

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JULY 18, 1955

FIVE CENTS

## THE POST-McCARTHY CLIMATE

... page 6

## REPORT FROM ROME: HOPE IN SICILY

... page 7

## BRAZIL: THREE HATS IN THE RING

... page 3

## HISTADRUT AND WORKERS' DEMOCRACY

... page 4

## BLUE-BLOOD: EDEN'S FAMILY TREE

... page 4

## Diplomatic Ritual-Dance Around Disarmament

By GORDON HASKELL

During the first fifteen years which followed World War I much of the "peace" sentiment throughout the world centered on the idea of disarmament. With the advent of nuclear weapons, this idea has taken on an urgency in the popular mind which it never had before. It is to be expected that in the current phase of the political war which is carried on under a banner of "peace," the governments of each war bloc will seek to exploit the widespread fear of war by advancing such proposals for "disarmament" as will put the blame for the continuation of the arms race on their opponents.

In the first round of disarmament discussions, the Russian government, which then had few if any nuclear weapons, demanded that all such weapons be destroyed and that all governments sign a convention prohibiting their use in warfare. The United States, which had A-bombs, countered with a demand for full international inspection of the production of nuclear materials and weapons as a preliminary step to their re-

duction or abolition. The Stalinists rejected this proposal on the ground that it would achieve no purpose other than to reveal Russian military and industrial secrets to the American camp.

Once the deadlock on nuclear armaments had been reached, there was little discussion of disarmament until recently. In the meantime, the Russians have succeeded in producing nuclear weapons of their own. Both sides have, in addition, been concentrating on the production of aircraft and guided missiles capable of delivering nuclear weapons at any point over each other's territory.

Although the United States has felt that it was far ahead in this field, recent developments indicate that the Stalinists may be catching up with respect to aircraft, and there is a dark suspicion that they may even be ahead in the design and production of guided missiles.

### RUSSIAN TACTIC

But this has been only one side of the armament race.

Ever since World War II the Stalinists have maintained a huge standing army equipped with all the modern weapons of war. The threat to Europe of this army has been the main argument the United States has used in inducing the governments of the other North Atlantic Treaty Organization powers to saddle their peoples with the costs of an expanding armament program. This Russian argument has been the chief American argument for the construction of air, naval and military bases in Europe.

(Turn to last page)

## Straight from the Huckster's Mouth

American advertisers have a duty to use their economic force to control newspaper editorial policies.

That's the blunt advice the Advertising Federation of America received recently from Clarence E. Eldridge, executive vice president of Campbell Soup Co.

Advertisers "have the right," Eldridge said, "to ask not merely whether the medium in question will sell goods . . . but whether, while pocketing the advertiser's money and publishing his advertising, it is permitting its editorial writers or its columnists or commentators to discredit business and business men."

Underlining his argument for advertisers' control of newspaper opinion, Eldridge said:

"We do not propose to be coerced by any phony argument about freedom of the press into lending our support, financial or moral, to a force which would, if it could, destroy us.

"Newspapers, magazines and networks are dependent for their very existence on the support of readers, listeners and advertisers. . . . This fact is given implicit recognition in the constant effort to find out what readers and listeners want—and to give it to them.

"Yet there are some publications and some executives of the broadcast industry who seem to concede no similar right or interest to advertisers.

"They permit the use in their columns or over their stations of material clearly inimical to business and business men, and even to the economic system of which the advertiser is a part."

The industrialist called upon advertising men "to whom the wise expenditure of billions of dollars has been entrusted" to use this influence to be "the most powerful single determinant of the future of our country."

—CIO News (July 4)

## German Unity Issue Spotlights

# The Cold-War Game Of Bluff-and-Swap

By PHILIP COBEN

The N. Y. Times correspondent in London, Drew Middleton, writes about concern in British government circles that the United States may miss a propaganda opportunity at Geneva on the German question:

"A more immediate reason for seeking the West's adoption of a positive program for Germany is acceptance in [British] government circles of the belief that the Soviet Union will not agree at Geneva to do anything creating a situation leading to German unification.

"This belief is strong. If events at Geneva bear it out, the British argue, a bold Western policy is all the more necessary because the Russians will make every effort possible to throw the blame for preventing German reunification on the Western powers.

"Failure of the West to elaborate on the Eden plan for unity, it was predicted, would enable Vyacheslav M. Molotov, Soviet Foreign Minister, to proclaim that the Western powers would go no further because they knew that the Soviet Union would not accept the 1954 proposals. Under these circumstances Moscow would be able to support future diplomacy for German unity on its own terms with a charge that the West had failed to show sufficient interest." (N. Y. Times, July 12.)

**That is frankness for you, and right from the Times. If we are sure that the Russians will stand like a rock against German unification . . . that is the time for us democrats to be passionately for it.**

But the Stalinists figure the same way: We'll be for German unity when we are sure the Americans will have none of it.

Thus German unity is used as a pawn in the imperialist game of bluff.

But Washington's hand in the game is tipped by the fact that it cannot keep a straight face as it claims to be for German unification. A speech by Britain's Foreign Minister Eden on Monday did indeed argue strongly for an over-the-counter deal with Russia which would gain such a result for Germany. It is not to be doubted that he was directing his argument across the Atlantic at least as much as in the other direction.

### NEW CAMPAIGN

More important, on Tuesday West Germany's leading conservative newspaper, the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeit-*

*ung*, and the mass-circulation news-magazine *Der Spiegel*, came out strongly against the rearmament program and the NATO orientation. This development means the beginning of "a powerful campaign to arouse public opinion," reports *Times* correspondent Handler from Bonn. And it is significantly keyed by a blast from a highly placed military man who has just come back from a conducted tour of U. S. military preparations. To the Germans he appears almost as an "eye-witness" of U. S. plans. And he tells them that the U. S. has and can have no intentions of permitting the re-

(Continued on page 7)

## TWO FACTS THAT MAY OR MAY NOT BE CONNECTED:

# Lib Party Says No Merger; Berle Resigns

By PETER WHITNEY

The resignation of Adolf A. Berle Jr. as state chairman of the Liberal Party of New York took the ranks completely by surprise. His resignation was accepted at a State Committee meeting held on July 7, attended by about 150 members; the State Committee also named a committee to nominate his successor.

The party is thus left in the somewhat embarrassing position of casting about for its next leader in the full glare of publicity. The question obviously occurs: What was Berle's great hurry and why couldn't he wait until his replacement had been selected?

Berle himself stated that he had first given the Liberal Party leaders notice about a year ago, feeling that new leaders ought to be developed and hoping to pursue some academic work of his

own. Six months ago, he had raised the question again in the inner sanctum, and now he felt the time had come to step down. His timing raised more questions than it answers, since his resignation was couched in terms of withdrawal and retirement from active Liberal Party politics, although he remained on as honorary chairman.

### PRESSURE FROM DEMS

Berle has functioned as state chairman since 1947 and has been the party's spokesman all during this period, stoutly defending the party's policy of coalitionism with the old parties. He was preceded by Dr. John L. Childs, Columbia University educator, who became the party's first chairman in 1944 when the Liberal Party was first set up. Childs has continued to remain a top leader in the party, a fixed star in its intellectual firmament.

Berle's resignation comes at a time

when leading Democratic figures in New York State have repeatedly urged the Liberals to drop their independent existence and go into the Democratic Party. In the 1954 elections, the Liberals supported practically the entire Democratic slate and helped substantially to elect Averell Harriman as New York's governor. In 1956, again, the indications are that the Liberals will tag behind the Democratic candidates and play no independent role. Thus, within the party itself, a polarization has begun—between those who question the need for a Liberal Party, pointing to its continued endorsement of Democratic candidates, and those who more or less clearly desire the Liberals to play a more independent role.

While Berle, as state chairman, publicly spurned the Democratic overtures, it by no means settles the question of his personal attitude. In keeping with the party's practices, the leadership al-

(Turn to last page)

# LABOR SCOPE

## Union-Busting... Wisconsin Law... Kohler Strike... UAW Explains

By BEN HALL

The AFL Amalgamated Meat Cutters Union, in the July issue of its magazine, features a series of articles under the front-page title, "Union-Busting Activity Gains Momentum: Trade Unions Are Really in Danger." The union hardly seems to expect a cozy future of mutual tolerance and friendship between labor and capital.

In the same issue, it editorializes over the Ford-UAW settlement which "has established what will be considered a new pattern in the realm of workers' security." None of the visions about "social engineering" and "era of peace" that liberals predicted are foreseen by the editor. In fact, as the following excerpts illustrate, his mood is different:

• "The trade union movement can now expect additional attacks by selfish employers as a result of the auto workers' victory. A guaranteed annual wage is the one thing big business has an abhorrence for."

• "What may we expect? Some 18 states have already passed phony right-to-work bills for the purpose of weakening organized labor. More such laws will be introduced in our state legislatures."

• "Organized labor will be attacked on the political field as well as on the industrial field. The state of Wisconsin only recently enacted a law which would prohibit trade unions from collecting money for any kind of political campaign."

• "The vicious injunction will be applied more ruthlessly."

• "From all appearances, the forces of capital and labor will come to a parting of the ways. History will probably repeat itself in that 'cooperation' between the employer and the worker will operate for a decade or so of industrial peace, only to end with more vicious industrial warfare over issues such as the guaranteed annual wage."

### Union-Gag Law In Wisconsin

Here is what AFL's Labor's League for Political Education has to say about the Wisconsin law:

"One of the most vicious laws ever to pass a legislature has just been signed by Gov. Walter Kohler of Wisconsin—and may well become a model of similar vile legislation in other states."

"The law ties the hands, arms, knees and feet of working people—and then sticks a gag in their mouths—so that they cannot take part in politics."

"The Wisconsin act—known as the Catlin bill because its author is an assemblyman named 'Speed' Catlin—pro-

vides that no union or organization shall contribute any money or thing of value directly or indirectly to any political party, political organization, political committee or individual candidate for any political purpose whatsoever.

"The measure could be interpreted to mean that a trade union could not even use its meeting hall to discuss politics or to make plans for supporting a candidate. It could mean that no business agent or other representative of a union could be active on behalf of a candidate.

"It means that voluntary groups of individuals—such as Labor's League for Political Education—cannot be formed to help elect men and women to public office.

"The law is expected by big-businessmen to dry up labor union contributions and permit rich people and corporations to continue to spend wads of money as they have in the past."

### Sugar and Sweat

Something always turns up to prevent labor peace from getting set. In two Louisiana counties, 1,500 workers are on strike against the Godchaux Sugar Co. and the Colonial Sugar Co. Their union is the CIO Packinghouse Workers Union. Wages are now 41 cents below standards paid along the Atlantic Coast. Strike highlights:

• Gov. Kennon has already sent state troopers into the area to protect ingoing scabs.

• One local state senator is calling for the declaration of martial law.

• Thirty-one union members are on trial for conspiracy to incite acts of violence. Class harmony comes hard in Louisiana.

### The UAW Explains

Talking of class harmony, we are reminded that Walter Reuther, in the early hours of the auto settlements, was almost effusive in his praise of company responsibility. But that was for reporters and the "public." The *United Automobile Worker*, UAW newspaper, tells a different story. Headlines reporting the GM victory read: "Settlement at GM finally reached at dawn after midnight walkouts enforce demands."

The Ford agreement is reported under the head: "Solidarity brings victory." And the article points out that the peaceful settlement was "the product of careful building and planning—at all levels of the union."

Including this: "Rank-and-file members elected convention delegates who voted overwhelmingly for the temporary dues increase. That gave the union the tools it needed. Everybody knew then the UAW-CIO was better prepared for a strike than it had ever been. Then rank-and-file members in Ford and General Motors plants voted 95 per cent in favor of a strike—if that became necessary to win justice. It all added up to real PRESSURE."

### Kohler's Last Stand For Free Enterprise

The American Party line about how the class struggle has been eliminated in this blessed country is not helped any by the longest strike now going on in the country. This is the bitter battle of the UAW against the Kohler Company in Kohler, Wis.

An article in the current *Progressive* by Richard Schickel adds some vivid details to the information we have carried in LA before.

"The company charges the union with 'the promotion of class hatred and violence. . . . Union leaders who convince the workman that his employer is his natural enemy. . . . serve only the Marxian doctrine. . . . But the company must take the major share of the blame for fomenting class warfare. It is Kohler that has refused to bargain seriously. It is the company that is trying to break a legal union far more devoted to 'bread and butter' than to class struggle."

Why particularly should this strike, with the 350-400 acts of violence, represent such a reversion to the days of brass-knuckled unionism? The answer,

basically, is that the company itself is an anachronism. It doesn't want a union in its plant at all. Most employers probably don't, but they face up to the realities of American economic life by recognizing and dealing with unions. . . ."

"Underlying the company's attitude is an unyielding commitment to laissez-faire. A company negotiator was quoted, for instance, as saying of the union's demand for a Blue Cross, Blue Shield, hospitalization plan, 'It'll make a plant full of hypochondriacs.' The union charges that the company is anti-humanitarian. That may or may not be true, but it is clear enough that it is devoted to that American folk fiction, unbridled free enterprise. 'The company sees itself as a knight on a white charger riding to the rescue of American capitalism,' said the most knowledgeable union man on the scene.

"Here, in the fortress-like plant, nineteenth century capitalism, in the company's view, is making its last stand. The barricades, in both the literal and figurative senses, are up. This is war, the company thinks—and stern measures are required.

"A year ago Herbert Kohler testified at a Wisconsin Labor Relations Board hearing that there were 'plenty' of guns stored inside the plant.

"Any tear gas?" a labor attorney asked him.

"I wouldn't be surprised," came the reply.

"A few days later 375 rounds of tear gas were seized at the plant."

Author Schickel quotes one striker—"a family man, a good worker—but a man near the end of his patience"—as saying that "Our main gripe is that things have been too quiet." This in a strike marked by unusual violence for these times.

It is perfectly true, of course, as the article emphasizes that the Kohler strike is no typical case today, but the Kohler attitude is not quite as unique in this 20th century as Schickel seems to think. He would see so little of it, for example, in the South. The difference between Kohler and many other employers is that Kohler thinks he can really be successful today in breaking the union.

So far the strike has cost the UAW four million dollars. Even a rich union could hardly afford that in order to keep a single dozen employers in line. And this in times of war prosperity. The comfortable illusion about the "end of the class struggle" is clearly a luxury which can be afforded only in the dollar aristocrat of the world as long as the Permanent War Economy holds up.

### Pamphlets by LEON TROTSKY

The first eight pamphlets listed are by Trotsky, and are editions published in Ceylon by Lanka Samasamaja Publishers.

Revolution in Spain (January 1931)	\$25
The Lesson of Spain: the Last Warning (Dec. 1937)	.25
Marxism and Science (Speech, 1925)	.15
Against Social-Patriotism (1916)	.10
Europe and America (Speeches in 1924 & 1926)	.30
Whither Europe? (Speech of 1926, included in the above)	.15
I Stake My Life! (Speech on Moscow Trials)	.15
In Defense of October (Speech, 1932)	.15
The Zimmerwald Manifesto (The famous anti-war declaration of 1915)	.10
The Last Words of Adolf Joffe	.10

Package price for all 10 pamphlets—\$1.50

Labor Action Book Service  
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.  
(Remittance must accompany all orders)

## Passport Echoes

The impact of the Shachtman passport decision by the federal Court of Appeals was felt by the State Department this past week as it reversed itself on a number of passport cases pending before it or before the courts.

The Passport Division decided that it was the better part of valor to throw in its hand on the Clark Foreman case. Foreman is director of the Otto Nathan case. Foreman's own passport had been blocked by the State Department bureaucracy on the usual ground that his travel abroad would not be in the best interests of the U. S. On July 7 the department announced that Foreman was being given a passport.

The same was true simultaneously for Willard Z. Park, an export-import businessman who was formerly with UN RRA in Ethiopia and who had been fingered by the notorious Elizabeth Bentley.

A partial victory was won in favor of the *Daily Worker* correspondent who wanted to cover the Geneva Conference. Joseph Clark was granted a limited passport for this purpose. It is likely that this concession was made in order to avoid the free-press aspect of the Stalinist's case.

In another case, after 8 years of refusal, the passport pooh-bahs also gave in to Dr. Martin D. Kamen, an atomic scientist who was on their blacklist.

Pretty soon, everybody may have a passport except. . . . Shachtman, whose court victory broke the roadblock but whose passport is still held up by the government.

### ANOTHER CLARK

On the same day as the above-recorded events, ex-judge William Clark, who was dismissed in 1953 as chief justice of the U. S. High Commission's Court of Appeals in West Germany and then barred from visiting West Berlin, was given a hearing by a State Department official. To the press Clark gave peppery denunciations of the government's "un-American tyranny by passport control."

Citing a case some years ago in which the State Department overruled its consul general at Mukden, who had refused to renew the passports of "two ladies of the evening," Clark said: "The present generation in the department is treating me worse than its predecessors treated a prostitute."

At the hearing a statement was read into the record from James B. Conant, U. S. ambassador to West Germany, objecting "strongly" to Clark visiting Berlin. Clark indignantly pointed out that it is "preposterous" for an American ambassador to a foreign country to "exercise some sort of censorship on persons whom he wishes or does not wish to come to the country to which he is accredited."

Clark's was the first passport hearing held by the State Department at the behest of a court.

### 'ALWAYS DUBIOUS'

In an editorial hailing the Shachtman court decision, the *Youngstown Vindicator* ended up with a special swipe at the attorney general's "subversive list".

"Probably the list is a useful guide in hiring federal employees, but it has been misused as a blacklist in a much wider range to which it should never be applied. For example, attempts were made recently to remove a small-town librarian and to deny a storekeeper an ordinary retail license, on the basis of the list. It is high time that the always dubious and now out-of-date list be whittled down to its proper size."

### PLAYING DOWN

One of the dimmest views to date taken of the Shachtman court decision appeared in *I. F. Stone's Weekly* (July 4). Its tone is indicated in the headline, "The Right to Travel Is As Yet Only a Right to Litigate," and in general it tends to play down the impact of the decision. Stone is a strong supporter of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, which has been working actively on its own string of passport cases.

### YOU'RE INVITED

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

At last available!

The SECOND volume  
of  
Leon Trotsky's  
THE FIRST  
FIVE YEARS  
OF THE  
COMMUNIST  
INTERNATIONAL

384 pages.....Paper covers

Only \$2.50

All orders must be accompanied  
by payment.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE  
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

NOTE: The first volume is still  
available too, of course . . . also  
for \$2.50.

## LONDON LETTER

# As the Labor Party Returns to Normal

By OWEN ROBERTS

LONDON, July 9—The six weeks which have passed since the general election in Britain have been sufficient for the Labor Party to recover its breath from the nasty crack under the ribs administered by the Tory party, and to regain its normal course in the life of the country. The past few weeks have brought many developments to the Labor Party and while none of them, taken in isolation, add up to a great deal, in total they serve to indicate that the party has hung the sign "Business as Usual" outside its shopfront.

The Parliamentary Labor Party has now completed the process of electing its Shadow Cabinet. The full and proper title of this body is the Parliamentary Committee and it is elected by the Labor members of the House of Commons. Its function is to interpret policy in the light of current events and to provide the Parliamentary Party with day-to-day leadership as the official opposition party in Parliament. The composition and efforts of the Shadow Cabinet—which occupies the Front Benches on the opposition side of the House of Commons—usually determine the general character of the opposition to the Tories.

Clement Attlee and Herbert Morrison were elected unopposed as leader and deputy leader respectively. There had been rumors that Aneurin Bevan intended to contest the position of Deputy Leader, but in the event this did not in fact happen and Morrison once again took the position of No. 2 without challenge.

In the election for the committee proper, there were more than fifty candidates for twelve seats. The contest was made all the more interesting because there were five members of the old committee not standing—either because they did not want to stand or because they had failed to secure re-election as MPs. As can be imagined, there was much speculation as to who would fill these five new places.

## NEW LINEUP

The results gave them to Aneurin Bevan and Anthony Greenwood, two Bevanites; George Brown and Richard Stokes, two definite anti-Bevanites; and to George Mitchison, of whom little is known and who has been described in the press as "a judicial referee"—which in plain political language probably means a middle-of-the-roader.

The poll was topped by Jim Griffiths, who is renowned for his ability to steer a carefully chosen middle course; and he was followed by right-winger Hugh Gaitskell, who needs no introduction. Jim Gallagher and Alf Robens tied for third place; both of them can be described as right-wingers but not of the violent type. The remainder of the committee, in order of voting popularity, are: Harold Wilson, Edith Summerskill, Bevan, Brown, Philip Noel-Baker, Greenwood, Stokes and Mitchison.

The committee therefore consist of three Bevanites and nine who are either passive or violent anti-Bevanites; in addition

tion there are Attlee and Morrison. This all adds up to the fact that the leadership of the Parliamentary Party is relatively unchanged as a collective but that the Bevanites have increased the representation from one to three.

The National Executive Committee of the party also met recently and looked over the election result. It decided, as a consequence, to set up a special subcommittee to inquire into party organization; for the weakness of this is being largely blamed as the cause of the election setback. The composition of this committee is also of interest. It consists of four members and three of them are right-wingers. One of them, Jack Cooper of the General and Municipal Workers' Union, was leading the fight for Bevan's expulsion in the fight a few months ago. The lone Bevanite on the committee is Harold Wilson.

This committee has now prepared plans to embark on a tour of the country conducting an inquiry into the state of all the local organizations. It will hear evidence and receive statements from the full-time party agents and various local secretaries. Rank-and-file party members can also submit reports to the committee. When all this work has been completed the subcommittee will be reporting back to the full NEC, which will then decide what measures are necessary to tighten up the party organization and get it running as near perfection as possible.

This emphasis on organization is looked upon with some suspicion by the average party worker. While no one doubts that the organization of the party needs attention it is felt that the great concern for this matter displayed by the NEC is largely a smokescreen to divert attention from policy failures.

## 'HERALD' ON THE PAN

At its meeting the NEC also gave some attention to the *Daily Herald*. This newspaper has 49 per cent of its shares held by the Trades Union Congress and the remainder by the private firm of Odhams. Its editorial policy is, according to the agreement when it was set up, largely determined by the TUC line.

During the election it was felt that the *Daily Herald*, which advertises itself as "Labor's Daily," did not push the party policy with the enthusiasm which is desirable. The NEC have approached the TUC on this matter, which in turn referred it to the TUC General Council members who are members of the board of directors of the *Daily Herald*.

This criticism of the *Daily Herald* by the NEC has provoked some amusement, for usually it is the rank and file who are attacking the paper and the NEC who are stoutly defending it. Now, it seems, the situation has reached the position where even the NEC is forced to give tacit recognition to the fact that there is something amiss with the paper.

In a few days time the Socialist International Congress opens at the Caxton Hall in London, and the Labor Party NEC is sending a British delegation of eight. Every single one of the eight is a right-winger of no uncertain character! This is a situation which clearly indicates that the line which the British delegation is to take will need forceful personalities to push it over, so much so that not even a token gesture—such as is usually made—of including one left-winger in the delegation could be permitted.

It also indicates that the right wing have no intention of allowing the past to be forgotten and that the fight between the right and left is carrying on as normal.

This is confined by articles which have just appeared in the first issues of the monthly periodicals since the election. Morrison and Gaitskell have both opened up with big guns against the left wing in no uncertain fashion. In the next column from London an endeavor will be made to analyze these latest contributions to the battle which is stoking up ready for the party conference in October.

## BRAZIL

# Presidential Race Sees Three Hats in the Ring

By J. R.

SANTIAGO, June 25—In August of last year Brazilian President Getulio Vargas, who had governed for 20 years, committed suicide, under pressure of the army and political opposition. Thus the "August Revolution" put an end to the period of state-capitalist experimentation in the Brazilian economy and of anti-parliamentary, semi-totalitarian rule in politics. But the "August Revolution" was politically sterile and showed itself incapable of replacing the Vargas system with a new, dynamic, democratic regime; for the government of Café Filho is only a caretaker regime to organize impartial elections of Vargas' successor to the presidency.

At this moment, after several months of pre-election conflict, there are three important candidates for the presidency in the running.

The first is Juscelino Kubitschek, candidate of the Vargas "Labor Party" (Partido Trabalhista de Brazil, or PTB) and also of the so-called "Social-Democratic Party" of ex-President Dutra. He is the candidate of the Vargas camp.

He proposes to continue the policy of "Getulism" (as the tradition of Getulio Vargas is called) with respect to state capitalism and social demagoguery, supported by his vice-presidential candidate Jango Goulart, who is president of the PTB and an ex-minister of Vargas.

As of this reckoning, it looks as if Kubitschek has the best chance to be elected, because the two parties that support him enjoy the backing of a majority of the country's voters. The main difficulty that his candidacy faces is the company of Jango Goulart. This Getulist leader is rabidly opposed not only by the conservative National Democratic Union (UDN) but also by the army, including Dutra.

Kubitschek's candidacy represents the efforts of the Vargas camp to reconquer power and continue the ex-dictator's policies; hence the opposition of the rightists and the military, the latter being the most important political arbiter in the present political situation in Brazil.

## ADVENTURER

The second presidential candidate is Adhemar de Barros, ex-governor of Sao Paulo, leader of the PSP, which is his own political organization of all kinds of political, social and economic canaille and scoundrels. He is notorious as the author of the slogan, "Steal—but do something!"

He is the man who was defeated by Janio Quadros in Sao Paulo elections and was publicly tried for the crime of stealing public funds. After the disintegration of the Janio Quadros camp, Adhemar's party once again won out in the Sao Paulo elections; and now the mayor of Brazil's greatest city is his man Lino de Mattos.

This victory in Sao Paulo encouraged Adhemar de Barros to throw his hat into the presidential race in spite of the criminal scandals which shadow his name and his administrative record in Sao Paulo.

This man is a typical upstart adventurer. Before embarking on his political career he was a poor doctor; and now, after having controlled the Sao Paulo municipal and state governments, he is the richest man in Brazil, larded with public funds. The fact that such a man, with such a career behind him, can put forward such a candidacy speaks volumes about the political scene in Brazil.

His slogan is: "Brazil needs a manager, and I will do it." The possibility (or better, danger) of his victory is great, because of the demoralization of so many voters by the widespread political ineptitude and corruption. But he is opposed by the conservative UDN, the army, and all the "honest people" of the middle class and class-conscious workers.

## REFORMER

The third candidate is General Juarez Tavora, candidate of the Socialist Party and Christian-Democrat Party.

Though he is backed only by minority parties that do not have a big electoral following, it is still possible that he may gain the support of the middle-class and working-class voters, for he has an honest past and his electoral program is moderately progressive. He is for a democratic government policy, for agrarian reform, for profit-sharing for workers, for trade-union liberty, for defense of Brazilian economy against foreign ex-

ploitation, and in particular in favor of Brazil developing its own oil resources with its own capital.

Tavora was one of the organizers of the "August Revolution," and therefore will be fervently opposed by the pro-Vargas ("Getulist") camp. The Socialist Party named him as its candidate because he accepted the SP's minimum program, while however declaring that he is not a socialist but a "nationalist" and a Christian.

But, as one can see, everything's possible in the present state of Brazilian politics: not only a candidate who runs under the banner of "Steal, but do something" but also a non-socialist nationalist as the candidate of the Socialist Party.

Juarez Tavora has great personal prestige, as an honest and democratic military man, as an author (*Oil for Brazil*), as an adherent of social reform. He would seem to be the "ideal" opposition to Kubitschek as representative of the "great moral reserve of the country." The conservative UDN will probably also accept him as its candidate after the resignation of Etelvino Lins, because it does not have any other leading figure to put up. Thus Tavora could unify all the forces opposed to both the Getulist and Adhemarist camps and maybe even win the election—except that the support of the rightist UDN would be a scarecrow to the workers and the radical petty-bourgeois.

Given the support of the UDN, Tavora would be transformed into the candidate of the conservative camp, the candidate of "national union"; and the Socialist Party would then be the ally of the UDN. That will not be favorably looked on by the workers, who supported Vargas' social policy and whose support Tavora must obtain if he is to win.

## SP'S FLIGHT

It is true that Tavora is the only "democratic" solution of the succession crisis unloosed by Vargas' death; and it is true that he is against the solution of a coup d'état which is popular in certain military circles. His weakness lies in his political program, which is "too radical" for the bourgeoisie and too moderate for the workers. In reality there is not a great deal of difference between Tavora and Kubitschek with respect to the content of their economic policy, for both are in favor of a state-controlled economy, even though Tavora wishes to limit this only to oil development. The difference lies mainly in political program.

This electoral struggle could have been important in mobilizing the working-class masses and awakening them to fight for their own class policy. In this fight the Socialist Party could have played a big role and helped to prepare the workers for future socialist struggles. But to speak frankly, the Socialist Party here is not so much a socialist party as a left liberal party of the petty bourgeoisie; and after the defeat of its left wing, it was transformed into a mere electoral machine for Juarez Tavora. It does not have an ideology any more; it simply has electoral and bureaucratic interests.

The realistic prospect for Brazil today is, to be sure, not socialism but capitalism; the development of industry in Brazil requires a new political structure and new political methods. But the task of the Socialist Party is not so much this or that electoral policy or support to this or that capitalist policy, but rather the awakening of the Brazilian working class to its own class interests and the preparation of the class for its own fight under the socialist banner. The Socialist Party, including its left wing, is backing only one bourgeois orientation among others, with an electoral policy that has nothing in common with proletarian socialist tasks.

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

## A New Collection!

## MARX AND ENGELS ON BRITAIN

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

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE  
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

Read the  
**NEW INTERNATIONAL**  
America's leading Marxist review

# Elections in the Histadrut And Workers' Democracy

By AL FINDLEY

The coming national election in Israel for a new Knesset (parliament) casts its shadow long before the actual campaign. A preliminary to the main bout was the convention of the Histadrut, the federation of labor. Histadrut conventions are not held at stated intervals; the timing of the convention for May was no doubt decided with an idea to the election.

The results of the vote at the convention were undoubtedly a victory for the Mapai, the governing labor party, which received about 60 per cent compared to 57 per cent in 1949.

Mapai ran on its record, defending its pro-Western policy, its contradictory position on peace with the Arabs, and above all its role as the builder of the state and the country. It came out for a "stabilized economy" and "holding the line" on wages—in effect endorsing the government policy of reducing the standard of living of the Israeli population. Like all other bureaucrats, the Mapai leaders think of raising productivity only in terms of machines, ignoring the human factor, namely, the importance of raising living standards in order to give more incentive to labor productivity.

The pro-Stalinist Mapam had gotten 34.5 per cent of the vote in 1949. Now, since the split in the party, it presented two lists. The Achdut Avodah, which is the more nationalistic and relatively less Stalinoid group of the two, went into the vote with a numerically smaller membership than the official Mapam, but got 16 per cent; whereas the official Mapam (Hashomer Hatzair) obtained only 11 per cent.

The main reason for the gain by Achdut Avodah with respect to its rival in the split no doubt lies in the declining attractiveness of pro-Russianism because of Moscow's anti-Semitic and anti-Zionist forays. The Achdut Avodah's advocacy of militant retaliation against the Arabs also played a role. Observers report that this group spent more money than other political groups in the campaign. This may be explained by the fact that it was its first public contest since its break with Mapam. However, there was also a rumor that the sums involved were so large that they must have come from another political grouping in order to defeat Mapam.

The open Stalinist party received 4 per cent, as compared with its previous 2.5 per cent, partly because of the adherence of the group of Moshe Sneh, former Haganah commander who led a small section of Mapam into the CP.

## NO VOTE FOR ARABS

It is important to report that the Arab members of Histadrut were not voters in this election. Despite the fact that the Histadrut leadership last year admitted Arabs into the organization, under pressure and very belatedly, the Arab workers were not given a chance to vote.

The "democratic" Jewish press, as well as the general press, was not concerned enough even to mention this "flaw" in a democratic election. We invite our readers' attention to dwell for a moment on the strange fact that this piece of information appears exclusively in LABOR ACTION.

The votes of over 10,000 Arab workers

are involved. These Israeli Arabs were admitted to membership but not given full and complete equality. Their exact status was left unclear.

At that time we wrote in LABOR ACTION that the formal admission of Arabs into the Histadrut was not enough to remove the stigma of racial separatism from it. Everything depended on the kind of membership the Arabs would receive. The fact that they have been denied the right to vote on an equal basis with Jewish workers augurs ill for the intentions of the Mapai leadership of the Histadrut with respect to their full integration. The struggle for the equality of Arab labor is still on the agenda.

The liberals have long had a labor group of their own in Histadrut, the Haoved Hatzioni, and it upped its vote from 4 per cent to 5 per cent.

The conservative party of Israel, the General Zionists, also put up a slate. Clearly, sectarianism is not their problem. They had the temerity to enter a Histadrut election by running on a "give-away program," to give away the cooperatives and the social-welfare institutions.

It was the first time they ran and they received only 2 per cent of the vote. In doing this, the General Zionists were not only engaging in a pre-election campaign but were giving left-handed recognition to the position of organized labor in Israel.

## BUREAUCRATIC SETUP

In one way or another, 90 per cent of all Israel workers are part of some Histadrut organization. About 70 per cent are members of the Histadrut proper. Others are connected with the Histadrut through its welfare organizations or cooperatives.

Histadrut cooperatives center in agriculture, but there are also industrial, building-construction and transport sections. The largest employs 25,000 workers. The movement also engages in public service activities, the principal one being Kapat Holim or workers' sick fund. About 60 per cent of the Israeli population receive comprehensive medical care through the Kapat Holim.

Of the 500,000 workers enrolled in Histadrut, over 400,000 voted. This fact has been hailed in lyrical terms to prove the democracy in the Histadrut. That it bespeaks the Histadrut's democratic forms cannot be denied. But there are more serious questions to be raised about democracy and bureaucracy in the Histadrut, in addition to the already discussed issue of Arab discrimination.

In a small country, with a small organization, it may once have been sufficient to have shop organizations controlled from the top with a democratic national convention, and with very few or no local unions and meetings. Given the structure of the Israeli labor movement today, this setup is at best an anachronism (to speak charitably about it). As against the system of appointment of local officials from above, the election of local and regional secretaries by the trade-union workers whom they serve would make the Histadrut more responsive to the wishes of its members.

The Histadrut's co-ops are run by appointed officials without any direct democratic participation of the rank-and-file workers in these fields. The tendency exists, and is growing, for the workers in these enterprises to look on the Histadrut as an employer and a capitalist to be fought.

Any number of strikes have taken place against the Histadrut, the largest being the seamen's strike of a few years ago. Anyone familiar with the system of distributing jobs and economic support knows the terrible power the officialdom has to punish rebellious strike leaders. Only deep-felt grievances and a growing alienation between the Histadrut and the workers could lead to such strikes.

A burning question for the Histadrut is therefore the problem of workers' democracy in enterprises which are nationalized or institutionalized as they are in Israel.

# BLUE-BLOOD

ANTHONY EDEN'S FAMILY TREE:  
A SOCIO-BOTANICAL SURVEY

By F. A. RIDLEY

Both Sir Anthony Eden and his more famous predecessor are "True Blue" Tory aristocrats; both belong to the authentic English aristocracy. The antecedents of Sir Winston Churchill are, by now, we imagine, tolerably well known, but those of the new prime minister are, by no means, common knowledge.

However, Sir Anthony, as well as Sir Winston, is an authentic product of the political and social oligarchy which was the effective ruler of England from the end of the seventeenth, to the end of the nineteenth century. . . .

Our present prime minister, Sir Anthony Eden, K.G., is a member of, what one could, perhaps, describe as one of "our noble families" of the second rank. For, unlike his predecessors, the Edens do not rank as "great" landowners with the Cecils, the dynasty of his present colleague, Lord Salisbury and of the earlier Lord Salisbury, who was Tory prime minister at the turn of this century, or with the Spencer Churchills, the House of the Dukes of Marlborough and of Sir Winston, Eden's immediate predecessor.

The Edens, however, as an aristocratic family of the second rank, have now been steadily accumulating "pelf and place" during the past centuries. Though their family fortunes have not attained the dazzling fortunes of the Grosvenors (Duke of Westminster), the Stanleys (Earl of Derby), or others of our topmost aristocratic rank, they have been slow but steady, until in the competent hands of Sir Anthony, they have now got right to the top.

The Edens are a North country family, originating from County Durham. Their evolution has proceeded with an "inevitability of gradualness," which must move the Labor leaders to an envious admiration! The North country proverb that has it that three generations take a family "from shirt-sleeves to shirt-sleeves," is not born out by the history of the English landed aristocracy.

Whilst it is true that there are very few aristocratic families that go back beyond the fifteenth century—when the old feudal nobility committed collective suicide in that sordid dynastic quarrel effectively disguised under the picturesque title of the "Wars of the Roses"—yet there are quite a number of our "old" families who can trace their unbroken descent, and unbroken "accumulation of capital," back to the, at least, sixteenth century.

Amongst these long-lived houses are the Edens, who can even trace a shadowy descent back to the fifteenth century, at which distant date the Edens held land in feudal tenure from the Prince Bishop of Durham who ruled over the northern Marches with a semi-royal authority throughout the Middle Ages.

In the reign of Charles the Second—1660-85—an Eden married an heiress of the Lambton family, later to become Earls of Durham, and was created a baronet. A little later, we find an Eden as governor of the then American colony of Maryland. Soon, there were generals in the army, admirals in the navy, and at the Board of Admiralty, commandants at Woolwich, and other high appointments, held by members of the Eden dynasty.

## REWARDS OF 'PRUDENCE'

The Edens, however, really "arrived" with the first Lord Auckland, a prominent politician in the later years of the eighteenth century. His lordship was, successively, Irish Secretary, foreign ambassador, and postmaster-general. His pensions and perquisites from these exalted positions ran into many thousands a year. The Edens, as one of their biographers has remarked, "have been very liberally rewarded for their services to the state."

In view of present-day Eden association with the Churchill dynasty, it is interesting to recall that the association between the two families dates back to the eighteenth century, when the Lord Auckland, of whom we spoke above, was returned to Parliament for the "rotten" borough of Woodstock, then owned by the Duke of Marlborough. This particular Eden died in 1814.

In the early nineteenth century, another Lord Auckland became governor-general of India, then salary £25,000, an office which he held from 1835-42. His tenure of office was "distinguished" by his disastrous First Afghan War, when only one man survived out of a large British army which had rashly invaded that rugged land, "the Switzerland of Asia." However, as a compensation for the loss of some 20,000 men, one of the greatest disasters ever experienced by

British arms in India, Lord Auckland received a large pension and his son was made a bishop!

As late as 1873, another son was still drawing another pension of about £800 a year. Quite a respectable record.

The motto of the Eden family is *Si Sit Prudentia*—"If there be but prudence." The past and present fortunes of the Eden family would certainly seem to indicate that it has steadily lived up to its dynastic motto. As Mr. Howard Evans wrote in his brilliant book, *Our Old Nobility*, from which most of the above facts have been taken:

"Thank Heaven we live in an enlightened country, where the members of aristocratic houses serve the state purely from patriotism and public spirit. We have not among us place-men, adventurers, and office seekers, even as these Americans! We make our Parliament the close preserve of wealthy men, and try to keep out those whose moderate means might tempt them to turn politics into a trade. What need of more Burts and Maddisoes and Gromers so long as we have plenty of Edens?"

## GENTLEMAN AND LANDOWNER

It has, however, been reserved for the present century to witness the "arrival" of the Edens at the topmost pinnacle of contemporary British political life. In which last respect, Sir Anthony has not had the best of luck. Jacob, in the Biblical story, had to wait seven years for his wife, Rachel; similarly, Mr. Eden has been waiting since the retirement of Lord (Mr. Stanley) Baldwin in 1937, that is, 18 years, for the highest office in the state, and for the concurrent leadership of the Tory party.

First, Neville Chamberlain, then, Mr. Churchill, the then "black sheep" of the Tory Party, by-passed the hopeful Eden.

However, during most of this time, Mr. Eden held high office, usually, the Foreign Office, the War Office, during the war. His career, if not particularly brilliant, has not been marked by any major disaster. Its solitary spectacular incident was his resignation from the post of foreign secretary in 1938, during the Chamberlain policy of "appeasement." Eden had been made foreign minister by Baldwin originally, in 1935.

As will be now be obvious from our brief sketch of his family antecedents, our prime minister is not—to put it mildly!—a member of the proletariat. Nor is there anything particularly petty-bourgeois about him! Contrarily, he belongs to an old and well-established English "county" family, which has now been steadily on the upgrade for several centuries. Sir Anthony Eden has his social and economic roots in no mythical Garden of Eden, but in solid English soil in County Durham where we understand, the prime minister is still quite a substantial landowner.

Sir Anthony has the appropriate background of his class; he was born at the apogee of the British Empire in 1897, the year of the "Diamond Jubilee" of the "great" Queen Victoria. He was educated at Eton and Oxford, and was, we believe, in the Guards during the First World War. With such a social background, and with such economic advantages, Mr. Eden could not fail to have become a Tory MP, and, granted a pleasing personality and fair abilities, both of which the present prime minister appears to possess, the road to high office lay straight before him.

—Socialist Leader (London)

Condensed.



**LABOR  
ACTION**

July 18, 1955 Vol. 19, No. 29

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

Editor: HAL DRAPER

Associate Editors:

GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL

Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

**BERKELEY**

## Young Socialists Demonstrate At the United Nations Talkfest

By JACK WALKER

BERKELEY, June 26—Despite the urgings of the Berkeley police to withdraw, and in the face of threatened arrests, the Berkeley unit of the YSL went ahead with a successful poster display and leaflet distribution before the UN meeting held at the Greek Theater of the University of California, this afternoon. However, no arrests were made and close to a thousand leaflets were distributed by a small group of participants.

The atmosphere of sickening adulation over the UN's "tenth birthday" in the Bay Area was also ameliorated by two vari-sided bright orange and yellow posters carrying slogans: "The UN—Den of Thieves" and "Neither Washington nor Moscow! For the Third Camp!" Each was signed "Young Socialist League."

The Berkeley cops—usually quite amenable about free-speech matters—had threatened to invoke an ancient ruling calling for special permits for such activities, which has been honored only in the breach in recent years. The YSL rejected this ad hoc ruling and ostentatiously kept one person aside as an observer at first, to see if poster holders or leaflet distributors were going to be arrested and therefore need legal help.

We also made a telephone call to the Northern California American Civil Liberties Union advising its Mr. Besig of our activity, and making an agreement to call back in an hour if not arrested—no call meaning the ACLU should contact the Berkeley police station to obtain the YSLers' release. This agreement, also repeated for the post-meeting demonstration, was loudly discussed in front of the cops, as about five police cars gathered in front of the YSLers, and it was undoubtedly communicated to the Berkeley chief of police, who arbitrated the matter via radio or telephone, with the cars soon withdrawing.

### BLAST AT UN

The YSL's unique view of the UN—as opposed to rumored G. L. K. Smith-inspired, Know-Nothing signs in San Francisco earlier in the week—drew a good deal of attention and questions as to what we were for.

Some of the UN delegates' chauffeured cars also passed the signs, and it would be interesting to speculate on the feelings of the smaller countries' delegates, especially those who have had their requests for an end to colonialism repeatedly ignored by the UN. The more European and Asian-minded lesser guests (there was only a sprinkling of students in the 10,000 ticket-holding audience), whether from foreign national staffs or simply residents of the Bay Area, were given something to think about beside the coordinated press accounts and lengthy syrupy coverage of fine details of the UN celebration over the radio and TV.

The headings of the YSL's leaflet clearly showed its position and declared the alternative sought by the YSL. The leaflet led off by blasting the UN as a "fraud and a failure," citing its impo-

### Young Socialist CHALLENGE

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

tence in the face of matters affecting the American-Russian conflicts, and discussing the Korean intervention where the UN acted as a U. S. façade in Korea. It noted how "At the Geneva conference last year the UN secretary-general ignominiously begged the powers to inform the UN of their plans, a servile gesture to save-face."

The second paragraph stated that "The fraud of the UN lies in the hypocritical justifications for its creation and existence advanced since its inception." The *San Francisco Chronicle's* special UN supplement described the UN as the "free nations" who fought the Second World War "against forces of greed and totalitarianism," but this was rejected as "the rationalizations of the victorious coalition in the imperialist Second World War. But the lie is given to these claims by both the structure and activities of the UN—the built-in domination of the big powers and their cynical struggles."

"The UN is a failure," the leaflet continued, "since its real function was to give formal organization and continuance to the wartime Teheran and Yalta conferences of the Big Three, and to police their peace. But this plan of the ruling imperialists was predicated on the assumption of an essential unanimity among the victors in negotiating and maintaining a division of the world into spheres of influence. The irrepressible expression of inter-imperialist rivalry and struggle between the antithetical economic and social systems put an end to the UN's intended purpose, within only a year of its founding [the Greek civil war]! Despite the UN's fundamental failure it still has a residual function beyond the burbling platitudes emanating from San Francisco this past week. Like the old League of Nations, the UN is an arena and a sounding-board where the great powers can conduct their normal imperialist policies, issue propaganda, and unite to throttle movements for independence or 'little' conflicts not instigated or controlled by them."

### GOOD SEND-OFF

"While rejecting illusions about this UN, we are still faced with the problem of preventing a new war, fostering international integration and obtaining security for the peoples of the world. As Third Camp socialists, who follow neither Washington nor Moscow, and who seek no deals between them, we urge the exploited masses throughout the world to rise up against all their oppressors and ignore UN conniving. Let the East and West Germans win reunification by revolutionary action from below, despite and in the face of the two foreign overlords. We urge the various labor and socialist parties to break with their 'own' ruling classes and put forward a truly democratic foreign policy, which coupled with a resolute program of social change at home can remove the existing capitalist and Stalinist governments that bar the way to a new, vital and democratic UN. We ask you to join us in this endeavor."

The YSL was the only demonstrating organization at this meeting, in contrast to the welter of signs and posters present—and confused—at the opening San Francisco sessions. In the face of a delay of the Yalta issue of LABOR ACTION intended for distribution, and with the notification of the Berkeley meeting, the YSL had decided to concentrate its activities in its "home" arena, and undoubtedly attracted more attention thereby.

Together with the recent front-page news coverage and radio and TV commentary on the favorable and precedent-making ruling on the Shachtman passport case, Third Camp socialism is receiving a good send-off at UC's first summer session this year.

## SDA Takes a Middle Road On Issue of ADA Relations

By ELI FISHMAN

The convention of Students for Democratic Action at Baltimore last month did not result in the vigorous kind of programmatic thinking which the current situation in American liberalism requires. At the same time, the left-wing, civil-libertarian tendency in the youth group emerged as a responsible and significant minority.

On the whole, the SDAers reaffirmed their previous political positions. There was some little discussion in the foreign-policy debate as to whether or not Formosa should be defended, but the convention majority clearly adhered to the regular liberal—and State Department—line on this issue. On most other political questions, there was little consideration of the need for a significant change in SDA's approach.

On the question of academic freedom, SDA reaffirmed its own position (which does not regard Stalinism as automatic grounds for dismissal from a teaching post). This, however, is hedged in by the relation between SDA and ADA. The adult organization does not have this position of academic freedom, and the extent to which SDA can push it politically will be determined by the way in which SDA-ADA relations are worked out.

It was this question of relations which was actually the main political issue at the convention. The actual discussion and vote took place in executive session, and cannot be reported on here. However, some public panels which occurred before the executive session, and discussion with the convention delegates, makes it possible to assess the situation.

### THREE VIEWS

In general, there were three major positions. One was for accepting the ADA proposals on relations, i.e., agreeing to considerable limitation of youth autonomy. The position upheld by the majority of the left wing was to attempt to negotiate the question with ADA and to struggle for youth independence with all means short of risking disaffiliation.

Then there was another position which would have split the two organizations if this were necessary in order to gain autonomy.

It is clear that there is probably no place for an independent liberal youth organization. Given the current political situation, it is difficult enough to build an affiliated group with the aid of ADA. Cut off from this aid, it is doubtful whether SDA would be able to survive in any meaningful sense over a substantial period of time.

Another factor is the nature of a liberal youth organization itself. The degree of political sophistication and commitment is not, in general, high enough to attempt the task of an independent existence. Here again, disaffiliation would probably mean the end of SDA as

### THE AIM OF THE YSL

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

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

—From the Constitution of the YSL

a political force among the American youth.

### SDA HAS A ROLE

This was the position which seemed to prevail among the left-wing delegates. In general, they refused to be moved by ultra-left arguments calling for an absolutist, i.e., disaffiliation, position. The element of consciousness and responsibility involved in this attitude is probably the most important thing to emerge from the convention. It provides the basis for a sound left-wing development in the organization in the year ahead.

At the same time, this gain will be lost if the left wing simply accepts the situation. It is clear that, since SDA must be affiliated to the organization of adult liberalism in the United States, it must work to change that group as well as its own. Indeed, the two go together: a fight in SDA is meaningless without a concomitant struggle in ADA.

If the left wing which appeared at the SDA convention maintains its level of responsibility and political maturity, it can still have a significant effect upon the liberal movement in the year to come. Internally, it can work in SDA to educate the organization to its politics. And internally, also, it can make of the close relation between SDA and ADA an advantage; it can press its case in the adult group and make itself felt there.

### NEW YORK YSL

## New Summer Class Starting July 13

### THE FUNDAMENTAL IDEAS OF SOCIALISM

WEDNESDAY EVE'S at 8:15

- (2) July 20  
What Is Capitalism?
- (3) July 27  
What Is Stalinism?
- (4) Aug. 3  
Why a Labor Party?
- (5) Aug. 10  
How Socialists Work for Peace
- (6) Aug. 17  
Democratic Socialism and the Future

All sessions will be held on consecutive Wednesday evenings at 273 Madison Street, Apt. 3A (Lower East Side), New York. Take D train to E. Broadway sta.

### YSL CLASS • NEW YORK

## Perspective on History & Revolution

TUESDAYS at 8 p.m.

- July 19—ABE STEIN  
Germany, 1914-1924
- July 26—HAL DRAPER  
The European Revolution and the Comintern, 1918-1920
- Aug. 2—ABE STEIN  
Germany, 1924-1934
- Aug. 16—ANNE RUSSELL  
The Spanish Revolution and Civil War
- Aug. 23—GORDON HASKELL  
Revolution in Asia—I
- Aug. 30—GORDON HASKELL  
Revolution in Asia—II

114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

# A Question of 'Normal Temperature'

## THE POST-McCARTHY CLIMATE

By HAL DRAPER

Especially since the personal eclipse of the man named McCarthy, some wishfully-thinking commentators have been talking as if the witchhunt hysteria is now a thing of the past. Such talk is mainly a commentary on the capacity of people to forget the civil-liberties picture of only yesterday. In a sense this kind of talk only underlines the permanent imprint of McCarthyism on American life.

To be sure, in the past period there has been an ease-up in the extreme manifestations of the witchhunt, especially in government employee circles. The last thing we want to do is derogate the ameliorations that have taken place. As a matter of fact, we're rather proud of having ourselves contributed not insignificantly to this amelioration by means of the impact which the Shachtman passport case had on government practice.

What this situation means, as we emphasized once before in LABOR ACTION, is that there is a great opportunity for the liberal and labor forces to go on the offensive in a positive drive for a "roll-back" on civil liberties.

But when, instead of seizing this chance for a successful attack, the liberals begin to talk as if we are practically back to the status quo ante McCarthyism, then it must be said: this is a way of evading the real fight that still has to be made. That's assuming they really believe their own talk.

### WHAT'S 'INSANE'?

For example, on June 30 an editorial in the N. Y. Post (which we take as example only because it has the best record in the major-newspaper field, not because it's especially bad) went out of its way to refer in the historical past tense to "that dismal era in American life known as the Time of mccarthyism." It was discussing the New York City eviction notices on 241 families in federal housing projects who had refused to sign loyalty oaths.

This is, said the Post, "a reminder that some of the insanity has survived the senator's political collapse."

Well, how much of the "insanity" has survived McCarthy's political collapse?

This is where a yardstick has to be used to distinguish between mere "insanity" and something which is not insane at all, namely, reactionary attacks on and deprivation of civil liberties.

If the government jails or otherwise punishes a man because of his radical political and social views, that is an authoritarian assault on civil liberties and a step toward a police-state.

But—

If the government jails or punishes a man for holding over-radical views when he does not hold such views at all but in fact is a conservative, then this is not merely anti-democratic but "insane" witchhunting.

"Insane" in this usage means: irresponsible; getting out of hand and threatening the witchhunt system itself; self-defeating; irrational even from the point of view of the witchhunters.

### RUSSIAN EXAMPLE

Irresponsible witchhunting of this sort is recognized as a serious danger to the regime not only by the Russian totalitarian despotism but especially by this kind of state. For it is precisely under totalitarianism that the purge system continually tends to get "out of hand," i.e., go to irrational extremes. The Moscow totalitarians periodically and frequently have to catch themselves up on the suicidal consequences of this inevitable phenomenon, because it is a danger built into the totalitarian structure of political relationships.

We are making this comparison with Russian totalitarianism not in order to insinuate identity between the present U. S. witchhunt and this extreme form of bureaucratic state, but in order to provide

a test for the meaning of "insanity" on civil liberties.

Take, for example, the tenants' loyalty oath which occasioned the above-mentioned Post editorial. There is no "loyalty oath" hysteria in Russia. Of course, for one thing, the Russian system is far beyond such tactics. But as a matter of fact, the "loyalty oath" drive in its contemporary American form would never have made any sense there. And this is for the very reason which liberals have so often cogently argued against the oath system: real "subversives" or really dangerous opponents of the regime will not be caught this way. This American oath hysteria has been a blow, not primarily against the Stalinists who are its ostensible targets, but more often against "harmless" non-conformists who insist on sticking their necks out precisely because they glory in the proud confidence that they are not really "subversive."

### BERIA-TYPE ARGUMENT

Certain things may follow when a liberal argues that the "loyalty oath" device should be curtailed or abandoned because it is entirely ineffective in catching any "subversive"—that is, certain things follow when such a liberal simultaneously accepts the assumption that "subversives" should be caught and punished, and that (say) a Stalinist comes under this category of people who are to be deprived of democratic rights.

An argument which accepts the witch-hunting premise while opposing the given witchhunting device only on grounds of efficiency is not a civil-liberties argument at all. It does not distinguish itself ideologically from the viewpoint of the intelligent and "sane" police-state thought-cop (like Beria in his time) as against the frenzied and "insane" police-state terrorist (like the Yezhov whom Beria replaced) who is a danger to his own regime.

Again, we do not make this comparison in order to throw into the same bag both compromising liberals and GPU hangmen. We will not insult our readers by painstakingly pointing out the gulfs between. We are inquiring into a means of distinguishing between "insane" witchhunting and "sane" attacks on civil liberties and democracy.

Many a refugee from the Russian concentration camps has stressed the frequency with which wholehearted supporters of the regime find themselves in the GPU net without any idea of how or why they got there. Up to a certain point there is a totalitarian rationale for this which is no part of our subject. But even in the extreme conditions of Stalinland, the tendency is to go beyond this point, with a cyclical recoil and return to totalitarian "liberalization." (The period when Beria took over from Yezhov, and the present post-Stalin Great Relaxation, are two cases of the latter.)

### LADEJINSKY-TYPE CASE

Now in America when a Ladejinsky is caught up in the coils of the witchhunt and victimized "by mistake," and then this mistake is corrected, the civil-liberties character of this pattern bears some analysis.

It would surely be a mistake to assign it no civil-liberties meaning at all, on the ground that Ladejinsky was ideologically a thorough conformist himself and the whole thing simply a matter of political "mistaken identity." In point of fact, the forces that were mobilized around the Ladejinsky case on both sides split along lines mainly determined by civil-liberties viewpoints.

The case became a cause célèbre because it was taken up by influential political figures who were more concerned with preserving civil liberties as against those who were less so concerned. The former were often types (Fair Deal Democrats, for example) who thought the witchhunt was going "too far"—which means that it was quite all right with them when it went a considerable distance, as in the Smith Act prosecutions of the CP. They became patrons of Ladejinsky because they could take up

his case without coming out in support of democratic rights for a "subversive." They became enthusiastic about his case because they rightly thought they could convince even the witchhunters, and thereby administer a check to "excesses." In the Ladejinsky-type case, there are formally no ideological differences on civil liberties at stake, but the actual political line-up has an impact on the actual drift.

There is no question, consequently, of merely derogating the value of defending a Ladejinsky-type victim of "mistaken identity"; but at the same time it is a self-deception and an evasion to puff up such "corrections" into a basic defeat or elimination of the witchhunt. The real value of even a mere "mistaken identity" case is that it can encourage the pro-democratic forces to fight; but if the latter pretend that the fight has already been won, they are rationalizing capitulation.

The "fight" we are talking about in this case is for the right to non-conformist views—and we mean not only socialist and radical views but also the Stalinist views of our political enemies.

The degree to which a liberal can find himself accepting the witchhunt in the very act of chortling over its defeat is excellently shown by an article of Vannever Bush in the March 20 N. Y. Times magazine.

It begins with thanksgiving: "After a spell of fever the country has now returned to an almost normal temperature as it regards the problem of loyalty on the part of its citizens in high or sensitive places."

### NEW NORM

Now this is an immensely significant statement, because it means that this no-doubt well-intentioned liberal, who detests McCarthy, accepts the present atmosphere as the new "normal temperature" of civil liberties:

New York City imposes a loyalty-oath test for prospective jurors.

A couple of FBI informers who proclaim that they lied are indicted, not for lying against "subversives," but for "perjuring" themselves by confessing.

An Oregon teacher is ordered to cease using "The Lonesome Train" as an English class recitation.

While Bush was writing about his new normality, Attorney General Brownell tells a Congressional committee why the Justice Department secured a grand-jury indictment of Val Lorwin on the false charge of being a Communist, when it had no evidence. Brownell explained that the government prosecutor "indicated that he felt it was better to indict Mr. Lorwin on slight evidence rather than appear before a Senate committee to explain why he had not obtained an indictment."

Edward Corsi, a Republican stalwart, is run out of Washington as being next door to a subversive because of his dim view of some McCarran Act provisions.

Bail-bondsmen will not "extend to pro-Communists the credit they habitually offer dope-peddlers," explains Murray Kempton in a N. Y. Post column. "The surety companies do have one excuse for their refusal; it was a regular habit of Harry Truman's Justice Department to harass anyone who came forward with bail for an indicted Commie."

In Kentucky, a Negro's home was bombed after Jim Crow threats, and justice is done by arresting a friend of the bombed Negro, who may or may not be a Stalinist; this Carl Braden is sentenced to 15 years for advocating the violent overthrow of the State of Kentucky, and though he appeals, he remains in jail because his bail is set at twice as high as the previous state record in capital cases.

The Supreme Court refuses to review a decision of the Illinois courts that a lawyer seeking admission to the bar in that state may be denied permission to practice if he refuses to answer questions as to whether he is a member of the CP.

The Federal Communications Commission proposes a loyalty-oath program for

commercial and amateur radio licensees.

The Board of Education of the enlightened and cosmopolitan city of New York decides that all teachers must be compelled to be stoolpigeons and informers.

The Post Office imposes a rule (protested even by some deep-dyed reactionaries) limiting the right to receive publications from Russia, in such a way as to hamper everybody BUT Russian agents.

At the port of Boston, customs agents burn sacks of mail arriving from the Stalinist states, and not only that, but also pacifist pamphlets and literature from England.

"Anti-subversive" Broyles bills, previously stopped in Illinois as blows against everyone's civil liberties, are signed by the governor at last.

In the California legislature, two solons introduce bills requiring that occupational licenses be taken away if the Fifth Amendment is invoked by would-be doctors, optometrists, bedding inspectors, dry-cleaning operators, dog-trainers, etc.

The liberal-Democratic Governor Harriman of New York State shows up his Republican predecessor Tom Dewey by barring the Daily Worker from his "off-the-record" press conferences, whereas Dewey used to coddle the Communists at these affairs.

In January, a South Carolina Democratic senator (no subversive, huh) accused the administration of using "fascist methods" in the federal employee security program. . . .

The above is not an attempt at a complete record of the last few months but is jotted down partly from some clippings and partly from memory.

### BUSH'S AXIOM

Yet a liberal scientist happily speaks of a return to "an almost normal temperature." The vagaries of this liberal mind can be further assessed when it is mentioned that, in substantiation, Bush immediately refers to three cases: Oppenheimer, Condon, Ladejinsky. What—the Oppenheimer and Condon cases show a "return to normal"? Both were fired from their posts, and in Condon's case it was a job in private industry, not even in government. The semi-credible summary by Bush is:

"Oppenheimer is living a happy and constructive life, contributing to our philosophy, if not to our defense. Condon is teaching physics rather than making new kinds of glass, and no doubt teaching well."

Perhaps Bush is merely a Polyanna? No, we are afraid that his trouble is not simply an excess of optimism. It is his "normal temperature" which has changed.

For in the very course of chortling over the happy victory of democracy, he documents his full acceptance of the new norm established by McCarthyism.

He takes it as axiomatic that "In the first place, we want to throw the Communists out. If there is a man, of any rank in the government, who is taking his orders from the Kremlin, we want to get rid of him promptly." (Emphasis added.) There is little reason to doubt that when he says "taking orders from the Kremlin," he is not referring to proved spies but to CP members as such, in the common way of our naive neo-McCarthyites who detest McCarthy. If a citizen is "part of a foreign conspiracy to wreck the nation," says Bush, "he is a traitor"! No less. Now even the liberal ADA has labeled the CP as such as primarily a "conspiracy." The scientific thinker Bush can hardly be unaware of the meaning of his off-hand words. If the "conspirator," he adds, is not a citizen, then he is a "spy." "In either case he must be found out and dealt with according to his deserts."

Taken literally, this call by Bush for such draconic treatment of Stalinists is somewhat more horrific than McCarthy's formal positions. We need not take him literally, of course. In the first place, he is tossing these terrible words off simply in passing, without any more than casual thought, as something which is ABC. This, indeed, is the most vivid comment on his new "normal temperature"!

### CHANCE TO WIN

But Bush wants a security system that will offer "reasonable protection to the innocent. . . ." Here is a hallmark of the "liberal" distinction on civil liberties! If a man is not really a sympathizer with subversive ideas, why then Democracy insists that he must not be victimized. . . .

Time was when liberalism made its mark by defending the right of non-conformists, not of those "innocent" of non-conformism.

Few have been the voices that have

(Continued bottom of next page)

## REPORT FROM ROME

# Hope in Sicily for Socialism: CP and Rightist Vote Declines

By LUCIO LIBERTINI

ROME, July 2—The elections to the Sicilian Regional Assembly, which were held on June 5, represent an important event in Italian political life.

Sicily has a cultural and political history of its own. A tenth of the Italian population live on the island, which contains important sources of wealth (sulphur, oil and many agricultural products, especially citrus fruits). As reparation for the damages suffered at the hands of the central government in Rome after the unification of the Italian state, the island receives a yearly subsidy of 32 billion lire (about \$5 million). It obtained considerable local autonomy, and is ruled by its own parliament, which has extensive legislative powers and administers part of the revenue from taxes.

Although there is an old socialist tradition in Sicily—going back to the great socialist peasant movements of 1893—the parties appealing to the left were relatively weak after the liberation. In the referendum on the form of government, about 70 per cent of the electorate voted for a monarchy, while socialists and Stalinists together polled less than 300,000 votes.

Sicilian society was, and to a large extent still is, dominated by a few great landowning families controlling thousands of acres as well as the sulphur mines, who attempt to maintain their despotic power with the help of the mafia and sometimes of banditism. The mass of the population in the cities (mainly Palermo, Catania and Messina) is in a state of social disintegration and is easily maneuvered by the powerful; thousands of families live in real hovels, many are permanently unemployed, many are illiterate.

## PEASANT STRUGGLE

The peasant class is socially more solid; it lives in the center of the island under miserable conditions but, because of its militancy and of its old socialist traditions, it has a real revolutionary potential.

In the countryside the contrast between classes is sharp and obvious: next to the large landowners defending their possessions live the mass of peasants who demand the division of the great estates. Up to now, the property owners were able to keep the peasant movement in check with the help of the *lumpen-proletariat* of the cities and especially with the help of the state apparatus.

In 1947 the Communist Party began organizing in Sicily with much ability and success. Thousands of workers from Northern Italy were sent by the CPI to Sicily with the task of organizing the peasants. Sections sprang up everywhere.

By means of this organizing drive, and

in close alliance with Nenni's socialists, the Stalinists created a political and trade-union movement which tackled the land question with great energy. There were hard fights between the peasants and the landlords. Many peasants were imprisoned, others were murdered by the bandits of the landlords, still others were wounded in encounters with the police.

## 'PEOPLE'S BLOC'

The social result of these struggles was a law finally conceded by the major conservative party, the Christian Democrats, in 1951. According to the terms of the law, 400,000 acres of land were to be divided among the peasants.

The political result was a great electoral advance of the "People's Bloc" (CP and PSI), which polled over half a million votes in 1951. It should be noted that Saragat's social-democratic party (the PSDI), which did not exist in 1946 and which was formed only in 1947 as a result of a split in Nenni's party, obtained at that time over 120,000 votes.

At this point (between 1951 and 1953) the problem of political clarification arose within this great mass movement—a problem which had already arisen in the North. The masses who joined the united movement because they felt it corresponded to their fundamental class interests, had made direct contact with the Stalinist organization and, along with its great strength, began to experience its defects. Consequently the peasants were again faced with the problem of having to distinguish between socialism and Stalinism.

In 1953, when Nenni considered it opportune to present separate socialist tickets in the general elections and the "People's Bloc" broke up, the situation had not yet matured completely in this sense. Therefore the majority of former "People's Bloc" supporters voted for the Stalinists, which in their eyes had the merit of having led the fight for the land. Only a part voted for the socialists.

## 1955 RESULTS

The parties appealing to the left received the following votes: CP 497,000; PSI (Nenni) 175,000; PSDI (Saragat) 55,000; USI 26,000.

The strong loss in Saragat's votes is

to be explained partly by the appearance of the USI, the Independent Socialist Union led by Magnani-Cucchi, which advocated the unity on a Third Camp position of all three socialist parties, and partly by the distinction which the PSI had made between itself and the Stalinists, thereby attracting many voters who had formerly supported Saragat.

In the camp of the right the 1953 elections increased the strength of the Christian Democracy (831,000 votes), followed by the monarchists (263,000) and the fascists (267,000). The regional government was formed by a coalition of Christian Democrats, monarchists and fascists, which the social-democrats occasionally supported.

The 1955 elections, on the contrary, were characterized by the decline of the extreme right and of the Stalinists, with an advance of Christian Democracy and of the PSI. The Christian Democrats rose to 895,000 votes, the PSI to 225,000. The independent socialists (USI) lost 6,000 votes; Saragat's social-democrats lost about 20,000; the liberals (a conservative party) lost 15,000; the fascists 45,000, and the monarchists about 30,000.

The orientation of the voters can easily be explained on the basis of a few fundamental considerations. The progress of Christian Democracy has taken place at the expense of the extreme right. The fascist propaganda is becoming less and less effective, partly because of the cultural and political evolution of the masses, partly because the capitalists consider it more useful to support Christian Democracy. Similar reasons explain the decline of the monarchists, who have, however, stronger roots in Sicilian society.

## NENNI'S GAINS

The process of differentiation and of political clarification which we mentioned earlier has led to the spectacular success of the PSI. This party has conducted a very expensive and very able campaign, with substantial help from the Stalinists: 200 million lire, it is said. Relations with the Stalinists were systematically ignored by the speakers, who only mentioned the "unity of the working class."

Nenni promised a policy of autonomy and hinted that he would differentiate himself more clearly from the Stalinists if his party would receive a large number of votes. The electors believed him, so the PSI drew votes from every other party of the left: from the Stalinists, in spite of their powerful organization; from the independent socialists, who were lacking both money and an organization; from the social-democrats, who

Our new correspondent, Lucio Libertini, is a national committee member of the Unione Socialista Indipendente of Italy. We hope to see his Reports from Rome at regular intervals in our columns.—Ed.

were considered to be too closely allied with the clericals. To these one should add the Stalinist or Christian-Democratic voters who publicly declared that they would have voted socialist had there been a single, genuinely independent socialist party. If Nenni and Saragat had not rejected the proposal of the independent socialists to present a united socialist ticket, the socialist movement might well have totaled 400,000 votes.

In spite of the advance of the PSI the Sicilian elections represent a conservative victory. Christian Democracy is preparing to renew the alliance with the monarchists and fascists, which will give the right once again a comfortable majority in Parliament.

The new Parliament will resolve the four major problems of the island according to the interests of the capitalist bloc. These problems, which were also the main campaign issues, are oil, land, sulphur and electric power. The parties of the left demanded that the great Anglo-American monopolies be excluded from the oil concessions; that all the land set aside by the 1951 law, plus an additional 250,000 acres, be divided among the peasants; that the sulphur mines be nationalized, since private enterprise is no longer able to keep them operating (unemployment among miners is growing daily); that the Sicilian company which holds the monopoly of electric power be curtailed.

## SOCIALIST IDEAS GROW

After the vote of June 5, it is easy to foresee that, in conformity with the forces they represent, the government parties will continue to grant large oil concessions to the Anglo-American cartel and that they will stifle any serious attempts at carrying out a land reform. The nationalization of the sulphur mines will not be mentioned again, and the monopolists of electricity will maintain their profitable stranglehold.

Yet there are hopeful signs to relieve this perspective of reaction. For one thing, the total vote of the parties appealing to the left (socialists and CP) rose in these years from 250,000 to about 800,000. More important, there has been a growth of socialist consciousness, which could give the Sicilian working class a secure and effective leadership.

The Stalinists greatly contributed, it must be recognized, to the awakening of the people's consciousness, but today their subjection to Russia inhibits the growth of every popular movement they lead. The socialists alone can stimulate and extend future struggles of the people. In Sicily, as in Italy as a whole, the unity and the independence of the socialists is the only instrument capable of breaking the domination of clericalism and conservatism.

# Game of Bluff-and-Swap — —

(Continued from page 1)

unification of Germany.

Adelbert Weinstein, a General Staff major in the war, now military editor of the Frankfurt organ, visited the U. S. in a 6-week tour of military installations, including the Strategic Air Command; discussed military problems with "some of the leading U. S. strategists"; and—

"He returned to West Germany convinced, as he reported, that the U. S. Air Force never could give up its air bases in Western Europe and West Germany and that this in effect meant that Washington's strategy implied the permanent partition of Germany."

## EDEN'S OFFER

This is a conclusion which has been borne in on the West Germans by far more extensive evidence. It flows from Washington's basic orientation toward dependence on short-range militarization at the expense of any political considerations. The German people were told substantially the same thing by Von Bonin, in the explosive case which hit the country's headlines when the NATO policy was attacked by this head of Bonn's shadow General Staff.

These are conservative rightists launching this campaign, "solid" bourgeois elements, it must be understood. It is not simply a question of the Social-Democratic Party's "neutralism."

Hence, Eden's worries. To counter the

expected power of Russia's political appeal to the Germans, he proposes what is in effect a standard-type imperialist deal. In exchange for a unified Germany which is to be tied to the West despite Moscow's insistence, he offers a "guarantee of the Soviet Union's Western borders," including the borders of the satellite states.

Formally, this is supposed to reassure the Russians and Poles against German expansion beyond the Oder-Neisse boundary. Behind this formal reassurance is the wider concept of tempting the Russians with a Western approval and endorsement of its control over its present empire short of Germany.

The U. S. has been rejecting the thought of any such deal for its own reasons, but the Eden flyer underlines the difficulty of all of the neutralists. How is a neutralist solution to be worked out without some form of cold imperialist bargain made over the lives and freedom of subject peoples?

Behind Eden's ideas is the fact that there has always been strong pressure in Britain, not only from Eden's party but also from the Labor Party neutralists, to make a deal with Russia for an imperialist peace at the expense of the German people. These ideas have been more crudely expressed, indeed, by some Bevanite leaders than by anyone else (R. H. S. Crossman, for example). There is now the analogous proposal to make a deal with Russia for German

unity at the expense of the satellite peoples.

## SOCIALIST DEMANDS

Simply to demand German unity, therefore, evades the real issue of cold-war politics. If German unity is a conceivably possible outcome of the Geneva conference, it is so only on the basis of some such violation of democratic morality as the British appeasement plan.

(As a matter of fact, however, Russia has shown no readiness to yield up its East German satrapy even for Eden's stakes, as its reply on Tuesday indicated.)

Socialist demands for German unity, therefore, can be meaningful only in the framework of a democratic foreign policy which is directed toward carrying on political warfare against the Russian despotism, not toward making an imperialist deal with it.

In this, the socialist approach differs basically not only from that of the neutralists, but also from that of the German bourgeois anti-NATO propagandists, who would be quite happy to accept a unification deal at the expense of reinforcing Moscow's control over East Europe. It makes possible "political warfare" not only against the Russian designs, but also "political warfare" against the reactionary policies of U. S. imperialism, which can have nothing in common with a truly democratic foreign policy.

## Post-McCarthy — —

(Continued from page 6)

been raised on cases that are not simply cases of "mistakes" and "excesses" in the witchhunt against dangerous thoughts. Ex-Senator Cain has even made a "liberal" reputation for himself, which we duly appreciate as well as the next man, by his simple and elementary demands for a minimum of democratic procedure on the notorious "subversive list," but it is not Cain who questions the need and propriety and desirability of enforcing an accurate "subversive list," namely, the kind of subversive list that Cain himself has been working up as a member of the McCarran Act's Subversive Activities Control Board.

Cain too, in a sense, has been calling for a return to the new "normal temperature" of American democracy—that new norm which was established by the Truman-Eisenhower witchhunt and the impact of McCarthyism.

Back in March, LABOR ACTION headlined: "Government Witchhunt Thrown on Defensive: It's a New Chance for Labor and Liberals." This is still the significance of the new developments on the civil-liberties front: we have a new chance to fight—and win. One of the obstacles is the pretension that there is no need to fight because the fight has been won. Insofar as this latter idea gains ground among liberals, their fight has been lost.

# Disarmament Ritual-Dance — —

(Continued from page 1)

North Africa, Japan and the islands of the Pacific. It has been the clincher in inducing France and other reluctant partners to accept the idea of the rearmament of Germany.

Other factors, to be sure, have contributed to the spread of American military might all over the globe. Economic bribes have gone along with the argument from military necessity. The position of the United States as the overlord of the capitalist world, as well as its chief prop, has made it difficult for weaker nations and governments to resist the establishment of American military bases on their territory. But whatever the pressures may have been behind the scenes, the political justification was always the same: If we don't accept the American proposals and demands, who will defend us from the Russians?

In the course of their current world "peace" campaign, the Stalinist leaders appear to have recognized the enormous political advantage the United States has derived from the menace to Europe of Russia's military might. It is this political advantage which they are seeking to destroy, or at least to undermine, by their current proposals on disarmament.

## PROPOSAL

In a nutshell, what they propose is that Russia and the United States reduce their armed forces to about 1,500,000 men each. China and the East European satellites would reduce their armed forces proportionately, as would the remaining NATO powers. International inspection teams would be placed at strategic railroad and embarkation points which would make it possible for them to observe any unusual movements or concentrations of arms or men. At the same time, all the governments concerned would withdraw their armed forces to their national frontiers, giving up all bases on foreign territory.

The Stalinists do not expect the United States or the governments most closely allied or most dependent on it to accept this proposal. The fundamental basis of America's world imperialist position is its economic strength, not the foreign territories over which it rules. Nevertheless, this economic strength requires a vast military establishment spread over most of the world to be exercised effectively.

American bases on Okinawa, Japan and the Philippines, in North Africa,

Spain, Italy and France, may not be needed every day in the year to impress the peoples of these countries and surrounding territories with the fact that they must reckon with the might of the United States in every major decision they make. But when crises arise, whether of Stalinist manufacture or stemming from other sources, American bases on the spot give the United States a power of intervention which it could not possibly have without them.

**If the Stalinists do not really make these proposals in the expectation that they or anything like them will be accepted by the United States, why do they make them? Because they believe they will appear reasonable and "peace-loving" to the peoples of Europe and Asia; and because they believe the American rejection of them will undermine the political justification for the military expansion of the capitalist bloc.**

## TWO SIDES

The Stalinist argument is simple enough: *You, the peoples of Europe, have been afraid of the powerful Russian army. Your fears have been baseless, as we are peace-loving people who never intend to conquer others. We have maintained our armies solely for self-defense. But be that as it may, we now propose to remove any possible basis for your fears. We will reduce our armed forces to levels which would make an invasion and conquest of Europe impossible. All we ask is that you and the Americans simultaneously reduce your armed forces to levels which would make the invasion and conquest of our bloc impossible. If this is done on both sides, there can be no possible need for American troops and planes to remain based in your countries. Let all withdraw to their national frontiers. And in these circumstances the Germans, whom many of you fear, will not have to be permitted to build up a strong army.*

Up till now, the standard American approach to all disarmament proposals has been to raise the question of inspection as the chief obstacle to disarmament. The American argument has run: *We would be willing to reduce our armaments, if we could be sure that the Russians and their satellites would do likewise. In our country, and in the democracies of NATO the level of armament is pretty easy to ascertain. Appropriations for military use are made openly in parliamentary bodies. But in totali-*

*tarian countries like Russia, where every industrial and military matter is a state secret, only the closest and freest inspection can assure adherence to any agreement on reduction of armaments. Unless we can agree on a satisfactory method of inspection, there is no point to discussing anything else with regard to disarmament.*

## EISENHOWER RENEGES

The Stalinist proposal on reduction of armed forces does not meet the American demand for inspection. At best, the "control" provisions could give a warning of mobilization for large-scale war. But the American demand for inspection, justified though it be on technical grounds, would lose much of its political effectiveness if the United States makes it clear, under Russian pressure and prodding, that even if the American inspection provisions were met, the United States would still be willing to withdraw from its world-wide bases as part of a scheme of general disarmament.

Further, the inspection demand is now being exposed as an evasion of the popular demand for disarmament in the atomic field, where it was first proposed by the American government. Now that the Stalinists have nuclear weapons too, the United States is seeking to withdraw from the position it took in the United Nations debates on the control or banning of nuclear weapons.

In his press conference on July 6, President Eisenhower was asked a number of questions on disarmament. Here is the bulk of what he had to say on inspection, especially with regard to nuclear weapons:

"Now, one way to approach this problem is what would we, in the United States . . . what kind of inspection are we ready to accept? Are we ready to open up every one of our factories, every place where something might be going on that could be inimical to the interests of somebody else? . . . This question of inspection, what we will accept and what, therefore, we would expect others to accept is a very serious one and, consequently, there is just nothing today that I could say that is positive beyond this point.

"We earnestly want to find some answer to this complicated question because, to my mind, it is perfectly stupid for the world to continue to put so much in these agencies and instrumentalities

that cost us so much, and if we don't have this war, do us so little good."

Later in the same press conference the president stated that there is no way to detect "items that have been already manufactured and concealed," and that "if there was peacetime work going ahead, as reactors working with even a lower grade, I think there would be no assurance that you could not convert them rapidly to war use, nor I think, possibly could you be sure that they weren't actually producing a little bit of, you might say, extra, auxiliary, that was going into weapons."

Even though Eisenhower's remarks were made off the cuff, and were followed by some further expressions about the earnest desire to find an answer, it is clear that the American government is backing away from its inspection proposals, or is preparing to back away from them in the event the Russians should decide to call their hand on the inspection bluff.

## THEY HAVEN'T CHANGED

Thus, the popular desire for disarmament has no more bearing on what the imperialist powers will actually do than it did between World War I and World War II. It is useful to remember that the disarmament proposals and schemes and negotiations of the '20s and early '30s foundered before Hitler began to rearm Germany. Most powers were willing to accept proposals which would not hurt their power positions, but rejected those which would have. One item from those earlier disarmament negotiations may serve to cast light on how much store is to be placed in the possibilities of disarmament now.

In one of the conferences of the inter-war period it was proposed that all governments sign a convention pledging themselves not to bomb civilian centers from the air. Britain refused to sign. Why? Because the British made it a regular practice to wipe out the villages of rebellious tribesmen in the Northwest frontier area of India by aerial bombardment.

The imperialists have not changed from those days. They have only become more clever in their attempt to exploit the peace sentiments of the peoples. A merciless exposure of the fraud they make of "disarmament" is a necessary task for all those who really want to combat the political warfare of both power blocs in the interest of human liberation.

# Liberal Party and Berle — —

(Continued from page 1)

ways presents a monolithic front to the ranks, and all differences among the top leaders are classified as top military secrets as far as the members are concerned. This bureaucratic practice only leads to heightened rumors and speculation among the members as to what the real story is.

Will Berle find his way back to the Democratic Party? ILGWU President David Dubinsky spotlighted the fact that Berle had been an enrolled Democrat when he was originally asked to become Liberal Party chairman. Berle was a "brain-truster" for both Roosevelt and LaGuardia, and served as assistant secretary of State under Roosevelt. With a Democratic administration in New York State, and a possible Democratic victory in 1956 nationally, perhaps Berle has visions of advancing again and doesn't want to be encumbered by any Liberal Party baggage. Time will tell.

## STAYING IN BUSINESS

The Liberal Party leaders—Dr. Childs, Dubinsky, and Hatters Union President Alex Rose—in turn were in the position of protesting a bit too much in the midst of their accolades to Berle. Their speeches sounded especially hollow following Berle's oration and the report of the special party organization committee. This committee, after months of meetings and conferences with club representatives to get a comprehensive review of the activities of the party, reported on its findings.

While the report was miserably inadequate, nevertheless the committee was bent on scotching the rumors about Liberal Party dissolution and strongly recommended intensified organizing efforts and justified the party's separate political existence. While endorsing the general policy of coalitionism, it urged

that the party "act alone when coalition would mean a sacrifice of principles."

Berle spoke after the committee report, with its recommendations on how to build and strengthen the party. His speech was in the nature of a "legacy"—a last testament, embodying "new" ideas, controversial by his admission, presumably to arm the party for the 1956 presidential campaign. He was offering these ideas not exclusively to the Liberals but to the Democrats as well, and he had nothing, literally nothing, to say about the urgent need to maintain the Liberal Party. His silence on this point was eloquent indeed.

## LOVE AFFAIR

The highlight of his speech, pointing up his continued shift to the right, was a ludicrous vision of union welfare and pension funds stealthily taking over big business by 1975. Berle, who once wrote a classic study exposing the monopolistic trends of American capitalism (more recently atoned for by a new book celebrating the glories of "The Twentieth Century Capitalist Revolution") now predicts that unions will own 35 per cent of all big business in 20 years and this percentage is "normally working control." He didn't comment on who would control the other 65 per cent.

With such a trend, Berle insisted, labor and liberals must revise their attitude to big business—after all, you can hardly go around attacking yourselves! Berle's love affair with big business gets more passionate with time, but some hangover from better days made him issue a word of caution—the usual platitude that big business must become "a public civil servant, not a public master."

Dr. Childs hailed Berle's collection of diluted liberal clichés as a brilliant legacy and gave him full credit for his mastery of the "irrational, fantastic logic of coal-

ition politics." Childs attempted to grapple with the problem of the gap between the stated high ideals and principles which the Liberals trot forward on holiday occasions and the muck and muddle of Realpolitik. It was a truly disgusting performance from a man of vaunted integrity and intellectual honesty. Hopelessly caught in the Liberal Party dilemma, his speech became a defense of sordid means to justify worthwhile ends.

At this point, too, he felt it necessary to attack those who wish to keep their principles so pure and undefiled that the result is their withdrawal from active politics. Somewhat obscurely at this point, he referred to "those whom my friend Alex Rose likes to refer to as the card-playing socialists." It was unclear whether he was referring to the social-democrats and other retired ex-socialists who enjoy a game of pinochle, or to certain Liberal Party clubs whose headquarters are graced by fully occupied card tables. Childs placed Berle somewhere between the Olympian heights of pure principles and the lower depths of sewer politics by naming him an "oriented situationalist"—fancy title for an opportunist.

## ROSE WARNS

Alex Rose spoke less on Berle's resignation and more on an evaluation of the post-war decade and the role of the Liberal Party within it. He drew an analogy between the reactionary trends of the decades following World Wars I and II, reminding the audience of the Palmer raids and the political terrorism of the '20s and the McCarthyism of our decade.

In a strong attack on the invasion of civil rights and liberties, he termed the decade "degenerated, discouraged, demoralized, and depressed." In this darkness, he asserted that the Liberal Party had dared to go counter to the trend and

that it had played a great role. He warned too against merging the Liberal Party since invitations to merge are not always a "sign of affection," and that "they would rather have us inside their party without influence than outside with influence."

Rose charged that individualism and non-conformism were suspect in our decade, and he chided the liberals for hiding under their political beds (which is surely no worse than sleeping in some of the political beds made by Rose). He announced that "a new intellectual leader" would replace Berle. Why not an outstanding trade-union leader?

## HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE

### LABOR ACTION

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

Please enter my subscription:

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

NAME (please print) .....

ADDRESS .....

ZONE STATE .....

CITY .....