

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

OCTOBER 1, 1956

FIVE CENTS

AMERICA AS ARBITER

... page 6

Why Nenni and Saragat Are Talking Unity

... page 3

Racist Counter-Offensive in the South

... page 5

Louisiana Story: The Tale of a Sellout

... page 2

Bertolt Brecht as the Poet of the GPU

... page 4

Dulles' 2nd Suez Plot Fizzles Out

The latest chapter in the Suez story—the second London conference to set up Dulles' "smart lawyers' play," the Canal Users Association, as an alliance to blackmail Egypt—can be summed up in one word. It was an historic fiasco from the point of view of the Big Three.

The reason: lack of support to the plot even from among the 15 nations that went along at the first conference. Has there been another occasion when the colonialists appeared before world public opinion in such shunned isolation?

Evidence for and consequence of this is the bitterness of unofficial governmental and official press comments in Britain and France, the latter at first even refusing to join Dulles' users' outfit.

But Egypt is by no means out of the woods, even if it can continue its success in operating Suez in spite of every step taken by the company, its pilots, and the Big Three governments to sabotage the canal.

As before, the French imperialists led by Mollet and Pineau are still raging on about using armed force, to appease right-wing hysteria at home in the face of their grandiose fizzle. Dulles too still hints at possible armed assault ahead, though now the issue has been put before the UN for a breather.

THE CAMPAIGN UP TO NOW:

Both Parties Dodge the One Live Issue: Implementing Desegregation, Civil Rights

By MAX MARTIN

The election campaign began rolling in earnest this past week as both parties started to probe for and hammer away at each other's weak spots. Amid talk of high-level campaigns and low-level campaigns, each intensified its attack on the other.

Nixon stirred up a fuss over Truman's expression of belief in Alger Hiss' innocence, forcing Stevenson to repeat his repudiation of Hiss and to underline his coolness toward the former president once more. In turn, the Democratic standard-bearers stepped up their criticism of Eisenhower, insisted more strongly than heretofore upon his responsibility for the actions of the present Republican administration, and began to invoke images of Hoover.

Both the Democrats and the Republicans laid down heavy barrages aimed at the Midwestern farm vote, as the feeling grew that the farmers may very well prove one of the decisive factors for the outcome of the election, as in 1948. Informal polls taken by Samuel Lubell and other experts indicated a significant shift toward the Democrats by farmers who had voted for the GOP in 1952. This increased the optimism already on the upsurge in the Democratic camp since the party coup in Maine, and brought additional reason for creased brows to the Republicans.

A serious blunder by a Republican congressional candidate in Tennessee may do much to help Stevenson in the farm states. Said candidate revealed he had informed Eisenhower that the small farmer should "get off his butt" and "go to work" if he wants to solve his economic problems. Eisenhower, he stated, had nodded his agreement.

DANGLING PROMISES

This episode, reminiscent of Secretary Charles E. Wilson's remarks about unemployed workers some time ago, reveals the callous attitude of politicians toward the problems of the people, but naturally it is something which must not be said aloud. So White House Press Secretary Hagerty denied the whole event immediately. The Democrats will undoubtedly still find it useful.

In addition to increasing their attack upon each other, both parties stepped up their offers of lavish promises to the peo-

ple, trying to outdo each other in this regard.

Nixon dangled the prospect of a four-day work-week in the not-too-distant future before the eyes of the workers as a product to be expected from an additional four years of "Republican prosperity." And Stevenson released the first of his series of reports on a "New America," which is his campaign tag—this one envisioning the resolution of the problems of the aged if the Democrats capture office in November.

TONGUE-TIED

Loquacious as the candidates are, and as full of promise as they can be on most matters, one question leaves them virtually tongue-tied, and that is the one issue which is of first-rate importance this year.

The question of rights for Negroes, the struggle for integration, the concrete battles now taking place in Kentucky and elsewhere in the South, bring out all of Stevenson's diffidence and reticence and produce a lofty disdain of politics on Eisenhower's part.

If both candidates have not been completely silent on this question, if each has said a few banal words on it, it is only because events force them to, and not because they want to. Every ginger-

(Turn to last page)

LONDON LETTER

Our British Correspondent Reports on Impact of Suez:

Eden's Cabinet Split by Factional Crisis

By OWEN ROBERTS

London, Sept. 21

Britain's Tory government is in trouble. The thin strips of brown paper and sticking plaster which have been used to cover up the cracks in the government since it lost the unifying force of Winston Churchill last year are beginning to curl at the edges. Any moment now they can be expected to peel off to reveal the deep divisions of opinion which now exist between rival groups of Tories at top levels.

The crumbling of this paper facade of unity has been finally forced by the Suez Canal crisis. But the divisions go far deeper than that and are bound up with Britain's shaky economic positions and the quiet maneuvering for power which has been going on inside the cabinet since Churchill threw in his hand as prime minister and leader of the Tory party.

Piecing together rumors, behind-the-scenes gossip and odd gleanings of information, a picture emerges of a cabinet crammed with rival personalities pointed up

in two opposing factions as a matter of expediency. Even after making due allowances for duff information and upside-down facts, the picture is clear enough to see that—as with any body which is fundamentally unstable—the seams of the Tory cabinet are coming apart in a time of stress.

The line-up of the opposing factions in the cabinet is roughly pro- and anti-Eden; but there are complicating factors.

Behind Eden there stands Lord Salisbury, Tory leader of the

House of Lords; Harold Macmillan, the Chancellor of the Exchequer; and Selwyn Lloyd, the foreign secretary. This pro-Eden coalition is, in itself, composed of elements which in other circumstances might well line up in a different way.

Lord Salisbury is currently tipped off as the hidden hand behind much of Tory government policy and it appears he enjoys being the man behind the scenes. He is at the moment pro-Eden because the prime minister has so far shown no resentment toward the situation where a member of the House of Lords has a big finger in the cabinet pie.

IN THIS CORNER

Macmillan is a different character. When it became known that Churchill was to retire he was

marked out as one of the contestants for the role of the new Tory leader and, consequently, prime minister. The fact that at this moment Macmillan is on Eden's side is dictated by the composition of the anti-Eden faction.

Selwyn Lloyd is a character who defies classification. As foreign secretary he has had almost nothing to do with foreign affairs and has been content to leave them to Anthony Eden and Harold Macmillan (who was the former foreign secretary). It can therefore be assumed that Lloyd is at the moment marking time and keeping in with Eden and Macmillan in the hopes that a bigger reward will come his way in the future. When the time comes, if it does, to choose between Eden and Macmillan Lloyd will be well placed to cast his lot with the most likely victor.

(Continued on page 2)

Louisiana Story: How Farm Labor Was Sold Out

By BEN HALL

At first glance, it seemed like a great victory. The Louisiana legislature voted to repeal the state's "right-to-work" law. The vote in the House was 57-44; in the Senate 21-18. Governor Earl Long quickly signed the repealer and that was that.

The trade-union press was jubilant; big lead articles hailed the result as a brilliant example of intelligent and effective political action; there, you see, was the first fruit of united AFL-CIO power. Impressive.

And it was clever and "realistic." One report explained how B. Raynal Ariatti, director of the Greater New Orleans LLPE, conceived labor's strategy:

"Taking advantage of a factional Democratic split in the city, labor tried to endorse against hostile incumbents whichever of their opponents seemed to have the better chance of winning."

No wild-eyed plans here.

Besides, it was subtle and responsible. Victor Bussie, president of the united State Labor Council, related that the campaign was "quiet" but "effective"—"We cut out the rank-and-file 'mass demonstrations' before committees or at any other time," he said.

"We had to explain to our own union business agents that they should stay away but they agreed to trust our judgment. The result was that we got friendly comment from the press on the dignity and effectiveness with which labor had presented its case. It's the only friendly comment we got—the state's big dailies were unanimously opposed to repeal but we did get that."

Thus with dignity and without coarse rabble-rousing, labor won what seemed a great victory. . . .

But only at first glance and thereby hangs a tale.

Louisiana's agricultural workers were abandoned by the unions. H. L. Mitchell, president of the AFL-CIO Agricultural Workers Union, charged that its members were sacrificed by the State Labor Council to repudiate the "victory" of its state affiliate.

200,000 WORKERS

The State Council, as part of the repeal bargain, had supported and endorsed a right-to-work law for agricultural workers only! That was the sum and substance of its remarkable campaign.

Here is how it was reported in the IUE News on July 30: "One internal problem arose during the repeal fight: State Council leaders became convinced that they could not get the votes of rural legislators for repeal unless they agreed to a new, separate anti-union security law covering agricultural workers only."

Council President Bussie puts it in more gingerly fashion: To get the support of rural legislators, "We would present our case to him, pointing out that while in his rural area the law might have little impact, it meant life and death to us. If he indicated that if elected he would be friendly and reasonable we would support him." But Bussie's Council was "reasonable" too; it supported a law directed against agricultural labor in return.

In the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on August 14, Eleanor Roosevelt wrote:

"The Agricultural 'right-to-work' bill which the AFL-CIO Labor Council helped to get passed does not cover field workers alone. It also applies to sugar workers and refinery workers in the

state, to cotton compress and gin workers and to rice mill workers. Upwards of 200,000 workers are involved and their average wages range from 50 to 60 cents an hour."

In a letter to the New York Times dated September 11, Norman Thomas, who is a member of the national board of the National Sharecroppers Fund, fills in other details: "They [the Council] not merely accepted, but worked for the passage of this law and praised it as a 'good outstanding legislative accomplishment.'" Louisiana union leaders at no time consulted with leaders of the Agricultural Workers Union who had led a bitter strike in Louisiana cane fields in 1953. On the other hand, they promised the big-business Sugar Cane League to do nothing to change the law for two years.

"It [the Council] actually criticized the Agricultural Workers Union," writes Thomas, "for its strike against 'the men of stature and influence who controlled the system,' i.e., the sugar corporations, not the small farmers."

APOLOGETICS

When the Agricultural Workers Union appealed to the AFL-CIO - Executive Council for a repudiation of the Louisiana sponsorship of a farm "right to work" law, it was turned down. At its meeting last month in Forest Park, the Executive Council, according to *Labor's Daily*, unanimously approved the Louisiana strategy.

George Meany, while not too happy about the incident, defended the autonomous right of the state labor body to its own course. Anyway, he argued, the law now applies only to 1 per cent of

organized labor in the state and was repealed for 99 per cent of union labor.

This absurdity has become the official apology. It ignores only the main point: right-to-work laws are most dangerous and disruptive to labor's objective of organizing the unorganized; the Louisiana labor movement surrendered "only" the unorganized agricultural workers; in other words, it abandoned one of its main responsibilities.

Why? Norman Thomas suggests that "The Louisiana story is of national importance because it indicates a pattern which may be followed elsewhere, a pattern of deals between big business and big labor at cost to the most exploited of workers."

It seems to us that he is mistaken. Louisiana labor is not really "Big Labor." It claims 200,000 organized members while it has sold out 200,000 unorganized potential members. In 1953, according to the recent figures compiled by Leo Troy for the National Bureau of Economics Research, organized labor in the state represented only 19 per cent of the non-agricultural labor force against a national average of 32 per cent. In Michigan, unions enroll 43 per cent; in Pennsylvania and Illinois 40 per cent; in California 35 per cent.

Louisiana, on the contrary, could be said to represent "small" labor; the State Labor Council, in weakness not in strength, in the anti-labor agricultural South carried out the accepted labor political policy of supporting the "lesser evil." It persisted in this line right down to its most miserable and self-destroying conclusions. In Louisiana, the policy looks repulsive; but it is national policy, Southern style.

CLASS PEACE?

Labor unionists in the United States will be interested in this view of class relations expressed by some Canadian brothers. The following article is reprinted from the August issue of News and Views, published by UAW Local 199 in St. Catharines, Ontario.

"CLASS PEACE"—A MYTH

"Any serious-minded student of labor relations—and all union members should be—who has had any illusions sponsored by a distorted press on the amicable manner in which unions and management have been getting along under our so-called 'free enterprise' system should by this time had them well and truly shattered.

"4500 McKinnon workers had to stay out five months here to wring from the arrogant GM Corporation the recent contract gains. IUE workers in the U.S.A. suffered longer in their struggle against Westinghouse. Our brothers and sisters in Sheboygan, Wis., have been out 860 days—2 years and 4 months—fighting the feudalistic Kohler family there. And now 650,000 Steelworkers have been forced on the street by a united front of the biggest U.S. steel corporations who offered a measly 10¢ an hour for five years on a 'take-it-or-leave-it' basis—and this in an industry where the union heads have tried to educate their members away from a 'hate-the-boss' attitude.

"Make no mistake—the class struggle is sharpening and it is ridiculous to believe—as some 'experts' have theorized—that 'Big Industry' and 'Big Labor' are in collusion to 'exploit' the public.

"It is not unions that go on strike—it is people—when they are forced to take that action to secure a share of the increased wealth they have made with the sweat of their brows and the ache of their backs."

Eden's Cabinet in Crisis — —

(Continued from page 1)

Ranged up against this pro-Eden faction there is an equally strange collection of personalities which has as its leader R. A. Butler, one-time Chancellor of the Exchequer who was relegated to an obscure cabinet position when a reshuffle put Macmillan in charge of Treasury.

Another personal point of issue between Butler and Macmillan is the fact that Butler was also a starter in the race for the position relinquished by Churchill. Like Macmillan, Butler never reached the finish post. But unlike Macmillan he was unable to come to terms with Eden—and as a consequence was ditched in favor of Macmillan.

Allies of Butler include Sir Walter Monckton, at present minister of Defense but previously minister of Labor until a cabinet reshuffle; Peter Thorneycroft, president of the Board of Trade; Iain Macleod, who replaced Monckton as minister of Labor and who owes his political advancement to Butler because of the careful schooling he received from that individual when engaged on "back-room" work for the Tory Central Office when it was under the direction of Butler.

WORRIED OVER SUEZ

A number of ministers outside of the cabinet have also thrown their weight behind Butler; they include Reginald Maudlin, minister of Supply, and Sir Edward Boyle, economic secretary to the Treasury.

It will be noted that Butler has a strong area of support among those ministers whose work involves the handling of Britain's economy—and herein lies the clue to much of the bitter hostility which now exists between various sections of the top Tory leadership.

The Butler faction are worried lest the government's handling of the Suez crisis worsen Britain's economic position by piling more military commitments on to an already top-heavy armament burden. With the current feeling in industry—particularly following the adoption of a tougher line on wages by the Trade Union Congress earlier this month—any down-

ward movement in the economic situation would be followed by widespread industrial activity by the trade unions and increasing bitterness by the working population as a whole. The Tories could then kiss goodbye to any chances of remaining in office for a further period—or even completing the present one.

Earlier this year Chancellor Macmillan said in his annual budget speech that unless he could manage to slash government expenditure by some \$280 million it would be necessary to introduce "very heavy increases in taxation." Since then Macmillan has been pruning and slicing government spending in an endeavor to avoid this unpopular action of increasing taxes.

ECONOMIC FEARS

But Macmillan's efforts have been in vain. By June Macmillan had managed to save some \$150 million on the war budget bill—but the military preparations undertaken by the government following the Suez crisis have now almost wiped out these savings and Macmillan is nearly back where he started.

In addition his strong support for the employers against the trade unions has reduced to nil any chances he may have had of enlisting the aid of the right-wing union leaders in securing a pay-peg in order to offset inflationary tendencies.

Therefore the government's belligerent line on Suez has worsened the country's economic position and there is talk in business and financial circles of a special autumn budget to repair the damage. This can only mean the "very heavy increases in taxation" of which Macmillan warned in April.

The Butlerite faction are very alarmed about this, particularly as Macmillan has been one of the foremost advocates in the cabinet of a "tough" line towards Egypt. Butler and his friends accuse Macmillan of sabotaging his own economic policy in order to take an adventurous attitude in foreign affairs. This, they say, has undermined the position of the Tory government both in Britain and overseas. Coupled with this the Butlerites have no great enthusiasm for the government's current economic poli-

cies in any case—they much prefer the "softer" attitude taken when Butler himself was chancellor.

In case all of this seems frightfully complicated to American readers, it will be advisable to restate the position in simple terms. Eden is faced with opposition in his cabinet on three counts:

First, there is the personal motive which is an expression of the maneuvering for power which has been continuous since Churchill retired into semi-obscurity.

Secondly, he is opposed because a number of his cabinet "colleagues" have been at odds with his bellicose attitude toward Egypt and in particular his line up to now of ignoring the United Nations.

Thirdly, he is opposed because his foreign policy is ruining his economic policy—which is not very good in any case, say his opponents.

WELCOME DIVISION

The ultimate outcome of this cabinet split cannot be predicted. The dominant class philosophy of the Tory party has on similar occasions been able to put the lid on the pot before it boils over and to solve the difficulty by removing the offending ingredients at a more opportune time—usually when public attention is diverted elsewhere.

But the fact that there is a split, no matter what attempts are made to conceal it, can only be welcomed by socialists and others who have no desire to be rushed over the brink in a war for British imperialism in the Middle East.

All the time the present wide differences of opinion continue in the British cabinet, the less chance there is of the Eden faction capitulating to the even louder saber-rattling of the "Suez Group," the ultra-right-wing Tory backbenchers led by Captain Waterhouse, who would solve the Suez situation by sending the British fleet to bombard Alexandria. A body which is divided in itself can never take an effective line of action and, as a consequence, the role played by Britain in the Suez crisis is more likely to be determined by the mass action of the people rather than by the decisions of a few men meeting behind locked doors in a cabinet meeting.

NEW YORK

LABOR ACTION FORUM
THURSDAYS AT 9 P.M.

Oct. 4—Michael Harrington

THE ROOSEVELT MYTH

A Review of
"The Lion and the Fox"

Labor Action Hall
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

Our Correspondent Reports from Rome on Why Nenni and Saragat Are Talking Unity

By LUCIO LIBERTINI

Rome, Sept. 15

During the summer most Italian politicians and journalists peacefully go on vacation, on the assumption that nothing can happen while the August heat bears down on the cities. Parliament is closed down and the trade unions avoid strikes and agitation that could inconvenience those workers who are also on vacation. However, it happens not infrequently that the noisiest "bombs" burst in the middle of this period, and that journalists and politicians are forced to return hastily.

This year too the summer "bomb" did not fail. What has become known as the "Pralognan meeting" between Nenni and Saragat unexpectedly reanimated the whole political scene.

Symptoms of a closer association between Nenni's Socialist Party and Saragat's Social-Democratic Party have been apparent since May 28, after the last administrative elections. As we described in an earlier letter, the PSI emerged from the polls strengthened, thanks in part to its alliance with the Independent Socialist Union, with a vote of 4.2 million. On the other hand, the Social-Democracy, although remaining rather weak and polling about a third of the PSI vote, nonetheless stood up well under the test of the elections, contrary to the forecasts of those who expected its rapid disappearance.

All other Italian parties lost votes, and it seemed as though a large and decisive part of the electorate, concentrating its votes on the PSI and PSDI, appealed to these parties for socialist unity.

On the international scene, the progress of "relaxation" reduced to some extent the differences in point of view between the two parties and took some of the sharp edges off the polemics. Finally, a tendency developed within the Social-Democratic Party demanding a break with the "center" government coalition, while widespread circles in the PSI began to realize that, in order to propose a socialist alternative to the country and to force Christian-Democracy against the wall, it was necessary to remove the Social-Democratic obstacle by means of unification.

S. I. INTERVENES

From an ideological and psychological point of view a powerful impulse toward unity occurred when the PSI reversed its position on international affairs, breaking sharply with the old Stalinist line and moving from a position of unconditional support for Russia to a position of critical reserve or at least of considerable caution.

In this situation and in this political climate the "Pralognan bomb" was exploded.

Nenni, who had gone to this Savoyan mountain village on vacation, invited Saragat for a private meeting. Saragat accepted and had a long talk with Nenni. A strict silence was maintained on the actual content of these talks, but at the end of the meeting the whole Italian and European press published a written note by Saragat in which socialist unity was announced as imminent and Nenni's capitulation was pictured as certain, the latter having supposedly agreed to support the Atlantic alliance and the "democratic center." At the same time it was announced that M. Commin, vice-secretary of the French Socialist Party, was coming to Italy on a mediating mission on behalf of the Socialist International.

While a powerful movement toward unity had matured on the grass-roots level, the right wing of European social-democracy was launching an offensive to capture socialist unity for its own benefit.

Very significant in this connection was the attitude of Commin, who was enthusiastically supported throughout his mission by the bourgeois and conservative press. The French "mediator" extended the range of his consultations to representatives of the bourgeois government parties (such as the Republican Lamalfa, the theorist of the "lay front" between Social-Democracy and the small liberal parties) but excluded the USI and many representatives of the PSI left wing.

Moreover, he defended on several occasions the Algerian policy of Guy Mollet and repeatedly declared that socialist unity in Italy should be achieved in such a way as not to endanger the interna-

tional obligations of the country. Everybody knows what Guy Mollet's socialists mean today when they talk of these "international obligations": the support of NATO viewed as an instrument of colonial repression.

BATTLE AHEAD

These developments brought about a violent reaction on the part of a majority in the PSI and of the USI. The Directing Committee of the PSI practically disavowed Nenni, stating in a political document that socialist unity must be achieved but only on the basis of a specific class policy; against the "center-party" coalition, for a foreign policy of neutrality, for a trade-union policy of unity in the CGIL.

The USI specified in its document that the political basis of socialist unity cannot be merely a transition from Stalinism to reformist opportunism, but the development of Third Camp socialist positions.

The document released by the DC of the PSI, in an indirect answer to Commin, explicitly stated that the process of unification must include the independent socialists.

This is the way things stand at the present time: a great battle has begun around the policy of socialist unity. It will be long and closely fought. After the great gain on the Stalinist front, which has led the PSI and the whole of Italian socialism to positions of practical independence, the task is now to win on the other front, against social-democratic opportunism.

To Transform Italy's Labor Movement

By ANDRE GIACOMETTI

Paris, Sept. 15

A major consequence of the current movement toward socialist unification in Italy will be its impact on the trade-union situation.

In Italy, as in France, the trade-union movement is split three ways, that is, in three different federations or trade-union centers: respectively under CP, right-wing socialist, and Catholic leaderships. Before we discuss what is likely to happen, here is a bird's-eye view of the setup.

The majority of the Italian workers are organized in the CGIL, which is under predominantly Stalinist leadership and has been a pillar of the Stalinist-led international, the World Federation of Trade Unions. The two smaller federations are the CISL, which is under Catholic leadership, and the UIL, which is led by Social-Democrats and Republicans.

Superficially these three correspond to their similars in France: the CGIL to the French CGT, the Catholic-led CISL to the French CFTC, and the UIL to the French Force Ouvrière (F.O.). But there are important differences which highlight the specifically Italian situation.

To take the Stalinist-led union first: The French CGT is solidly controlled by the Communist Party, but in the case of the Italian CGIL the rank and file and the secondary cadres (and even, to a lesser extent, the leadership) include many socialists of the PSI (Nenni's Socialist Party) and other groups. These socialists in the CGIL are not hostages of the CP, like the French "progressives" Le Brun, Rouzaud or Le Léap. Their independence has a solid basis in large sections of the working class which support the CGIL for want of a better alternative and not because its leadership is Stalinist.

As for the Catholic union: In France the CFTC has a significant left-wing tendency within it, the "Reconstruction" group. In Italy the CISL has no such significant left tendency that can force it to act independently of the Christian-Democrats or ally itself with secular groups on a socialist program, as in

France. The CISL is completely controlled by the Catholic politicians, and any serious assertion of independence on its part would lead to its destruction.

Finally, the reformist union: The Italian UIL is in great part corrupt in a literal sense and has most of the characteristics of a "yellow" union. The honest trade-unionists within it (notably in the metal trades) do not play a leading role and do not determine policy. There is no appreciable basis for a left-wing minority such as exists in the French F. O. In practice this means, for instance, that the UIL would never be the starting point for a significant strike movement, such as the August 1953 strikes in France, which started among the F. O. postal workers in Bordeaux.

DEAD-END

As a result of this situation, the Italian trade-union movement was condemned to stagnation as long as CGIL policy was determined by the Stalinist leadership alone.

This latter fostered among its followers a messianic expectation of a revolutionary apocalypse, while in practice it proved unable to conduct a serious struggle for an effective defense of the workers' interests. Any consistent struggle against the Italian bourgeoisie was precluded by the Russian foreign policy of "peaceful coexistence"; at the same time, the sway of the Italian Stalinist bureaucracy over CP and PSI was dependent on the passivity of the rank and file of these parties. Thus petition-signing was substituted for militant action on the shop level, and lethargy was encouraged rather than fought in the CGIL.

Meanwhile, neither CISL or UIL could claim to represent a real substitute for the Stalinist-led union, and confined themselves to the role of reformist instruments of class-collaboration at best, or yellow company unions at worst.

This situation led to widespread discouragement in the working class, which became evident for the first time in the union elections of spring 1955, when the CGIL lost heavily in the advanced industrial centers—notably in the FIAT works in Turin, which play a comparable role to GM in the United States and to Renault in France. The FIAT workers, who had openly voted for Communist shop stewards during the first years of fascist rule, now gave in to company pressure under the influence of a defeatist mood.

SOCIALISTS REGROUP

At present, an entirely new situation has arisen, mainly through the fact that the supporters of Nenni's PSI within the CGIL have assumed for the first time a specific identity and responsibility as socialists. Already in July, the leadership of the PSI organized a series of meetings of PSI trade-unionists, and started a discussion on socialist policy in the trade-unions. The Stalinist leadership of the CGIL is being challenged at a time when it is weakest and most disoriented.

As a result of unification, the influence of the socialist tendency can only grow. Thus, the conditions now exist for the transformation of the CGIL from a Stalinist-led trade-union into a democratic mass movement including workers of all tendencies, potentially an instrument of independent and effective labor action. Since this transformation would take place under socialist initiative, the socialists would undoubtedly play a leading role in such an organization.

On September 9, this problem was dealt with knowledgeably by the trade-union commission of the Independent Socialist Union (USI), which adopted a resolution on it. This outlines a militant socialist policy in the trade-union movement, as a part of a general policy lead-

ing to an independent working-class movement.

At this point the policy of the USI has a special importance. Under the pressure of working-class opinion and under the influence of events, the PSI of Nenni and the PSDI of Saragat are being driven toward positions which have been defended by the USI alone for more than six years, against seemingly insuperable odds, continuing the work of the "Iniziativa Socialista" group and the PSU.

The USI has a record of having tenaciously defended the cause of working-class independence in the face of terror and intimidation from the CP and against disloyal maneuvers, pressure and corruption of all sorts from supporters of the "Atlantic bloc"; and this record now invests the USI with an authority and an audience among the workers of all parties.

Together with this authority there is another factor which must be accounted decisive: the solid organizational structure which the USI has been able to maintain, alone among socialist groups. In comparison, the social-democratic PSDI is a loose aggregate of cliques built around different personalities; the PSI is an amorphous mass without cadres, though with wide electoral support; and the "Unità Popolare" group is a loosely organized gathering of intellectuals who are able to publish good magazines but cannot act for lack of a real organization.

USI PROPOSES

Consequently, the USI is now in a position to play a very substantial role in the movement toward socialist unity and toward the transformation of the trade-union movement into an instrument of united and independent labor action.

The USI trade-union commission outlined its recommendations under five points:

(1) Independent socialist workers should join the CGIL.

(2) In practical terms, the resolution says, this means that activity in his appropriate trade union is a "political

(Continued on page 4)

A Problem in the Relation Between Literature and Politics

BRECHT AS POET OF THE GPU

By MICHAEL HARRINGTON

Last month Bertolt Brecht, one of the most unusual literary talents of this century, died.

Some of the reactions were predictable. A *Daily Worker* columnist rushed in, all full of praise for Eric Bentley who confessed admiration for Brecht's art and disagreement with his politics, and used the occasion for some standard sentiments. But he also had to make his hack point, comparing Brecht with some American Stalinist literary figures (Gold, Fast, etc.) who are not even in the same class.

The eminently predictable Sol Stein, formerly of the American Committee for Cultural Freedom, was on hand too. In a *New Leader* letter, he concluded by pointing out that Brecht, by his own standards (of art as a weapon, I assume) had blood on his hands. Stein is, of course, on record as being opposed to Brecht's conception of artistic responsibility, but this did not prevent him from using his adversary's errors in order to condemn him.

But the issue of Brecht as an artist and Brecht as a Stalinist agent remains. It poses a most serious problem for a socialist.

The case is not even as relatively simple as that of Ezra Pound. For in Pound's poetry, the intrusion of anti-Semitism and pro-fascism almost always marks a sharp downward turn in the quality of the poetry as poetry. Because of this, one can make a fairly clear separation of the political and the artist. The same is even truer of a painter like Picasso who created for years in defiance of the esthetic line of the Communist Party.

LYRICAL TOTALITARIANISM

But there is no easy out with Brecht. He was not an artist who was a Stalinist. He was a Stalinist artist, a man who put his great gifts to the use of apologizing for murder, totalitarianism and the like. Indeed, one can accurately say that he labored to defend the most terrible excesses of Stalinism, even that he anticipated Stalin on this count.

Most Americans know of Brecht today as the librettist for *The Three-Penny Opera*, as a pungent, brilliant social critic whose lyrics were set to music by the late, great Kurt Weill. But the Brecht of the early thirties in Germany was an-

other quantity. One play of his, *Die Massnahme*, stands out in this regard.

It is not simply totalitarian in ideology; it is drunk with totalitarianism, hypnotized by it; it is tender and tragic about totalitarianism.

At the time of its production, it came as an important intellectual event in pre-Hitler Germany. It was responsible for bringing many intellectuals over to the cause of Stalinism. As Ruth Fischer described it in *Stalin and German Communism*, it was a work which generated an audience excitement not unlike that of *Waiting for Lefty* in the United States. *Die Massnahme* was, in short, a magnificent weapon in the hands of the German Communist Party, and at a time when the Stalinist line of "social-fascism" was preparing the way for Hitler.

STALINIST SAGA

Politically, the play has several levels. On the face of it, it is a justification for Stalin's line in China and an attack upon Trotsky (who is, of course, never mentioned; neither is Stalin for that matter).

It begins with the Agitators returning from China and being greeted by the Control Commission (Control Chorus) of the Party. The Agitators tell the Control Chorus that they have been forced to put the Young Comrade to death. The play centers around their reasons for doing this and ends, of course, in their complete absolution by the Control Commission.

The basic fault of the Young Comrade was that he broke discipline on the question of the bloc of four classes, that "he willed the right, but did the wrong." At first, he works among the coolies who pull the boats along the river. When he is sent to this task he is told, "Do not fall into pity."

Later he is commissioned to go to the very merchants who oppressed those with whom he was working, to seek their aid (a struggle between the Chinese capitalists and the imperialists had broken out). At this point, the Young Comrade hears from his new allies a "Song of Trade." The refrain goes, "I do not know what rice is/ I only know its price," and ends, "I do not know what a man is, I only know his price." The Young Comrade cannot stand this, refuses to eat with the merchants, and breaks discipline. When he proposes calling the people to fight in their own name, he is told that the people are unprepared.

HYMN TO THE PARTY

At this point, one must stop and think of the context. Brecht was presenting, not an abstract argument over whether a revolutionary might make a bloc with the bourgeoisie in an anti-imperialist struggle, but a defense of the Stalinist line in China.

He does not, of course, dramatize the fact that the position taken by the Agitators led to a blood-bath for the revolutionary forces in China. He does not identify the political origin of the line of independent struggle. But in the Germany of 1932, this was not necessary. An audience of intellectuals would know the reference.

They would recognize *Die Massnahme* for what it is: a defense of the Stalinist line in the China of the twenties. Some five years after the subordination of the Chinese Communist Party to the Kuomintang had resulted in the destruction of that party, Brecht marshals his considerable dramatic and poetic gifts to back up the position which led to a catastrophic tragedy!

But more. One might even be able to ignore this context, to declare that it is

irrelevant to a work of art, yet one cannot miss the way in which Brecht argues for his murderous politics.

The infallibility of the Party, the Party as History's monolith; that is Brecht's theme. And he manages it magnificently. There is repetition, constant, monotonous, hypnotic repetition of this thought, until, like the drum in "The Emperor Jones," it obsesses the entire play.

There is, for example, the Song of the Party which begins, "A man has two eyes/ But the Party has a thousand eyes . . . A man can be destroyed/ But the Party can never be destroyed." Throughout, this point is made over and over: that the Party as some supernatural force is all and infallible, and that the individual can only accept.

INTO THE LIME-PIT

When the Agitators and the Young Comrade cross over the border, they put on masks because, as the Party Leader tells them, "you are no longer Karl Schmitt from Berlin, and you, no longer Anna Kjersk of Kasan, and you are no longer Peter Sawitsch from Moscow, but you are now, all, without name, without mother, the tablet upon which the Revolution writes its direction." And when the Young Comrade breaks discipline, crying to the people, "We are come to help you,/ We are come from Moscow," at that moment he tears off his mask.

And at the end of the play, the Young Comrade sees that he has done wrong and accepts the judgment of the Agitators that he must be annihilated by being thrown into a lime-pit.

This scene is Orwellian in effect. The Young Comrade has concurred in his own death. He says to his executioners, "Help me." And they reply, "Lean thy head on our arm./ Close thy eyes." And just before he is killed, the Young Comrade tells that he does this "In the interest of Communist unity with the advance of the proletarian masses of all lands. . . ."

And the Agitators tell the Control Chorus, "And then we threw him into the lime-pit./ And when the lime had eaten him away/ We turned back to our work."

The Control Chorus replies, "And their work was good./ For they brought/ The lessons of the classics,/ The ABCs of Communism" to the downtrodden.

HYPNOTIC

It would be difficult to imagine a more totalitarian play. Some four or five years before the Moscow Trials, Brecht had anticipated their outcome, he knew of the confessions; some five years after the murder of the Chinese Revolution, he continued to defend the path toward tragedy and betrayal.

But again, this is not the work of a hack propagandist; it is the creation of an artist. Perhaps the most frightening thing about *Die Massnahme* is that it does grip the imagination, that it is hypnotic in its creation of a fictional world. And that fact makes this play, and Brecht himself if we take this as an extreme statement of the unity of politics and art which he achieved, a most difficult one to deal with.

At the very beginning, one point should be made clear: inasmuch as some of Brecht's work were presented as political events, then they should have been opposed politically, every bit as much as one would have reacted to Ezra Pound's fascist radio broadcasts. But then, as time goes on, as the context recedes, how do we handle such a play and such an artist?

In the case of *Die Massnahme*, there is, again, no problem. The very content of the play is so anti-human that its craft is perverted. That, I think, must be our judgment upon it: that it is, for all time, bad literature.

But at the same time, we must recognize that it is not all bad, we cannot deny the existence of the brilliant—though evil—craft that is before our very eyes.

Edith Stein, the personalist philoso-

pher killed by the Nazis, once remarked that when a column of marching fascists passed by, one part of her was Nazi. By that, she did not, of course, mean that she in any way accepted a fascist ideology. She was simply admitting a level of human response which reacts to the purposeful community of a group of men marching, no matter what they march for.

Die Massnahme is a similar experience. In reading it, there is a schizophrenia of the imagination which sets in: a horror of the mind and emotions of the terrible thing the man has made; a fascination, of the emotions certainly and perhaps even of the mind, with the craft which went into the terrible.

MAN OF TRAGEDY

"*Die Massnahme*" was not, of course, Brecht's only work, or even his chief work. But in discussing his death and the meaning of his life, it must be put into a prominent place. "The Three Penny Opera," the lyric poetry, these must be considered too. Yet ultimately, the only word to describe Brecht is tragedy. Here was a man of great talent, of craft with words, of incisiveness and wit, and he devoted that gift, for years, to the defense of anti-freedom; he used it to make a eulogy to totalitarianism.

Indeed, the one theme that runs through some of his work is, exactly, how difficult it is to kill, how Brecht wished that all this was not "necessary." In the poem "To Posterity," for example, there are the lines, "For even hatred against injustice/ Makes the brow grow stern" and "We who wanted kindness itself/ Could not ourselves be kind."

As the rationale for murder, these ideas are monstrous. And yet, they have another existence, for a poem like "To Posterity" continues on when its context is past, when those who must, and can only, react to Brecht's intended meaning are gone. The politics which pervade *Gulliver's Travels* are not a source of emotion to us; we do not react to the specific barbs of the work.

And in time some of Brecht's political art will share the same fate: the cryptic reference in "To Posterity" will lose its effect, and the work will exist on another level, more basic, less particular.

But with *Die Massnahme* one cannot imagine that happening. For this play is not totalitarian in an "accidental" sense; its very heart-beat, its meaning, its effect, is, for all times, totalitarian. And there, we must distinguish between various of Brecht's works; we can only hope that all ages will reject the monstrous inhumanity of such a play.

But finally, we return to Brecht himself, to the tragedy of his life. It is one of the losses of our time that such a talent should have been in the forefront of those who struggle for inhumanity.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, New York City

specializes in books and pamphlets on the Labor and Socialist movement, Marxism, etc., and can supply books of all publishers.

Send for our free book list.



LABOR ACTION

October 1, 1956 Vol. 20, No. 40

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, 1879.—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

To Transform—

(Continued from page 3)

duty" for all USI workers, who in the CGIL will act unitedly "as one of the socialist tendencies" in it.

(3) In the CGIL the USI trade-unionists "will establish close ties of collaboration with the comrades of the PSI, with the aim of creating a tendency including all socialists of the CGIL."

(4) The counter-proposal that socialists should join UIL is rejected. The idea of a particularistic "socialist" trade-union federation is also rejected; what is needed is a united trade-union center which can include also the workers who are presently in the Catholic unions and those who follow the CP politically, all organized together with the socialist workers.

(5) To this end, CGIL socialist militants should work for closer collaboration of their own union with the others, with the CISL and UIL, in the hope of eventual trade-union unity. But the resolution turns thumbs-down on the idea of constituting permanent committees of socialist trade-unionists cutting across federation lines—an idea which it sees as being pointed in the direction of "an exclusively socialist union," previously rejected.

In short, the USI trade-unionists are oriented toward building points of strength in the CGIL which would take that movement away from control by the CP and transform it into the natural instrument for all-in trade-union unity.

Dixie Racists Push Counter-Offensive While Candidates Look the Other Way

By MAX MARTIN

The Negro people and all other anti-Jim Crow forces in America have suffered a severe setback to their struggle for desegregation of education in the last ten days.

The major battle for integration which occurred in Tennessee and Kentucky during the first weeks of September had appeared by the middle of the month to have resulted in some victories for Negro rights.

The School in Clinton had been successfully integrated. In Sturgis the heroic Negro children were attending integrated classes and the boycott by the white children which the White Citizens Council had instigated was waning. In Clay the Negro children had finally been able to enter the school under the protection of the Kentucky National Guard, and while a boycott was in progress, the situation looked as if it would follow the Sturgis pattern.

Today the whole development has gone into reverse, winding itself backward.

The forces of racism scored a victory in Clay, which in turn spurred them on in Sturgis to duplicate the same result in that community. And as this is being written, the White Citizens Council in Henderson, Kentucky, where integration has been operating smoothly and quietly since the first day of school, organized a boycott to attempt to force out the five Negro pupils of the Henderson school.

And unless the efforts of the racists to put an end to what little integration has been achieved are stopped somewhere along the line, it may spread to other places as well.

In politics, as elsewhere, both victory and defeat carry their own momentum along with them. The victory scored in Clinton encouraged these Negro parents in Sturgis to carry the fight to their town. In both cases, the local and state administration seemed ready to comply with the Supreme Court decision and to do so firmly.

Student boycotts were organized by the racist White Citizens Councils, but the firmness of the authorities and the courage of the Negro children and that of their parents, made itself felt. The opposition to integration backed down.

KENTUCKY RENEGES

These apparent gains led to similar efforts in Clay. There the situation was different from the beginning, in that the local mayor and other officials announced their intention of doing all in their power to thwart the desegregation effort, and joined with the racist extremists to organize the boycott and to encourage the mobs who attempted to bloc the Negro pupils from entering the school. But the National Guard, presumably reflecting the decision of the state administration of Governor Chandler, succeeded in getting the children through the mob and with its power firmly on the side of the Negroes victory appeared likely.

At this point, the government of Kentucky revealed its colors. In response to the demands of the white chauvinists, Kentucky Attorney General Jo M. Ferguson ruled that in the absence of a federal district court order specifying that a specific school board had to integrate the schools under its jurisdiction at a certain time, the school board had power to decide when and where to integrate.

The Clay school board thereupon declared that it was not integrating the school and thus accomplished what mob threats and violence had not been able to achieve.

Emboldened by their victory in Clay, Kentucky racists then turned their fire on Sturgis.

By this time, the mobs in Sturgis had disbanded, 90 per cent of the boycotting white students had returned to classes, and the need for the Guard appeared ended. The White Citizens Council held a mass rally, at which the mayor of Clay was a guest speaker, which called for the resumption of the boycott. The following day, some 80 per cent of the students stayed out of school again; on the next, the Sturgis school board voted to oust the Negroes pupils who were formally enrolled there and who had been attending classes for over a week. This, under conditions which had almost returned to normal.

And now the racists are looking for a second repeat in Henderson.

KEY LESSON

One lesson emerges clearly from these events: governmental action can spell the difference between victory and defeat.

Wherever and whenever some governmental body is prepared to defend Negroes pursuing their elementary rights from those who would violently prevent them from doing so, the worst that the racists can do does not suffice to prevent gains for democracy and equality. And where on the other hand, it stands aside and looks the other way, or worse yet, openly ranges itself on the side of that minority of white chauvinists who are willing to use force to prevent Jim Crow from beginning to end, there the mob can hold sway. Thus it was in Kentucky this month.

When Governor Chandler was ready to back the Supreme Court decision the Negroes won victories. When that backing was withdrawn, defeats ensued.

This idea has to be underlined over and over again. One of the favorite themes of the "moderates" of all political groupings runs to the following effect: *Governmental coercion cannot solve this problem. We must let the long-range courses of education and persuasion take effect. Only when there will occur a conversion of the souls of Southern whites can we expect progress.*

This idea, in a thousand different forms, is used to justify do-nothingness by the government.

JOHNSON'S THESIS

The events in the border states during the last few weeks prove the direct contrary. If the government seriously desires to protect the Negroes in the exercise of their democratic rights it can do so even though the attitudes of large numbers of whites, even of a majority, remain full of prejudice. For very few of the biased white majority believes in its views strongly enough to stand up to authority for them. Moreover, firmness in defense of the rights of Negroes helps produce changed attitudes; the lessening of prejudice follows the end of segregation and discrimination.

Charles S. Johnson, president of Fiske University, made just this point in a

hard-hitting article in the New York Times of September 23:

"The Southern Negro does not seriously expect very much change in his civil rights status through 'grass roots' conversion... in employment and wages, voting, personal security, access to cultural facilities, and other requisites of democratic living, there has been very little change except that brought about by a stronger and higher authority.

"It was the federal government that wiped out the racial differentials in Southern wages, and the federal courts that equalized white and Negro teachers' salaries and opened the ballot box. It was the impact of national and world criticism that curbed mob violence in the South and gave the stigma of crime to such brutal indulgences as the Emmett Till case in Mississippi; it was not the local courts or the neighbors. Few Southern whites of liberal or humane views regarding Negro civil rights want personal responsibility among their less liberal friends for advocating such. It is simpler if the mandate comes from some unchallengeable and objective authority than the community itself."

It is precisely for this reason that the failure of Eisenhower and Stevenson to utter a word in rebuke to the reversal that took place in Clay and Sturgis is such rank betrayal.

Stevenson had finally managed to say a few words of praise for the way Governors Clinton (Tenn.) and Chandler (Ky.) were enforcing the Supreme Court decision. A statement of condemnation for Chandler's withdrawal of that enforcement might have seemed to be in order, and might have had some effect in offsetting that withdrawal. But Stevenson had other fish to fry, or rather other votes to chase after.

ASSAULT ON NAACP

At the same time as these victories for racism were taking place in Kentucky a general offensive against the Negroes was unfolding throughout the South.

Texas outlawed the NAACP and a general stepping-up of the pressure against Negro militants was reported in that state. Louisiana and Alabama have already declared the NAACP illegal; similar action is pending elsewhere. The NAACP will take these cases to court but the road to legal redress will be a long and rocky one.

Meanwhile, another salient in the fight to perpetuate Jim Crow in general and school segregation in particular was opened up in Washington, D. C. A group of Southern congressmen of the House subcommittee on the District of Columbia opened hearings on the effect of desegregation in the nation's capital.

Considering who they and the committee counsel are, there could be absolutely no doubt that this would develop into a scurrilous and defamatory attack upon the Negro people, with the intention of trying to discredit integration.

The hearings had been preceded by the release of a "report" by one Professor McGurk of Villanova College, which with scientific pretense "concluded" that Negroes had less educational and mental capacity than whites. *U. S. News & World Report*, a right-wing Republican organ that scarcely even tries to conceal its racist bias, gave McGurk's views great prominence and wide publicity.

The hearings followed suit: subcommittee counsel William Gerber paraded a group of school teachers and principals before the congressmen and asked them questions, which, stated the New York

Times, "seemed to be keyed to develop the view that desegregation... had lowered scholastic records and increased disciplinary and sex problems."

In response, most of the witnesses stated that the Negro children were far behind the whites in educational achievement, and that since integration there had been an increase in petty theft, use of obscene language, etc.

The NAACP protested these hearings, receiving an evasive reply from President Eisenhower, and a telegram from candidate Stevenson in which he found the courage to state that the hearings "served no useful purpose." Eugene Davidson, president of the Washington NAACP, announced that its request to be allowed to place witnesses before the committee to refute the slurs cast against the Negroes had gone unanswered by the committee and its counsel.

That the whole socio-economic status of American Negroes as well as the inferiority of the schooling they receive results in lower educational achievement for Negroes is a well-known fact; indeed, it is one of the impelling reasons for putting an end to segregation and discrimination. Likewise the fact that the greater poverty and slum housing conditions in which Negroes live tend to make for difficult problems and greater delinquency in Negro slum neighborhoods.

WILKINS ON DEMOS

The point of the hearings, of course, is to make the results of inequality and oppression a justification for continuing them.

Roy Wilkins of the NAACP spoke some words on the hearings which all liberals might ponder as they pull down the voting lever for Stevenson:

"I'll take civil rights from both Democrats and Republicans, but for eighty years we have got no civil rights.

"But we wouldn't have this investigation in the first place if we didn't have the Democrats in control of Congress and the Southerners in control of committees.

"You may not have got any action from the Republicans, but you didn't get slander. You don't get men like Davis and Williams [the two congressmen running the committee] insulting you, your race, and your children."

The many-pronged offensive against the Negro people now rolling on may have a retarding effect on the struggle for civil rights. Whether or not it does so, and whether or not the tides of battle are reversed again to the detriment of reaction, will depend in great part on whether the labor movement and liberals continue their present silence and inaction in order to remain in a position to continue to support Stevenson, or whether they allow their convictions on civil rights to override their debilitating ties to the Democratic Party.

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.

AMERICA AS ARBITER

AN ESSAY IN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE ON THE ROLE OF THE U.S. IN THE SUEZ CRISIS

By HAL DRAPER

The role of the United States in the Suez Canal affair has been more complex than is indicated by the true statement that Washington has been backing London and Paris in their colonialist attempt to beat Egypt into line.

We explained the essential character of this complexity in the August 20 issue of *LA* ("How the State Department Backs the Colonialist Camp") but it is worthwhile coming back to this subject in more basic fashion now that Guy Mollet and Anthony Eden are glowering daggers at poor John Foster Dulles and making grumbling noises for the benefit of their national press. The fiasco of Big Three policy at the second London conference has had, as one consequence, mutterings from the Right in England and France to the effect that the U.S. let its allies down (or stabbed them in the back, the lunatic-fringe chauvinists are no doubt saying).

If anyone thinks that a good leftist policy can be manufactured automatically simply by inverting whatever the Right says, here is an opportunity to hail Dulles as a savior of peace or what-have-you. That would be quite as fantastic as the current hints from France's ultra-chauvinists that Dulles is a heinous enemy of Western civilization and all that it holds dear.

It would be perhaps sufficient to explain, as we have explained before, that the interests of American imperialism in the Suez crisis are by no means identical with those of London-Paris (and the interests of London and Paris are not even identical with each other) even though all these powers have common and over-weening interests as bastions of world capitalism and as the kingpins of the NATO alliance.

That is true; and it is a good thing to keep in mind when the dilemma of the colonialist powers becomes so difficult that the latent differences between the allies, beginning as cracks, are pried apart into open splits. So weighty has been the force of world public opinion against the crude assault on Egypt that the colonialists have had a minimum of room in which to maneuver.

But it is not *only* a matter of differences in interest as between U. S. imperialism and its fellow imperialists in Europe. To put it this way is to view the U. S. solely as one imperialism among others. That is not enough. The United States is more than that.

It is the mediator and arbiter of its imperialist camp. There has never been anything better than the course of the Suez crisis to put flesh and substance on this abstract idea to which we have often pointed. At the same time it is also the key to an understanding of the twists in U. S. policy—which Nasser claims is a "puzzle" to him, and which French and British journalists are now engaged in lambasting.

The United States is certainly not on the side of Egypt in this conflict; nor has it been *simply* a supporter of Britain and France; and no one at all ever took seriously some tentative attempts by Dulles to pose as a neutral referee as between the colonialist powers and the small country; nor can the U. S. course be entirely explained merely as a reflex of particularist U. S. interests.

These are four things it is *not*. What is left is an aspect of contemporary American imperialism which is relatively new and unexplored. It is indicated when publicists speak of the U. S. as the "leader of the free world," which is their code-language for saying the same thing that we are saying here.

1 WHY AN ARBITER?

Make this contrast:

Back in the period of the First World War, the internal relationship in (say) the Entente camp, as between the major member-imperialisms in that camp, was roughly that of *equals*. No single belligerent dominated the alliance; that, incidentally, was one reason why no really unified military command was possible, either.

At the other end of the spectrum of possibilities, look at the internal relationship of the Stalinist war camp at least under Stalin: namely, the relationship between the Russian *master* and the East European *puppets* or slave-states.

But these two cases do not exhaust the types of relationship inside an imperialist camp. Since the Second World War, the relationship that has grown up in the Atlantic bloc has been neither one of approximate equality nor of master-slave. It has been, rather, that of *overlord and vassal* (to continue the figure of speech).

The United States has increasingly tended to assume the role of overlord in the Western capitalists camp, as the only one of the capitalist powers which still has the military and economic, industrial and financial power to

bear the burden of arming, nourishing, rewarding, reconstructing, bribing and replenishing other states. An "overlord," one must remember, had other and powerful lords below him, not only serfs. The king began not as an autocrat but as "first among equals."

They Don't Choose Up Sides

This position of eminence has been granted the U. S. by reluctant allies not simply out of gratitude or in payment for Marshall Plan aid, nor was it imposed upon them by force, but because the entire capitalist world faces a common enemy in the face of which its internal squabbles could be disastrous, and may yet be; this common enemy is Russia and its fellow-Stalinist allies and/or satellites.

The Russian empire is not simply another imperialist rival. It is a rival exploitive *social system*, which is as anti-capitalist as it is anti-socialist. From the vantage-point of the bourgeoisie, the anti-socialism of the Stalinists is a very fine point of secondary interest if any; the victory of this rival system means the death of capitalism, of this bourgeoisie's system, and that is what quite understandably concerns them.

The consequence of this fact is that we do not today have the same thing as the balance-of-power politics of World War I (or even II) days. In the classic pattern that led up to 1914, the rival imperialist powers "chose up sides" like kids on a sandlot; Italy switched alliances with the aplomb of a baseball player being traded from the Dodgers to the Yankees, for instance.

Today the capitalist powers do not have this kind of latitude in choosing their side, or in declining to choose any side, and this must be said with emphasis in spite of the strength of so-called "neutrality" in Europe. The division of the world between the two war camps is not primarily the outcome of balance-of-power jockeying, but is primarily a reflection of the given world division between the rival *social systems* of capitalism and Stalinism.

The looming world war is not a struggle simply of one set of imperialist powers against another set. It will be a war for the survival of *capitalism* or its rival. In the First World War, each participant could feel that it was only partially committed to its own side; it need not have felt that *everything* it had was riding on its colors. (Hence, for example, the phenomenon of the respect shown by the contending armies in going easy on bombing and destroying each others basic industrial targets—a phenomenon that was already on the way out in World War II.) In the war of systems which looms, there will be no holds barred.

It is under these new conditions that the necessity arises of subordinating the conflicting interests and pulls within the capitalist camp to an arbiter, lest the camp be pulled apart.

Complicating Elements

At the same time, that supra-national imperialist arbiter is also one of the contending imperialisms, itself, and not just a disinterested umpire. This immediately introduces a complicating element of conflict within the very institution of this arbiter, but is not the only one, and it cannot be avoided.

The United States has naturally become that overlord—that arbiter—and its status *works* as long as (and to the extent that) the lesser "lords" feel the pressure of the Russian threat. American domination over Europe feeds on Stalinism's very existence. American imperialism could never have attained its present position of pre-eminence except by the grace of the Kremlin.

But while the institution of the arbiter can mediate inter-imperialist squabbles, it cannot hope to abolish them.

This is the fascinating problem of the interrelationships between the imperialist powers which has been illuminated by the shifting course of the Suez dispute.

It has been especially illuminating because here was an international crisis in which Russia was *not* directly involved. Where Stalinist power is directly involved, of course, it has been easier for the U. S. to "take the

lead of the free world," i.e. (to translate) to marshal its junior allies behind it—though even here it has had squabbles with the latter, as with France over Indo-Chinese policy.

The case of Suez introduces a greater complexity; for from the viewpoint of an *individual* imperialist state, how much difference does it make if it is stripped of sources of exploitation by the Stalinist foe or if it is so despoiled by the exploited peoples themselves? In the name of Unity Against the Russian Menace, it is a little difficult for any given colonialist power to resign itself gracefully to losing *now* that which the aforesaid Russian menace may try to take away later.

Of course, when Nasser nationalized the Suez Canal, this was not yet equivalent to England and France's definitive loss of all the perquisites of colonialism; and so the preceding paragraph is an exaggeration; but it is an exaggeration that points accurately to the drive that pushes Mollet and Eden into their present posture of bitter intransigence.

2

THE INTERNAL NATIONAL ANALOGY

On the international scale, capitalism faces a problem which is analogous to one which it faces within each national capitalist system, but which it *cannot* solve in the same way.

Here is the problem as it has always existed historically *within* a national capitalist system:

If each individual capitalist unremittingly and always pursued only his individual profit interest without regard to any other consideration, in proverbial dog-eat-dog fashion, then capitalism itself would tear itself apart in short order. The internecine conflict which is inherent in the structure of capitalist competition must be mediated, at least enough to keep the warring particles from flying apart, at least enough so as to moderate the self-destructive tendencies from shattering the framework of the system itself.

This is done in part by agreements "in restraint of trade" (as the anti-trust laws naively put it), that is, in restraint of the inherent tendencies of really "free" enterprise. Even very shortsighted businessmen, who keep their eyes tightly glued on the elusive fast buck just before their nose and not an inch beyond, can usually see the advantages of curbing their impulses to knife the competitor if the immediate result (say, a price war) would be mutually suicidal.

Question of Sacrifice

But as the system grows more complicated, and the self-destructive tendencies of capitalism grow in areas further and further removed from the immediate economic plane, it is only the more farsighted leaders of the system who can continue to see clearly what sacrifices have to be made by capitalists-as-individual-profit-makers in order to ensure their continued existence as capitalists, i.e., to ensure the continued health of the system.

Here are some examples from yesterday:

- Should the pillars of the business community oppose the newfangled notions of universal free education for the common herd, which will cost hard money in more taxes, or should they accede to this demand, at least under pressure, since an educated working class will be more productive in the long run under modern industrial conditions?

- Is it more profitable to keep your immediate wage bill down by paying starvation wages, or is it more profitable in the long run to pay \$5 a week more and set up an assembly-line system (Fordism)?

More difficult kinds of sacrifice (sacrifice of the immediate buck) were demanded of capitalists by the New Deal, whose braintrusts more or less consciously set themselves the problem just as we are presenting it here. This is what was behind the nature of capitalists' resentment against "that man in the White House."

These were more difficult only because they were harder to see by a capitalist class which (like its working class) was still so politically backward. The reforms of the New Deal were in essence, old stuff in Europe. Today the whole capitalist class has become used to them, and even Adlai Stevenson proclaims that the "conquests" of the New Deal have been irreversibly accepted by the Republicans themselves.

The Far View

Now the ability of individuals to see, and respond to, the longer-range interests of their class, as against keeping myopic eyes fastened to the chalkline of immediate profit, is not simply a personal factor or a function of IQ.

For one thing, those capitalist leaders who live in the upper reaches of the financial world, with the most far-flung and varied interests, have naturally the widest horizons; they can get the best bird's eye view of the needs of the system as a whole, as against (to go to the opposite) the small sweatshop types. This consideration is germane to such a question as the "internationalism" (interventionism) of Eastern finance-capitalist Republicanism, as distinct from the political cultural-laggards who give some of its tone to Mid-western tendencies in the GOP, from Taftism to McCarthy-type McCarthyism.

But even these wider-scanners cannot see the whole house within which they live as long as their own perspective remains bound within it. Hence it has often been true historically, and for good reason, that vital reforms for the fundamental health of capitalism have been put through not under the leadership of *individuals* who are themselves practising capitalists, but rather under the leadership of individuals who themselves (in

The Problem Is How to Organize the Western Capitalist War Camp...

training, tradition, perspective) stand outside the system, or removed from its centers, though allied with it in all interest.

The classic examples of this have been Bismarck, the Prussian Junker who was able to carry through the national unification of Germany where the pettifogging German bourgeoisie was too nerveless to fulfill its own class destiny; and F. D. Roosevelt, the "Country Gentleman in the White House" from the Hudson patroon family, who had no shortsighted and obsolete class prejudices hanging over from the past to prevent him from accepting methods which at first pained a good portion of the capitalist class and its experienced funkies.

The prime instrument which serves to mediate and arbitrate the otherwise racking internal conflicts of the capitalist class is—its state.

3

TOWARD SUPRA-NATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Now we have reviewed the internal-national capitalist problem not because its answers can be transferred point by point to the international scene, but only because its problems can be so transferred—if not point-by-point then at any rate in outline.

We may remark in passing that these problems are thus shown to be unanswerable without the analogous solution of setting up a world-state, superseding the present capitalist-national sovereignties, such as World-Federalists and other bourgeois utopians dream of so futilely; but it is the existence of the analogous problems themselves which provides the steam behind the contemporary rash of talk about world-government and which gives a color of life to bourgeois schemes for supra-national federalism, "Council of Europe," etc.

The capitalist world might well have become overwhelmingly self-conscious about these systemic problems without the rise of such a world-scale social rival to its own system as is constituted by the anti-capitalist (bureaucratic-collectivist) power of Russia—perhaps, in due time; that is, with the increase in its own decline.

Tarzan could become conscious that he was a man only after meeting other human beings; world capitalism as such, if we can make such an abstraction for the purpose of an analogy, could become conscious of itself as a social system with its own needs only after running into another social system.

To some extent this already happened in the course of the First European Revolution of 1917-1923, when the specter of socialist revolution raised its head on a continental scale; but the U. S. was not really involved; and anyway that prospect was put down in a few years.

Centralism and Decline

As we said, perhaps world capitalism's consciousness of the above-discussed type of problems would have matured without the catalyst constituted by the rise of a bureaucratic-collectivist world power counterposed to capitalism as such. After all, in the past too, supra-national centralization has been a characteristic accompaniment of the precipitous decline of a social system, even where that social system was not being threatened by a rival society but merely dying in its boots.

Thus it was that the acme of the ancient slave society, the Roman Empire, in its centuries of disintegration twisted in the throes of bureaucratic centralization and in forms of statification which one might almost call totalitarian without being too anachronistic.

Thus also it was in the period of the decline of feudalism that the local particularities and petty sovereignties of the lords were overcome to make way for absolute monarchy, which already reflected the impact of the rival social system that was destroying it.

But such analogies from the past can only be suggestive, since today one of the most powerful driving forces behind the impulse to international consolidation is new and modern: the existence for the first time, in a real sense, of a world economy (we are referring to world capitalist economy, in the capitalist world)—the interdependent world character of the economy and the productive forces. The achievement of this stage is one of the conquests of capitalism of which it can be proud—and which is therefore racking it with unresolvable problems.

The "Outsiders"

Who has the most farsighted view of the nature of this capitalist problem, among the capitalist statesmen and thinkers? Who has the widest bird's-eye view? There are several contenders for this status, each of whom share a piece, though they tend to think that the sector which they can see is the whole vista of foreign policy.

Thinking of the internal-national problem, we can perhaps ask analogously who it is that, in a sense, stands outside or removed from the world-capitalist centers (by tradition, training, perspective—as before) and, though bourgeois in sympathy, can hope to see a wider sector of the house out of which he is leaning. . . .

The question points to such figures as Nehru, brought up ambivalently in conflict with capitalist imperialism, even in hatred of it, yet tied to bourgeois values and conscious of his responsibilities to his own native capitalism.

This is the source of those truths about the Western war camp which Nehru has been capable of pointing out; the source of those warnings against suicidal measures by the capitalist camp which lies in the "neutrality" of his type. (The sharp limitations of neutrality are a topic that LA has devoted itself to often

and at length, and would be a digression here.)

The same semi-detachment from, yet basic involvement in, the capitalist world can be noted, in a quite different form, with regard to the social-democracy in many countries. Here indeed we have a bridge between the internal-national problems and the analogous world problems of capitalism.

Imperialist Supra-Nationalism

Internally, the social-democracy has often functioned as that necessary "alien" class force which alone was able to put through needed bourgeois reforms when the bourgeoisie itself was unable to rise to the task, or indeed, not infrequently, to mobilize counter-revolutionary forces to put down socialist aspirations when the bourgeoisie itself was paralyzed with panic.

On the scale of world problems, the social-democracy in governmental control of not a few countries has stressed hospitality to attempts at world-cooperation (UN-ism, chitchat about united Europe, etc.), to mention its formally "progressive" side; and also has not blanched from the task of doing for its bourgeoisie's imperialism what no bourgeois party could effectively get away with—which is the present role of Mollet's Socialist Party as the current vanguard of colonialist oppression in North Africa. Yet this same Mollet, who with "socialist" speeches on his lips sends French youth to get killed murdering Algerian patriots, could recently, in a much publicized interview, tell Washington some home-truths about the shortsightedness of its cold-war policies vis-à-vis Russia.

It is (to coin a phrase) no accident that last week it was a gathering in Europe quaintly calling itself the "Liberal International"—a talk-fest of so-called liberal parties from European countries—who raised the slogan of European unity precisely as a means of jointly organizing European imperialism against the threat from the colonial and smaller countries to weaken its domination. This was immediately in connection with the Suez crisis.

It is another manifestation of the problem which, however futilely, stimulates hopes of supra-national leadership as a defense-mechanism of imperialism.

There are other candidates for the post of he-who-sees-furthest among capitalism's world problems, i.e., whose position is such that they see a wider sector.

From the point of view of simple experience as manipulators of world forces, Britain, on the background of its centuries of responsibility for administering an empire, is analogous to (say) the board chairman of GM if we think of the United States (with its parochial past) as analogous to a *nouveau riche* who has come into wealth and power by developing local bonanza oil wells but who is just discovering the world outside Texas.

The Unprecedented Gulf

But none of these can aspire to the position which they know is necessary for the safety and self-defense of world capitalism in these days of its decline—that of over-all supra-national leadership, that of the Arbiter.

That position can go only to the United States by virtue of its overshadowing power, and in spite of its lack of many other qualifications.

Yet what other major power is so raw and gauche in world diplomacy, that is, so inexperienced and unskilled in the arts of manipulating and utilizing international forces on a world scale? The United States has never yet had a president who had half the understanding in world politics of a second-string man in the British Foreign Office.

Franklin Roosevelt, for instance? What stands out from a perusal of the notorious Yalta record is not at all any "treason" or "pro-Communism" but rather the overwhelming, sometimes hair-raising but always utter and complete inability of Roosevelt to understand the first thing about Russian Stalinism; and that goes, perforce, for his international rep. Harry Hopkins as well. And Roosevelt was a cultivated, sophisticated and worldly-wise man compared with the courthouse politician who succeeded him or the brassbound gladhander who followed in due course.

No other nation has ever been pushed into the position of responsibility for a world system such as the American arbiter has had to assume, simply because there has never been room for an arbiter before; and yet there are few major powers that have ever been so haplessly prepared for any kind of world view.

Unprecedented task—perhaps unprecedented incompetence; together, an unprecedented gulf between need and reality.

In a burst of charity we might, at this point, fittingly make a plea for a charitable attitude toward what seems to so many people to be the fantastic ineptness and stupidity of J. F. Dulles. Far be it from us to cast doubt upon this single pillar of consensus in a world of otherwise conflicting opinions. But this theory of stupidity, which has its place, can hardly account for what is now one of the biggest fiascos in Atlantic Alliance strategy, the Suez affair; nor can it account for the far from brilliant record of U. S. foreign policy—one which the Republicans are still factionally living off—under a man who is personally not at all stupid, Dean Acheson.

The truth is that the contemporary role of U. S. imperialism as the Arbiter of the capitalist imperialist world is one that could hardly be adequately played by artful and seasoned performers; it calls forth tremendous difficulties; it imposes a crushing burden; and if the individual Dulles or the State Department is so far from measuring up to it, it is because of the inextric-

able contradictions that tie up the Atlantic camp of the capitalist world.

4

THE SUEZ LABYRINTH

It is this that has been dramatized by the course of the Suez crisis, and it is this that provides the intelligible key to the twists of U. S. policy. Here are some of the conflicting strands in the Suez imbroglio—how is an Arbiter to find his way among them?

(1) As everyone knows, France's first concern in the Suez affair is peculiar to it alone: Algeria. Mollet and the French press make no bones about it whatsoever. Paris is not half so much interested in the talk about international operation of the canal as it is in uninterrupted French operation of its Algerian colony.

(2) The U. S., as a friend, can sympathize with France's appetite in this respect; but as Arbiter of a more serious operation than that of milking a single country, how far can it afford to antagonize unnecessarily Middle Eastern countries which can retaliate by flirting with The Enemy, Russia?

(3) Britain is interested in the future of its oil and spheres of influence in the Middle East, and expects the Arbiter to keep it happy, for what more valuable ally does it have?

(4) The Arbiter is very anxious to keep Britons happy, and therefore wants to convince the ex-empire that "we" cannot afford to make an open military assault on Egypt, because this would be the biggest boon for Russia among all the uncommitted peoples of the world.

(5) At the same time the British suspect, perhaps not without justice, that behind Dulles' very statesman-like arguments is the economic reality that American oil men do not have the same stakes to lose in the Middle East; that, in fact, the closing of the Suez Canal would only make American oil capital virtually completely dominant in the world. (In other words, the Arbiter is, at the same time, one of the imperialisms to be mediated—a difficulty.)

(6) Israel, which has its own interests in the affair, is another disturbing factor: (a) For the most part, even at the height of his imprecations against Nasser, Eden until very recently refrained from saying a good word for Israel's rights to use the canal, with a foresighted eye on future reconciliation with the Arab bloc. (b) For the State Department, one consequence of the Israeli factor is consideration of the vote at home.

(7) The Baghdad Pact gets shot full of holes; the moribund Arab League revives. How does this fit in?

(8) Cyprus flares up; the British pull back on offers of concessions; the nationalists threaten reprisals if Cyprus is used as a jump-off to Suez. The Cypriot struggle is wound into the Suez question.

(9) A military assault on Egypt would take French troops out of Algeria—which could be expected to redouble its guerrilla operations while its oppressor is embroiled elsewhere.

(10) Likewise, the troops used would be in part NATO troops, which have already been mobilized for the purpose. But this is not simply a British-French affair; the commander of these troops is an American, naturally. And furthermore: if the first battle in which NATO troops shoot angry bullets turns out to be against Egypt, as against Algeria, this is not exactly an inducement to uncommitted peoples to get enthusiastic about building the Atlantic Alliance against The Enemy Russia.

(11) Speaking of The Enemy, the Arbiter has to keep in mind (even if in a chauvinist frenzy the British and French are willing to forget) that it is not smart to scotch Nasser through an "international operation" which gives Russia for the first time an official, formal and legal foothold in the Middle East.

(12) On the other hand, if Nasser wins, the Arbiter (this time its national-U. S. form) has to remember that Panama will get restless about the canal on its sovereign territory; and that is happening now.

Can the Arbiter Do It?

Since that gives us an even dozen already, we will only hastily mention such internal-political complications as the Labor opposition in Britain, which makes the home front so much different for Eden than it is for Mollet; the domestic-economic considerations of countries even like India and their dependence on Suez-carried foreign trade; the fears of other imperialists besides Britain and France, like the Netherlands, of rambunctious colonials being encouraged to act up; etc.

Like chips in an eddying whirl, all the existent issues of imperialism, and many of the besetting political issues at home, get sucked into the Suez affair.

As the Arbiter, the mediator, of this imperialist world, the U. S. tries to do the job of balancing and reconciling, weighing and organizing innumerable conflicting pulls. Can the Arbiter get on top of all this, and pull it together into a coherent policy for a social system?

It is a well-nigh hopeless task.

A good stab at it would take brilliant leaders who had the capacity really to understand the world they were trying to defend. It is doubly difficult for representatives of an egocentric imperialism with their class-limited range of thinking. It is triply difficult for such representatives who are far from brilliant and even less experienced.

This, at any rate, is a sketch of the type of problem which confronted the U. S. in the Suez affair, as the Arbiter of its war camp, not simply as one imperialist contender among others.

Both Parties Dodge — —

(Continued from page 1)

ly uttered word on this subject amply proves this.

The parties and candidates criticize each other's views on foreign policy; they accuse each other of ignoring the plight of the farmer; they charge that the economic policies of the opponent will create a depression, or inflation, or both. But they find it so difficult to criticize each other on Jim Crow.

Stevenson forces out a word or two on Eisenhower's failure to call a conference on integration and indicates that Eisenhower should do something to secure a solution, but cannot get himself to state what he is in favor of seeing done. And a few Republican candidates, on the other hand, omit some half-hearted propaganda toward the Negroes about the racism of the Southern Democrats.

Eisenhower contents himself with a few words in praise of the superintendent of schools in Louisville, and then hastens on to assure the Southern racists that he understands their problems.

HOW ABOUT TEETH?

Stevenson, speaking in Little Rock, Arkansas, states that he believes the Supreme Court decision to be "right." But to reassure the Southern racists who support him, he quickly added that he stands on the Democratic platform, that platform which sold out the Negro struggle.

Stevenson, however, does not find it possible to indicate how he proposes to implement that decision, or even to state that he proposes implementation at all, and his liberal supporters find it convenient to ignore this fact.

"Our common goal," he states, "is the orderly accomplishment of the result decreed by the courts." The goal, one wonders, of the more than 100 Democratic congressmen and senators who signed the Southern Manifesto repudiating that decision? Of the Democratic governors and legislatures of those Southern states which are openly planning to circumvent it? Of the racist mobs who tried to prevent, and are preventing, integration in Clay, Sturgis, Henderson and Mansfield?

This failure to speak out, moreover, takes place right at the time when the racists have launched an all-out offensive against the Negro people. The victory for integration which seemed assured in Clay, Kentucky turns into a setback.

This defeat for desegregation emboldens the White Citizens Council in Sturgis, which quickly reverses the integration apparently achieved in that community. And from Sturgis it begins to spread to other border-state towns in which integration has been working smoothly. At the same time the NAACP finds itself outlawed in Texas, as it already has been in Louisiana and Ala-

bama. Other states prepare similar action.

DYNAMITE-LADEN

Negro leaders in Texas report that a stepped-up effort to intimidate Negroes is under way in that state and elsewhere in the South. Virginia completes its legislative action to nullify the Supreme Court decision. A scurrilous and defamatory attack upon the Negro people occurs in the nation's capital in the guise of a House subcommittee hearing on the effects of integration in the District of Columbia.

And Stevenson finds that he can speak of "our common goal."

Under pressure from the NAACP, he sends a telegram to the House subcommittee, cautiously informing it that the hearings are "serving no useful purpose." Congressman Davis (Dem., Ga.) lashed out at the "radicals" who criticize this outrageous performance, but quickly explains that he did not mean Stevenson by his characterization and that he is a Stevenson supporter. How well he knows his candidate!

The civil-rights question is loaded with dynamite today, and Stevenson understands this quite well. Precisely because masses are in motion fighting against Jim Crow, precisely because it has become the No. 1 issue of the campaign, Stevenson weighs every word on Negro rights a thousand times more carefully than his words on other matters.

His primary orientation is to retain the allegiance of the Southern Democrats won in Chicago at the Democratic convention by the sell-out on the civil-rights plank in the party platform. For this reason he decides to release a series of policy statements to blueprint his plans for a "New America" on such issues as aiding the aged, housing, social security, etc., but not one on civil rights.

EVASIVE JARGON

In regard to the other questions, it is easy for Stevenson to use the jargon of liberalism just as long as he remains on the level of the general, shunning the concrete always, and committing himself to nothing specific. The "radical" talk is in terms of "goals to be worked for" and not in terms of policies which the Democratic Party pledges itself to carry out.

Thus he attacks the foreign policy of the Eisenhower administration, demands a "fresh approach" and warns that Dulles' blunders on Suez may lead to difficulty. And what approach do you take on Suez? he is asked. It might embarrass our State Department which is now engaged in delicate negotiations, if I discussed it in detail, he replies.

The Democrats this year have been firing away at the GOP as the "party of the giveaway." They condemn the Republicans for having given the tidelands

oil reserves away to private interests. They have been yelling about the need for conserving the country's resources for the benefit of the people. Do you propose to secure the repeal of the tidelands oil act, it is inquired of him? Well, it is the law of the land and the Supreme Court has declared this law to be constitutional, he stammers.

And what has that got to do with working for its repeal? There is nobody to ask him that question, nobody to call him on it. Instead there are dozens of prominent labor leaders and liberals to hail his attacks on Republican giveaways to big business, without pointing out their hollowness.

SAUCE FOR THE GOOSE

This, of course, contrasts markedly with the reaction of the labor leaders and liberals to Republican promises. In response to Nixon's demagogic call for the four-day work-week, Reuther asked some searching questions.

He demanded that Eisenhower, key cabinet officials, and Republican leaders in the House and Senate commit themselves firmly to the support of "a four-day, 32-hour work-week without any reduction in wages." He called upon them to spell out "enthusiastically a practical and specific legislative program for a shorter work-week." Unless this is done, he challenged, the Nixon speech may be written off as "merely an example of political expedience." In view of the Republican record of broken campaign promises, he stated, "more assurance is required than a generality in a campaign speech by the Republican vice-presidential candidate."

But from Stevenson generalities alone suffice.

Reuther, by implication, advances the idea that the record of the Democrats in carrying out promises to the people is so good that specifics are not required. Of course, Reuther would be hard put to substantiate this thesis. The various Democratic congresses since 1948 have not lifted a finger to repeal or even seriously revise the Taft-Hartley Act, or to carry out Truman's 1948 civil-rights program. Reuther knows this quite well, but every vote counts on election day, and so he ignores it.

Moreover, it is precisely from the Democrats that more than generalities on civil rights must be required, in view of the power of the racists in that party, and in view of the fact that the region in which the civil-rights fight is carried on is under Democratic control. But there is nobody in the labor-liberal leadership to make these demands today.

DOUBLETHINK THEORY

Indeed, some of the liberals are working out the conscious doublethink theory that we have no right to demand of Stevenson what we should legitimately demand of Eisenhower. New York Post columnist Max Lerner, a well-known liberal pundit, gave this notion an interesting treatment a few weeks ago.

In his article, Lerner related a dream of his, one in which Eisenhower made a speech to a group of White House correspondents on the integration struggle then in progress in Clay, Kentucky. In his speech, the president strongly, eloquently and by name endorsed the efforts of the Negro children to attend an integrated school, and condemned all of those trying to prevent them from doing so. Eisenhower's speech electrified the nation, and helped score significant vic-

tories against Jim Crow in Clay and elsewhere in the South.

In commenting on his "dream," Lerner explained that such a speech can be made only by the president, and not by Stevenson, who is merely a candidate for that office, since presumably a speech by one who is merely a candidate would be interpreted as "politics" and not produce the same effect.

Now we can grant readily that the president can be more effective in struggling against Jim Crow than a would-be-president. But how does this justify the candidate's silence? Especially when it is his supporters and his fellow-Democrats, whether they be his supporters or not, who have to be defeated in order to end Jim Crow? Lerner does not explain, but the clear implication is that Stevenson's silence is justified is plainly there.

It is on this basis that the Democratic campaign is unfolding. Stevenson will continue and even accelerate his attacks on big business, on "giveaways," on Republican foreign policy. And that will be enough for the trade-union leadership and the liberals.

His failure to detail his proposals will be accepted since "the Democrats mean what they say." Given the hard-to-see differences which exist between the two parties, the supporters of Stevenson will stress their candidates "sincerity." Stevenson himself recently defined the difference between the Democrats and the GOP simply on the ground that the former mean what they promise—an implied admission that there is no significant political difference.

If the Maine election and the indicated shift among farmers portend the final result in November accurately, the Democrats may well be able to win this year, despite the edge given to the GOP by Eisenhower's personal popularity. But a Democratic victory, any more than a Republican, will not mean a victory for the cause of labor and the people. And especially will it not be a victory for the Negro people who are struggling for democracy and equality.

The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Launch Clemency Campaign for C.O.

Pacifists and Socialists are cooperating in a petition campaign urging President Eisenhower to grant executive clemency to Vern Davidson, Socialist Party member now in Tucson federal prison for refusing induction into the armed forces.

Davidson began serving a three-year prison term early last December. His imprisonment climaxed a vigorous three-year court battle carried on by the Davidson Defense Committee which charged the government, in refusing Davidson a C.O. classification because he was an agnostic, with the violation of the American tradition of freedom of conscience. The case went to the Supreme Court twice but was refused a hearing.

The draft law includes a requirement, in Section 6-J, that a man must believe in a "Supreme Being" in order to be exempted from military service. This provision has been viewed by many as discrimination against agnostics and those whose religious beliefs cannot be adequately defined by Congress. Such discrimination is contrary to America's cherished separation of church and state.

At the time of his imprisonment more than twenty people picketed the jail where Davidson was being held, in a demonstration sponsored by the Socialist Party.

Recently Don Thomas, member of the Socialist Party arrested for the same offense, and also an agnostic, was acquitted in a trial in Wisconsin. Since Davidson's case had already been to the Supreme Court there are no judicial steps that can be taken. But on the basis that Thomas in Wisconsin was acquitted for essentially the same offense for which Davidson is serving a three-year sentence, concerned pacifists and socialists are cooperating in a campaign to get petitions and letters to the president, urging him to grant executive clemency—a full pardon.

Copies of the petition can be obtained by writing: Davidson Defense Committee, care of Rina Garst, 167 West 60 Street, New York 23, N. Y. (phone Columbus 5-0485), or, on the West Coast, Davidson Defense Committee, care of Gordon Smith, 2827 Haven Street, Los Angeles 32, Calif. (phone Capitol 2-6735).

SUBSCRIBERS — ATTENTION!

Check your NAME—ADDRESS—CITY—ZONE—STATE appearing on the wrapper.

If there are any mistakes or if anything is left out, especially the ZONE NUMBER, cut out your name and address and mail it to us with the corrections clearly printed.

20-40

If the above number appears at the bottom of your address, your subscription expires with this issue.

RENEW NOW!