

Swindle Planned On Rights

Seek to Dupe Negro Voters

By John Thayer

Democrats and Republicans in Congress are jockeying fiercely on the civil rights issue. Each party is accusing the other of not really wanting to pass an effective civil-rights law — and for once both are telling the truth. But a Presidential campaign is fast approaching and the Negro vote can be pivotal in a number of key states. Therefore each party is impelled to make enough of a pro-civil rights record in this Congress to enable its candidates to placate Negro voters.

While no one in Washington sees any drastic or really effective legislation in the offing, most observers expect passage of something with a civil-rights label.

Much of the jockeying is over timing. Democratic strategy is to get the debate over with and forgotten (they hope) as soon as possible.

Precisely to embarrass the Democrats, Republican strategists prefer the civil-rights debate to come in the latter part of the session.

Consequently, the Democrats rushed into this session of Congress with demands for immediately taking up civil-rights bills. In the House, Northern Democrats circulated a discharge petition to take civil-rights proposals out of the Rules Committee and directly onto the floor. Such a petition requires 219 signatures.

Northern Democrats denounced Republicans for "obstructing" civil rights by their slowness to sign; but this did not hurry the Republicans who relished pointing out that the Rules Committee, two-thirds of which is Democratic, could report the bills out immediately and that the 280 Democratic representatives were more than enough to fill the petition.

For decades Democratic liberals "made the record" cheaply on civil rights. They would introduce bills and let them die in committee or at the threat of a Southern Democratic filibuster. By 1957 Negro voters were onto this shell game and demanded a real fight for passage of the perennial bills.

Moreover, Republican leaders Nixon and Knowland were already bidding for Negro support in the 1960 elections. Under direction of Senate Democratic Leader Lyndon Johnson (Texas) a new tactic was devised: actual passage of a bill, but one so weak that Southern Senators would agree beforehand not to filibuster it. Thus in 1957 Congress passed the first civil-rights bill in 80 years.

Its coverage was cut down from civil rights merely to voting rights and it has been almost completely ineffectual since passage.

Northern Democrats raised a great outcry over Eisenhower's coolness to the Civil Rights Commission's proposal for federal voting registrars in areas where local officials refused to enroll Negroes. But the Nixon forces recouped on Jan. 26 by getting administration sponsorship for a somewhat stronger plan for federal judges to appoint voting supervisors and use contempt of court power in such areas.

Racists Cancel Brubeck Jazz

Jazz pianist Dave Brubeck has revealed that 22 Southern colleges have canceled concerts scheduled this spring by his celebrated quartet upon learning that his bass player, Gene Wright, is Negro.

"Don't blame the kids," Brubeck said. "Those kids know every jazz group in the country and they knew we had a Negro member when they asked us to come. It's the officials."

Three white Southern colleges which did not cancel the interracial combo's appointments are: The University of Jacksonville, Vanderbilt University in Nashville and the University of the South in Seawannee, Tenn. The canceled concerts called for payments of \$40,000.

Return Guantanamo To Cuban People!

An Editorial

At his press conference Jan. 26 Pres. Eisenhower emphasized the official "no reprisal" policy of his administration toward the Castro government.

"The American people," said Eisenhower, "still have the greatest affection and the greatest interest in the Cuban people. We are not going to be party to reprisals or anything of that kind. At this moment, it is not our time to do it, and certainly we are not going to intervene in their internal affairs."

The Cuban people, however, continue to indicate profound distrust. The distrust is justified, in our opinion. The State Department has made it a major concern to represent the interests of American capitalists and landholders who object to the social and economic reforms undertaken since the revolution swept Castro to power.

No doubt the Cuban people will listen to Eisenhower's friendly words with interest. But they will be inclined, we imagine, to demand that he match them with deeds.

If Eisenhower really has the interests of the Cuban people at heart and is "certainly" not going to intervene in their internal affairs, he might well demonstrate this by returning the Guantanamo naval base to Cuba.

This base was obtained when the U.S. intervened in Cuba's struggle for independence from Spain. From 1899 to 1902, the U.S. imposed its military rule on the island. When the Cuban constitution was drawn up, the U.S., with a bayonet at Cuba's throat, forced the new government to "lease" naval stations.

Two strategic harbors, bearing on the approaches to Panama, were taken. Of these, the U.S. still clings to Guantanamo.

In the days of the intercontinental rocket missile, the base long ago lost whatever military value it once had in imperialist wars. For that matter the Panama canal has lost strategic usefulness. Even the Navy recognizes this. Some of its aircraft carriers are too big to go through it.

Thus Guantanamo can serve no purpose but to facilitate the landing of marines and armed intervention.

Isn't it high time that the government of our country pulled its military forces out of Cuba?

Let's give Guantanamo back to its rightful owners!

On Tour

Searching Questions Indicate the Trend

San Francisco

Editor: If you prowl around the Bay Area asking questions among the workers, you get some interesting answers these days. Here are some of the things I was told:

A lithographer: "The bosses forced us out on strike and they are using the Kennedy-Landrum-Griffin law to try to drive us back to work like whipped pups. Wages are not the only thing involved. The bosses are shooting for bigger profits at the expense of our working conditions and for some of us at the cost of our jobs."

A longshoreman: "Day in and day out we have to fight employer attempts to cut the manpower used to handle cargo. Sometimes we win, sometimes we lose; and the bosses keep whittling away."
A teamster: "Our contract says one thing but the boss says another and most often the union big shots go along with him. Many of us don't like it much, but we haven't figured out just what to do about it."

An optical technician: "People in my line are pretty skilled, get good pay and don't always think like workers. Lately though they are getting uneasy about the attack on labor. They talk about it quite a bit and are more inclined to listen to everybody's ideas."

Answers like these came from workers in response to questions about their immediate situation. An indication of broader issues disturbing them came through at a meeting of the Militant Labor Forum held in the new Longshoremen's hall on the waterfront.

What About Now?

I spoke there on some of the big problems facing labor today; and a number of questions came from the unusually large audience present: "A labor party would be a good thing but we haven't got one; so what do we do now?" "How can we save our jobs in the face of automation? What about the bosses' answer that we will all find jobs as technicians? It sounds good but what would it really take to accomplish that?" "What must be done to repeal the Kennedy-Landrum-Griffin law? Meantime should labor knuckle under to the law or defy it?"

Franco's Emissary Gets Boot Cuban People Cheer Ouster

By Lillian Kiesel

Cuban TV fans were given an unusual show Jan. 26. Juan Pablo de Lojendio, the Spanish Ambassador, burst into the studio during a speech by Premier Fidel Castro. He demanded "equal time" to answer Castro's "slandering" charge that Gen. Franco's Embassy has been aiding and abetting Cuban counter-revolutionaries.

Castro answered his Falangist heckler by noting that the ambassador was a "representative of tyranny" and of fascism. He declared him persona non grata and gave him "twenty-four hours to get out of Cuba."

Thousands of telegrams, acclaiming Castro's action, poured into his headquarters the next day from labor, civic and patriotic organizations. And 400,000 members of the Confederation of Cuban Workers demonstrated before the Spanish Embassy. They cheered David Salvador, the Confederation's General Secretary, when he called upon the government to definitively break diplomatic relations with Spain.

The ouster of the Spanish diplomat was supplemented with another diplomatic rift with the United States. Castro produced documents which he said linked both the U.S. and Spanish Embassies to counter-revolutionary activities. Ambassador Philip W. Bonsal went back to Washington for consultation.

Castro held that U.S. opposition to the progress made by the Cuban government in carrying out agrarian reform accounted for the hostile campaign waged against Cuba by American public officials and the American press, particularly the demand for revision of the Sugar Quota Act.

He cited, as evidence, an "insolent" remark of Vice-President Richard Nixon threatening Cuba with "economic consequences" if its government persisted in pursuing a policy of "confiscation without compensation."

Bonsal declared that Castro's charges of U.S. "determination" to defeat the revolution were "unwarranted."

Scoring Bonsal's visit to the Spanish Embassy to bid de Lojendio a bon voyage, Revolution, official newspaper, of the Cuban government criticized U.S. relations with fascist dictator Franco:

"What an inconceivable alliance . . . what an embrace without decorum . . . Franco and Eisenhower. What an historic fraud! What deception! What democratic falsification! What 'Free World' slaves! What a monstrosity!"

Cubans could not be "prostituted or destroyed," added Revolution, "by dollars or bayonets."

The State Department, representing U.S. vested interests in Cuba, has been applying steady pressure on the Castro regime to modify its Agrarian Reform Law. U.S. tycoons, after exploiting Cuban labor and land for 57 years, want to get paid in cash for their confiscated property. Cuban officials have explained repeatedly that Batista drained the treasury dry and payment

(Continued on Page 4)

Witch-Hunters Open Inquisition On Visitors at Youth Festivals

By Nora Roberts

JAN. 26 — Launching its first attack on young people, the House Un-American Activities Committee has subpoenaed five young New Yorkers to testify before it in Washington, D.C., Feb. 3, 4 and 5. This is the witch-hunting group's first use of the \$327,000 appropriated for it by Congress four days ago.

All five of the young people have been called to testify because of their participation in World Youth Festivals held in Vienna, Moscow and Warsaw during the past five years. The five are Joanne Grant, aged 29, Fred Jerome, 20, Alan McGowan, 24, Paul Robeson, Jr., 32, and Jake Rosen, 21.

A group has been established, Youth Against the Un-American Activities Committee, to "protest this inquisition of American youth."

A protest rally will be held in New York Sunday night, Jan. 31 at 8 p.m., in the Fraternal Clubhouse, 110 W. 48 St.

The rally is jointly sponsored by the newly formed youth defense committee, the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, which has given its office as headquarters for the group, and the Religious Freedom Committee.

The program will include Paul Robeson, Jr., speaking for the subpoenaed youth, Dr. Clark Foreman, director of the ECLC, Rev. Lee Ball of the Religious Freedom Committee, Mrs. Dorothy Marshall of the Los Angeles Citizens Committee to Preserve American Freedoms, and Dr. Otto Nathan.

Entertainment will be furnished by the "Harvesters" singing group.

De Gaulle's Regime Shaken by Uprising

Army Fraternizes with Mutineers



French Foreign Legion paratroopers in foreground (wearing berets) are supposed to be besieging insurgent French "colons," some of whom are shown standing in front of cobbles and lumber barricade they erected in Algiers business district. But "besiegers" and "besieged" proved very chummy. The paratroopers, notorious for brutalities against Algerian Moslems, have become a fascist-minded elite corps similar to Hitler's SS troops. They are openly in sympathy with the insurgent French "colons" who oppose any concession to the Arabs by DeGaulle. Instead of sealing off the barricaded mutineers, many of whom belong to the local national guard, the paratroopers encouraged them; allowed them to be provisioned and supplied them with ammunition.

Fascists Gain In Influence

By M. L. Stafford

An armed uprising by the reactionary French "colons" or colonists in Algiers, which the French army officers are unwilling to put down, threatens to topple the "strong man" regime of De Gaulle in France just as a similar uprising 20 months ago toppled the Fourth French Republic.

Fascist-minded elements in France as well as Algeria were emboldened by the demonstration of armed force and defiance of the French government.

The chain of events immediately leading to the "mutiny" in Algiers began Jan. 22 when De Gaulle removed Gen. Jacques Massu from the military and civil command of the Algiers area.

Massu, a candidate for the role of France's General Franco, is the darling of the "colons" and the fascists in France. Under his command the paratroopers became storm troops specializing in torturing and slaughtering Algerian freedom fighters.

Massu played a leading role in the 1958 army mutiny in Algeria that brought De Gaulle to power. Recently in a press interview he threatened to use force against De Gaulle's proposal to end the war in Algeria by granting concessions to the Algerian freedom fighters. For this insubordination De Gaulle relieved him of his command.

Massu's ouster was the signal for demonstrations and riots by the fascist organizations of the colons in Algiers. When police moved to disperse a mob which had been rioting for six hours on Jan. 24, they were met with rifle and submachine gun fire. The police fired back.

Most of the demonstrators fled, but a hard core of about 900, including many armed and uniformed national guardsmen, holed up in nearby public buildings and erected street barricades. Casualties totaled 24 killed and 136 wounded, of whom 8 and 80, respectively, were police.

For the next 24 hours neither police nor army moved against the insurgents. This raised the colons' hopes and many more joined the "besieged."

When the army finally moved in, the rebels were joyous, for the generals had sent the paratroopers, their closest sympathizers, to guard them.

Continuation of the rebellion was taken as evidence of De Gaulle's inability to get the army brass to carry out his orders. His prestige as a "strong man" sank daily.

The generals claim they haven't disobeyed any orders because they weren't formally ordered to fire on the insurgents. If true, that means De Gaulle was aware his orders would be disobeyed. He sent Michel Debre to confer with the generals.

They said they could not depend on their troops to carry out any orders to "fire on fellow Frenchmen."

(See related stories, page 3.)

Strike Ranks Remain Solid At Wilson Co.

Can They Tie a Knot In the Donkey's Tail?

By Tom Kerry

"We all went into this strike together and we are all going back together when a settlement is reached."

This was the answer the AFL-CIO United Packinghouse Workers Union gave Wilson and Co. last week when the company announced its union-smashing formula.

Negotiations were broken off when Wilson demanded the following conditions as terms of a strike settlement:

(1) The 2,000 non-strikers hired since the strike began three months ago will be retained as regular employees.

(2) The strikers will be put on a "preferential hiring" list and will be recalled as the company needs additional help.

(3) No striker guilty of "violence" or of an "illegal act" will be rehired under any circumstance.

(4) The company won't sign a union contract until the workers in the struck plants determine whether they want to be represented by the UPWA.

The company included the fourth demand after the National Brotherhood of Packinghouse Workers — an independent union — petitioned for elections in the six struck Wilson plants.

Morale among the strikers is still high after three months on the bricks. For instance, at Albert Lea, Minn., only ten of the original 1,100 workers who walked out Oct. 31 have scabbed.

Three top AFL-CIO officials have addressed large rallies of Wilson strikers to underscore labor's solidarity with the UPWA. Emil Mazey, secretary-treasurer of the United Auto Workers spoke at Albert Lea; James Carey, president of the International Union of Electrical Workers, spoke in Cedar Rapids, Iowa; and Thomas McCormick, secretary-treasurer of the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers, spoke in Kansas City.

Meanwhile, AFL-CIO unions have ordered a quarter of a million "Don't Buy Wilson" leaflets from the UPWA to be distributed to their members.

Working people throughout the country can help the Wilson strikers by adopting and popularizing the following slogan: "The Wilson Label is a Disgrace to You: Table."

Two thousand workers at an auto parts plant in Birmingham, England, walked off the job Jan. 17 when a foreman swore at one of the men.

There is not a single labor-management contract anywhere in America that is worth the paper it is written on if there is a Congress or state legislature that wants to weaken or destroy it.

The Jan. 16 AFL-CIO News reports the decision of umpire George Meany on the numbers dispute. "The federation president," says the News, "ruled out any test relating to the roll calls on final passage of the compromised bill that emerged from the Senate-House conference committee, declaring that at this point, labor and its friends in Congress had only a choice of 'two evils.'"

Thus, Meany summarily rules out the one test that makes any sense: How the "friends" voted on the final passage of the Kennedy-Landrum-Griffin bill — which Meany himself stigmatized as a "killer" bill. By doing so he condones the slippery practice of "making the record" on preliminary test votes to alibi the stab-in-the-back when the final vote — the one that really counts — is cast.

In effect, this is what Meany is saying: "Just be sure that you make the record, boys, and we'll see that you retain your standing in the League of Labor Friends."

So you see it is not as simple as the COPE statement would have us believe. Let us take one case that should be very simple: Nixon. That the undisputed Republican candidate for president is a cherished friend of big business.

(Continued on Page 4)

SWP Demands President End 'Security Risk' Screenings

NEW YORK, Jan. 26 — Complete abolition of the government's "industrial security" screening program was demanded today by the Socialist Workers party in a letter to Pres. Eisenhower. The SWP also supported a Jan. 20 request by the American Civil Liberties Union that a public hearing be held on a draft executive order to establish a new screening program for industrial workers. Such an executive order is expected to be issued shortly to replace the current one which was partially invalidated by the Supreme Court in a June 1959 decision.

The letter from Tom Kerry, SWP organization secretary also joined the ACLU in hitting at the reported plan to continue using faceless informers. The new executive order is being designed to meet the legal objections made by the

Supreme Court in the case of W. L. Greene, an aeronautical engineer and executive. He was fired on Navy orders from a plant whose main government contract was a device designed on the basis of testimony from faceless informers that his former wife, divorced eight years before, allegedly held "subversive" views.

In ordering Greene rehired, five of the justices of the high court strongly suggested that the whole procedure of firing employees on the basis of secret denunciations was unconstitutional. However, the actual decision of the court was limited to a technical point — that neither Congress nor the President had authorized those running the program to deny victims the right to confront and cross-examine their accusers.

(Continued on Page 4)

Those Trotskyist 'Reds' in the British Labor Party

Is Healy Really a Russian In an Irish Potato Sack?

By Murry Weiss

The witch-hunt against the British Marxists of the Socialist Labor League has not lessened any since our report in the Dec. 28 and Jan. 4 issues of the Militant.

This tendency, as most of our readers know, has been pressing for adoption of a fighting socialist program as a solution to the crisis that has plagued the Labor party for some years and which led to its defeat in the recent elections.

The labor bureaucrats responded by staging a hunt for "red conspirators." For the past year and a half they have been conducting a McCarthylike campaign against "Trotskyism." They even tried a few expulsions although widespread protest in the Labor party itself prevented a mass purge.

A number of radicals, who should know better, joined the pack against "Trotskyism." A few members of the Socialist Labor League buckled under the pressure, although the overwhelming majority rallied in magnificent style against the witch-hunters.

Early this month the Lancashire area of the National Union of Mineworkers, acting on a ukase from the National Executive Committee of the NUM, banned the Miner, a rank-and-file paper, for its association with the Socialist Labor League. The paper has a sale of 6,000 in the Lancashire and Yorkshire coal fields.

In this latest attack on the democratic rights of the left wing in the unions, the bureaucrats threatened to cut off the pensions of retiring miners and warned that sick workers would lose their jobs if they retained membership in the union branch which officially sponsored the paper.

The professional red-baiters stepped up their fire likewise. IRIS (Industrial Research and Information Services) is now concentrating every issue on

"exposing" the Trotskyists. This sheet uses the technique of Red Channels, listing names, reporting open conferences as if they were conspiratorial gatherings in cellars, blacklisting printshops that deal with "reds," and so on.

In its December 1959 issue the front page headline of IRIS reads: "Be Warned — Now!" In the guise of a report on the National Assembly of Labor sponsored by the SLL in November, it quotes National Secretary Gerald Healy "freely," that is, without quotation marks. And so "Healy" talks, of course, like a comic-strip Red "Rooshian" disguised in an Irish potato sack.

"We are more Communist than the Communists," Healy is supposed to have said. "We are Leninist-Marxists and intend to bring about a Communist society... Everyone who stands in our way will be opposed — We will not compromise — Strikes must be supported to give the workers experience of fighting for the establishment of a Marxist society."

"Trotskyists are Britain's most determined band of industrial and political agitators," IRIS reveals. The SLL "has six full-time, \$24.40 a week—M.W.—two in Scotland and one each in Liverpool, Manchester, Birmingham and London."

In its January issue IRIS really goes to town. "Shop Stewards, Watch Out!" it warns. The shop stewards' movement "has been revived and is now being permeated by Communists and Trotskyists who want to capture it for their own reasons."

But the choice item in the page of revelations refers to Peter Fryer's leaving the SLL. We are informed that "the personal column of Tribune recently carried an advert for sixpenny copies of Peter Fryer's answer to Socialist Labor

League's General Secretary, Gerry Healy."

This is in tune with the general stepping up of the campaign against the SLL that occurred when Fryer and a small group of intellectuals broke with the League and denounced Healy's organizational methods as "Stalinist." What a choice item! Publications like IRIS had been insisting all along that there is no difference between Trotskyists and Stalinists and now they had confirmation. Fryer himself, one of the founders of the SLL, and

Five Organizers on Fish and Chips

It is instructive to note how rigorously the logic of red-baiting operates, whether it is used in an attempt to break a strike, or on a wider scale to smash a political grouping. In the first instance, screaming about "reds" in the leadership of the strike is supposed to drive a wedge between the radicals and workers, who may hold conservative political views. Some of these workers are then induced, according to the calculations of the red-baiters, to go back to work. Next, all channels of publicity shout about a tremendous back-to-work movement. This is supposed to weaken the morale of the mass of strikers and panic them into giving up the struggle.

Admittedly the proportions are different, but the red-baiters are seeking to use the case of Fryer in the same way against the Socialist Labor League. For 20 months the capitalist press and the labor bureaucracy in England have been pointing at the Trotskyist "red" issue. In the midst of this, Peter Fryer resigns his post as editor of Newsletter, indicating that no political differences are involved; he is sick. Then the capitalist press reports him as having said that the national secretary of the SLL is "intolerant" and "dictatorial." A few individuals agree with Fryer.

This is then depicted as a **stampedo**. Apparently, the surest way in Britain to get big publicity is to break with the SLL.

Unfortunately, this standardized red-baiting technique is not being used solely by such obviously rabid right wingers as the editors of IRIS. Little centrist discussion groups, who have long been claiming that "Trotskyism equals Stalinism," and "Leninism contains the seeds of Stalinism," have picked up their ears joyfully at the baying about the red menace in the British Labor party.

Among these the Socialist Leader, newspaper of the Independent Labor party, has displayed imaginative appreciation of the opportunities. In the Jan. 9 issue, Walter Kendall, who likes to hint that he is an expert on Trotskyism, wrote "An Open Letter to Gerald Healy, General Secretary of the Socialist Labor League," in which he retails some of Fryer's wild charges and demands that Healy answer.

"If these charges (Fryer's and Cadogan's) are true," Kendall says, "then both yourself and the SLL are outside the workers' movement, and unworthy of any support." Kendall, however, is the loyal type, a persecuted radical's best friend. "My letter," he says, "offers you the opportunity to restore your reputation."

Startling "Proofs"

Here are some of the "proofs" Kendall offers that Healy is "acting in a manner indistinguishable from Stalin":

Item: "The SLL, with a membership of far less than 1,000, has five full-time organizers in the field. (We were misled by IRIS into hoping it was six—M.W.) If the Labor party, which you accuse of bureaucracy, had the same proportion, it would employ 10,000 professionals in addition to its office staff!" (Kendall's exclamation mark.) "In the SLL, as in Stalin's Russia, the apparatus has usurped control of the party."

Five organizers on fish and chips equals the economic basis of the privileged bureaucratic caste in the Soviet Union! Honest, it's not made up; Kendall really wrote that. At least the editor printed it.

Item: Kendall quotes Trotsky on the Stalinist suppression of the views of the Left Opposition: "The party is compelled to judge our disagreements on the basis of official interpreters and cribs, often illiterate as well as false, and nauseating to everybody."

Kendall asks: "Does not the treatment of Cadogan and Fryer, the apparent attempt to prevent a fair statement of their criticisms from reaching the membership, show that Trotsky's words might have been directed, not only against Stalin, but against yourself?"

No, Kendall, it does not. The fact is that Cadogan moved fourteen amendments to the SLL's policy at its founding conference. His position was fully presented by himself in a

discussion bulletin July 1959 which was made available to the membership along with the author's name, address and an invitation to write him. Does this resemble the Stalinist practice of gagging dissenting views?

When Cadogan grossly violated the discipline of the SLL and was expelled he publicly stated that he had been given fair treatment and allowed ample time for discussion. When Peter Fryer used Cadogan's expulsion as a pretext for resigning from the SLL, the League's leadership invited both him and Cadogan to fully present their views for discussion. And in order to remove the question of organizational discipline from the dispute the SLL proposed to suspend Cadogan's expulsion and lay the matter over to the next full conference of the League.

Can Accept Offer

Fryer is still perfectly free to accept the offer of the SLL and debate his differences, whatever they may be, before the membership of the SLL. Is he free to do the same in the Communist party? Isn't there something instructive in this difference between Trotskyism and Stalinism?

Item: Kendall says to Healy, "Fryer claims to give your opinions of your comrades. One is 'a primitive Irish peasant'; another 'could be a police agent'; one more 'is completely useless.' Each judgment is personal, each concerned with a struggle for personal power, NOT ONE INVOLVES A POLITICAL JUDGMENT." (Kendall's emphasis.) "The regime within the SLL today is, it seems, Stalinist to the core."

Now, after all, keep that up, and you'll drive us to exclamation marks. Kendall passes on some hearsay purporting to be accurate reports of remarks

made no one knows where or when. This is then presented as Healy's estimate of his comrades and we have the highly political judgment... "NOT ONE INVOLVES A POLITICAL JUDGMENT."

And so we proceed with remorseless logic from ordinary absurdities to sheer lunacy: "Not even Stalin at the height of his megalomania concentrated such power in his hands." (That sentence is so priceless it scarcely needs emphasis but Kendall put it in bold face.)

Item: Kendall, who writes for a paper that makes a sectarian principle of refusing to work in the Labor party, admonishes Healy: "For twelve years you consistently advocated that Marxists must work inside the Labor party and made this a cardinal point of your tactical approach. Suddenly, faced with

What Is Unique About the League

The creation of a Marxist working-class leadership in Great Britain could tip the scales in the world-wide struggle between dying capitalism and nascent socialism. Next to the U.S., Great Britain is the most powerful link in the chain of the remaining strongholds of capital. The British working class is one of the most advanced sections of the world proletariat, certainly in the capitalist orbit. It possesses a rich history of class struggle and revolutionary tradition. It has created its own class party and developed a socialist consciousness.

Consequently, the emergence of the Socialist Labor League is not a mere episode of obscure factional interest. The fact is that in the difficult process of building revolutionary parties, the SLL constitutes one of the most promising developments in many decades. For those who believe,

as we do, that the crisis of humanity boils down to the crisis which the working class faces in finding adequate political leadership, the emergence of the SLL can prove to be of the greatest consequence.

The first striking fact about the Socialist Labor League is that it places program and principles first. It decides these before proceeding to tactics and organization. This, in our opinion, is one of its greatest merits.

At the same time this is the cause of 99% of the animosity toward it. Mere activism, and

Labor party counter-action, significantly including the prospect of your own expulsion, all this was abandoned."

Everything here is utterly distorted and turned upside down. What has the SLL "suddenly" abandoned? Absolutely nothing! It has continued the Marxist policy of working for a socialist program in the Labor party. That is why the party bureaucrats opened "counter-action." The SLL was gaining ground for the views it advocated.

The motivation of the right-wing purgers of "Trotskyists" should be clear to every socialist. And every socialist should know where he stands in such a battle. Kendall is not on the right side. He says nothing about the right-wing witch-hunters. Such conduct violates the basic principles of class solidarity and should be condemned by every militant.

God knows the SLL is active, would hardly frighten the staid gentlemen of Transport House. Not seriously, that is. But to see the steady growth of a cadre of Marxists, who have theoretical capacities and use them, and, at the same time, fuse their program with the daily activities and struggles of the working masses — that is what disturbs the capitalists and their labor lackeys.

Organized a Struggle

The second striking fact about the Socialist Labor League is that it takes the Marxist program so seriously that it has organized a struggle for it in the Labor party against the false program of the misleaders. How else can Marxists act? How else can the cadres of Marxism be educated in the working class, among intellectuals and the youth?

How does the work of Marxists take shape in a Labor party dominated by such a bureaucratic leadership? Can they work without the democratic right to organize as a group of Marxists, to publish a paper, to advocate their views? Yes, they can, even when they are denied these elementary democratic rights. But it can not be done without fighting for these rights!

And that is exactly what the supporters of the Socialist Labor League are doing. More power to them. And let the Marxists in every corner of the world cheer them on and help them in every possible way. Experienced fight-

ers for socialism know very well that every step, however modest, in the construction of a revolutionary party encounters the

A Product of Regroupment

Another striking feature of the Socialist Labor League is that it emerged from the turbulent regroupment period following the Khrushchev revelations in 1956 as a fusion of previously separated elements on the basis of a commonly agreed upon principled program. It is the only organization in Britain of that kind, perhaps the only one in the world of such weight.

Even the editors of the Socialist Leader note this impressive fact. "The core of the (SLL) organization," they say in the Jan 9 issue, "is a group of pre-war Trotskyists under the leadership of Gerald Healy, supplemented by recruits made by the work within the Labor party and significantly increased by an influx of former Communists who left the Communist party after the Khrushchev speech and the suppression of the Hungarian workers' revolt."

What emerged is doubly notable. In addition to the numerical strengthening of the Marxist movement in Great Britain, the fusion signified a qualitative advance.

The group which came from the British CP was composed of two elements: (a) qualified intellectuals of the highest integrity who, unlike any other similar group in the world, delved into the historical and theoretical sources of Stalinism. Through arduous study they reached Trotskyist conclusions — and then did something about it. (b) A cadre of tested Communist worker militants with years of experience in the class struggle. These two interrelated elements, together with the cadres which the British Trotskyist movement had assembled previously in long years of struggle are a formidable combination.

It is not only a political regroupment of revolutionary socialists, it is a new beginning in the fusion of the best intellectuals in the academic and professional world with revolutionary workers. This is one of the key ingredients in the successful organization of a revolutionary tendency.

A revolutionary tendency is based in the working class and this, of course, must be reflected in its composition from top to bottom. But as the experience of the Marxist movement has demonstrated from Marx to Engels through Plekhanov, Mehring, De Leon, Liebknecht, Luxemburg, Lenin, Trotsky, and a host of others, the role of intellectuals who free themselves from capitalist ideology and fuse themselves with the destiny of the working class is of crucial importance.

Alasdair MacIntyre, a lecturer in philosophy at Leeds University, gave an instructive Marxist analysis of the various currents among British intellectuals in a talk over BBC which we highly

most stubborn resistance and punitive action from the ruling class and its agents in the labor movement.

recommend. (See the Militant, Jan. 26.)

MacIntyre points out that in addition to the "much publicized exodus [from the CP] to the right; there is the as important — or more important — exodus to the left." He observes that many of the former CP intellectuals, "who remained Marxists joined with their predecessors the British Trotskyists in founding a new Marxist revolutionary organization, the Socialist Labor League."

Not Surprising

Naturally, such a complex process as the testing of revolutionary intellectuals is not easy, smooth and free of setbacks. How could it be? One has only to examine the rich experience of the Russian Marxist movement to see this. In our times the relation between the Marxist movement and revolutionary intellectuals has become even more complicated, due to Stalinism. It is thus not surprising that the SLL should have lost a few of the intellectuals it gained when the fusion took place.

Marxist analysis can offer an illuminating insight into the attraction and repulsion which intellectuals experience in relation to Marxism. As we can see in the case of Britain, the final determinants are the ebbs and flows in world politics and behind them the alterations in class relations.

Why did we witness a swing to the left in 1956 among many intellectuals (as well as workers) in the British Communist party? The answer is well known. The Khrushchev revelations, the Poznan revolt, the subsequent Hungarian uprising and the broad workers' movement for democracy in Poland and Eastern Europe in general, precipitated an acute phase in the world crisis of Stalinism. For a moment the power of the bureaucracy seemed to waver, seemed even about to be shattered — and by the blows of workers imbued with a program of anti-capitalist, independent struggle for socialist democracy. Inspiring vistas opened up for the regeneration of the world revolutionary movement. Trotskyism, previously despised, was suddenly seen in a completely new light and became the subject of re-examination and deep concern to the most thoughtful and honest minds.

The highly progressive content of a revival of workers' democracy in the Soviet orbit was reflected in the new vigor and buoyancy it gave to currents in the Communist parties throughout the world. The fresh currents stirring in the Soviet bloc were sufficient to propel many of the most responsive radical intellectuals into the orbit of Trotskyism.

As often happens in the class struggle, the upsurge gave way to a decline. The attempt of the Hungarian workers was crushed. In the USSR, the power of the bureaucracy stabilized around the Khrushchev group. For many radicals the spotlight shifted from the struggle for workers' democracy to the bright economic developments in the Soviet Union and China.

Middle-class intellectuals, like all middle-class people, are particularly sensitive to shifts in power. Standing as a class between monopoly capital and the proletariat, vacillating between them, they are easy victims of power cults.

Even tested revolutionary elements can succumb. Note the veteran Bolsheviks who left the Trotskyist Opposition in 1929 and capitulated to Stalin when he suddenly took over the Trotskyist program on industrialization and collectivization. A group of Trotskyists capitulated under the slogan: We have won a victory, why continue the fight?

The cracks that appeared in the Stalinist monolith in 1956 opened the possibility of struggle against other bureaucratic formations at the summits of workers' organizations like the British Labor party. The momentary stabilization of Kremlin rule has now dampened such impulses and given the bureaucratic structures once again the appearance of unassailability. This has registered in the latest oscillations of sensitive elements in the radical intellectual camp all over the world.

The present "thaw" in the cold war has lessened the feeling of crisis and made it easier for some people to relax. Why fight bureaucrats when there are more

But these fighting socialists reply that they didn't choose the difficulties. They chose only to dedicate themselves to socialism and to face whatever came along.

Despite the immediate difficulties, long-range perspectives are excellent. The British Trotskyists are demonstrating qualities in the current struggle that should give socialists everywhere cause for the greatest optimism about the future in Britain.

An Objection...

January 12, 1960

To the Editor of the Militant

Dear Comrades,

I have just seen the article by Comrade Murry Weiss, "Guilty of Daring to Battle for Marxism," in your issue of January 4, 1960.

It is, naturally, Comrade Weiss's right to interpret in his own way recent developments in the policy and organization of the Socialist Labor League. What is regrettable indeed is to proceed to declarations of a scarcely responsible kind.

To suppose that "Socialist Fight" is in effect a Trotskyist paper, linked with the IVth International, according to the version now peddled by Comrade Weiss, is objectively to denounce this paper to the bureaucratic leadership of the Labor Party, and to provoke the expulsion of the comrades who support this paper.

It is feasible to propose to carry out a long-term entrust work in a Party such as the Labor Party and at the same time to agitate openly for another, revolutionary organization, the implacable enemy of reformism, such as the IVth International?

In the present relationship of forces between the revolutionary Marxists integrated in the LP and the bureaucratic leadership, such an attitude would be an adventure of guaranteed self-destruction of the entrust work.

That is the path chosen by the SLL since its formation, for reasons which escape ordinary understanding. Comrade Weiss now gives his approval to this policy of suicide, and after the example repeatedly provided by

the SLL press seeks to impose the same state on revolutionary Marxist forces which would try, with good reason, to maintain by all means a genuine entrust work.

I refuse, of course, to accept the version given by Comrade Weiss of "Socialist Fight" and its so-called links with the IVth International.

"Socialist Fight" is not an organ of the IVth International, and in particular has no links with me personally. My personal position is that of a militant elected to a particular position in a Marxist organization, democratically and collectively led: The IVth International, in connection with the precise accusation launched by Comrade Weiss against "Socialist Fight," I have taken the trouble to check the facts.

It is easy to obtain this paper, circulating freely in British labor movement circles.

In its issue dated August 1959, there is an article signed by Councillor Brian Deane replying to accusations launched by the SLL, which Comrade Weiss, without exercising critical judgment, now takes as his stand.

I quote in appendix this article in extenso:

From this quotation it is clear that the charge made by the SLL against the Left Labor paper which is "Socialist Fight" does not hold water, and that the facts, as often the case, were grossly twisted.

The "crime" of the LP members in Liverpool who support "Socialist Fight" was to refuse to follow the comrades of the SLL in their "operation suicide" within the LP, in declaring themselves members of an organization outside the LP.

The SLL has latterly chosen a peculiar way to proclaim the "truth": regardless of the particular circumstances of those whom it now considers to be its "enemies," often erstwhile militants in its own ranks, against whom it lets fall calculated "indiscretions" objectively equivalent to denunciations. This was the case, for example, with "Socialist Fight" and also with Comrade Peter Fryer, whose illegal presence in a semi-fascist country is denounced.

It is necessary resolutely to call a halt to this really factional backsliding, now damaging terribly the great name of Trotskyism in Great Britain.

It is to be hoped that after careful reflection on the facts, Comrade Weiss will likewise arrive at this opinion.

With my Communist Internationalist Greetings,

M. Pablo

... And the Editor's Reply

Dear Comrade Pablo,

We were pleased to receive your letter clarifying your relationship to "Socialist Fight." We hope that by publishing this and by clarifying the allusion in Comrade Weiss's article, to which you objected, we can make it clear that "Socialist Fight" is not at all linked with the Fourth International or with you personally.

I am sure that Comrade Weiss did not intend to imply the existence of organizational ties in the brief reference he made to "Socialist Fight" and to its association and the association of its supporters with Trotskyists internationally "who belong to a faction headed by Michel Pablo in the Fourth International."

What Comrade Weiss actually referred to, or meant to refer to, was the common political position held by you and the supporters of "Socialist Fight" in relation to the attack that has been mounted against the British Trotskyists by a wide range of foes.

We take it that you do not question the accuracy of the reference in that context, or the propriety of discussing it, since in your letter you solidarize politically with the supporters of "Socialist Fight" in this question and defend their position against the Socialist Labor League.

We note also that you indicate in your letter that your political sympathy for such opponents of the Socialist Labor League extends to Peter Fryer, whose rather wild charges, evidently colored by emotion, offer little of interest, in our opinion, except as symptoms of vacillations of a kind seen often enough among some intellectuals suffering from an ambivalent attitude toward the Marxist movement.

We regret that you would lend a sympathetic ear to complaints of that kind, particularly in view of the way reactionary forces are scavenging for such things for their own purposes.

Your charges regarding possible "indiscretions" which you interpret as "objectively equivalent" to denouncing comrades to right-wing bureaucrats and even semifascist authorities, seem to us without factual foundation. It would be well to with-

draw them, we think, in the interest of reducing the heated factional atmosphere and establishing more comradely relations.

We wish that all the factions, groupings and tendencies that adhere to the Fourth International, or consider themselves cothinkers, would decide to close ranks in a situation like this and follow policies to facilitate this aim. Much of our criticism of your policy in Britain stems from this consideration.

In the latest issue of the magazine "4th International," for instance, we were struck by the fact that although you printed an article about the British Labor party and the crisis it faces, you did not mention the witch-hunt against the Socialist Labor League. The issues raised by the Socialist Labor League are at the heart of the crisis in the British Labor party. It would therefore seem essential, even from the limited aims of an analytical article, to defend with the utmost vigor the Trotskyist tendency which has been proscribed by the right-wing bureaucrats.

Many of your readers, rightly or wrongly, will come to the conclusion that such an oversight is deliberate; this in turn is not conducive to narrowing the present unfortunate division in the Fourth International.

In your letter, too, you appear to blame the victims for the witch-hunting visited upon them, since you imply that they invited it by a self-immolating tactic, an "operation suicide." To give any comfort whatever to the witch-hunters because they have highly debatable tactical differences with the victims is a strange position for a Trotskyist leader. It is scarcely calculated to convince the victims or their supporters that you are interested in narrowing political differences.

We feel this all the more keenly because we have been impressed with the argument — and you happen to be among those who have voiced it rather strongly — that the political differences among the various groupings in the world Trotskyist movement have narrowed to such manageable proportions that organizational unity is called for. If you really believe this, your failure to open a

vigorous campaign in support of the British Trotskyists who are under concerted attack from centrists, right-wing bureaucrats, and professional red-baiters is quite difficult to understand.

Some comrades have come to the conclusion that in reality you are not interested in unity and that your main concern at the moment in Britain is to seek immediate gains for your faction by approaching those in the Socialist Labor League or its fringes who might buckle under the attack that has been launched by the foes of Trotskyism. Such a policy seems to us so short-sighted that we hesitate to subscribe to this ungenerous interpretation. It would seem much more to the interests of a faction that believes itself capable of loyally representing Trotskyism as a whole to deliberately demonstrate in this situation how it would act if the movement were united and its leaders were holding elected positions of authority. In other words to give the Trotskyist movement a sample of what could be expected from you in a united organization.

In our opinion the best course for every comrade to follow, no matter which faction he favors, is to seek to uphold the interests of the world revolutionary-socialist movement as a whole. Right now these are heavily involved in the historically important struggle in Britain. Every genuine socialist, we believe, should feel it his first duty to close ranks against the enemies who have set up a united front against the specter of Trotskyism. Let's unite in a counter campaign! We think this is the only principled course. We hope that responsible revolutionary-socialists in every part of the world will recognize this and act accordingly.

We trust that you will not feel offended at our frankness. Our intention is simply to suggest, from where we see the struggle, that the advantages to be gained from a change in your course in Britain could prove considerable to the world movement for revolutionary socialism.

Again we want to thank you for your letter.
Fraternally yours,
Joseph Hansen

Subscribe!

To keep up with the real meaning of big events at home and abroad, you need the Militant. Try it for six months. Send your name and address and \$1.

The Militant
116 University Pl.
New York 3, N.Y.

Enclosed is \$1 for a six-months trial subscription.

Name

Street

City

State

Subscription: \$3 a year; Canadian, \$3.50; foreign, \$4.50. **THE MILITANT** Second class postage paid at New York, N. Y.

Editor: JOSEPH HANSEN Managing Editor: DANIEL ROBERTS Business Manager: KAROLYN KERRY
Published weekly by the Militant Publishing Assn., 116 University Pl., N. Y. 3, N. Y. Phone: CH 3-2140.
Signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the Militant's policies. These are expressed in editorials.

Vol. XXIV — No. 5

Monday, February 1, 1960

The Crisis in France

For the second time in twenty months, the French working class has received sharp notice of a deepening trend toward fascism.

The combination is much the same as in May 1958. It consists of (a) semi-military organizations among the French colons in Algeria; (b) the officer corps—spearheaded by the paratroop commanders—waging the imperialist war against the Algerian Arabs; and (c) right-wing politicians including several members of De Gaulle's cabinet.

This is a determined combination. Its rallying cry is "L'Algerie Francaise"—"Algeria is French"—which means no compromise with the Arab national independence movement. But the "Algeria is French" crowd seeks more than military victory against the Moslems. It wants a "strong" government for France like that of Mussolini, Hitler and Franco.

The fascists seek to recapture the "glory" of the French empire and to avenge France's defeats at the hands of the colonial revolution in Indo-China and North Africa by punishing the "traitors" at home. Working-class militants head the list of those they consider "traitors." They thus threaten a blood bath of the working-class organizations.

The "Algeria is French" party has already scored one success. Its uprising in Algeria and Corsica in 1958 smashed the parliamentary democracy of the Fourth Republic and substituted the "strong man" regime of De Gaulle. That was the first step toward a totalitarian government.

De Gaulle virtually stripped parliament of its powers. His constitution provided for elections easily rigged to return right-wing majorities. It armed the president—that is, De Gaulle—with the power to rule by decree whenever he chooses to declare an "emergency." De Gaulle's bonapartist rule, however, has retained a number of democratic trappings. These, together with his offer of "self-determination" (meager as it is) to the Algerian Moslems, have inflamed the colons and military.

Once more the fascists are seeking to advance. The resistance of the colons to De Gaulle's "self-determination" scheme, the fraternization between them and the paratroopers and the connivance of the army command in Algeria with the colon's rebellion—all these developments have again opened the door to further strengthening of the fascist tendency.

The French working class must cope with this danger without delay. For the paralysis of the French labor movement—imposed by its Communist-party, Socialist-party and trade-union leadership—has been one of the principal causes of the recurring fascist threat.

Potentially, the workers are the stronger force in the situation. A mass demonstration of the workers' organizations, siding with the Algerian Moslems, and advertising labor's readiness to resist the colons and the army brass, can drastically alter the situation. The army officers and colons are reported to have drawn back in 1958 from attempting an invasion of France for fear of precipitating a civil war which they believed the workers would win.

The Germans Say 'Nazis Raus'

The outbreak of anti-Semitism in West Germany has served to call attention to the fascist tendencies that are again festering in the social fabric of that country. But insufficient attention has been given, we feel, to the fact that the vast majority of the West German people are opposed to neo-Nazism and are trying to find means to stamp it out.

In a Jan. 24 report from Bonn, New York Times correspondent Sidney Gruson writes that most observers there are agreed that the outbreak does not "signify . . . that the Germans as a people have retained the Nazis' racial teachings."

Gruson continues: "At least to this reporter, the group in a Darnstadt bar who threatened to rough up a man shouting anti-Semitic slogans was more representative of the German people's feelings and attitudes than the muted voices of approval for the swastika painters and slogan smearers."

However this sentiment is not reflected in the actions of the Adenauer regime. It has sought to placate West German and international anger over anti-Semitism with pious pronouncements but stubbornly refuses to take any meaningful steps to strike at the sources of the outbreak.

Gruson's report confirms that the West German government has taken only "minimal" steps against those responsible for the anti-Semitic acts and that it has refused

Just the same, the fascist junta undoubtedly took note of how the Communist and Socialist party leaders acted in the crisis. The latter shrank from mobilizing the working-class organizations for united struggle. They relied on bourgeois liberals like Premier Pflimlin to preserve the Fourth Republic. And they presented the workers no proposals for struggle when Pflimlin handed the power to De Gaulle.

In the present crisis the working-class leaders are relying on De Gaulle to defeat the fascists. Vain hope! Given the army's "neutrality" in the conflict, De Gaulle cannot cope with the "Algeria is French" mob without calling on the workers to come to his aid.

De Gaulle is a faithful servant of big business and is unwilling or unable to take decisive action against the most determined partisans of capitalist reaction. That is why, in the current crisis, he seeks to get the colons and the army to back down voluntarily.

While the European population in Algeria is ranged against De Gaulle, the lines are not yet drawn clearly in the population in France. To offset the potential strength of the working class, the fascists must win significant backing from the petty-bourgeois masses in metropolitan France. This they lack at present.

If the workers manage to break the paralysis and dependence on De Gaulle foisted on them by their leaders, they can rally the petty-bourgeois masses or at least neutralize them and thereby cut the ground out from under their foes.

How the French working class tackles the fascist advance is of momentous importance to the working people throughout the world. The events in France foreshadow developments in all other major capitalist countries.

In every one of them, the army and police are shot through with killer types nursing their grievances against "traitors" and waiting for the time when they can settle accounts with the working class, the liberals, the Jews, the "enemy" abroad. In this country, Sen. McCarthy's campaign in the early 1950's against "twenty years of treason" made rapid headway among the brass and the police forces as well as among reactionary politicians. We may be sure that in West Germany, the Nazis, returned to their posts, are biding their time for the most opportune moment to stage a coup.

In addition, in several countries, entire sections of the population—such as the colons in Algeria—are steeped in racism and can be readily mobilized behind a fascist solution.

Conditions today favor the swift maturing of fascist tendencies and periodically create opportunities for them to bid for power unless the working class moves just as swiftly to counteract them.

Even if beaten back by vigorous demonstrations of workers' strength, the threat of fascism will be renewed in France as long as capitalism remains in power. The working-class struggle against fascism is thus synonymous in the final analysis with the fight for a socialist government.

to concede to the "mounting public pressure" to kick out the former Nazis who hold posts in the regime at all levels.

The source of Adenauer's resistance to popular anti-fascist sentiment is not difficult to determine. At a Jan. 20 meeting with Pope John, Adenauer proclaimed that "God" had given his government the assignment to spearhead the cold war against the USSR. The statement is entirely accurate if the words "U.S. imperialism" are substituted for the word "God."

The hard fact is that the American big-business government is the supreme power in West Germany today. And it has no more desire to stamp out racism there than it does to stamp it out at home.

This is the great problem confronting the West German people as they grapple with the problem of how to oust the Nazis. They face the combined resistance of Adenauer and his Washington masters who decreed the halt to the post-war de-Nazification and who released the Nazis from jail to join the Adenauer government and to reassume the reins of German industry.

Solidarity with the anti-fascist demands of the West German people calls for mounting pressure in this country for an end to the cold-war remilitarization and re-Nazification of West Germany and for the withdrawal of the U.S. troops which bolster the forces of reaction in that country.

They Brought De Gaulle to Power



Members of fascist groups in Paris marched on the French National Assembly in May 1958 shortly after the successful coup of the colons and the generals in Algeria. Though the police dispersed this particular demonstration, the pressure of the fascists in France and Algeria led the National Assembly to hand power to De Gaulle.

Why Algeria's "Colons" Want Nazilike Regime

By George Lavan

Who are the French "mutineers" in Algiers? Why have they taken up arms against the De Gaulle regime which they did so much to bring to power in France just a year and a half ago?

The armed groups who have barricaded themselves in the government buildings in downtown Algiers can be likened on the American political scene to the Ku Klux Klan and White Citizens Councils—with the difference that in Algeria the whites (Europeans) are a small minority of the population.

They are fighting mad against De Gaulle not because his "self-determination" plan for Algeria gives the colony any chance of independence but because it is a cover for a compromise to end the war by giving the Algerians some concessions. And the extremist colons bitterly oppose any reform whatsoever of the political, social, economic and cultural oppression of the Algerian people.

Algeria is the oldest and most profitable of French imperialism's colonies. Its population is about 10 million, about 12% of which are French colonists or "colons." These are not necessarily French or of French descent; the term is racial, meaning any settler of European ancestry.

The standard of living of the native population—in terms of food, shelter and clothing—is lower now than when French armies conquered the country a century and a quarter ago.

Almost all the arable land was taken away from the Algerian people by French plantation owners, corporations and wealthy farmers. The native Algerians were reduced virtually to serfdom in their own country, becoming sharecroppers and low-paid wage workers.

They live in rural slums and urban shanty towns—victims of malnutrition and disease. In the few schools allowed them, Arabic, their own tongue, was declared a foreign language and the rulers carried on a persistent campaign to denigrate and destroy the native culture.

Constituting about 12% of the population, the colons owned 67% of the country's wealth at the outbreak of the independence revolt in 1954.

In violation of the people's will and the facts of geography, this Moslem country in North Africa was declared by French law to be part of European France. One of the reasons for the Algerian independence fighters' mistrust of De Gaulle's offer of elections sometime in the future to decide Algeria's status is that Algeria has had "elections" for some time. These were rigged so that the Algerian 88% of the population could never outvote the European 12%; moreover, the Algerians found that because of corruption and intimidation they could not even elect their own representatives—the Algerians who

won office were hand-picked stooges of the colons, or as Americans would put it, Uncle Toms.

Whenever the Algerians tried to build their own parties the French would declare them illegal and break them up with arrests, or as with the African North Star Party in 1946 by massacring tens of thousands.

The present war for independence broke out in November 1954. In France the war was as unpopular as the "dirty" war then being waged in Indo-China.

In the 1955 elections the Social Democratic and Communist parties campaigned on slogans for ending the war in Algeria. Both parties received big votes and right-wing Socialist leader, Guy Mollet, became premier. He soon made a visit to Algeria where the colons, infuriated by his intention to negotiate the Algerian freedom fighters with reforms, organized violent demonstrations against him.

Mollet's knees buckled after he had been pelted with garbage during a speech. This traitor to socialism surrendered completely to the colons and their semi-fascist organizations. Instead of negotiating with the independence fighters, he ordered the war of repression intensified.

Emergency powers, making Algeria a police state, were given to the colon officials and army officers. Adding another page of betrayal to its record on freedom struggles in French colonies, the Communist party members of the French Chamber of Deputies voted for these bloody measures.

From that moment the colons and the reactionary army officers in Algeria constituted an independent power. Not only was the Arab population in the big cities and coastal areas of the country ruthlessly purged of all suspected advocates of independence, but among the colons themselves all sentiment for granting independence or compromising was stamped out.

Government and army officials helped solidify the colons into the most extreme anti-Arab attitudes and encouraged the growth of fascist organizations among them.

By 1958 this army brass-colon combination was strong enough to start the train of events that ended parliamentary democracy in France itself.

Like Nazis

French imperialism's war in Algeria is one of the most barbarous and brutal in history. Only the Nazi extermination of the Jews and treatment of the populations in Poland and the USSR exceed it in savagery.

Torture of Algerian prisoners is a standard practice and a leading recreation for the paratroopers who have evolved on lines similar to Hitler's SS units.

One of the Nazi's most infamous deeds in World War II was the reprisal shooting of the male population and burning of the Czech village of Lidice. This crime has been duplicated repeatedly by the French army in Algeria. A French priest, a colon himself, exiled from Algeria by the army, has estimated that a million Algerians have already been killed.

The great majority of these were not killed on the battlefield but were villagers, killed in reprisals or to set an example, and prisoners in jails and camps for suspects.

Drained by a war which had no prospect of ending, pressured by U.S. imperialism which all along has been footing a good part of that war's cost, French

capitalism in the spring of 1958 cast about for some compromise short of independence to end the struggle.

At this point the army brass and colons staged a rebellion in Algeria. The French parliament and its capitalist parties, rotten to the core, shook with terror.

The leadership of the huge working-class Socialist and Communist parties showed themselves impotent, their only "program" was to support the capitalist politicians, who in a matter of days sold out.

The French bourgeoisie, sections of the government bureaucracy, and the Catholic hierarchy decided to seize the opportunity to rid France of parliamentary democracy. They joined with the army generals and colons to bring De Gaulle to power as a "strong man."

Thus ingloriously ended the Fourth Republic and began the Bonapartist regime of De Gaulle.

In Other Lands

U.S. Pact Leaves Japanese Cold

People Fear Being Dragged into War

The military pact between the United States and Japan signed in Washington Jan. 19 is getting a cool reception in Japan. Stripped of diplomatic verbiage about the "equality" of the alliance, the pact ensures continuation of U.S. military bases in Japan and on Japanese islands for at least eleven more years. It confronts the people of Japan with the danger of being embroiled in a U.S.-sparked Far Eastern war.

"Despite assurance of the treaty's peaceful intent . . . many Japanese still seem obsessed by the fear it might increase the danger of their country becoming involved in a war it did not choose," East Asian correspondent Takashi Oka reports in the Jan. 23 Christian Science Monitor.

The two dominant sentiments in Japan today, the report continued, are "extreme sensitivity toward the merest hint of nuclear weapons, and intensely idealistic fervor for pacifism."

The Monitor correspondent gently suggests that in his projected visit to Japan, Eisenhower will not beat the war drums but rather "both recognize and creatively utilize" the powerful anti-war sentiment in that country.

Warn of Moves To Block Sated Ceylon Elections

Political parties in Ceylon have vigorously condemned the action of Prime Minister Dahanayake in setting up a Ministry of Internal Security.

They warned Jan. 21 that this may be part of a plan to postpone the pending general elections and rule by dictatorial "emergency" powers.

Dr. N. M. Perera of the Lanka Samasamaja party (Trotskyist), who was leader of the Opposition in the parliament dissolved Dec. 7, called for a meeting of leaders of opposition parties; and plans were reported under way to force a reconvening of parliament as a preliminary to holding the elections March 19.

Dahanayake, whose "caretaker" government took over after the assassination of Prime Minister Bandaranaike by a Buddhist monk, is thoroughly unpopular in the country and is

The American Way of Life

Not Recommended for Children

A new adult game is on the market that clearly deserves a federal subsidy. Called "Diplomacy," it's the answer to the State Department's shortage of trained personnel. Participants in the game play as great powers of Europe in 1914. They deploy pieces, representing their armed might, on a board that is an authentic map of that period. Object of the game is to capture a majority of fleets and armies.

One of the attractions of the game is that "any tactic based on deception is legitimate," according to inventor Allan B. Calhauer.

The Jan. 11 Publisher's Weekly explains the game further: "Players may form secret alliances and plan their moves jointly or they may even double-cross their allies. Among the nefarious tricks entirely permissible are 'military intelligence' (peeking as another player writes down his moves); 'infiltration' (slipping extra pieces on the board unnoticed); 'backstabbing' (showing an ally one set of orders and then making an entirely different move)."

The retail price of \$6.95 includes a free subscription for a newsletter, the Dispatch, which reports latest ideas in playing the game and new "sly devices" for winning.

Publisher's Weekly says the game "is not recommended as good character training for children." Sounds like double talk from "Diplomacy." Are there any easier lessons in the American Way of Life?

A Dry Martini Or a Book of Math?

Dr. Charles W. Shilling of the Atomic Energy Commission says that America is wasting its intellectual resources. He offers some impressive figures to illustrate his point.

Americans spent \$10½ billion in one year on alcoholic drinks, he says, and only \$9 billion the same year on public, grade and high schools.

Despite the cancer scare, Americans plunked down more than \$4½ billion for cigarettes but only about \$3 billion to operate colleges and universities.

About \$296 million went into the coffers of the chewing gum manufacturers in a year, he said, but only about \$217 million for all federally supported basic research.

And, he added with a sniff, some \$77 million was spent for external personal deodorants and \$71 million for lipstick, while federal support for basic research on the life sciences amounted to only \$70 million.

Dr. Shilling overlooked one other small but related figure. Next year the American people will dump (whether they like it or not) some \$46 billion into expenditures related to war. A quick calculation might suggest that this would provide two martinis, two packs of cigarettes, five sticks of gum, a lipstick and a jar of deodorant daily for every American and still leave plenty for developing our intellectual resources.

Hipster Problem

Author Herbert Gold believes that American youth today don't see a cause worth identifying with. "When people my age and older were young, they could become young Socialists or young Communists or even young Fascists and really try to change the world."

But to a young man interested in politics today, "it might appear that as between the two political parties he has a choice of twiddle-dum and twiddle-dee."

That's like a choice between being a square or a cube. The youth decides like, man, he's not with it. He becomes a hipster, a "non political expression of non politics."

According to Gold, "A hipster smokes a cigar, reads Life magazine and makes love all at the same time." That shows what he thinks of them and the system.

Until America is no longer offed at fighting types like McCarthy, Gold believes, "we will have hipsters."

— Harry Ring

given little chance of surviving an election.

The Ceylon Observer warned Jan. 24 that agent provocateurs may attempt to rekindle communal strife so that Dahanayake "will be in a position to put into swift and ruthless operation the dictatorial plans that are now under way."

U.S. Approves Krupp Keeping Ruhr Empire

While officially deploring neo-Nazi acts of anti-Semitic vandalism in West Germany, the U.S. government acted Jan. 25 to ensure that Alfred Krupp, the powerful Nazi industrialist, will continue to operate his giant steel and coal industries. To help soften public opposition to this, Krupp had magnanimously announced Christmas Eve that he would grant a cash payment of 5,000 marks—about \$1,190—to each Jewish survivor who could establish that he or she had been a slave laborer in a Krupp enterprise.

At the close of World War II, Krupp, a principal Hitler backer, was sentenced to a 12-year prison term as a war criminal. In 1951 he was released on U.S. orders after serving but three years. His property was returned, with the face-saving provision that he dispose of it by the end of 1959. When the deadline arrived he blandly announced he couldn't find a buyer and U.S. authorities sympathetically agreed to the two extensions.

Now profiting from U.S. war plans even more than he profited from Hitler's, Krupp's industrial complex grossed about \$1 billion last year. His new power has encouraged the Adenauer regime in its policy of retaining former Nazis in high office.

Cuba and Egypt Sponsor Parley Of Small Nations

The United Arab Republic has agreed to join Cuba in sponsoring a conference in Havana next September of underdeveloped countries of Latin America, Africa and Asia. It is reported that only those belonging to the United Nations will be invited. This would exclude the People's Republic of China.

The agreement was reached

during Cuban Foreign Minister Dr. Raul Roa's visit to Cairo. He is on a tour seeking to establish ties for his country's new regime.

Dr. Roa also worked out an agreement for an exchange of visits between Premier Castro and President Nasser. An exchange of visits has also been arranged between the Cuban leader and President Tito of Yugoslavia.

The Cuban government is sending representatives to Latin America and Asia to seek support for the conference.

Guatemala Faces University Crisis

The University of San Carlos, Guatemala's lone institution of higher learning, may be compelled to shut its doors because the country's U.S.-installed regime has fallen three months behind in its legally required monthly subsidy to the university.

Poland Eases Abortion Rules

The Polish Health Ministry announced regulations Jan. 11 that will simplify obtaining an abortion. From now on the sole requirement for a legal abortion by state medical authorities will be a declaration by a woman to a doctor that "she is in particularly difficult material conditions justifying interruption of pregnancy," according to the official Polish news agency.

Previous laws involved long delays and resulted in a higher rate of illegal abortions, the agency said.

Auto Production In Western Europe Reaches New Level

Western Europe produced 4 million automobiles last year, whereas the U.S. produced 5.5 million. Ten years ago, the American industry supplied 84% of the world market and Western Europe only 13%. Last year the U.S. share was 56% and Western Europe's 41%.

According to the Jan. 11 U.S. News and World Report, steady automation accounts for Europe's rapid gains over production in this country. Today, U.S. plants have the edge over those in Europe only in making greater use of electronic "brains" and in size of operations.

Special Know-How Displayed in the Missile Business

Editor: Here in Denver the Martin Company is putting on a drive to produce a Titan intercontinental ballistic missile that will get off the ground. Several of Martin's ICBM's have exploded on the pad down at Cape Canaveral. Failure of the last one was blamed on loose bolts. (And nuts?)

Convar, the producer of the rival Atlas ICBM, is trying to convince the Pentagon that it should be given the exclusive on the weapon. But Martin has shown some real technical know-how in blocking such moves. The papers report that the company has been flying Defense Department brass down to its swanky Bahamas vacation club. I also read that Martin has sixty-three ex-brass on its payroll, including nine ex-generals or ex-admirals.

Music to Eat A Paper By

Editor: Only to say thanks for the paper's existence. And that I've not written to say so before is a sad

thing as I know anyone working for the labor, radical side of the social problem always needs encouragement. While working and studying at the University of Chicago I became interested in socialism and eventually joined the Young Socialist Supporters group there. Since I've been here in rural Ohio this past year your paper has been practically the only contact I've had with the left's current views and ambitions. Again my thanks and best wishes to you to continue such a fine paper.

Queries Estimate Of John L. Lewis

Editor: I was somewhat confused with the article by Joseph Keller on John L. Lewis in your Dec. 28, 1959, issue.

While I do not know much about the history of the United Mine Workers with Lewis as their leader I have read James P. Cannon's book, "The Struggle for a Proletarian Party" and Cannon's observations on Lewis are diametrically opposed to Keller's.

Cannon says of Lewis (page 217), "He (the UMW) is headed by a thoroughgoing scoundrel and agent of the master class who also differs from Stalin

only in degrees of power and opportunity" and quotes the strikebreaking activity of the same John L. Lewis who in Keller's words "has earned an honorable place in history."

Whose history? A. McL. Glasgow, Scotland

(Keller was measuring Lewis against the other labor fakers. In comparison to them, Keller's opinion was that Lewis had earned honorable rating. For another article on Lewis dealing with the Stalinist estimate of the head of the United Mine Workers, see the Militant of Jan. 25. The author of this article, M. L. Stafford, criticizes Lewis, as Keller did, for his bureaucratic suppression of democracy in the union and for his support of capitalist politicians. "The conservative, even reactionary political outlook of John L. Lewis," declares Stafford, "dealt momentous injury to the American labor movement as a whole. And it did the mine workers no good." — Editor.)

Passes It On

Editor: Enclosed are three dollars for renewal of your educational paper. I really enjoy reading it and passing it along. A. U. Bellingham, Wash.

Lobby Against Shipyard Bill On West Coast

By Jack Wright

SEATTLE, Jan. 24 — Last night I attended a meeting of the Seattle Metal Trades Council, AFL-CIO. At this meeting there was much discussion of a bill now pending in Congress to repeal the six per cent differential on contracts which favor West Coast shipyards. At the present time West Coast yards are allowed contracts at a figure six per cent higher than competing eastern shipbuilders.

The Metal Trades Council, the West Coast shipyards, the Chamber of Commerce and sundry other groups are trying to defeat this bill by organizing a well-financed lobby. To accomplish this they are out to raise \$25,000. The Metal Trades Council has pledged \$2,500 of this amount, the rest is to be raised by contributions from various unions, the Chamber of Commerce, employer groups, etc. Governor Rossellini has personally pledged \$1,000.

At first glance this might appear to some workers as a very worthy enterprise that would provide work for West Coast shipyard workers.

But widespread unemployment exists East, West, North and South, and this maneuver, even if successful, will not alter the over-all picture one iota. There will be only so many ships built, whether these ships are built in the East or the West. If the West Coast yards get more contracts, the East Coast yards will get less. Employment will rise slightly in the West and fall by the same amount in the East.

The answer to the problem of shipyard unemployment is no different from that of unemployment in general. To solve this problem labor, East, West, North and South must work together in unity for the six-hour day with no reduction in pay.

Only then will the West Coast get its share of shipbuilding as well as other industrial work, because with the six-hour day all of the available nation-wide labor force will be utilized.

Screenings

(Continued from Page 1) The executive order now being drafted offers what the Jan. 17 New York Times calls "significant concessions to the principle that suspects should be able to confront their accusers."

These "significant concessions" are so well hedged in by "ifs" and "buts" as to render them meaningless. According to the Times report, the draft provides that the name of "a genuine confidential informant" — i.e., a paid FBI stool pigeon — may be withheld if disclosure of the stool pigeon's identity would be "substantially harmful to the national interests."

In the case of "casual informants," such as next-door neighbors of the accused, the right of confrontation could also be denied if the informant is said to be unavailable because of "death, severe illness or some other good and sufficient reason."

The sole "protection" offered against abuse of these "minor" exceptions to the rule of the right of confrontation is that the head of the federal agency involved would now "certify" the need for shielding the identity of the informant.

The ACLU letter points out that these broad "exceptions" mean that the new order will not meet the "constitutional requirements of due process and will only lead to repetition of some of the individual cases of injustice which occurred under the old program. . . . We know from the sorry record of the 50's that too frequently mere gossip of a next-door neighbor formed a major part of a security risk charge."

Tom Kerry charged that the attempt to continue the faceless-informer practice shows that the "security" program itself is not based on the commission of unlawful acts but represents in reality "a hounding of those industrial workers suspected of holding minority political views."

The basis for the victimization of thousands under the screening program, he added, "has been the charge of association, real or alleged, with organizations arbitrarily branded 'subversive' by the Attorney General."

Gladys Barker Runs For U.S. Senator

NEWARK — Members and supporters of the Socialist Workers party have opened a drive to obtain the independent nominating petitions necessary to win a place on the ballot for Gladys Barker, candidate for U.S. Senator from New Jersey. Accepting the proposed nomination, Gladys Barker said:



GLADYS BARKER

Can They Tie a Knot?

(Continued from Page 1) Nixon is considered "wrong" on every count. One would think that the decision of the labor statesmen would be unanimous in this case. Judged by the yardstick used to measure "friends" and "enemies," Nixon should be slated for summary punishment. The attitude of the labor leaders on the 1960 presidential race was canvassed by Rosco Born, staff reporter for the Wall Street Journal. Born reports his findings in the Jan. 18 issue. "The AFL-CIO high command," he begins, "is now preparing to sit out the 1960 Presidential campaign. It is willing to let the White House fall to Richard Nixon without a concerted fight."

According to "key union leaders," says Born, there will be no national AFL-CIO endorsement in the presidential race; no activity by COPE which "will concentrate on Congressional contests." It is conceded that this will aid Nixon. But, says Born, top union leaders reason that Nixon will be elected anyway — barring unforeseen accident. And, he continues:

"While most of the union chieftains who now plan to shun the Democratic nominee will not cozy up to Mr. Nixon, the plain fact is that they are not greatly alarmed by the expectation of his victory. A Nixon administration wouldn't be good, but it wouldn't hurt us too much either; one union tactician remarks, 'It would be about like the Eisenhower Administration, or maybe just a little worse.'"

An important factor motivating the decision to "sit this one out," says Born, is to teach the Democrats a lesson. The union leaders complain: "Democrats have proved themselves ungrateful for past union support. Specifically, the heavily Democratic Congress elected in 1958 with a 'strong push from labor' has enacted a hated new anti-corruption law, and failed to pass many bills on the AFL-CIO's 'must' list."

"So, the labor statesmen reason, 'this is the ideal time to teach the Democrats a lesson. Labor nevertheless "deeply concerned and perplexed" by Castro's "virulent" anti-American attacks. Opposition to this policy of "patience" is gaining ground in Washington. Senator Kenneth B. Keating (R-N.Y.) declared that Eisenhower should be given authority to revise the sugar quotas to "drive home to the Castro regime the economic facts of life."

Cuban People Cheer Ouster

(Continued from Page 1) will have to be made through 20-year bonds at 4 1/2% interest. The foreign owners protest the Cuban government's low evaluation of their properties. Cuban officials say they are basing their estimates on property taxes paid during Batista's rule. Carefully avoiding this point, another State Department note, the latest in a series, protested the "denial of the basic rights of ownership of United States citizens in Cuba."

President Eisenhower announced Jan. 26 that the U.S. would continue its policy of "no reprisals" against Cuba. He is

"Burglar" Cops Hauled Plunder In Patrol Cars

Chicago's Democratic administration has a reeking new scandal on its hands — this one with a novel twist. Seventeen members of the city's police force have been suspended on charges of participating in a burglary ring that is reported to have accumulated some \$100,000 worth of loot over a two-year period. Police Commissioner Timothy J. O'Connor has resigned his post because of "ill health" and has been handed the lower-paying position of captain.

Discovery of the burglary ring came after the arrest of Charles Morrison, 25, a reported "master" burglar. According to State's Attorney Benjamin Adamowski, Morrison admitted he acted as a second-story man, breaking into North Side business places at night while police members of the ring cruised the area in their patrol cars acting as lookouts and then hauling off the loot in the cars.

At least four truckloads of stolen goods were recovered from the homes of five of the cops said to be involved. The merchandise included television sets, radios, draperies, tires, revolvers, outboard motors, furniture and batteries.

The operation was so efficiently organized that cops were able to "order" specific merchandise that they needed at the moment such as antifreeze for their cars and other seasonal equipment, Adamowski said.

The scandal has been happily seized by the state Republican administration headed by Governor William G. Stratton, who is now demanding that Mayor Daly "clean up his city — or else."

Daly replied by telling newsmen to "ask the Governor about the Hodge scandal." Orville Hodge, a Republican, is doing a 15-year hitch in prison for helping himself to more than \$1 1/2 million in 1956 while state auditor.

An analysis of the police scandal in the Jan. 22 Christian Science Monitor urges understanding of the fact that the police department "works within the confines of the political, economic and social code of the city it serves."

If that is any excuse, the cops involved should all be returned to their patrol cars. They were simply engaging in free enterprise in the style of the founders of some of America's wealthiest ruling families.

Why not pass this copy of the Militant on to a friend?

Rail Clerk Unit Elects Negro As President

Last month, Thomas Watkins became the first Negro president of an integrated lodge of the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks. He was elected by the predominantly white membership of Lodge 173, Haverstraw, N. Y. In December 1958, the lodge elected William Scott, also a Negro, as president. But international president George M. Harrison ruled on a constitutional technicality that Scott was not eligible to serve. The Scott case was then taken to the courts by the Urban League and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Scott has charged that national union officers campaigned against him and raised anti-Negro issues in the election. They have not moved to unseat Watkins.

Calendar Of Events

LOS ANGELES School of International Socialism presents its winter lecture series. Milton Alvin on "THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION TODAY." "The Consolidation of the Stalin Regime — 1929-1945." Sunday, Feb. 7, 11 a.m. "The Soviet Union as a World Power — Its Present Position and Future — 1946-1960." Sunday, Feb. 14, 11 a.m. Forum Hall, 1702 East Fourth St., Los Angeles 33. Telephone, AN 9-4953 or WE 5-9238.

NEW YORK An eyewitness account of current revolutionary developments in Cuba. Speaker, Henry Gitano, reporter for the Militant, just returned from an extensive visit covering all sections of Cuba. Friday, Feb. 5, 8:30 p.m. Militant Labor Forum, 116 University Place (Off Union Square). Contribution 50 cents.

Local Directory

BOSTON Boston Labor Forum, 295 Huntington Ave., Room 200. CHICAGO Socialist Workers Party, 777 W. Adams, DE 2-8735. CLEVELAND Socialist Workers Party 10609 Superior Ave., Room 301. SW 1-1818. Open Thursday nights 8 to 10. The Militant, P.O. Box 104, University Center Station, Cleveland 6, Ohio. DETROIT Eugene V. Debs Hall, 3737 Woodward. Temple 1-6135. LOS ANGELES Forum Hall and Modern Book Shop, 1702 E. 4th St. AN 9-1953 or WE 5-9238. MILWAUKEE 150 East Juneau Ave. MINNEAPOLIS Socialist Workers Party, 322 Hennepin Ave., 2nd floor. Open noon to 6 P.M. daily except Sundays. NEWARK Newark Labor Forum, Box 361, Newark, N.J. NEW YORK CITY Militant Labor Forum, 116 University Place, AL 5-7852. OAKLAND-BERKELEY P.O. Box 341, Berkeley 1, Calif. PHILADELPHIA Militant Labor Forum and Socialist Workers Party, 1303 W. Girard Ave. Lectures and discussions every Saturday, 8 P.M., followed by open house. Call PO 3-5820. SAN FRANCISCO The Militant, 1145 Polk St., Rm. 4. Sat. 11 A.M. to 3 P.M. Phone PR 6-7286; if no answer, VA 4-2321. SEATTLE 1412-18th Avenue, EA 2-5554. Library, bookstore. ST. LOUIS For information phone MO 4-7194.

Ad Men, Too, Must Live

By Herman Chauka

I was quite indignant when I first read the various exposes of television commercials. The idea that our leading corporations should try to hoodwink the public almost made me see red. But now I'm beginning to feel that maybe they have justice on their side, after all.

Take some of the recent complaints made by the Federal Trade Commission against leading American companies. These complaints, as I look at them more carefully, simply don't hold water.

For example, the commission says that the TV commercial for Palmolive Rapid Shave is phony. According to the FTC, a hand holding a razor is shaving what "purports to be a piece of dry sandpaper to which Palmolive has been applied."

The misleading implication, says the FTC, is that Rapid Shave's "moisturizing" action makes it possible to shave off the sandpaper. The truth is that the "supposed sandpaper" isn't sandpaper at all. It's a "mock-up" made of plexiglass to which sand has been applied.

The Palmolive people say they used a substitute only because of technical problems and that Rapid Shave will actually help you remove the sand from sandpaper. But even if this doesn't turn out to be true, there's no reason for all the fuss. How many people buy Rapid Shave in order to shave sandpaper?

Or take the commission's complaint against a Blue Bonnet margarine commercial. The advertisers show Blue Bonnet and a slab of butter. Both slabs appear to have drops of moisture on them while a sample of Brand X margarine, which is shown next, doesn't have a single drop of moisture.

The announcer tells the viewers: "Blue Bonnet is made by the new, exclusive 'flavor gem' process. When Blue Bonnet is spread like this you see 'flavor gems' just like on this 'high-priced' spread [the butter] . . . But no flavor gems appear on this other popular margarine

and a margarine without flavor gems just doesn't taste like the 'high-priced' spread."

The FTC worked up a sweat because those drops of "moisture" are really drops of a "non-volatile" liquid like glycerine or cotton-seed oil that are added for the demonstration.

But again, I can't see where the Blue Bonnet people have done anything crooked. The FTC itself points out that moisture isn't what makes butter taste better. In fact, the commission says, "visible moisture in butter and margarine is undesirable and ought to be avoided by the industry."

Now, the ad men say they are confronted by many technical problems and even some moral ones in preparing their commercials, and I feel that the FTC isn't sufficiently sympathetic. TV columnist Marie Torre discussed some of the ad men's predicaments in a recent series of articles in the New York Herald Tribune. They are not to be dismissed lightly.

Last year, business firms invested more than \$1 1/2 billion in TV commercials. Quite naturally they expect results.

How is an ad man going to get results? He searches his soul and asks: "Is it fraudulent . . . to put smoking cigarettes in the stomach of a turkey to make it appear as delectable as when it emerges from the oven of the average kitchen?" Well, is it?

I agree with Miss Torre that the ad men are a bit out of line when they add extra noodles to that "delectable bowl of beef noodle soup" they show on TV.

But she is being unduly harsh, I think, when she suggests that it's wrong for them to show comparative tests "in which the Brand X pill is coated with lacquer so that it doesn't fizz as the advertiser's pill does when deposited in water."

Would Miss Torre or anyone else deny that the Brand X people probably do the same thing in their commercial?

Notes in the News

SENATOR HOLDS 'ON THE BEACH' IS INDISCREET — Senator Wallace Bennett (R-Utah) has vigorously condemned the film, "On the Beach," which depicts the destruction of humanity by nuclear war. The senator says this is "dangerously misleading" because there would be quite a few survivors in such a war.

IT'S GOT THAT HEALTHY LOOK — Five persons in two families suffered from a mild case of food poisoning in Portland, Ore., while eating hamburger patties bought at the same market. They developed sudden flushing and burning of the skin — especially in the face and neck. This disappeared after about an hour. The U.S. Public Health Service investigated and said the symptoms were probably caused by an overdose of a food chemical used to keep red meat looking red and appetizing. Treating meat with chemicals to keep it from fading is illegal said a Health Service official.

A HEAVY THUMB — Daitch-Shopwell, Inc., which operates a chain of 97 food stores in New York, recently paid \$10,325 in penalties for short-weighting customers. The settlement, for 413 violations dating back to 1958, was said to be the biggest sum ever collected by the city for this type of violation. Daitch was charged mostly with mis-marking prepackaged meats and delicacies. The penalties against Daitch came in the wake of a recent New York scandal involving a number of city weight-and-measure inspectors who allegedly took bribes from shopkeepers employing rigged scales.

ONLY IN AMERICA — R. Brinkley Smithers is prepared for possible war. On his fifteen-acre estate at Mill Neck, Long Island, he has built a \$50,000 H-bomb shelter that will accommodate five of his relatives and three servants.

NO FURTHER VALUE — George Lincoln Rockwell, of Arlington, Va., is head of the American Nazi party and an active purveyor of anti-Semitic literature. He is also a commander in the Naval Reserve. When originally queried about Rockwell by the press, Navy spokesmen replied there was no reason for action against him since his outfit was not on the Attorney

General's "subversive" list. Besides, the spokesmen said, the Navy doesn't believe in interfering with people's political beliefs. After further newspaper publicity, Navy officers announced that steps to discharge Rockwell have been taken. He has also been informed that his "mobilization potential has been reduced to a point where he is of no further value to the Navy."

NEW PRESIDENT OF ST. PAUL NAACP — A nurse's certificate that went to waste enlisted Mrs. Addie C. Few in the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. More than thirty years ago she graduated from the nurse's training course at Tuskegee Institute. In a Jan. 19 interview with the Minneapolis Morning Tribune Mrs. Few said, "Then I decided to leave the South for Minnesota — which we considered the land of the free. But I discovered nobody here had ever heard of a colored nurse." She turned to the NAACP for assistance. This month Mrs. Few became the president of the St. Paul NAACP.

JUST TO BE SURE IT WOULD FIT THE FREEZER — Colorado weights and measurements agents raided Bruhn's Freezer Meats, Inc., in Thornton Jan. 7 on complaints of short-weights practices. One customer who had lodged such a complaint was sent back to order a quarter of beef. He did so. When he returned to pick it up after it had been cut and packaged for freezing, agents stepped in. They said they found a shortage of 1 1/2 pounds.

ARE WE ON A TREADMILL? — Pointing with pride to the Republican record, Secretary of Commerce Mueller in a speech last week in Fort Lauderdale, Fla. declared that ten years ago "Sou-bellied left-wingers fomented the class struggle. Pink-tinted pundits and eggheads scoffed at the value of private enterprise. The profit motive was labeled as degrading. All of this motley crew . . . held in contempt everyone engaged in trade." But are things really any better now? Speaking before the National Association of Manufacturers last Dec. 4, Mueller warned that the country is being ruined by the unions and consequently our "free enterprise" system may not survive the "Soviet threat."

Literature and Revolution By Leon Trotsky \$2.98 Written in 1924, this is a Marxist classic. It deals with the attitude of the working class and its party to art and artists after conquest of state power. Pioneer Publishers 116 University Place New York 3, N.Y.

On American Radicalism Has socialism a future in America? Why is the socialist movement so small in this country? How can socialists help to rebuild it into a power greater than it was in the 1930's and in the days of Debs? James P. Cannon, founder of the Socialist Workers party and active participant in the socialist movement for fifty years, attempts an answer. His examination of the ups and downs of the radical movement since 1900 makes illuminating reading. In the International Socialist Review. Send 35 cents for a copy. International Socialist Review 116 University Place New York 3, N.Y.