organs of production were put under the direct control of a management committee elected by the workers themselves and strictly controlled by them. The principle of wageequality on all levels of manual and intellectual work was put into effect. Armed workers acted as the police.

Page Three

"During its three months of existence (end of August to December 1945), this first proletarian government made it possible for mining production to proceed normaly, ensured the economic life of the whole region, conducted an intensive struggle against illiteracy, and instituted a social-security system.

FRANCE GETS AN ISSUE

Later, when the French regained a foothold in Southern Indochina (Cochinchina) with the help of British armed forces (and Japanese troops subject to British command), they were to accuse the Vietminh of having instigated and fanned the flames of revolution as paid agents of the Japanese, and of having acquired arms from the latter for this purpose. In 1946, the first post-war French high commissioner in Indochina. Thierry d'Argenlieu, abandoned this line for a new apologia: Vietminh was Moscow's tool in her scheme for world conquest.

D'Argenlieu could point to the fact that the provisional government established in Hanoi on September 2 was the creation of the Vietminh (which is short for League for Vietnam Independence); that the head of both the provisional government and the Vietminh was Ho Chi Minh, the founder of the Indochinese Communist Party in 1930; that out of the 15 members of the provisional government, 8 belonged to the Vietminh, and of these, five were Communist Party leaders.

The leading role of the Stalinists in the Vietminh and in the provisional government which the latter set up could not be denied. With this fact as his point of departure, d'Argenlieu could prove by Ho Chi Minh's past that he was an "agent of Moscow," and that he was fomenting revolution in Indochina in accordance with instructions from the Kremlin. And as the counterfeit revolutions, replete with People's Fronts and National Fronts, unfolded in Eastern Europe, Vietminh seemed to fit into the same pattern.

But the August revolution in Indochina was a genuine social upheaval. Ho Chi Minh's Vietminh was not supported by Russian bayonets, and the other parties and groups in Vietminh were not puppets of the Stalinists. Does this mean, as the Stalinoid "neutralists" of both the French and English variety are fond of saying, that in Asia the Stalinists are capable of sharing power and leading a genuine struggle for national independence? And that this is what they have been doing ever since August 1945 in Indochina?

It is to these questions that we must

(Continued)

New Anti-Colonial Movement Founded in England

By ALEX NEWBOLD

LONDON, April 13-A most important development in the struggle against Brit-April 11, when the Movement for Coloish imperialism took place on Sunday,

committees to be formed by experts on the various geographical centers of colonialism: one on Kenya and East Africa, another on Guiana and the Caribbean, and so on.

(4) Technical assistance to educational and economic advance in the underdeveloped territories, particularly to the trade unions and cooperative movements. (5) The substitution of international-

now turn.

nial Freedom was founded at an inaugural conference in the hall of the Waldorf Hotel here.

Three hundred fifty delegates and observers were assembled on what was rather unusual territory for a left-wing conference, and they set up a movement which should provide a most important anti-imperialist pressure group in British politics and particularly in the Labor Party.

For some time the organizers of the British Center of the Congress of Peoples Against Imperialism, and of the various ad-hoc committees which have sprung up as a result of each individual crisis in the reign of Oliver Lyttelton as colonial secretary, have been dissatisfied with the lack of coordination among antiimperialists. This new organization is a bold attempt to embrace all these obdies under one constitution, and at the same time draw in those other organizations which have expressed themselves for colonial freedom but have only stood on the sidelines so far: various religious and pacifist societies, and such leading churchmen as Canon Collins and the Rev. Dr. Donald Soper, chairman of the Methodist Assembly.

The most important new feature of the movement will be a number of standing

The British Center of the Congress of **Peoples Against Imperialism of course** provided the main body of support at the conference, as it was on their initiative that the new movement was founded. The Movement for Colonial Freedom will now become the new affiliate of the Congress, which will (according to Fenner Brockway, chaired the meeting) shortly be moving its headquarters from Paris to Africa, when the Pan-African Congress assembles there later this year.

PROGRAM

It is worth pointing up the objectts of the Movement for Colonial Freedom in full, and they are set out below:

(1) The rights of colonial peoples to independence (self-government and selfdetermination) and of all peoples to freedom from external economic or military domination.

(2) The application throughout the world of the principles of "fair shares for all" by extending to underdeveloped territories economic aid free from exploitation or external ownership.

(3) The application of the four freedoms and the Declaration of Human Rights to all peoples, including freedom from contempt by the abolition of the color bar.

ism for imperialism in all economic and political relations, including action through the UN.

It can be seen that this program is not so uncompromising as that of the British **Center of the Congress of Peoples Against** Imperialism before it, and indeed the result may be that it will lose some of the militancy found in the old movement. However, this is the only danger which could result from the new Movement, though of course it is the most decisive one.

Jennie Lee introduced the policy statement at the conference in an exceptionally well-received speech, in which she made numerous references to the absolutely bankrupt and counter-revolutionary role of the Asian and Indochinese policies of John Foster Dulles, who was just landing at London airport at that moment.

The success or other fate of the Movement for Colonial Freedom will depend on how far the members and affiliated organizations, particularly the associated MPs, will go toward carrying out the principles laid down in the constitution; and most important of all, how far the Labor Party can be persuaded by the Movement of the necessity and imperativeness of being on the right side in the present colonial neveration.

(Continued from page 2)

important; for the main speaker, Douglas, was anxious to evade the issues, not settle them. But one thing emerged: the delegates were eager for someone to hold out a road to peace without yielding to Stalinism.

"American boys and girls must not die for democracy," said Senator Humphrey as the conference was closing, they must live to enjoy democracy. On the world scene, our problems will not be settled militarily." His audience cheered and applauded because that is what they wanted to hear. But who if anyone will fight for peace, and howthat remained vague as they took their seats in cars, buses and trains to return to the factories.

Get All Your Books from LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE 114 West 14 Street, New York City



LOOKING BEYOND THE OPPENHEIMER CASE

By CARL DARTON

Though expected for some time, the scientific world was startled on April 12 by the announcement by Robert Oppenheimer himself that he had been tagged a poor security risk and removed from all contact with government atomic research.

Dr. Oppenheimer, as organizer and director of the Los Alamos laboratory which exploded the first atomic bomb in 1945, is considered the outstanding scientist responsible for U. S. leadership in atomic development. Thus is joined what may well be a knock-down fight between the government (and its loyalty program) and scientists long irked by its insanities.

The government, in removing Oppenheimer, recognizes a contradiction in its policy which has existed for many years. Here was a man who was for several years at least "next door to being a Communist," but who yet had access to top government research and policy activities. At the same time obscure scientists and technicians on the outskirts of government work were being discharged for reading liberal magazines or for considering sending published scientific reprints behind the Iron Curtain as a courtesy to scientists abroad. In the context of the witchhunt, it would appear that Oppenheimer just had to go, particularly since McCarthy was preparing to exploit the contradictions of his activities to the hilt.

From the scientist's viewpoint the Oppenheimer case is one they are anxious to defend. Here is a brilliant scientist who has answered what he considered to be the demands of his country even to the point of building mankind's most horrid weapon. Yet because some 15 years ago, from the highest idealistic motivations, he had associated with causes now considered tainted, he is now untouchable. What particularly rankles atomic scientists, already suffering from a guilt complex for having agreed to weapon research, is that, for slight indiscretions in the past, they may no longer have the solace of being considered patriotic. If Oppenheimer is cast aside, what further degradations may be in store for them?

With the Gray appeal board still in secret session and scientists rallying to Oppenheimer's defense, the decision is uncertain. It would appear that the government cannot come out of the conflict unscarred.

CHOICE OF EVILS

If they decide, despite his earlier history but because of his contributions and present avowals, that he is loyal, the whole system of guilt by association and derogatory statements would be impaired. If they are consistent with past actions on other people and continue to consider him a poor security risk, they will further seriously curtail the creative cooperation of most scientists. Even if he is formally cleared it is doubtful whether any government agency will continue to utilize his services.

A few scientists, whose love for their native land and all humanity as well goes further than that of narrow patriotism, are looking beyond the immediate question in dispute. Since they have never accommodated themselves to the application of science to destructive purposes, they have little sympathy for those whose hands, having built the A-bomb, are now being bitten and cast aside. For them the important question still is: How can science be best applied to constructive purposes for the good of all?

To this crucial question society today continues to give an inadequate answer.

FBI Methods Of Harassment

The following communication was received from the Burton Rosen Defense Committee, and we are glad to publish its exposure of FBI methods of intimidation. The case of Burton Rosen involves the rights of non-religious conscientious objectors, as explained in the letter and in previous news stories in LABOR AC-TION.—Ed.

America's secret police, as Alan Barth terms the FBI in the March issue of *Harper's*, are now set on intimidating the Burton Rosen Defense Committee.

The latter is not an organization in the usual sense, since it has no officers, no constitution, no headquarters, no dues, no formal membership, and no program. It has met only once, and for the single purpose of initiating a campaign for funds to support the appeal of Burton Rosen from his conviction for violation of the Selective Service Act. As stated in the single release issued by the Committee, Rosen challenges the constitutionality of section 6-J of this Act, which limits the privilege of conscientious objection to religious persons only.

The Sixth Amendment states that the accused shall have "the assistance of counsel for his defense." It is the aim of the defense committee to implement this guarantee by finding the money to support the work of such counsel on the case. Would the average American dream that the FBI would have any interest in such a matter? If a man, no matter what he has done, is entitled to a lawyer, it also follows that he is entitled to have friends or supporters raise money for this purpose. But any gesture whatsoever today which implies a spirit of independence is suspect to the FBI, whose duty, it is said, is to catch sub-versives who seek to undermine our basic civil rights.

INTIMIDATION

One of the persons associated with the committee, who allowed the use of his address for the mailing of contributions, learned that two agents of the secret police called at his home during his absence, around noon, on Wednesday, April 14, 1954. They spoke to his mother, and said that they were seeking "information" about the defense committee. (May I ask here why information about such a completely nonpolitical group of this sort should be of any more interest to them than information about the Shorthorn Cattle Breeders Association?) The woman willingly told as much as she knew, fearing that otherwise they might suspect her of being mixed up in some kind of skullduggery. They asked about Victor Howard, who signed the fund appeal for Rosen, and where he worked, and were given this information. (Why, I ask here, should they want to know details about a man's employment, unless their aim is to use such information to present to the man's employer and thus to jeopardize his job at a time when everyone is overcome with hysteria and fear?) The mother told the agents that Victor Howard was a pen name used by her son when he wrote articles for publication. Then these very cunning men e protecting us fr remember, who threaten our liberties) told the mother, in effect: "Suppose we go tell your son's employers about what he is doing? It wouldn't look very nice, would it?" This threat to a person's livelihood, because he is supporting an unpopular but completely legal cause, by a group of men who theoretically exist to "keep America free," is the lowest and most reprehensible form of pressure and intimidation ever concocted by the diabolical mind of man, yet it is a regularly employed technique in current FBI police-state methods.

had served their aim of intimidating a man's family, who are then expected to pressure the victim into withdrawing from the activity which brings displeasure to the FBI.

The question for all civil libertarians here is: When are some powerful voices, such as the ACLU, going to begin to make a noise about such FBI prying, spying, and intimidation of people who are known anti-communists, but who engage in libertarian activities? The \$64 question which follows that is, if indifference to the low and underhanded methods of the FBI continues, how long can we continue to believe that we are not living in a police state?

A Veteran Who Knows the Score

To the Editor:

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

I read LABOR ACTION recently and found it very timely and interesting. There is an urgent need to replace the controlled press, and give voice to the wrongs done to the veterans and workers. I am a disabled veteran who, because of the capitalistic-dominated veterans' organizations, has no official voice. As a worker I know the score. A drastic revision of government must be accomplished now. If a revolution is necessary —let's have it.

A VETERAN

As the Man Said: How Ridiculous Can You Get?

To the Editor:

An article signed by Bernard Cramer in your issue of the 19th of April makes reference to the undersigned as a "Mc-Carthyite." Now, what in the name of the sainted Leon Trotsky does that mean? As disciples of St. Leon, I take it you are opposed to "smearing." You say I'm a "McCarthyite," and I gather that that means that I, along with Max Eastman, Ralph de Toledano, Victor Riesel and Jim Burnham, am a Fascist (to judge from the New International's current "analysis" of McCarthyism). If so, can you prove I'm a Fascist? Or that the others you named are Fascists? How ridiculous can you get?

I can't speak for the others named, but as far as I am concerned personally I believe in civil liberties even for Trotskyites. I also believe that "McCarthyites," whatever that means, are entitled to civil liberties.

To indicate how absurd your reference to me is, may I point out that you listed my name as appearing on the letterhead of the American Committee for Cultural Freedom. While I have absolutely nothing against the ACCF (for the most part, they're doing a much-needed job), I am willing to go under oath to swear that I am not and never have been a member of the ACCF.

To wit: how ridiculous can you ridiculous people get?

New York, April 17.

We have sent Lasky an ACCF letter-

head so that he can see with his own eyes

that his name is listed there, as we wrote.

ISL FUND DRIVE It's the Last Week to Make It!

By ALBERT GATES Fund Drive Director

We are entering the final week of the fund drive with \$2400 short of our goal of \$10,200. Some of this deficit will be made up in the last days of the drive, but if we are to judge from the pace of the past weeks, we will not make up the big difference between the present standing and the total quota unless those areas not far behind in their individual goals come through in the next days.

Almost \$700 was received within the last week: a fair amount, but less than the estimate of \$1000 a week made in an earlier report on the drive.

This week, Cleveland came through in fine style, going way beyond the quota to rise to second place with 133 per cent. And this is above our highest hopes for Cleveland, which told us it would have a tough time making its quota. Chicago too, with a quota of \$1800, has gone over the top with 101.7 per cent. Our friends write that they have ended their local campaign, but are going ahead because they are certain to raise additional funds in an effort to make up for those areas which are still far behind in their drives. An examination of the score will show that a number of branches are pretty close to coming through in the final week. Newark, which took a high quota, is coming through fine. At this writing, Newark needs only \$6 to reach 100 per cent. We know it will come through and go above 100 per cent with ease.

Our real trouble starts after these areas. Buffalo and Bay Area are pretty close and, given their quotas, should be able to do it before the campaign ends. But New York and the National Office with steep quotas are scraping the barrel with considerable sums to come in.

To put it frankly, we are relying upon the following areas to give the drive the lift it needs in these last days: Pittsburgh, Detroit, Philadelphia, Los Angeles and Seattle are the cities that will count heavily in the final accounting.

Several areas have already asked that the drive continue for an additional two weeks because they are certain that with this added time they can complete their quotas. This proposal is under consideration now, and a decision wil be made within a few days. There should be no slackening in the drive, however, pending such a decision.



Published weekly by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.— Telephone: WAtkins 4-4222—Re-entered as secondclass 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 riews of Labor Action, which are given in editorial itatements.

Editor: HAL DRAPER Asst. Ed.: GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

BOX	C	COD	È
DVA	J	COR	
Q	uota	Paid	%
TOTAL \$1	0,200	\$7805.42	76.5
St. Louis	25	50	200
Cleveland	150	200	133.3
Chicago	1800	1831	101.7
Reading	50	50	100
Streator	25	25	100
Newark	400	394	98.5
Buffalo	300	250	83.3
Nat'l Office	1500	1148	76.3
Bay Area	500	379	75.8
New York	4000	3002.92	75.7
Pittsburgh	150	,91	60.6
Detroit	300	175	58.3
Philadelphia	250	106	42.4
Los Angeles	600	225	37.5
Seattle	15 0	50	33.3
Indiana	50	0	0
Akron	50	0	0
Oregon	69	0	0

Actually, the secret police visited Victor Howard's employers about a year ago, for the purpose of jeopardizing his job, but the desired results did not follow.

The two agents also inquired as to who was Rosen's lawyer, a matter which can be learned from the records of the district court. Perhaps lawyers are to be annoyed also? They allowed the 9-yearold daughter of Victor Howard to go thumbing through her daddy's private correspondence in search of letters which might shed light on their inquiries. Then she asked them "What are you going to do to daddy?"

After this, the gentlemen left. They

Of course, he could have saved us the trouble by simply phoning the ACCF to check on the fact.

Lasky's oath raises two interesting possibilities: either (1) the ACCF is the kind of organization which lists people's names on their letterheads without asking—a practice commonly thought to be peculiar to Stalinist fronts; or (2) Lasky is the kind of person who forgets what organizations he joins and then takes oaths on the basis of a weak memory—a practice commonly associated with Stalinist dupes.

We use "McCarthyite" in the ordinary, or garden-wariety, meaning of the term: a supporter of Joe McCarthy, or his admirer, whitewasher or apologist. That includes Lasky et al. In our view, McCarthyism stands for witchhunting, antidemocracy, and a trend toward totalitarianization and a police state in these United States; but we think the label "fascism" is incorrectly applied to it. So does the author of the NI article to which Lasky erroneously refers.

In view of Lasky's remarks about eivil liberties, we are waiting with carefully restrained impatience to see him come out with a public denunciation of the inclusion of the ISL on the attorney general's "subversive list."...

Elernard CRAMER



May 3, 1954

Published by the YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE

This Is <u>Our</u> May Day

By BOGDAN DENITCH

May Day of 1954 is being celebrated the world over by socialists as the holiday of the international working class, as it had been celebrated for decades. In America, however, the international working-class holiday is now almost unknown.

In New York, for example, there are, as far as we know, three "May Days' that the public is aware of: the parade that is traditionally held by the American agents of Stalinist totalitarianism; 'socialist" May Day celebrated by the the Socialist Party, the Workmen's Circle and the few locals of ILGWU that still cling to a socialist tradition-and the parade of the "patriots" sponsored by the Hearst press and the Legion. The Stalinists and the "patriots" both loudly and proudly proclaim, on this day of all days, their blind and loyal allegiance to their respective war camps-while the "respectable socialists," the State De-partment socialists, use this day to make clear their devotion to the camp led by American imperialism.

And-irony of ironies-this year Union Square, traditionally first the socialist and then the Stalinist stronghold on this day, will witness a new kind of "May Day" celebration-a businessmen's celebration. The 14th Street Businessmen's Association has apparently decided to forstall the Stalinist possession of the square by taking over the square for their rally!

This day is one day when the usual objective analytical approach of the Marxist movement can legitimately be balanced by genuine emotional outrage at what has become of our holiday, the workers' holiday. It is symptomatic of the times that May Day in America is the property of professional political prostitutes with a sprinkling of "pinks" and pie-cards.

OUR BANNER FLIES

But there is another May Day. It is the May Day of those who have not ceased to fight for the aims of the socialist movement-those who still hold to the revolutionary and democratic aims of the proletarian movement----those who have not yielded nor weakened; in short, those who still pursue the class struggle against tyranny, against exploitation, against war. This is our May Day.

It is significant that May Day is not the celebration of a social movement in America, but that the social movement is still developing in consciousness and clarity. While it may never embrace the tradition and the terminology of the old socialist movement, it is being driven, by the pressures of the very society it tries to adjust to, into rebellion. But the forces of production which have given the workers' movement its birth have also made it organize economically-and now the increasing inability of capitalist society to organize production for peace begins to force the movement into the political arena. The Young Socialist League is primarily a student movement. Being a youth movement this is only natural. However, it is important at times to make clear that we orient to the only class that can ever transform this society into a socialist society, the only class, as a matter of fact, that can defend democ-..... racy. In the meantime, in the period of social peace and stability bought by the Permanent War Economy we have to keep our ideas alive-the ideas of independent socialism, opposed to the social regimes of both imperialist camps, supporting the struggle for a Third Camp of the working class and colonial peoples That is why we exist.

New Student Political Group Formed at U. of Chicago

By DEBBIE MEIER

CHICAGO, Apr. 26-A group of students at the University of Chicago have recently formed a new student political organization, called the Political Action Committee. The PAC was formed by a group of individuals who were dissatisfied with the existing student-political milieu on campus.

Some had previously been, and a few still are, members of the Student Representative Party, one of the two groups on campus competing in student government elections. But on the whole they were dissatisfied with the activities and nature of SRP, and felt the need for a new and dif-

ferent organization. The growing conservatism of the campus, along with the new "popular front" line of the Stalinists has made it increasingly difficult to maintain a militant progressive student political party engaging in student elections. A series of dramatic and traumatic events within the SRP prior to the NSA election of last week proved a final blow to the illusions of many of the more radical and militant SRPers. (A more detailed account of these events will appear in Challenge.)

On the other hand there were also some students who were seeking an arena for "left wing" political views, but who did not want to absorb all their time and energy in student government politics, especially in view of the inherent and structural impotence of the Student Government at the University of Chicago. In political makeup the various individuals who gathered together to organize the new PAC ranged from socialists of the YSL tendency, SP-type socialists, independent left-wingers, and leftwing liberals.

The group met informally during the week of April 13 to establish some basic principles and an outline of activity for the founding of the PAC. They drafted at their first meeting a rough outline of their principles. Following a preamble, which stresses the need for student interest and understanding in the problems of society the PAC defines itself as an organization devoted to the following four principles:

(1) An uncompromising defense of de-

YSL FUND DRIVE Drive Is Still Warming Up

By SCOTT ARDEN National Secretary, YSL

The first month of the three-month National Fund Drive of the Young Socialist League has met with mixed success. A quick glance at the score box below will easily explain why the term "success" must be qualified. Though \$000 of the total quota is in, which is 00 per cent, almost all of this is from mocracy and civil liberties for all, regardless of how distasteful their political ideology might be.

(2) An orientation toward developing a better understanding of and closer ties with the trade-union movement, in the belief that arganized labor represents one of the major forces toward progress and the maintenance of democracy.

(3) An unceasing effort to explore alternatives to the present international tension existing between the totalitarian bloc surrounding the USSR on the one hand and the bloc around the U.S., allied as it is with totalitarian and imperialist forces in Spain, Korea, Indochina, etc., on the other hand.

(4) To provide a forum for the expression and interchange of radical and progressive ideas.

The group plans to engage in four types of activity. First, it plans to mimeograph a biweekly newsletter to distribute to the campus, putting forth its views on various questions of the day. Second, it hopes to run occasional large forums with outside speakers (for its first meeting it plans a debate on the need for a labor party).

A third activity will be running small discussions for its members and friends where events of the day can be analyzed and editorials for the newsletter written. And finally, it aims to involve itself and where possible other groups and individuals in activities outside of the campus -trade unions, community functions, race-relations activities, local electoral - campaigns, etc.

well for itself, and promises to continue to do so. The response of our friends remains, on the whole, to be demonstrated. It is clearly to be expected that the bulk of the weight of the drive must be carried by our members, but this cannot be enough. An absolutely essential part of the drive rests in the hands of our friends and their contributions alone can make the drive a real success. Our campaign on Indochina, as well as our numerous

No U.S. Troops **To Indochina!**

The government of the United States has been aiding the forces of French imperialism in Indochina with munitions, supplies and non-combattant personnel. It now has threatened to take the full leap into the war by the sending of troops. This policy can only lead to a futile and senseless war - one more futile and senseless than even the late "police action" in Korea. Moreover it opens the possibility of the beginning of the Third World War.

The Young Socialist League is firmly opposed to American intervention in Indoching. The YSL calls upon the government to scrap all plans for sending troops to Indoching. We urge the withdrawal of all military personnel who are already there and an end to all aid to the French forces. We, therefore, favor the cessation of all American aid to France since such aid necessarily serves to help the French imperialists.

The French struggle in Indochina is an imperialist struggle for the purpose of trying to continue the subjugation of Indochina to French imperialist rule and exploitation. The French do not belong in Indochina; that country belongs to the Indochinese who have a basic democratic right to national independence and to self-determination. The French must leave. We call upon the Indochinese people to take their country back from the French oppressors.

The Vietminh movement which opposes the French is a movement under the decisive control of the Stalinists. Its aims in the struggle are the creation of a totalitarian Stalinist state. Such a state would not be a genuinely independent one; it would be a typical Stalinist satellite state. Socialists do not give any support to the Vietminh; they are its uncompromising opponents.

Socialists are for the third camp of the Indochinese people against both French imperialism and the Stalinist-controlled Vietminh. The independent democratic nationalists of Idnochina should begin the task of creating such a movement nowa movement which will fight for a free, democratic, united and independent Indochina.

Indochina may contain the forces for building such a movement now. Whether it does is still unclear. But one thing is clear; American intervention will not defeat Stalinism nor give the Indochinese. people their independence. America must not intervene.

units, plus the "at large" ιwo category.

Chicago is well ahead and will probably complete the drive in first position. New York has done well but the size of its quota leaves it with a long way yet to go. The only cause for serious worry at this stage is the showing (or lack of showing) of Berkeley, Los Angeles and Boston.

On the whole the news that has come into the National Office is good. Newark guarantees that it will meet its quota in full within the near future. Berkeley promises a sizeable first installment in about a week, and we expect to hear from Los Angeles in about the same amount of time.

Despite this welcome news there are offsetting considerations. Boston is still unheard from. (Get a pen, comrades!) New Haven has requested an extension 'til September, which has been granted, with the understanding that pledges will be made during the period of the drive. Though the Boston and New Haven situations pose problems, the real question mark is the "at large" category. Based, as it is, not on an organized unit but on our scattered members-at-large and our friends, both old and new (and even those yet to be made), it is by far the least certain category of all. Our membership-atlarge has accounted

other projects, must be backed up now, in advance, if any real success is to be achieved. Give generously, and give now. Considering the newness of the YSL a slow start is fairly understandable. From this point on, however, a real push must be begun, and sustained for the two

months of the drive still ahead. The first month has served as a "warming-up" period-but this period cannot safely be extended.

N.Y. YSL FOLK-DANCING CLASS

starts next Tuesday, May 4, at 8 p.m. Folk dances of various countries will be taught-Israeli, Russian, Scandinavian, Italian, etc. No previous experience required and everybody welcome. Instructor is Hal Draper. At Labor Action Hall,

114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

Get The Challenge

every week - by subscribing to Labor Action. A student sub is only \$1 a grear.

Give to the Fund Drive!

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

Enclosed is \$.....as my contribution to the YSL's Fund Drive.

(Make out checks to Scott Arden)

.....

-16 ek

قرائيون مدر

(STATE]

(NAME-PLEASE PRINT)

(ADDRESS)

(CITY)

BRAZIE Where is the Regime Going? Vargas' Army Vetoes the Peronist Trend

By MADEIRA

Page Six

RIO DE JANEIRO, Apr. 4—In the two last weeks of February, while the preparations for the Carnival deepened still further the usual apathy of Brazilian political life, a serious crisis broke out in Vargas' government. Vargas was compelled to dismiss his ultra-demagogic minister of labor, Joao Goulart, to prevent his government from being overthrown and replaced by a military "junta."

1 (a. 1) + -

11 A. M.

As a result of that crisis, Vargas was forced by the upper ranks of the army and navy to give up any idea of establishing a "Peronist" regime and the army became the strongest oppositionist force against Vargas, keeping him to the pattern of a conservative constitutional president who is prevented by military pressure from launching demagogical adventures or undermining the allegiance of the Brazilian ruling class to "Pan-American solidarity" (i.e., the U. S. imperialist bloc).

The demagogic electoral demands of Vargas and Adhemar de Barros in 1950 were a distorted reflection of the Brazilian masses' confused wishes for better wages, industrialization of the country. agrarian reform, and independence from U. S. imperialism, as well as their revulsion against the policies and politicians of the Brazilian bourgeoisie, as embodied in Dutra's government. These demands could not be a political program for any government of the ruling class. On their side, the masses demanded higher wages and expressed their disgust with the old political movements, but they have been unable to outline a political program of their own and so followed "the Father of the Poor" (as Vargas used to call himself), expecting the satisfaction of their demands to be granted by Vargas as a gift.

ARMY ON TOP

On the other hand, that sector of the big industrialists who supported Vargas could not embark on a line of industrialization and demagogic organization of labor against the oldest sectors of the ruling class, with an anti-Yankee foreign policy, as the Argentinian industrial bourgeoisie did with Peron.

In Argentina, the alignment of the two sectors of the exploiting class-the industrialists on one side, the old agrarian oligarchy on the other-was much clearer than in Brazil, which has a socioeconomic structure that is much more complicated. At the end of World War II, the economic situation in Argentina in 1950 was bad and today is much worse. in 1950 was bad and otday is much worse. Last but not least, Argentinian labor was already organized in the CGT which, once it was in Peron's hands, gave him control over the workers of his country; whereas in Brazil the bad economic conditions both prevented the bourgeoisie from using workers' fights for its own purposes and made it difficult to suppress strikers and unions, which were all the more dangerous as the CP had been strong between 1945 and '47.

Consequently, since the end of Vargas' dictatorship in 1945, instead of a struggle between a nationalist-demagogic industrial bourgeoisie and an old oligarchy, Brazil has been ruled by a bloc of all the sectors of its very heterogeneous ruling class, all of them interested in suppressing the labor movement, hampering civil liberties, financing their enterprises with state resources and begging for dollars from the U.S., while a crowd of demagogues profited from the disgust of the masses and betrayed them once in power. The group that looks after the interests of the whole of this ruling bloc in the long run is the upper ranks of the army. look upon Vargas as an inefficient, corrupt, demagogic agitator of the workers, indulgent toward Stalinist infiltration in the army and the state apparatus. They also began to look for a "Public Salvation Government" which would be able to "improve" the conditions of the country at the cost of the working class and civil liberties.

The coming elections in October for the federal Congress as well as state governors and assemblies impelled Vargas' camarilla to find out some way to regain support in the working class. A typical representative of the most demagogic wing of Vargas' Labor Party— Joao Goulart—had been made minister of labor some months ago with the task of giving new life to the existing statecontrolled trade-union bureaucracy in order to enable them to profit from the return of the workers to the unions, after their disillusionment in the electrical campaigns.

The minister of labor's union bureaucrats started campaigns to increase the number of organized workers, launched slogans•asking for a general raise in wages, and even led a strike on the Rio docks. In many cases, they joined forces with Stalinist elements. Vargas' efforts to regain his hold on the working class culminated in a campaign launched by Goulart to set the minimum wage in Brazil at 2400 cruzeiros (twice as much as the present minimum official wage).

WARNING TO VARGAS

For months, the ruling classes became more and more worried about the fact that the minister of labor himself was leading a "class struggle" while the gap between wages and prices became larger and larger. The general atmosphere of demands for higher wages began to spread through the lower ranks of the army and navy, among sergeants, subofficers and even low officers. The "liberal" press of the big bourgeoisie denounced the government as plotting a Peronist "coup d'état" through the unions.

Then 82 colonels sent the minister of war a memorandum calling his attention to the critical economic and social situation of the country resulting from the sharp rise in the cost of living, social unrest, administrative scandals, lack of foreign currency, shortage of fuels and raw materials, decay in the agricultural production, administrative scandals, and Stalinist infiltration in the state apparatus. They warned the minister against "The threat that all these facts represent for discipline in the army ranks." The "liberal" press soon got wind of this documentwhich was supposed to remain secretand started using it as propaganda against Vargas.

The minister delivered Vargas a copy of the memorandum and resigned his office, thus opening up a crisis in the government. At the same time, a number of meetings of generals were held.

DANGER OF COUP

A military triumvirate was already appointed to overthrow Vargas and take his place. It was Air Force General Eduardo Gomes—the former liberal candidate in the 1950 elections—who persuaded the generals not to overthrow Vargas and limit themselves to demand the immediate resignation of the minister of labor. Vargas would stay in the government as long as he gave up any Peronist trend and obediently followed the policies drawn up by the generals. Goulart's machine in the ministry of labor began to be dismantled.

As long as Vargas plays the part assigned to him by the generals and a sudden worsening of the situation in the country doesn't occur, the ruling class prefers to keep the constitutional framework.

The fact that the army is now the real president of the republic in Brazil, (even the chief of police is now responsible to the minister of war and no longer to the minister of interior) adds a new feature In our April 12 issue, we published a survey of the political situation in Brazil by our correspondent Joao Machado, highlighting the Peronist trend in the Vargas government, especially revolving around the activities of Vargas' minister of labor, Goulart. This article noted the last-minute development that Goulart had been ousted after the bulk of the article had been written.

The present article, by another correspondent of LABOR ACTION in Rio, Comrade Madeira, particularly discusses the meaning of Goulart's ouster, and the new direction that Vargas' policies have taken. We note that in his last paragraph Comrade Madeira also expresses his own point of view with regard to the Brazilian Socialist Party, or rather the attitude which left socialists should take toward that party, and that this point of view is not held, of course, by the leftwingers who are fighting for a Marxist line in the SP.—Ed.

to the political stalemate in Brazil after the decline of all the political forces that had enjoyed popular support since 1945. A new wave of labor demands is likely to be answered by the establishment of a military dictatorship. The same result is likely to follow the worsening of the economic conditions of the country or any Vargas drive to return to demagogic policies. The tragedy of Brazil is the absence of any political or union force to oppose this threat of military dictatorship.

Nothing would have saved Vargas from being deposed if the generals who forced him to dismiss Goulart had known a fact which was revealed a few weeks later.

Anti-Peronist Argentinian refugees in Uruguay sent a Rio newspaper a copy of a secret speech which Peron had made in the School for High Staff Officers of Argentina. In this speech Peron disclosed the talks that had taken place between delegates of his own with Vargas (when the latter was the candidate for president of Brazil in 1950) and the present president of Chile, aiming at the recon-

24

(Turn to last page)

Co-op Party Rejects Attlee Foreign Policy

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, Apr. 21—Easter week-end was the occasion for a number of conferences. The most important was the conference of the Cooperative Party, the political wing of the 9,000,000-strong cooperative movement, which was held at Blackpool. The Cooperative Party is affiliated to the Labor Party and has 19 members of parliament bound by its decisions.

By a large majority it turned down J. M. Peddie, advocating controlled rearmament of Germany. Peddie thought that it was alien to socialist ideas to keep Germany permanently occupied and the alternative was to allow her limited rearmament, and forestall secret rearmament had not shown enough willingness to compromise at the Berlin Conference, or they distrusted the intentions of the Germans as a people. They have not yet understood that it is not just a question of being nice to the Russians, and expecting mutual concessions. Likewise the chauvinism of the "don't-trust-Germans" school would hardly survive socialist analysis.

The same sort of division of opinion was seen at the conference of the Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers the sixth largest trade union. Nearly 1000 delegates met at Brighton, and voted with only two dissentients against German rearmament.

ROBENS vs. BURKE

Conference at Brussels had decided that they had to integrate Germany into EDC. "Strength will not debar your negotiations. It will assist and ensure that they become fruitful."

Burke was right in thinking that only the threat of strength would move the Malenkov regime, but it would not enlist world opinion in the ideological war, which was just as important.

OTHER CONFERENCES

Meanwhile, the Northern Ireland Labor Party, meeting at Newtownards, County Down, passed by 17,700 votes to 2,400 a resolution condemning German rearmament as a threat to peace.

Labor Party thinkers seem to be blind-

DISCONTENT GREW

Vargas knew all these facts very well; he was the first to drop this demagogic mask in order to take the position of leader of the above-described ruling bloc. As a consequence, he lost his support in the working class, his partner Adhemar de Barros broke with him, and a wave of strikes swept the country in 1952 and 1953.

The election for mayor of San Paulo, one year ago, showed that the existing demagogic forces are worn out and that a revival of unionism was beginning throughout the country. At the same time that a political void developed within the working class and the economic situation of Brazil became worse every day, a number of scandals involving Vargasi camarilla were exposed to public opinion.

The apper manks of the army began to

which would be much more dangerous.

Howell James of Liverpool put down an amendment calling upon the Cooperative Party and Labor Party to oppose German rearmament on the grounds that however big the armies were built up in Europe, they would not deter the Russians. At a later stage in the debate James shouted, "We disagree with the Russians. To blazes with them. We disagree with the Yanks, too. Our solution is to build a free democratic socialist world."

W. T. Williams, M.P., supported the amendment with his distrust of the Germans. He was not sure if they would remain on our side if we rearmed them. For the Executive, Peddie replied that "No sane or sensible person . . . could honestly suggest that Britain, America, France, or even Western Germany could allow any state of complete disarmament in face of Eastern armaments."

However, the amendment was carried by 5,100,000 votes to 2,410,000 against the Executive.

The interesting point was that most of the speakers, except James, were right in opposing German rearmament, but for the wrong reasons. Either they trusted the Russians, and thought that the West

The two principal protagonists here were Alfred Robens, M.P., former minister of labor, versus Wilfred Burke, M.P., on behalf of the Labor Party, of which he is chairman.

Robens, generally considered a rightwinger, was again right for the wrong reasons. He thought that the Berlin Conference had failed because the West had not put the right questions to the Russians. The question he wanted put was, "Are you prepared to have free elections in Germany to unify Germans, if we are prepared to keep Germany disarmed for a further period of years?" Once again, he was working on the "goodwill" approach to Stalinism.

The peculiar thing about Robens' personal position is that he strongly opposes German rearmament while a member of Labor's "labor cabinet," which supports it. He said afterwards that he had no intention of resigning from it, as Bevan had done.

Wilfred Burke took the official line. In an heroic quixotic speech, he thought that EDC was sufficient guarantee against the vise of German nationalism. The problem of Germany had worried the Labor Party a lot since Potsdam 1945. The recent Socialist International ed by ignorance, a Stalinist conspiracy of silence, or wishful thinking, to the fact that East German rearmament on a considerable scale has already occurred. They have also ignored another important fact. Malenkov's regime must have a pretext to occupy Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Rumania and Bulgaria. This is provided by tension in Germany and the non-conclusion of a national peace treaty. Were the Russians to make any agreement requiring withdrawal from Eastern Germany they would be hard put to it to explain their continued occupation of Eastern Europe.

At the Independent Labor Party Conference a resolution proposing that membership in the Labor Party should not be incompatible with membership in the ILP was rejected on the grounds that the LP's attitude to national conscription and its foreign policy based on armed force rendered this impossible.

At the annual CP get-together of Stalinist hacks, 55 delegates spoke, although there were no disagreements on party policy. Two branches, which had proposed abolition of conscription, did not have the courage to put forward their view when the Executive put its resolution to reduce the period of conscription to a year.

May 3, 1954 Page Seven May Day Greetings to Labor Action and the Challenge Pittsburgh **Build the World** MAY DAY GREETINGS Branch Thru Socialist ISL For the Third Camp **Planning** — or Salutes **Destroy It with Of World Labor Labor** Action **Capitalist** War **And Colonial Peoples!** on its 14th and H-Bombs **Birthday** CLEVELAND ISL **New York** Independent Socialist League Revolutionary Greetings Socialist MAY DAY GREETINGS of TO ALL FIGHTERS Greetings Solidarity FOR SOCIALIST FREEDOM! from the San Francisco **National Action Committee** from the **Bay Area** Young Socialist League ISL **NEWARK** ISL MAY DAY GREETINGS **May Day Greetings** The East German "Man's dearest possession is life, and since it is given to him to live but once, he must so live as not to be workers have shown seared with the shame of a cowardly and trivial past, so live as not to be tortured for years without purpose, so the way to If this be live that dying he can say, 'all my life Our and my strength were given to the first cause in the world—the libera-tion of mankind.'" socialist emancipation! 'subversive, ' -Norman Mailer, in The Naked Youth and the Dead. let's make **BERKELEY YSL** DETROIT ISL Must the most of it . . . **BUILD THE** Not Los Angeles LEAGUE! Chicago Young Socialist League YSL Die Philadelphia ISL **May Day Greetings** In Memory of



Martin Abern

". . . In the present period, American capitalism is steadily moving to supplant in fact, if not entirely in form, the parliamentary machinery of the American government with a bureaucratic military regime.

"War measures' are the excuse today for gradual curtailment of c:vil and economic rights of the working class. Tomorrow they will be the 'necessary' measures of the imperialist order in the post-war periods, if im-perialism is not destroyed during the war itself. Therefore, with the growth of American capitalism along bureaucratic-military lines, it becomes necessary for the American masses to be on guard to protect, to the greatest pos-sible degree, their civil and economic rights."-from Civil Liberties in the U. S., by Martin Abern, Labor Action, October 19, 1942.

Page Eight

U.S. Blind Alley in Geneva

(Continued from page 1)

pulls out of Indochina, the United States would probably send ground troops there. The panic (not among the Stalinists, but among the Western allies) broke loose again.

In the meantime, the French government has gone from consternation to despair. They want a deal in Indochina anything which will leave them a toehold in the country. They are willing to agree to anything which will stop the hopeless fighting there, except to give the country its unconditional independence.

They don't want the United States to replace them . . . they just want it to agree to give the Chinese Stalinists what they want in return for some kind of truce, partition, or other arrangement which will save France's "face" and a bit of her material interests in "her" colony.

RIDING FOR A FALL

What does the American government want in Indochina? For what is this government threatening to send American troops to that far-off country? What is the American government willing to concede to the Stalinists in exchange for some kind of peace there?

The American government seems to want unconditional victory in a situation where unconditional defeat for its policy, its allies, and even its army is a far more likely prospect. At this conference, it appears to be demanding that the Stalinists give up a plum which is rotten ripe for them, while it itself is willing to give nothing, absolutely nothing, in return.

That is not diplomacy, or even principle. It is the approach of a person who has lost contact with reality, or at the very best, of a little headstrong child who has never learned to distinguish between its wishes and the real world.

Actually, of course, neither Dulles nor his advisors, nor even the men with whom he has to reckon in Washington, are mad. Hence it is most likely that what they really want, what they really hope for, is for this conference to break up over secondary questions, or over some such matter as the seating of Stalinst China as a full participant rather than as an "invited guest."

As at Berlin a few months ago, Dulles hopes, at best, to return from Geneva with his diplomatic shirt, not with a resounding victory.

The Geneva conference is bound to fail. About that, there can be no question whatever, from the point of view of the American government. If the French should, in utter desperation, make some kind of deal with the Stalinists, that would be a failure for the Eisenhower government. If the conference should break up with nothing accomplished, that would certainly not be a success. The only alternatives are various degrees of failure, various orders of disaster.

But after the conference breaks up, or even before, the Eisenhower administration will have to do something, to adopt some policy in action for Indochina. And the American people can have some influence on what is actually done.

100

The American government has been seeking to prepare the American people

for the idea of eventual U. S. military intervention in Indochina. At best, this would mean another "small war," like that in Korea. At worst it would be the beginning of World War III.

NOT FOR THE FRENCH

We have no way of knowing whether this course has really been decided upon in Washington, or whether it has been publicized in this country as part of a bluff against the Stalinists. But we do know that the response from the American people has been a very, very cold one.

Socialists, and every person who takes democracy seriously, can have no interest in "saving" Indochina for the French. That imperialist power must get out of the country, and the sooner the better. That should be the first demand of all real democrats in this country.

The only thing which socialists and all real democrats can *hope* to do is to refrain from contributing to the victory of the Stalinists in Indochina, and at the very best, to contribute to preventing that victory from taking place or being final.

For this also, they must demand the immediate withdrawal of France from Indochina, and specifically an end to American military and economic aid to the "dirty war" there. If there is any possibility that forces can be rallied in that country which can stem the tide of Stalinist conquest, the French must get out to give them a chance.

We have no doubt that if the worst disaster should befall, and the United States should be dragged into full-scale war against the Vietminh and/or their Chinese Stalinist allies, voices would be raised in the camp of labor and from the ranks of official liberalism demanding that every man, woman and child bend every effort and give their full support to holding Indochina for "democracy," to defend the "free world" (or "the West") against Stalinist attack.

THE ONLY HOPE

If that point is reached, such spokesmen will impatiently wave aside anyone who asks: How was it that after seven years of massive military and economic aid to the representative of the "free world" and "the West" in that country, it was unable to mobilize any serious native forces to fight with it? How was it that America had to go in because the Stalinists kept growing stronger every year among the *local* population at the *expense* of the French?

As they did with regard to Korea, these official liberals will shout: "Let's not talk about the past. That is all water over the dam. Now is the time for everyone to put his shoulder to the wheel and fight for democracy, for freedom, for the democratic values and way of life. Yours not to reason why, yours but to do and . . .!"

We have not reached that stage yet. Today the official liberals look toward Geneva and ask more questions than they even dream of seeking to answer, or mumble some incomprehensible gibberish. They don't know what to propose. We say: there is only one line of ac-

tion which is immediately necessary. No U. S. troops to Indochina!

Not a drop of blood, not a cent to support French colonialism in Asia!

The only hope for the defeat of Stalinism in Indochina or in the whole of Southeast Asia is to help free Asians defeat Stalinism themselves!

U.S. Intervention-

(Continued from page 1)

Asia are far higher and more decisive than in Korea. The latter was properly written off as having no intrinsic strategic value for American interests.

But 90 per cent of the world's crude rubber, 58 per cent of the world's tin supply, and 30 per cent of the world's rice comes from Southeast Asia, the last rich colonial grab in the world. This, as any imperialist will tell you, is worth fighting for, provided of course, that World War III doesn't erupt and eliminate both major antagonists.

In nearly eight years of bitter combat, the French colonialists have not been able to make a dent against the Stalinistdominated Vietminh who are easily able to maintain a firm grip on the burning desire of the Vietnam people for independence, by their "anti-French" war.

If the French imperialists are forced to give up their grip on this rich country, what can keep the flames of freedom from sweeping like wild fire over all of Southeast Asia, and end, once and for all, the foreign domination symbolized by British and French imperialism in the immediate instance?

Unable to answer this question, American policy-makers are determined to keep control of this vast area for themselves and their European allies by military means.

It may be noted that editor Knight assumes "military victories" for America if further and complete intervention is carried out. This, however, may be questioned, just as the military theories relating to Korea were questioned and the doubts turned out to be far more realistic than the blind optimism of General Mac-Arthur.

But the first point to be emphasized is that the entry of American troops on a large scale in Indochina will constitute a major world political victory for Stalinism, worth any military defeat that it may entail for the Stalinists. Its impact on India, and the rest of Asia would be incalculable.

As for its impact in America, the Eisenhower administration has already found it is meeting with terrific resistance to the idea of its military program. What editor Knight is saying publicly is what millions are thinking.

Perhaps, after the November elections, the Eisenhower administration may get enough "bipartisan" support to carry out its plans. What good will they do?

MacARTHUR SAID IT

For that cruel and desolate land known as Korea, which remains a nightmare in the minds of millions of Americans, is a veritable paradise, when it comes to war terrain, compared to the jungles, the mountains and the fields of Indochina.

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 Social-
ism and the ISL.
\Box I want to join the ISL.
NAME (please print)
ADDRESS
,
•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••
CITY
· · · · ·
ZONE STATE

(Continued from page 6) and

Army Vetoes Vargas

and at the same time they indirectly ask the generals to overthrow Vargas, who

stitution of the ABC block of the three largest South American countries in order to create some sort of economic unity between them and counterbalance U. S. power in the Americas. Peron said that Vargas, after his election, had given up this trend for the sake of the policies of the whole of the Brazilian ruling class. This document—in which the Brazilian president appeared as a junior partner of a foreign dictator in a conspiracy against the heart of the Brazilian ruling class's foreign policy—produced a great scandal in Brazil.

THE LIBERALS

Bourgeois "liberalism," as represented by the oppositionist sectors of the UDN party and the big. press of Rio and San Paulo, is playing a role in the internal politics of Brazil which is very similar to that of the U. S. in world politics. It destroys democracy in the name of democracy. Its opposition to Vargas from the standpoint of the ruling class—son the ground that Vargas is an inefficient administrator and is trying to spread "class struggle"—is a direct incitement to the generals to get rid of Vargas.

These "liberals" say that the army is the guarantee of democratic institutions, is paving the way to "Communism." The publication of the above-mentioned Peron speech was made with that purpose.

In the opinion of this correspondent, the combat stations of the socialist forces of Brazil should be in the trade unions today and not in the Brazilian Socialist Party, which is corrupt to its marrow. The "Socialist" senator Velasco was mixed up in Goulart's drives and the former "Socialist" deputy Hermes Lima took part in the Brazilian delegation to the Pan-American Conference of Foreign Ministers in Caracas. The unions are the only way to contact the workers who are sick of demagogic electoral campaigns. Organization within the framework of the trade unions is also the only possible way to unite all the workers around their demands and hasten the overcoming of this stage in their political consciousness in which they followed people like Vargas, Barros, etc. Unfortumately there are no forces at all with a clear understanding of these tasks or strength to achieve them, and, above all, the pace of the construction of an independent workers' movement may be much slower than the trend of the ruling class toward replacing Vargas' government by something "stronger."

Here weather permits warfare for six months, in conditions for which American troops are less prepared than any in the world. As for the monsoon season, it presents obstacles in rain, rot, fever, leeches, and the crawling life of tropical jungles which makes living almost impossible for the white man.

It's not a land where large-scale battles are likely or possible. At best, a series of isolated garrisons, supplied by airlifts, can stand as a symbol of foreign power and domination. At night, the power disappears with the darkness.

How are the American people going to take that kind of war for their sons, with casualties likely to be greater from disease and jungle rot than from the enemy?

The fantasy of American foreign policy was explained better by Vice-President Nixon than anyone else can put in words. It was only on March 14 that Nixon pointed out:

"We found when we went to Washington that we were still involved in a war in Korea; that it cost us 125,000 American boys as casualties. And again, not a single Russian soldier lost in that war.

"We found that militarily their [the

and a straight

Kremlin's] plan apparently was to destroy us by drawing us into little wars all over the world with their satellites."

Nixon added, "Well, we decided that we would not fall into these traps."

One month later Nixon advocated precisely the opposite, urging the policies which were once denounced as Roosevelt's rashness and Truman's folly.

Perhaps American statesmen are so blind that they think they can bluff the Chinese Stalinist regime into a retreat and defeat. They ignore the fact that seldom in world history, including the reign of the fabulous Genghis Khan, has anyone been more enured to war and suffering and callous disregard of the fate of the masses then the present Chinese rulers.

It was just two years ago, that General MacArthur declared with rare wisdom that "only a madman would want American troops to engage in warfare on the Asiastic mainland." Those words might well be addressed to the present occupant of the White House.

a state with