

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

NOVEMBER 8, 1954

FIVE CENTS

The Strange Case of I. F. Stone

... page 6

Reuther, Curran and Corruption

... page 2

Sidney Hook vs. a British Tory

... page 4

Rally Hails International Freedom Day

NEW YORK, Oct. 30 — International Freedom Day was celebrated at the anti-colonial rally in Community Church last night, as six speakers called for "self-determination and independence now" for subject peoples exploited and oppressed by foreign imperialism, whether Western or Stalinist imperialism.

LABOR ACTION has already listed the distinguished individual sponsors in whose name the rally was held. A complete report on the rally, including publication of the speeches, will constitute a special issue next week, and so only a brief account is given here.

Over 200 in the audience heard A. J. Muste open the meeting, as chairman, with a short account of the Asian Socialist Conference's call for an International Freedom Day and the organization of the American response. Muste was also scheduled to speak at the end, but due to lateness of the hour, he limited himself at that time to remarks on the American role in Puerto Rico and in Okinawa.

The first speaker, Thakin Chit Maung of the Burmese Socialist Party, particularly discussed his own country's fight against colonialism and the after-effects of colonialism, as well as some of the problems of Southeast Asia at large. He expressed gratification at the U. S. response to the appeal of the Rangoon bureau of the Asian Socialists. Purshottam Trikamdas, a member of the Executive of the Praja-Socialist Party of India and an adviser to India's UN delegation, delivered an analysis of types of colonialism in the world and of the anti-imperialist struggle.

Max Shachtman, national chairman of the Independent Socialist League, next spoke with special emphasis on the "chauvinist mentality" of most Americans and the political test which is constituted by the fight against imperialism. His speech, often punctuated with laughter from the audience, was particularly well received.

After a collection and some greetings, George Houser of CORE gave a very informative account of his recent visit to South Africa, expressing the view that the situation was revolutionary there. Waldo Frank, the last speaker, discussed the dangers of colonial oppression to the white colonialists themselves, in view of their minority situation in the world.

NEXT WEEK

LABOR ACTION will be turned over to a **SPECIAL ANTI-COLONIAL ISSUE**

based on the proceedings of the International Freedom Day Rally, and containing the text of the speeches made by

**THAKIN CHIT MAUNG
PURSHOTTAM TRIKAMDAS
MAX SHACHTMAN
A. J. MUSTE
GEORGE HOUSER
WALDO FRANK**

DEMOCRATS GET THE EDGE IN CONGRESS IN MIDTERM SWING, BUT

Near-Deadlock Is the Result Of Issue-less, Idea-less Election

An issue-less, idea-less campaign has resulted in a near-deadlock between the two major political parties for control of Congress. The Democratic gains are so narrow that for an off-year election they represent the smallest kind of jog in the general conservative drift which has dominated American politics for so many years.

As LABOR ACTION goes to press, it appears that the Democrats have gained control of the House by an extremely narrow margin, and that they may have squeezed through to control of the Senate with the help of independent Wayne Morse. If so, it will mean a reorganization of both Houses which will place much greater responsibility for legislation on the shoulders of the Democrats than they have had during the past two years.

The narrowness of the shift in voter sentiment, however, will make it difficult for either party to claim that this election is an endorsement of any particular line in foreign or domestic affairs. Thus the months ahead will most likely see the most unprincipled kind of partisan infighting over patronage and for position in the next elections between the two parties which control the executive and legislative branches of the government, coupled with equally unprincipled cross-party collaboration among the dominant wings of both major parties for a program of conservative measures which will leave the workers and the mass of the population worse off, if anything, than they are now.

Labor has once again tied its fortunes to the Democratic Party in the name of "practicality." The result has been not a victory but a near-deadlock. The workers will now have the grim pleasure of watching "their" party ignore their interests in Congress for the next two years.

By GORDON HASKELL

Nov. 1—The electoral campaign which ends tomorrow has surely been one of the sorriest and drabest in American history, which is saying a good deal. Whatever the outcome may be, the campaign itself has demonstrated how narrow are the differences which separate the two major parties. And this despite the fact that the Republicans, in particular, have engineered some of the shallowest and dirtiest campaign fakery of recent times.

This election will not be decided by the great foreign-policy issues which have come to a head in the past year. Despite the rantings of the McCarthy-Knowland wing of the GOP and the bellicose bluffs of Dulles, the United States government has been dragged into the cold-war slowdown by its European allies, and the re-

ALL'S WELL

James Reston of the N. Y. Times presents the Tweedledum-Tweedledee analysis of American elections in his accustomed realistically cynical fashion:

"There is much less to this election than meets the ear. Despite all the noise on both sides, neither the economy nor the foreign policy nor the efficient conduct of the government is likely to be changed a great deal. Fortunately, the candidates don't believe their own charges; don't have faith in their own predictions; don't have the courage of their prejudices; and will probably be saved from the consequences of their duplicity by their lack of sincerity." (Oct. 31.)

sulting easement in tension has tended to obscure the fact that Washington's policies have been getting nowhere recently.

The Democrats have apparently realized that any attempt to exploit Dulles' blundering too vigorously in the campaign would be bound to backfire. They have grumbled quietly about the "loss of Indochina," and have mumbled something about the dissipation of good-will

(Turn to last page)

UAW Has to Supplement the Guaranteed Annual Wage Plan — Labor Needs Shorter Work Week

By JACK WILSON

DETROIT, Nov. 1—The revolution in auto production methods in the form of automation provides one of the big question marks before the forthcoming national wage-policy conference of the United Auto Workers (CIO).

Last spring, at the UAW Educational Conference, the leadership put the spotlight on its Guaranteed Annual Wage plan. By the time negotiations begin in the summer of 1955, this plan—by itself—is likely to look like last year's model.

For the UAW plan was geared to high production, full employment, and a gradual technological improvement in auto manufacturing—the kind that could reasonably be handled by the annual-improvement-factor clauses in major contracts.

Since the most optimistic industry sources do not predict over 5,500,000 cars built and sold in 1955, this signifies another year like 1954 for automotive centers like Detroit—and the recession is still here, and 150,000 workers won't be rehired even when production schedules for 1955 are met.

By reverting back to pre-war "normalcy" the auto industry's main production for the coming year has already begun, and by the summer of 1955, the industry will have plenty of cars in dealers' hands to weaken the economic bargaining and pressure of the UAW-CIO.

Important as these considerations are—and an alert union leadership can easily shift tactics to cope with them, unless its arteries are too hardened—they are secondary to the impact of automation on the auto industry.

A CRISIS LOOMS

The latest public announcement of General Motors about its new Pontiac plant emphasizes the new crisis facing the UAW-CIO. Employing 15,000 auto workers normally, this new plant can easily produce 250,000 cars in the forthcoming season. It can produce 500,000 units a year without paying any overtime, merely by adding another 30 to 50 per cent of its labor force.

As a B-O-P plant, it can switch from Buick to Oldsmobile to Pontiac production without loss of time or operations. GM has another plant like this at Arlington, Texas. Ford is building two new plants along similar lines. And Chrysler likewise is rushing to revise its plants, and increase labor productivity by automation.

The fact that 1955 is conceded to be the most competitive year in automotive history will accelerate the race for automation, come next fall and the model changeovers for 1956 cars.

Earlier estimates that perhaps 50,000 more auto workers will never see the inside of a plant on this model must be revised upwards for next summer and the 1956 production schedules.

The auto work force is going downward from its present 600,000-odd to less than 400,000 in the coming period, due to automation. These 400,000 can easily build the 5,500,000 cars yearly that the optimists say the auto industry will sell in the coming five years. If sales do not approach that level, the crisis of auto shorter work-week industry employment will be even more acute.

In the face of this, for the UAW to concentrate mainly and exclusively on winning concessions for those employed—at the current 40-hour or more work schedules—would be fatal shortsightedness.

Automation demands that the UAW revise its Guaranteed Annual Wage plan to include as an integral part the concept of a shorter workweek with higher pay—far more than a five-cent annual-improvement factor.

As dozens of automation experts keep (Continued on page 2)

CURRAN AGENT ARRESTED—

What Will Reuther Do About Curran?

By BEN HALL

John T. Hunt, New York port agent of the National Maritime Union, was arrested on October 28 after a grand jury heard charges that he had received bribes for issuing union membership books and working permits to seamen.

This incident is of more than a passing interest to the labor movement. Hunt is a leading figure in the Curran administration in the NMU. And Joe Curran, NMU president, is a member of the CIO committee to investigate welfare fund rackets, appointed by Walter Reuther. Meanwhile, Curran's own union stands accused, in effect, of remaining passive while a racket developed within it.

True, Hunt pleaded not guilty before the judge when accused of violating a penal law that makes it a misdemeanor for a union representative to receive a bribe. But the main question is not whether he is guilty before the courts but whether he is guilty before the union. The CIO acted swiftly in the New York welfare fund cases even though no legal charges at all had been preferred against the cited local officials.

What is at issue is this: Shall the union movement clean itself up, or shall it wait for the police? Here, the collective union officialdom divides into two hostile camps: those who, for one reason or another, would tolerate racketeering are pitted against those who want decisive action to smash it!

Both the CIO and AFL call upon their affiliates to act themselves without waiting for the cops. But Curran, in the NMU, says wait. Meanwhile, not only Hunt but other leaders of the Curran administration stand accused of involvement in the racket.

RACKET CHARGES

Hunt's arrest comes as no surprise; it merely dramatizes charges that are at least six months old at a moment when the whole labor movement has been alerted to the dangers of racketeering.

Up to recently, the books of the NMU were closed and new members were admitted only under special circumstances. In order to get jobs, non-union members had to get working permits from the NMU. A racket ring arose within the union preying upon jobless seamen, selling permits and membership books for hundreds of dollars. In the very nature of the racket, it is obvious that the ring had to have connections high in the NMU officialdom in order to get the permits and books and cover its trail. The case blew open about six months ago with the arrest of Andrew Mele, a former NMU member, who signed a written confession admitting participation in the racket.

Three NMU leaders—Neal Hanley, secretary; Hubert Warner, vice-president; and John Moriarity, Galveston port agent (all now voted out of office in the last union elections)—demanded union action and the election of a union committee to investigate the charges inside the union. Curran refused, insisting that this was a matter for the police and that any union initiative would only hamper police action. But the accusations reached way up into the union officialdom.

Warner, Hanley, and Moriarity who had been part of the Curran machine, broke with him, organized a slate against his in the last union elections, and lost. The Curran regime, now purged of those who wanted action against the rackets, was reinstated.

Warner, Hanley, and Moriarty charged the following:

In 1950 Mele met Hunt, and in 1951 Hunt told Mele that he could supply NMU books and jobs for \$50 each, except for Negroes and Puerto Ricans who would have to pay \$100. In two years

over 100 books were sold. In 1952 the union officially decided to issue 125 new books and Mele and Hunt decided to raise the ante to \$300 each. Hunt told Mele that he was involving two New York patrolmen, Baker and Barisic, and one member of the NMU national council, Joe Ramos. Mele claimed to have had meetings with Adrian Duffy, union vice-president, to discuss the racket.

WHAT WILL REUTHER DO?

Plans went awry when the union stopped issuing books, jobs became unavailable, and several victims who had paid their fees but received nothing began to yell to the police. Mele was left holding the bag. He had, he said, turned over \$1200 to Hunt for books which were never issued. Hunt told Mele that he was broke and couldn't make restitution. When called before the grand jury about six months ago, Hunt refused to testify, standing on the Fifth Amendment.

"The matter is now completely in the hands of the police," said Joe Curran, "where I think it should remain." That was in February. Since then, the CIO has moved against rackets in welfare funds and Curran was appointed to a committee against racketeering. What he says now is obscure. The fact remains that the accused NMU officials, including Hunt, were just re-elected on Curran's slate.

The NMU is under the moral obligation to do what Curran's opposition demanded nine months ago: investigate the rackets. The CIO is under the moral obligation to put pressure on Curran. The new CIO committee has its first big case.

Question: What is Curran going to do about Hunt? If nothing, what is Reuther going to do about Curran?

Shorter Work Week — —

(Continued from page 1)

flooding the UAW with warnings of the significance of this new concept of manufacturing, and the pressure of the unemployed for a union answer to the job problem mounts, it seems unlikely that Walter Reuther and the UAW leadership can simply repeat the out-of-date arguments of the last convention against the slogan of 30-hour week with 40-hour pay. Of course, the presence of a Stellato faction in the UAW makes it unlikely that Reuther will reverse himself and change basic strategy; but some major concession, not to Stellato but to the economic and production trends, is a vital necessity for the UAW.

There is also the problem that the Big Two may well take the play away from Reuther if the UAW becomes too rigid and stubborn in its insistence on last year's model of the guaranteed annual wage based on the idea of the standard 40-hour work week. General Motors could conceivably come back with a guarantee of a 32-hour week and an increase in the annual improvement factor, and make things quite tough for the UAW negotiators.

It is a matter of record that after the General Motors wage conference in 1950 rejected the idea of retaining the escalator clause in the contract, it found itself reversing its decision when GM insisted on retaining that clause in the contract—which turned out to be a blessing to the union.

MORE IS NEEDED

At the present time, the main fetter of the UAW GAW plan is an unemployment-insurance supplement. While this

Notice to Readers

A perusal of Postal Regulations makes clear that a correction is necessary in our previous offer to send four sample copies of Labor Action to anyone whose address is sent us by a reader. According to Postal Regulations, only THREE sample copies may be sent to the same individual in any one year. We wish to thank those readers who have sent us lists for this purpose. The offer to send THREE sample copies of Labor Action stands.

L. G. SMITH
Business Manager

Lupa Case: Now It's Guilt-by-Innocence

By JACK WILSON

DETROIT, Nov. 1 — In military circles tactical flexibility is always considered a mark of an up-and-coming military leader, and for this trait, no doubt, some bright individual in Washington, D. C. at the Pentagon is due for a promotion.

As most literate persons know, the American army has been smarting somewhat under the stings and lashes of one Joseph McCarthy, the junior senator from Wisconsin. His technique of guilt by accusation and guilt by association has become part and parcel of the political scene, as the current election campaign indicates. The army brass suffered its share last summer in the one and only TV show of the year, the McCarthy hearings.

Never at a loss to learn a lesson, the Pentagon has come up with one that challenges any technique of the senator from Wisconsin. It has developed a new concept: "guilt by reason of innocence," or, for short, "guilt by innocence."

It was applied recently, and therefore became public, in the case of John W. Lupa, discharged last April from the Detroit Tank Arsenal as a "security risk."

Readers of LABOR ACTION may recall that Lupa was accused of

having associated with a member of the Socialist Workers Party some time in the past ten years, and of having subscribed to the publication the *Militant*.

REVIEW BOARD REVERSES

He was attacked for making his case public, by the director of the loyalty hearing here, and he was called upon to disprove a dozen accusations contained in a sealed envelope he was not allowed to read.

But Lupa, aided by three courageous lawyers, his parish priest, and a host of neighbors and fellow workers, fought the charges, and did such a superb job at the hearings that—the Hearing Board cleared him!

The Hearing Board said: "In connection with your suspension and proposed removal from employment by the Detroit Arsenal, you were given a hearing at your request before the Security Hearing Board for the 5th Army.

"That Board has completed its action and found that your continued employment by the Detroit Arsenal would be clearly consistent with the interests of national security."

When Lupa read this paragraph he was about to cheer, for he has been unemployed since his suspension in April.

However, the next paragraph said: "After review of the entire available record, including the material received at the hearings on 10 June '54 and with due regard to the findings of the Security Hearing Board, the Security Review Board has reached the tentative conclusion that your continued employment at the Detroit Arsenal would NOT be clearly consistent with the interests of national security."

You were found innocent by trial, but we find you guilty anyhow! Is it a wonder that the first reaction to this letter was simply shock and speechlessness?

ALL-OUT FIGHT AHEAD

Charles Lockwood, one of the three attorneys, speaking for them all, declared later: "To me the overruling of a Hearing Board by a so-called Review Board makes a farce out of such a proceeding and is an outrageous and shocking affair."

It may also be recalled that one of the intriguing phases of this affair was the journey of an emissary from the Pentagon to the Detroit *Free Press* to convince the editor not to print the news and take the favorable attitude it did toward Lupa.

In the closing days of the election campaign, the Lupa case is not receiving the attention it deserves. But this will soon be remedied, for an all-out fight is looming. "Guilt by innocence" is, after all, a bit too flexible for a mockery of justice.

The standard biography

KARL MARX

by

Franz Mehring

\$3.50

Labor Action Book Service
114 West 14 Street, New York City

Don't miss a single week of

LABOR ACTION

A sub is only \$2.00 a year!

FRANCE

Mendes-France Plays His Hand

By A. GIACOMETTI

PARIS, Oct. 26—In the last weeks, the Mendès-France government has continued to score political victories, all the more remarkable since they have not lately been based on real achievements.

The London agreements represent only another way of achieving the aims of EDC: the rearming of Western Germany and its integration into the American military system. The difference between the two treaties lies in the British participation and in the looser framework of the London agreements as compared to the close integration EDC would have brought about.

Another important feature of the London agreements is the settlement of the Saar question on terms decidedly favorable to the French bourgeoisie, i.e., the consecration of the political separation of the territory from Germany and its economic integration into the French system, naturally without consultation of the people concerned, the Saarlanders.

In other words, the London agreements represent the best deal the French bourgeoisie could have hoped to get—all other things remaining equal, namely, complete economic dependence on American capitalism, sharp competition from German capitalism, a restive working class at its back, colonial revolt throughout its empire.

For this reason, Mendès-France was able to unite the vast majority of the bourgeois parties on his program of limiting disaster. After conquering his own Radical Party at the recent congress in Marseilles, and greatly weakening its reactionary wing led by former Minister of the Interior Martinaud-Déplat, Mendès-France has obtained grudging but real support from De Gaulle, who has decided to dissolve his RPF as an organized political group.

DIDES CASE

The government scored another victory over its reactionary opponents with the "Dides case."

It had been known for some time that the Communist Party had access to classified material concerning military matters. Early this month, the government succeeded in discovering and arresting the CP's informers, and destroyed at least part of the Stalinist apparatus in the military administration.

One of the most interesting political aspects of this case, however, is the fact that the Stalinist espionage organization had been known to the extreme-right opposition, which seems to be maintaining its private police, before it had been known to the government. It appears that the right-wing opposition was going to use its knowledge to frame the government as an accomplice of the Stalinists ("four months of treason").

However, the government succeeded in arresting one of the opposition's cops, Commissaire Dides, precisely at a time when he happened to have all the incriminating documents in his briefcase. On this basis, the government was able not only to break the Stalinist espionage organization in the Ministry of National Defense, but at the same time expose and neutralize the frame-up from the right.

At the present time the affair is still far from clear, and many of its aspects could bear further explanation. The role

of the CP and the political use it has made of its information would be interesting to elucidate, as well as Commissaire Dide's relations with the U. S. embassy.

SP SUPPORTS GOVERNMENT

Although the above events cast a revealing light on the internal politics of the French bourgeoisie, they are not nearly as important from the socialist point of view as the rallying of the Socialist Party to the premier's policies.

Split in two by contradictions of bourgeois policy, unable to reestablish unity on a socialist program of its own, the SP has now temporarily regained its unity on the basis of Mendès-France's program and of the London agreements. Its National Council decided to support the government on the London agreements, Marceau Pivert being the sole dissenter, and is now considering an offer by Mendès-France to enter the government.

It is true that the SP's National Council has taken these decisions in great part under the influence of its ranks, who are pressing for a more active policy. Yet, as long as the SP's policy of "action" will confine itself to support of an active bourgeois politician, it cannot hope to fulfill its function, especially not, in the long run, in the eyes of its followers.

TUNISIA AND MOROCCO

While scoring several political successes, the government has run into trouble in areas where the issues are more clearly defined and where the possibilities for side-stepping have been exhausted. This is the case in North Africa, where recent developments have shown the basic inability of the government to follow a really constructive policy.

In Tunisia, after promising to meet the most important demands of the Neo-Destour, the government has been stalling and is drawing out negotiations. At the same time, full-scale military operations against the fellaghas (guerrillas) have been resumed, and are meeting increased resistance from all sections of the Tunisian people. The numbers of the fellaghas are increasing with every military operation designed to put an end to them, and are now estimated between 4000 and 5000.

INDO-CHINA

Vietnam SP Attacks Diem Gov't in South

By A. GIACOMETTI

PARIS, Oct. 28—A few days ago the Socialist Party of Vietnam published three documents defining in detail its position on the current political crisis in South Vietnam.

The first, entitled "Notes on the Political Situation in Vietnam," is a series of historical documents showing how Bao Dai betrayed his promises to cooperate in the establishment of a democratic regime on his return to power in 1949.

The second document is a motion passed at a special meeting in Saigon by 16 delegates from the three federations of the party (North, Center and South). In it, the representatives of the SPV make the following observations:

The premier Ngo Dinh Diem has systematically followed anti-democratic policies for the consolidation of his personal power. His acceptance of representatives of the religious and political sects into his cabinet is far from being a step toward re-establishing a representative democratic regime. The two papers of the party, *Canh Tan* and *Minh Tan*, fighting for civil liberties, were prohibited in August and October 1954 for refusing to follow the government's line.

Even though it constitutes the only legal and national organization, the SPV has never been consulted by the government, while military men and government functionaries have been called upon to occupy posts in the cabinet. Finally, Diem's policy is bound to alienate the confidence of the people in all non-Stalinist nationalist forces.

Therefore the delegates unanimously decide to call upon all nationalists to oppose the dictatorial policies of the Diem government by all available means; to call upon all democratic and socialist

On October 12, over a thousand UGTT mineworkers went on strike near Gafsa as a protest against the military repression in their region. Earlier, the UGTT (Tunisian Labor federation) had made public a motion demanding that military operations cease. At its recent congress, the federation of farmers unions (UGAT) also demanded the end of military operations, as well as the withdrawal of all troops from the country, the liberation of the political prisoners, the abolition of the state of siege and the abolition of military administration in the South.

All this has put the Neo-Destour in a dangerous position. Having accepted governmental responsibility, it is negotiating with the French administration but has so far obtained next to nothing. While negotiations have reached a stalemate, French military repression, involving now the use of planes and of contingents shipped over from Indochina, demonstrates to the Tunisian people that nothing has changed under the new government.

Consequently, if the Neo-Destour does not take a firmer position, it will discredit itself in the eyes of the Tunisian people. For the French government, on the other hand, there is no alternative but a quick end to the repression or a civil war which it is bound to lose.

In Morocco also a stalemate has been reached. The armed struggle has resumed in the form of terrorism on both sides, and the French government appears to be looking for a way of negotiating with the sultan it deposed without disavowing the puppet it has put in his place.

In the meantime it is trying to gain time by small concessions: wages have been increased, a number of nationalist and trade-union leaders have been released. It even seemed at the beginning of the month that Moroccan trade unions would be legally authorized, and representatives of the CGT and the ICFTU had arrived in Casablanca. However, nothing has been heard about this since, as nothing has been heard concerning the other nationalist demands.

It appears that Ahmed Balafrej, secretary general of the Istiqlal, is justified in declaring that "the Mendès-France government has no intention of reversing the policy of its predecessors."

WAR ECONOMY GETS ANOTHER INFUSION

The slight business upturn, primarily seasonal in nature, which has shown up in the past few weeks has been hailed as proof of the inherently expansive and self-regulating nature of America's capitalist economy. The "built-in stabilizers," we have been told, have at last gone to work and everything will once again be ship-shape.

Although the Democrats have been seeking to belittle the Republican claims of a revival in the economy, even they did not make any election capital out of a report issued by the Department of Commerce on October 31. The reason for this is obvious.

The particular "stabilizer" to which this Commerce report ascribes chief effectiveness in increasing business in September is none other than our old friend, the Permanent War Economy.

Under a headline "Military Buying Primes Industry," the New York Times gives a summary of the Commerce report on its financial page (November 1).

"Manufacturers received more new orders," this report begins, "for goods in September, largely military items, than in any month since the business downturn started in mid-1953, the Commerce Department reported today.

"It also said that manufacturers' sales had risen 'slightly' and that industry's backlog of unfilled orders had jumped for the first time in nineteen months. Higher sales were general throughout industry, except for auto makers, who were getting ready for new model cars.

"The department attributed the business spurt largely to 'the increased placement of defense orders with transportation equipment companies.' In other words, the armed services ordered more planes, ships, tanks and motor vehicles."

The report goes on to say that heavy military buying has continued through October, with the prospect that this month too will show further upward movement in manufacturing.

It would be an oversimplification to claim that this military spending alone is responsible for the little upward jog in the level of economic activity (that is all it is so far). But the question every true believer in the health and inherent progress of American capitalism should ask himself is this: What if, instead of a massive increase in military spending during September, the government had cut its military expenditures by the same amount? How would the "built-in" stabilizers be working then?

Rhyme for Children

Nero, from all historians tell,
Had commonsense and tact as well,
For, having set the fire, he turned
And watched in safety while it burned.
In luxury and ease he lay
Playing his fiddle all the day,
As happy when the sky grew bright,
As any boy on Guy Fawkes Night.
But we, for all our clever ways,
Can't get such pleasure from our days.
We paid a man with bulging cranium
To go and fiddle with uranium;
And then paid more to see if fire
From hydrogen went any higher.
And now we wait, without a fuss,
For them to make a Rome of us.

Moral: Nero was bad, like me and you.
I doubt if he was balmy too.

C.S.

—from "Peace News"

forces in the world, and in particular on the French SP, to support it in its struggle; to call upon France, as a principal signatory of the Geneva protocol, to enforce the democratic principles in South Vietnam.

The third document is a resolution of the Directing Committee of the SPV, and concludes as follows:

"The Directing Committee of the SPV demands: that the Diem government be immediately dissolved; that a Territorial Assembly of Vietnam be called together as soon as possible, being the only legal institution to have authorized the return of H. M. Bao Dai to South Vietnam in the first place, in order to: (1) set up a Constituent Assembly commissioned to prepare the general elections in 1956; (2) commission this Constituent Assembly to draw up a new constitution, to control the use of public finances, and to re-establish immediately the freedom of the press.

"The Directing Committee of the Party considers that in three months it will be too late."

DENOUNCE SENATOR FOR INTERVENTION

PARIS, Oct. 23—As is known, Senator Mike Mansfield was recently sent by the U. S. government to South Vietnam on a "fact-finding trip," and on his return published a report coming out in favor of the highly unpopular Diem government.

The reactions of the Socialist Party of Vietnam to this report were made public here in a recent issue of *Le Populaire*, the French SP's daily.

In a letter of October 17 to Donald

Heath, U. S. ambassador in Saigon, the general secretary of the SPV, Dr. Ngo, strongly protested against the U. S. senator's "interference in the internal affairs of Vietnam." The fact that Mansfield's statements were made after seeing President Eisenhower, Dr. Ngo added, indicated official sanction of the views expressed in the report and only aggravate the case.

It appears that the senator confined his fact-finding to "official dinner parties, and did not deign to contact the working people in any way." Consequently, the report "reveals complete ignorance of the realities of Vietnamese life and consciousness." After a strong indictment of the Diem government, Dr. Ngo then said:

"The Vietnamese nationalists have not struggled for all these years . . . to learn, on the day when independence finally materializes, that a foreigner has taken it upon himself to impose an incompetent, irresponsible, hated and despised government on their country. . . ."

The Vietnamese people will tolerate no foreign domination regardless of the side it may come from or the shape in which it may present itself. "We prefer to attempt building a self-sufficient economy in order to be able to reject an aid whose only purpose is to re-establish in fact colonialism, racial discrimination and political, ideological and economical dependence. . . . One does not struggle against Stalinist communism by opposing popular aspirations and imposing on the country a government which represents nobody but itself."

In conclusion, the SPV's General Secretary expressed the hope "that Senator Mansfield's declaration will not represent the definitive position of the U. S. government."

A PERSPECTIVE ON AMERICAN LIBERALISM SIDNEY HOOK vs. A BRITISH TORY

To get a perspective on what has happened to civil-liberties principles, and democratic thought in general, in this country, let us put an unaccustomed focus on the relationship between British Tories and U. S. liberals. A current article gives us an unusual opportunity.

England has its political spectrum, of course, like any other country and like the United States, running from right to left across the board.

On the right wing of British politics is the Tory party. Now, narrow the focus on this party of the Right, and exclude from the picture anything like the "young Turk" elements in the party who would like to look a little less stodgily status-quo-ish than the old men running the party.

Keep it focused on the rock-ribbed warhorses of Conservatism, the old Tory leadership, the backbone of right-wing capitalist statesmanship in this citadel of capitalism.

In this group, now, narrow the focus still more, pan in, and pick out the staid, aristocratic face of the British Tory stalwart who is the opposite number of our Brownell — old-line Conservative gentleman who is in charge of internal security in England, the home secretary.

His name is Sir David Maxwell Fyfe. He recently visited here; and the *U. S. News & World Report* conducted one of its feature interviews with him, on the subject of "How Britain Handles Communists" (October 15 issue).

AGAINST HOOK THEORY

Now, to be sure, the *U. S. News* is right-wing Republican in political complexion, and so it is not too surprising if the interviewer was obviously somewhat appalled by the revolutionary radicalism of the old Tory. But the main point that emerges from the interview is not directed at McCarthyism, or anything as extreme as this now-integrated ingredient of American politics.

It is directed at the theory of the American liberals, as formulated for them by their theoretician Sidney Hook, that the Communist Party is to be treated as simply a "conspiracy," together with accompanying witchhunt principles to suit.

The appalling fact which emerges is that the body of American LIBERALS stand substantially to the RIGHT of this Tory official Communist-hunter.

The point of view matter-of-factly expounded by the Tory is, in American political life today, sufficient to stamp one as an extreme radical.

Following are some excerpts from the text of the interview by *U. S. News* with Home Secretary Fyfe.

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.

18-45

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

RENEW NOW!



LABOR ACTION

November 8, 1954 Vol. 18, No. 45

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

Editor: HAL DRAPER

Assistant Editors:

GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL

Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

Interview Excerpts

Q: . . . but aren't they [the CP] still there as a conspiracy?

A: My attitude is, I want to know who they are. And therefore I don't want to drive them underground. . . .

Q: Do you object if they have non-sensitive jobs?

A: No, I don't.

Q: They can serve in government in non-sensitive jobs, then?

A: They can serve in government but not in sensitive jobs. . . .

Q: An individual suspected of "doubtful reliability" may quit, ask for a non-secret job, or appeal for a hearing?

A: Yes.

Q: Even if his "reliability" is doubted, an effort is made to find the employee a non-secret job, isn't that so?

A: Yes. . . .

Q: You don't in Britain, I take it, regard the Communist Party as a conspiracy—

A: No, we don't—

Q: If you don't, then why do you keep them out of sensitive positions?

A: Because a Communist has at least a double loyalty—if not a greater loyalty to international Communism than to his own country.

Q: Then under our terms you do, in fact, consider it a possible conspiracy against your own form of government?

A: I hope I'm not being legalistic, but the conspiracy has got to be shown to exist by overt acts. The mere formation of a view does not mean that a man is involved in a conspiracy, but the holding of that view may properly disqualify him from being put in a sensitive position where he has access to information.

Q: Then you wouldn't regard his teaching it or advocating it as a conspiracy?

A: No, not teaching it to try to get Communists into the party. But, on the other hand, if he were to try to get hold of secret information, he would then come within the purview of criminal law. . . .

Q: Britain isn't concerned about teaching Communism in the schools?

A: That is something for the local educational authorities to decide, whether they are doing it in such a way that makes them unsuitable as teachers. . . .

Q: Do the armed services accept Communists? Do you draft them?

A: Yes.

Q: Then what becomes of them?

A: That depends on what sort of soldier they make and whether, of course, they commit any offense.

Q: They aren't discriminated against?

A: No.

Q: Their Communist membership is not considered in advancement or rank?

A: No. They are looked at on their merits.

Q: You don't consider a Communist a security risk as such automatically, then? That is, is any Communist considered a security risk?

A: Well, he would be considered a security risk in the sense that he wouldn't be employed in a sensitive department where he'd have access to confidential or secret information. . . .

STALINIST RIGHTS

Six points are involved here that differentiate Fyfe's viewpoint from current U. S. practice.

(1) Communists, says the Tory, can hold government jobs without persecution by the authorities, as long as these posts are not "sensitive" ones. He makes pretty clear in other parts of the interview that a "sensitive job" would be one that involves policy-making or that would provide access to secret information.

In the U. S., a file clerk in a Veterans Administration office cannot hold his job if he is thought to be "subversive"—even if he is an anti-Stalinist socialist like James Kutcher. Suspected "subversives" are hounded out of the slightest and least important job.

(2) Even if an employee's "reliability"

is doubted, says Fyfe, he will be given another government job which is non-secret. In these United States, the man would be hounded and pilloried.

(3) The British government, says the Tory, does not regard the CP as a "conspiracy," even though it takes account of Stalinist "double loyalty." He distinguishes between the overt act of conspiracy and "the mere formation of a view."

(4) He is for the right to advocate the ideas of "Communism." He draws the line only at "trying to get hold of secret information," which has to do with the criminal law.

(5) He clearly accepts the right of CPers to teach, provided they are not "doing it in such a way that makes them unsuitable as teachers."

(6) Communists in the armed forces are treated without discrimination in any way, including with respect to advancement.

We assure our British readers that we are not engaged in praising the Tories. It is a fact about American life which is highlighted.

WHERE?

Let the American reader ask himself where, in the American political spectrum, he can find a point of view which is approximately as pro-civil-libertarian.

Not in the Democratic Party, whose administration under Truman was the one which launched the "subversive lists" and purges.

Not even in the Fair Deal wing of the Democratic Party, headed by the same Truman and rejoicing in the leadership of Communist-outlawer Humphrey, who out-McCarthyed McCarthy.

Not in the left wing of the Fair Deal wing of the Democrats—say, Americans for Democratic Action, which has in fact been harrying its student affiliate for agreeing with the Tory standpoint.

Not even in the labor left-Fair Dealers, say, in the CIO, whose statements on civil liberties have been full of mush at the best, and which has not even denounced Humphrey. (Incidentally, while the CIO bureaucratically expelled its Stalinist-led unions, our Tory minister, in another part of the interview, explicitly approved of the fact that the British TUI has taken no similar action against a CP-led union in his country!)

Not even in a good part of the leadership of the American Civil Liberties Union! Not even in the liberal-socialistic leader Norman Thomas, whose recent book on civil liberties is to the right of the Tories!

The Tory standpoint on civil liberties for Stalinists can be found in America, of course, if you look for it. It can be found among left socialists and radicals, organized in small groups. It can also be found, naturally, among the Stalinoid and Stalinoid-liberal circles, such as those around the *Nation*.

WILD-EYED RADICAL TORY

In other words, the great bulk of the whole American political spectrum—from right to what the Republicans call its "extreme left"—is itself, as a whole, to the right of the right wing of the Tory right wing of British politics.

And with regard to anti-Communist hysteria, the whole *British* political spectrum is probably as a whole to the right of that on the Continent, as well as most other parts of the world.

In terms of American politics, Sir David Maxwell Fyfe is a wild-eyed radical, or what Sidney Hook and his ilk call sneeringly, a "ritualistic liberal."

In terms of British politics, the "liberal" Professor Hook and his witchhunting liberal colleagues are so far to the right on civil liberties that perhaps their only near-associates on this question would be the crackpot fascist and semi-fascist fringe of that island.

Naturally, all this does not prove who's right. But it is bound to reinforce some suspicions about the disemboweling of U. S. liberalism.

On the HOME FRONT

While in England (see article to the left) the British Tories defend the right of Stalinists to government jobs, army ranks, teaching posts, etc., in the United States—while most liberals maintain a shameful silence or go along—the witch-hunt does not even permit a man to hold a private job with a private company which is not engaged in any secret work, nor even in war work, and which has no connection with security needs.

In the Bay Area, California, four workers were fired more than a year ago by the Pacific Gas and Electric Company, a utility company. They were fired shortly after being called up by the State Senate Un-American Committee, and after they refused on constitutional grounds to answer questions about CP affiliations.

The Un-American Committee thereupon wrote to the company informing it that, in the committee's opinion, the four men should not be permitted to work in a "strategic" utility, and that utilities personnel should be of unquestioned loyalty. The company took the cue and did the firing.

The division manager of the utility informed the electrical workers union of the Un-American Committee's action, in a letter justifying and explaining the dismissal, so that the witchhunters' intervention is documented.

Now the four victims have filed a complaint through the courts, seeking to collect damages totaling \$218,333 from the state witchhunt committee. The suit is being sponsored by the American Civil Liberties Union, Northern California branch.

Cole Case

Another case is being brought against a government agency. Kendrick M. Cole, a federal Food and Drug Inspector, is bringing an action before a federal court in Washington as a result of his dismissal from the civil service last January.

Cole will argue that Eisenhower's loyalty-purge executive order should apply only to "sensitive" agencies.

Cole was dismissed from the Food and Drug Administration because he was alleged to have (1) attended two social gatherings of the Nature Friends of America, a group with a Stalinist complexion that is devoted to furthering hiking, camping and nature activities; (2) donated \$1.50 to the same organization; and (3) maintained a close association with "individuals reliably reported to be Communists."

New Fund Set Up

Corliss Lamont, widely known as a non-CP Stalinist sympathizer, has established a new fund for civil-liberties defense. Starting off the fund is his gift of \$50,000; the goal is to raise a million, as a "Bill of Rights fund to defend the Bill of Rights."

Lamont will act as chairman of the fund; the executive committee will consist of himself plus Augustus Kelley, treasurer, and Edna Johnson, secretary. Philip Wittenberg is the counsel.

The purpose of the fund, Lamont's announcement said, is: "first, to give financial assistance to key organizations and enterprises that are working militantly and uncompromisingly for American civil liberties on the basis that the Bill of Rights should apply impartially to all groups and individuals in the United States; and second, to provide financial help in especially significant individual cases involving constitutional issues, in order to assist the victims with their legal defense and to lessen economic pressures on such persons if they have lost their jobs."

Labor Action FORUM

New York City

THURSDAY, NOV. 11 — 8:30 p.m.

ALBERT GATES reviews the ELECTION RESULTS

Nov. 18—STAN GREY reviews David Riesman's latest book, "Individualism Reconsidered."

Labor Action Hall, 114 West 14 Street, New York City

CCNY: Open Season on Student Witchhunt

By MEL STARKMAN

Following on the heels of the recent dismissal of three professors at Hunter College, one of the city colleges in New York, who were fired essentially for refusing to turn stoolpigeon on their former Stalinist associates, the Board of Higher Education continued its search for stoolpigeons in a new direction—this time into the domain of college students.

On October 8 the BHE's investigating committee on subversion in the schools called Sema Gorkin, a senior at the City College of New York and former employee of the BHE, to testify.

The fact that Gorkin was a Labor Youth League organizer at the campus supposedly did not enter the picture. Michael Castaldi, director of the commission, stressed that she was being called as a former employee—not as a student. But this alone, of course, would illustrate how the witchhunt is being extended day after day. A person who was a clerk of the BHE from February to May in 1951 is called to be investigated in October 1954.

However, the situation was much worse than that. For Castaldi also added that students, as students, may be hauled before the commission depending on "how the investigation progresses."

It appears that now college students, too, are plotting the overthrow of the government by force and violence. And if they are not, they should at least have the decency to expose those professors who, by their nonconformist views, "prove" that they are subverting, advocating, plotting violent overthrow!

CALL FOR STUDENT SPIES

Gorkin refused to testify on the grounds that the aims of the commission represented a serious threat to academic freedom in the American college community. Since Section 903 of the city charter requires only present employees to testify, the board was forced to postpone the Gorkin hearing indefinitely.

But the result of the summons was much more important than any actual hearing could have produced.

It served as a reminder that nonconformist political opinion is not the "correct thing" these days. It served as a warning that nonconformist political thinking will be punished. It served as a feeler for student stoolpigeons.

The president of the college, that well-known liberal, B. Gallagher, backed up Castaldi: "The purpose of the committee is to get information about subversives and it is well within the committee's rights—in fact, it is desirable—to get accurate information from whatever source it can."

Gallagher went on to express the belief that it would be desirable for the BHE investigating committee to question students who might have information on subversives employed in colleges. Summing up the Gorkin incident, Gallagher said: "Concealment of information about subversives is cooperation with subversion."

The assumptions behind the witchhunt in the United States are evident in Gallagher's statement: "conspiracy" and "subversion," whatever they mean, exist; investigating committees have the right to root out "subversion"; refusal to testify before these committees means "cooperation" with "subversion"; therefore refusal to turn stoolpigeon must be punished.

With this commitment to the "conspiracy" theory of Stalinism, the liberals continue to move toward blanket acceptance of domestic repression, as the consequences of the theory are worked out. And the conspiracy hypothesis is the only one which pro-capitalist liberals can maintain—for how else can the Stalinists be winning the cold war?

GALLAGHER REFUSES

Thus, failing to understand the political ideology and appeal of Stalinism, the capitalist protagonists fight in purely military terms, which on the domestic scene takes the form of repression of

"subversion." And in a losing battle on the world-wide scene, "subversion" comes to mean not only the Stalinists but everybody against the status quo.

In this particular statement of Gallagher's, we have an even further extension of the witchhunt rationale—the legality, nay, the morality, of spying out "subversive" professors by the students. For what else can be the meaning of students'

reports to investigating committees on their professors classroom activities, except spying?

On October 18, in response to Gallagher's statements, the City College Stalinist organization, which calls itself the Marxist Discussion Club, challenged the president to debate the alleged subversion in the schools.

Gallagher refused to debate because he did not "want to encourage" the club. The next day the club's faculty advisor, Professor Thirlwall of the English Department, backed up the president's decision by saying that he, too, "would not enter a debate sponsored by that group."

One cannot but deplore this attitude. These great democrats refuse to enter the market of ideas with people of speci-

fic opposing points of views. Even if the Stalinists were blowing up bridges—and they are not—what would that have to do with debating against their ideas? In fact, it would just make it that much easier to discredit their point of view.

But no, Gallagher does not want to encourage the club. Could it be possible that even the Stalinists can demolish President Gallagher's pro-witchhunt position?

SQUEEZE PLAY ON STALINISTS

However, the Statlinists, while busily trying to make political hay against straw men, did not notice the implications of their own publicly expressed and exposed position.

The next day, in a letter to the school newspaper, two members of the Young Socialist League attending City College challenged the Marxist Discussion Club to debate the intriguing proposition: "Who is responsible for the cold war—the U. S. and/or Russia?"

Now, of course, Stalinists do not want to debate socialists—if they can possibly avoid it.

But after seeking a debate with one opposing point of view, and being rebuffed, the Stalinists in turn could not back down from a public challenge from YSL—at least not without being completely discredited in the eyes of the college students. And therefore the Marxist Discussion Club was forced to accept the challenge.

To Debate Stalinists at CCNY

As mentioned at the end of the lead article on this page, a by-product of the current witchhunting proceedings at the City College of New York is going to be an unusual debate.

The Stalinist student group at the college, the "Marxist Discussion Club," was forced to accept the Young Socialist League's challenge to debate the question of re-

sponsibility for the cold war.

This will be the first debate between the YSL and a Stalinist group. In it the YSL's Third Camp point of view will be counterposed to the Stalinists' whitewash of Russian totalitarianism.

As presently scheduled, the debate will be held at CCNY uptown, on Thursday, December 2, at 12 noon.

THE U.S. FAILURE IN FOREIGN POLICY

By SAM TAYLOR

United States foreign policy has suffered a series of defeats in the past six months unrivaled in any recent comparable period. The policy planners in Washington appear to have the Midas touch in reverse—anything they touch turns into lead.

From Indochina to Germany to Guatemala, the United States has pursued a policy that has willy-nilly managed to alienate democratic and progressive forces in the world, and turn every Stalinist maneuver, almost by default, into a move of genius.

It would be grossly unfair to the present Eisenhower administration to ascribe all the defeats to the almost incredible ineptness of the Dulles-run State Department. As all Democrats admit in moments not dominated by excessive political passion, the foreign policy of the Eisenhower administration is the continuation of the Truman-Acheson policy.

The blunders and bluster of the Republicans alone could not have added up to defeats of the present magnitude—it is the entire American foreign policy of the post-war years that has led to the disasters of today and now stands on trial.

The fundamentally wrong thing about Washington's foreign policy is not that it opposes Russian imperialism and Stalinism, or that it seeks to prevent the spread of Stalinist influence throughout the world. What is wrong is that in trying to do this, while claiming to be the defender of democracy and freedom, the United States—the United States of Eisenhower and Truman, of Dulles and Acheson—is not defending democracy or freedom or undermining the strength and appeal of Stalinism.

Instead of winning allies and friends by the millions to the Western side of what is called democracy, the United States has managed to alienate millions who see in the United States little more than the richest and most powerful country in the world which threatens the world with an atomic world war.

How did this come about? Who is responsible?

Would it have been different if Thomas Dewey had won the presidency in 1948,

or Adlai Stevenson in 1952? Or is it all the fault of Joe McCarthy?

Or is it due to the fact that the rulers in the Kremlin are so devilishly clever that they have fooled, deceived or maneuvered millions into believing that the United States is a supporter of reaction determined to go to war if necessary in order to preserve its privilege and power against the rest of the world, which is only seeking an opportunity to live in peace and to better standards of living?

A POLICY CRUMBLES

The Stalinists may be clever, McCarthy a reactionary, and Stevenson more restrained than Eisenhower, but these things provide no answer, or at best explain only variations to a minor degree. Certainly they cannot account for the widespread anti-Americanism which is rampant throughout the world.

What has happened is that the entire structure of the policy of "containing" Stalinism and Russian power is now crumbling. "Containment," as first stated in the Truman doctrine for Greece in 1947, was and always has been a military policy in its basic approach. At bottom is the idea that Stalinism can be contained by forming a system of military alliances around the rim of the Stalinist empire. Therefore United States foreign policy has directed its attempts to establish a North Atlantic Treaty Organization, a Middle East alliance and now a Southeast Asian Treaty Organization; and once these are down on paper all the diplomatic energy is directed toward building up the military power of the member nations.

Once this has been decided upon as the way to deal with Stalinism, it inevitably follows that any power, no matter how reactionary, no matter how undemocratic, as long as it is anti-Stalinist, be-

comes eligible for support by the United States. The result is that the military allies who are viewed as the most trustworthy and dependable are the most reactionary forces outside of the Stalinist world—Franco, Syngman Rhee, Chiang, Bao Dai, Pakistan, and Thailand.

DEFENDING CAPITALISM

Nowhere in the world does the United States win the support of mass democratic movements. It is not that there is no desire in Washington for this kind of allies. The entire "psychological warfare" efforts are in this direction; but it is no accident that instead of winning allies and friends, in Western Europe for example, the U. S. stimulates anti-Americanism everywhere.

The fact is that the United States is not struggling for freedom and democracy, but rather for the preservation of capitalism. It is true that many Americans believe that these are the same thing, and for proof they point to the high standard of living in this country. But to the mass of the people in the world, capitalism has not brought the high American standard of living, and in many cases it has not even brought democracy.

The hard fact for most Americans to recognize, and most shut their eyes to it, is that anti-capitalism is dominant in most of the world today. The most democratic forces in Europe, the labor and socialist movements, are anti-capitalist; and to the peoples in the underdeveloped areas, capitalism has meant colonialism and their exploitation by Western imperialism.

The problem of the appeal of Stalinism is not exhausted by calling Stalinism totalitarian and reactionary and correctly demonstrating that when a Stalinist party comes to power it means the end of democracy and a free labor movement; or that Russia is imperialistic and that it has engaged in military aggression as in Korea. Nor does it really help to point out that what has to be done is to attempt to raise the living standards of people by sending large American economic aid through the Marshall Plan or Point Four.

(Turn to last page)

The STRANGE CASE of I. F. STONE

By HAL DRAPER

I. F. Stone, in a special editorial in his *Weekly* (Oct. 25), has come out in support of Eisenhower and the victory of the Republican Party in this election. This apparently fantastic step is of considerable interest not because it has any significance for the election, nor because Stone is politically influential, but because of the very harsh light that it throws on a type of Stalinoid-liberal mentality.

Who is I. F. Stone? He has had a substantial career as a highly competent and interesting political journalist. For a number of years he covered Washington for the *Nation*; later he was the political columnist of the New York Stalinoid dailies *PM* and *Compass*; with the demise of the latter, he launched his own weekly Washington newsletter of comment and editorial analysis called *I. F. Stone's Weekly*, now in its second year.

His political history is also somewhat indicated thereby. While no doubt never a member of the Communist Party, for a number of years he followed the essential aspects of the party line as closely as the usual fellow traveler. But he has also been a maverick. At least during the *Compass* period, he separated himself from the CP on civil-liberties issues (supporting the Kutcher case, for instance, and the rights of Trotskyists).

He is still pro-Stalinist in essential lines of politics, particularly foreign policy, where the burden of political propaganda in his *Weekly* is a Stalinoid-neutralist argument. But particularly in the last few years he has become more and more publicly critical not only of the CP but also of the Russian regime as totalitarian.

Stone is a prominent ornament of the tendency—grouped in part around the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, in part around *Sweezy's Monthly Review*—which can be described as "independent Stalinist"; that is, anti-CP Stalinist; that is, in fundamental agreement with Stalinist ideology but (for good and bad reasons) critical of, scornful of, or even antagonistic to, the CP.

Stalinoid Politics

This tendency as a whole is the nearest, though inexact, American equivalent of such common European formations as the Nenni "socialists" in Italy or the PSU in France. But it is not homogeneous.

On its "eastern" wing it extends to types who are willing to defend virtually anything about Russia, and above all Russia's sterling "socialist" character; to theoreticians like *Sweezy*, who is a far more convinced adherent of the theory of "building socialism in one country" than Stalin ever was; to ideologists who are willing to admit that the Kremlin's passion for civil liberties leaves something wanting, but who do not let such secondary considerations obstruct their politics of support to the Kremlin; to others who are genuinely disturbed or even revolted by Russian totalitarianism, but who tell themselves that this deplorable blot on the Great Socialist Experiment is perhaps an inevitable result of backwardness, not to be duplicated in the West; and it extends all the way over to its "western" wing which can look ideologically a good deal like Isaac Deutscher in theory—or, in practical politics, like I. F. Stone, who is no theoretician.

Indeed, Stone is situated around the "western" tip of this independent-Stalinist tendency; and at the latter's gatherings (for example, the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee conference, for which see *LA* of Feb. 9, 1953) he is just about among the most outspoken in his PUBLIC references to the sins of the CP and the totalitarianism of Russia. His *Weekly* has also had more and more forthrightly anti-Moscow cracks.

This, then, is the political type which is the center of interest for this article. How does it happen that such a type comes out for a Republican victory? Does it mean, perhaps, a break with his past politics?

No. On the contrary, it is a quite interesting illustration of the meaning of such Stalinoid politics. But before going ahead with generalizations, let us look at Stone's politics in operation.

Ike's Peace Party

On the surface, Stone's editorial "Why I Cast My Vote for Ike" has its weird moments in terms of the logic of its argumentation, but its essential logic is entirely frank and aboveboard, not devious. "The overriding issue is that of peace," he proclaims right off. The Democrats "have become the war party." That's it.

He does not really say that the Republicans are the "peace party." He measures the GOP against the Democrats, or more usually Eisenhower against Stevenson, with the standard yardsticks of "Who's for coexistence?" "Who's for negotiations (a deal) with Moscow?" "Who's for relaxation of the cold war?" etc. and finds that his readings of the result favor the Republicans.

The details of his argumentation, however, do not as frankly reflect the real thinking behind this conclusion,

or perhaps Stone is not aware of it himself; hence the aforementioned peculiarities of his arguments.

After all, he argues, "the Eisenhower administration did end the fighting" in Korea and keep out in Indochina.—No mention of the fact that the Korean peace came in the tide of the détente following Stalin's death (not ascribable to Eisenhower); and that if the Indochinese war ended without U. S. intervention, no one in the world thinks that Dulles, who sat glowering through the Geneva conference, can take the credit. It is incredible for a man like Stone.

He attacks Stevenson for referring to "the growing attraction of monstrous China." But he does not mention that a Stevenson speech was widely hailed (if I am not mistaken, by Stone himself, or at least by co-thinkers of his) as leaving more of an open door on the recognition of China; while Dulles-Eisenhower have howled blue murder over the very idea, not to speak of calling Peiping something more than "monstrous." Stone is not even being honest with himself.

He attacks Stevenson because, referring to the Indochinese settlement, the Democrat said the free world had there suffered "its greatest disaster since the fall of China." Can Stone possibly kid himself that the Eisenhower administration has any other evaluation of this Stalinist victory in Indochina? It's practically impossible.

Peculiar Arguments

He lambasts Stevenson for talking about "negotiation from strength." As if Eisenhower and Dulles do not talk this way twice as often and three times as hard! More fantastic still is that he counterposes a little quote from the good Eisenhower, one of those little homilies against seeking peace "in terms of military strength alone." Stevenson and the Democrats are twice as adept and three times as enthusiastic when it comes to such lip-service.

For the Democrats, he cries, the Korean peace and the Indochinese settlement and the new-look Russian policy "do not exist." This is simply high-pitched hysteria, obviously.

He throws a big bouquet to the administration for helping East-West trade, on very scanty grounds. He has more of a solid point in charging: "The Democratic leaders are so obsessed with the need to clear themselves of any suspicion of Communism, they and the trade-union leaders supporting them are so ready to relapse into an arms race as an easy means of pump priming. . . ."

But by a process of careful selection of isolated facts not half so one-sided as Stone's, one could "prove" that the Democrats are the lesser evil with respect to foreign policy. Guatemala—arm-twisting crudely in the UN—German rearmament—SEATO—rough handling of our noble allies . . . there is excellent raw material for a sophisticated case, which would yet be less ridiculous than Stone's. One suspects such items might not impress Stone as much for a characteristic reason: Stone talks about "foreign policy" but he often does not mean foreign policy as a whole; he means foreign policy with respect to the possibility of a deal with Russia.

How could the whole futility, and utter meaninglessness, of the "lesser evil" approach be better underlined? But Stone does not see it, of course. As far as lesser-evil thinking is concerned, he is out-Heroding Herod.

The Real Difference

Now, while Stone's arguments about the difference between Democratic and Republican foreign policy are so peculiar and unreal, there is a real difference which is at the back of his case. He does not formulate it, or perhaps face it.

Henry Wallace did, in his time—namely in the 1948 campaign. Wallace in virtually so many words proclaimed that from his point of view Taft was the lesser evil to Truman, and it was perfectly clear why. It was insofar as Taft was an "isolationist," insofar as (Wallace felt) Taft was blind to American capitalism's international interests and obligations, insofar as he was considered to be a "troglydite" or "dinosaur" in foreign policy.

For Stone, too, insofar as the Republicans are preferable for "peace," it is because such fossil-politics can be found more in ITS ranks, and less in the ranks of the Democratic leadership.

Of course, Wallace had an infinitely better case, because he was talking in 1948 not of the Dewey "internationalist" wing of the GOP (including Eisenhower) but of the Taft wing. Stone applies the same course of political thought to the GOP as a whole, and therefore looks sillier. But the basic motivation is the same.

This is illustrated by the point behind Stone's most defensible argument, already mentioned: the Democrats' greater urge to use arms spending for "pump-priming," that is, for shoring up the war economy. We will not stop to argue here that Eisenhower and his advisers have shown themselves, and very recently too, not at all unfamiliar with the advantages of this method. For the fact remains that it is within Eisenhower's political family, and not Stevenson's, that one gets the

greatest pressure for cutting down on the war budget—for the sake of cutting taxes and performing other domestic services for the profit-hungry capitalists.

One of the outstanding proponents of this trend within the Eisenhower cabinet is Secretary C. E. Wilson. It is inevitable, therefore, that Stone is going to have a soft spot in his heart for this unreconstructed capitalist stalwart. A slander? Just the reverse. Stone has proclaimed it.

In the previous issue of his *Weekly*, about the famous "dog" story, Stone had an amazing little item "In Defense of Charlie Wilson." And it is not satirical! We learn that this Wilson is "a blunt and honest old shop foreman," and that his kennel-dog outbreak did merely "reflect the self-made man's contempt for those with less git-up-and-git"; Stone even claims falsely that the dog remark was taken out of context.

Again, it is absolutely incredible for Stone, unless one understands the real fountainhead of his politics. And in this item it is only indicated when Stone writes, "Wilson has been a force for peace in this capital, and that's more than can be said for the bloodthirsty Meany or the equivocal Reuther."

And it is perfectly true that Secretary Wilson has gone out on a limb more than once with the public statement that the Russians don't want war and can't be expected to start it—a statement that would hang a Democrat today if he were caught saying it.

The Tell-Tale Pattern

So, since Wilson is in the "peace" party in Washington, his reactionary domestic views are whitewashed. . . . Not because Stone is toeing any party line but because his politics push him into this prejudice. The logic of politics is a hard taskmaster, if one is willing to follow through. So to speak, Stone's political ideology pushes him into the same corrupting habit—of whitewashing domestic reaction with foreign-policy "progressiveness"—which is so characteristic of the CP hack who takes to this pattern through bureaucratic subservience. The two are far apart morally and in human terms, but the objective political result tends to converge.

Finally, before turning to a bit of generalization, let us make clear that Stone by no means has fallen in love with the Republican Party, of course. His present course is strictly shortrace. He even concludes his editorial by saying that when the Republicans have "peace more firmly established," he looks to see the Democrats "come back and pick up where the New Deal left off." (It's a wonderful division of labor he has outlined for the two-party system.)

And, in some individual voting recommendations, he throws in some Democrats—and Stalinists—too. (He will not be a party-liner even for the peaceful Republicans.)

The rationale of his course is perhaps revealed when he recommends a vote "in Illinois, against Paul Douglas, not only because of his betrayal of liberalism on repressive legislation but because of his consistent pro-war attitudes." Against Douglas? and for whom? And why single out Douglas? He doesn't say, even though Douglas' opponent is the McCarthyite dinosaur Meek. Is the businessmen-candidate Meek also a type like honest-shop-foreman Wilson, in Stone's eyes? It is doubtful whether Stone is willing to look with open eyes at the political pattern which he has thus acted out.

Lesser-Evil Theory

It should be clear that Stone cannot be understood as merely a bourgeois liberal with pro-Stalinist illusions. In decisive aspects, he does not think like a bourgeois liberal. (This is often a virtue for him, journalistically, for it frees him to see many things about American politics to which the bourgeois liberal blinds himself with industrious zeal.) We once discussed his tendency under the head of the "neo-Stalinist type," a term which would require too much explanation here; so for rough use, let us distinguish him as a "Stalinoid-liberal."

An essential difference between the contemporary bourgeois liberal (take the *N. Y. Post's* crew as examples, Schlesinger, Max Lerner, plus the ADA) and the Stalinoid-liberal is the nature of their decisive political test. The bourgeois liberal's main center of interest is, and always has been, domestic (national) social and economic issues. For the Stalinoid-liberal it has been foreign policy.

In both cases, a dichotomy exists between the two fields, and both are thus distinguished from the Marxist socialist; but what is more important in this connection is the fact that the Stalinoid-liberal's crucial emphasis on foreign policy is his reflection of the full-fledged Stalinist's criterion of foreign policy (i.e., attitude toward Russia) as the decisive determinant of the party line, a characteristic of all CPs which has been well known even to the politically naive since the days of the Stalinist flipflops on the Franco-Soviet pact of 1935 or the Hitler-Stalin pact of 1939.

A man like Stone is not a party-line-toer and cannot be subsumed under the head of the simple party hacks who are willing to change their line 180 degrees, overnight, on news from Moscow's foreign office. That which is put through mechanically, bureaucratically, rapidly, and in disciplined fashion within the ranks of the party only leaves him more skeptical. He has to think it through himself, although on the basis of similar fundamental assumptions, and tactically he may indeed come to quite different conclusions. We repeat, therefore, that the often narrow foreign-policy focus of the Stalinoid-liberal is not derived from the automatic line-toeing of a subservient CP, but from the deeper recesses of the Stalinist ideology itself; and in any case it is a mark distinguishing him from the bourgeois liberal.

One thing they both share is the theory and practice of the "lesser evil" choice, and this is inevitable since the typical Stalinist shares it too. The lesser-evil policy

(Turn to last page)

The Algerian Tinderbox: Left-Socialist Victory Sharpens the Freedom Struggle

By A. GIACOMETTI

PARIS, Oct. 28—As reported in a previous issue of LABOR ACTION, the political crisis in the Algerian revolutionary nationalist party MTLD was ended by the expulsion of an opportunist tendency from the organization in September. These events caused a great deal of comment in colonialist as well as labor circles and, in the course of the discussion, more information has been made available concerning the program, the political significance and the strength of the two groups.

All sectors of colonialist opinion have greeted the reformist organization with great satisfaction, while deploring its weakness. In most comments of this type there is a distinct undertone of fear: what will the MTLD do, now that the reformists are no longer in it to press for a "practical" and "reasonable" policy?

No better confirmation of Messali Hadj's policies could be expected. The government has reacted quickly, giving the lie to the illusions of its liberal and socialist supporters, and in spite of widespread protest, it has aggravated the conditions of Messali's exile, transferring him from Niort to Les Sables d'Olonne, where he is even more isolated and kept under closer guard.

Fortunately, these fears are justified. It is now confirmed that the revolutionary tendency, led by Messali, has won the support of the vast majority of the organization, and especially of its working-class base. The opportunist faction remains confined to a thin layer of intellectuals and privileged workers, led by a few lawyers from the party's leadership.

WORKING-CLASS FOLLOWING

In a series of two articles *Le Monde*, speaking for the "intelligent colonialists" of the Mendès-France-Mitterand school, describes the situation in the following terms:

"It appears, then, that finally Messali has won out (among the Algerians) in France as well as in Algeria. His group, on the strength of the old leader's prestige among the Algerian masses, maintains a greater number of followers in the working class, especially among the immigrant workers and the Muslim shopkeepers in France and Belgium."

"The second group, led by Hocine Lahouel, includes the great majority of the candidates . . . of the MTLD in Algeria. It recruits its followers among the members of the professions, the small functionaries, the Frenchified workers (mechanics, railway and streetcar workers) and among the youth organizations, such as the Muslim boy scouts and the North African student organizations." (The Muslim boy scouts later wrote a letter

denying that they supported either tendency.)

"Led by people who seem to want to emerge from illegality and to abandon the methods of violence, the new party under Lahouel's leadership could be compared to the Neo-Destour. By their formation and their way of thinking, its leaders are very close to those of the Tunisian nationalist party and to certain leaders of the Istiqlal. What place will they take in Algerian political life? It is surely too soon to tell. Their support of the idea of an 'Algerian Republic' could place them close to the UDMA. However, it is true that their movement, as well as Ferhat Abbas' party, are running the risk of being outflanked by the Messalist MTLD with its proletarian roots."

The comparison of the opportunist tendency with the Tunisian and Moroccan nationalist movement fortunately applies only in part. If the reformists have anything in common with a few leaders of the Neo-Destour and the Istiqlal, it is only some of the latter's weaknesses: the inability to generalize from their experience and to link their own struggle with the North African and the colonial struggle in general; the notion that the good intentions of one or the other temporarily powerful personality can be turned to their advantage; the substitution of emotions and verbiage for political analysis.

Astonishing examples of the latter are to be found in the expelled faction's documents, especially in its report to the Second Congress of the MTLD in April 1953. "The nationalist idea," they say, "is a psycho-political force, that is, on the level of ideas, or of psycho-politics." Or: "The USA . . . also definitely clashes with the quintessence of French colonial policy."

REFORMIST ILLUSIONS

The authors of the report then offer a new contribution to political theory by setting up three ways in which a party can be revolutionary: according to its thought, according to its aims, and according to its means. It seems that the "revolutionary according to his means is one who, in order to achieve his aims, uses all the means authorized by law." Also, "it is impossible to conceive revolutionism without direct and constant relation to the real facts. In order to exert influence over them, one must begin by obeying them." Also, "now is the time to think on a national scale, which should incite the party to consider and appreciate not only the forces which are in its midst but also the potential forces outside it. . . . The revolutionary party must take these forces into account and consider with good will all progress accomplished even without its influence. . . ."

The Strange Case — —

(Continued from page 6)

is, as a matter of fact, an inevitable ingredient of any politics which looks for salvation to Powers above the masses, rather than to revolutionary action from below by the masses themselves; and everyone who is still hypnotized by ruling-class society, whether capitalist or Stalinist, cannot tear himself away from such lesser-evil politics.

What varies is the criterion for determining the lesser evil. We have seen what it is for the Stalinoid.

The lesser-evil ideologist, Stalinist or bourgeois, cannot conceive of a way out for the world except in terms of an appeal for "good" policies to the powers (social or governmental) that already rule. Internationally, the neutralists appeal for the preservation of peace through a friendly reconciliation of the world's rival exploiters, instead of through a struggle to overthrow both exploiting systems. Within the United States, Stone casts around for Powers that can bring peace and, disgusted with one major-party power-bloc, he runs to the rival Republican power-bloc in politics.

In view of this course, it would seem to be absurd to even raise the question of why Stone is unable to see that the alternative to supporting either Republicans or Democrats is to build a class movement of labor and, eventually, a class assumption of power by labor, i.e., a revolution. It would seem to be absurd

to raise such questions with a man who is so rudderless and politically disoriented as to plump for the reactionary wing of U. S. politics.

But on another page of the same issue of *I. F. Stone's Weekly* that we have been discussing, in a little piece about Senator Mansfield's report on Indochina, we can read the following sermon by the man who calls for support of Eisenhower on his front page:

"Here even our best observers like Mansfield firmly shut their eyes. Although Madison and Hamilton did, it is not respectable in America today to analyze situations in terms of economic classes. Nor to recognize that some things can only be accomplished by revolution. Revolution is a dirty word in America, except possibly on July 4.

Here, surely, is an example of a sort of "uneven and combined development" in a man's political thinking which can be found only in the Stalinoid world. He is for Eisenhower, the class struggle, C. E. Wilson the honest shop foreman, and revolution. One has a right to suspect that he can see the class struggle only when it is already distorted by the leadership of the Stalinists, and sees revolution as "realistic" only when it is under the control of a Power, not when it merely has to be stirred among the masses. It is because I. F. Stone has never arrived at any grasp of the real class struggle and workers' social revolution that he can shuttle between Stalinism and the GOP.

In Algeria today, the "law" and the "facts" the document refers to are those forcibly imposed by colonialism, and they spell poverty and oppression for the Algerian people. As long as this situation lasts, the revolutionary party maintains "direct and constant relation to the facts" by fighting to change them, not by "obeying" them.

As to progress, there hasn't been any in Algeria or in Morocco or in Tunisia that wasn't accomplished under the organized pressure of the masses, and the more militant the pressure the faster the progress.

Potential forces outside the MTLD? None that we can see. Certainly none in Algeria. As to solitary action from the French working class, none can be expected unless the MTLD itself becomes a factor on the political scene in France by decisive, militant and independent action. The authors of the report must no doubt be thinking of Mendès-France.

LINKED STRUGGLES

The political "realism" of the reformist faction turns out to be nothing more than a policy of capitulation. In opposition to this policy, the majority of the MTLD has reaffirmed the original revolutionary principles of the movement. In an interview to *Le Monde*, Moulay Merbah, spokesman for the majority, stated:

"Of course the solution of the crisis will put an end to the standpat attitude which was one of the causes of the crisis. This means that the party will follow from now on the principles of militant struggle which have inspired it since its beginnings. . . . As in the past, it will struggle to obtain satisfaction for its immediate demands . . . without ever forgetting or subordinating to these demands its main objective: independence for Algeria."

A new turn can also be expected in the MTLD's international tactics:

" . . . The Tunisian and Moroccan problems have been internationalized since 1950. To recall briefly the practical means

which favored this internationalization, let us point out that the situation in Morocco and Tunisia verges on insurrection. . . .

" . . . From the tactical point of view, the moment is very favorable to link the Algerian problem to the problem of Arab North Africa as a whole and, in this way, to internationalize the Algerian problem. . . . This belongs to the realm of diplomacy and, in order to succeed, the latter must be backed by a revolutionary policy within the country. There are no two ways of internationalizing the question, one either advances or abdicates. . . ."

The MTLD, then, is not only preparing to resume revolutionary action in Algeria, but also to link its struggles to those of the Moroccan nationalists and of the Neo-Destour, an indispensable measure that is neglected, if not outright opposed, by the reformists.

SIGN OF THE TIME

In reality, there is no separate Algerian, Moroccan or Tunisian problem, there is only a North African problem and a North African struggle for independence. It is true, of course, that Algerians, Moroccans and Tunisians have different historical traditions and live today within different juridical and institutional frameworks. Yet, these and related factors, important as they may seem to some bourgeois nationalists, become insignificant if compared with the cultural ties that unite the three peoples. This is especially true of the North African working class, which has no history except its own class history, and which has the same past, the same problems and the same enemies in all three countries.

The victory of the revolutionary wing in the MTLD may be a sign that the time is approaching when the working class in Tunisian, Morocco and Algeria will take the leadership of the nationalist movements, and link its struggle for nationalist independence to the worldwide struggle for socialism.

Not in the Headlines

Science-Fiction Note

Undersecretary of the Treasury W. Randolph Burgess to the N. Y. State Chamber of Commerce, on Oct. 7:

"After all, every politician must have a constituency and I think you come as near to being mine as any group."

A recent science-fiction novel, *The Space Merchants*, pictured a future society in America in which Congress is made up of direct representatives of the big capitalist enterprises. Life catches up with art again.

Plowing Under Farmers

Is big business preparing to campaign for a move to get operators of family-sized farms off the farms and into industry? Does it want bigger farms and fewer farmers?

The answer is "Yes" to both questions if Big Business follows the lead of Theodore Hauser, chairman of Sears, Roebuck and Company.

Hauser, in a farm policy memorandum prepared for Sears officials and, significantly, sent also to Chicago business leaders, urges a long-range agricultural program to put fewer farmers on larger farms.

"There can be no doubt that there are many farm units not large enough to justify mechanization, but which can hang on under an artificially high price support policy," is the way the Sears chairman puts it.

Such farm acreage, he continues, should be added to other existing farms. And he declares that operators of such farms would be better off in the long run joining the work force of industry.

Putting two and two together one is to understand that Hauser wants millions of rural people pulled off their family farms to seek work in cities. (He doesn't say anything about the drop of 732,000 jobs in nonfarm employment last month.)

—AFL News-Reporter

Democracy in Guatemala

Ninety-nine per cent "Ja" votes were reported, during the same week from two well-known democracies—East Germany under the Stalinist heel, and Guatemala under Washington's "Made in USA" dictator Castillo Armas.

Castillo Armas, however, got his 99 per cent the easy way. He inaugurated the system of an "oral plebiscite," not yet used by the Stalinists. No "Communists" were allowed to hide behind the protection of a secret ballot.

Unusual, and therefore worth quoting, was the forthright statement on the Guatemala atrocity which appeared in the organ of a local UAW union, *Voice of Local 212* (Briggs), in Detroit. The September issue of the paper first quoting the famous statement by Marine General Smedley Butler in 1935 that his years in the service had been spent acting as a strong-arm man for capitalist imperialism. It then added:

"Today the Eisenhower State Department is putting the muscle on Guatemala—not by direct intervention, as would have been the case in General Butler's day—but through the device which Stalin used, and which Soviet Communism still uses: The big power finds resistance in the small power—so the small power is promptly accused of harboring 'aggressive' designs—and you arm its neighbors in self-defense."

There's No Angel Around

to finance LABOR ACTION. It has appeared every week since 1940 because it's been backed by the dime and dollars of independent socialists — AND YOUR SUBSCRIPTIONS.

A sub is only \$2 a year—
Subscribe now!

Near-Deadlock Is Result — —

(Continued from page 11)

abroad, but they never got down to specifics. After all, the senseless Korean war was stopped, and no Democrat seems to think he can rally the voters to his side by proposing that it be resumed.

With Stevenson carrying the ball, they have talked vaguely about winning men's minds in foreign lands by helping them to improve their economic conditions, and have suggested that the cold war cannot be won by purely military means. But no Democratic leader has stood up to say that if his party is returned to a majority in Congress, it will appropriate so many billions for Point Four program, will allot so many hundreds of millions to the propaganda warfare agencies, and above all will vote to stop supporting the enemies of political and social progress throughout the world and start supporting its anti-Stalinist friends—no Democrat has done that at all.

No one has done this, because even campaign demagoguery has a way of back-firing if it is too specific. Far better to deal in vague criticisms of those who are carrying out the basic outlines of the policies of the old Democratic administration than to advocate a brand-new policy.

ECONOMIC DETERMINANT

Since foreign affairs has remained pretty much a dead issue in the campaign, both parties have been concentrating on other matters. And chiefly the Republicans have been beating the old Democratic drum of "you never had it so good," while the Democrats are simply adding to it "as when the Democrats were in power."

A continued decline in farm prices and a stubborn refusal of the economy to really get going in any sustained upward swing or to absorb the bulk of the unemployed—those are the ingredients from which the Democrats have been hoping to brew a powerful political medicine, or rather poison, for the Republicans. And pre-election estimates are that they have had no small degree of success.

They have hammered away at the unemployment figures with great persistence. After Secretary Wilson committed his famous dog blunder, all stops were taken out on this theme. And the only defense the Republicans could think of was a sorry one in the eyes of the unemployed and all their relatives and friends: it was simply to claim that even though it is regrettably true that there are some worthy unemployed, the fact to remember is that there are more em-

ployed workers than has been usual in recent years.

The Democrats really found their voices on the unemployment issue . . . in all but one respect. They were most reticent in revealing what a Democratic Congress would do about the problem. Here their campaign principle seemed to be: Give the GOP hell, but don't let anyone know what you would do if you were in their shoes. Vague references to more unemployment compensation, more government "action," and the like, constituted all that the most careful perusal of Democratic campaign literature can render.

It would not be truthful to give the impression that the Democrats have not at all hinted at what they would do to reduce the number of unemployed. One of their chief charges against the Republicans has been that they have cut the military budget below margins of "safety." The implication is certainly there that Democrats would increase the size of the military budget, whether the administration likes it or not.

And it is clear that Democratic labor leaders are not at all backward in seeking to stir up the unemployed to support Democrats by broadly hinting that if they win, the armament contracts will begin flowing again and thus "solve" the problem of unemployment.

SAFE TACTIC

It would be unfair to say that there are none among the Democrats who advocate a concrete program for their party, and seek to gain voter support for such a program. The farther Democratic politicians and their supporters are from the levers of power in their party, the more openhanded they tend to be with promises and assertions about what the Democrats will do if they get back on the inside in Washington.

But the big party spokesmen like Stevenson have to think about tomorrow, when Southern Democrats may head the committees of Congress, and about the day after tomorrow when these same gentlemen will be present in considerable numbers at the convention to nominate their presidential candidate. And when they think about it, they know that the safe thing is not to make promises about Democratic performance, but to simply play the changes on Republican non-performance.

And the Republicans have certainly given them a gaudy variety of issues among which to choose.

There is the oil give-away (though two of the chief beneficiary states were Dem-

ocratic), and Dixon-Yates, and the millionaire cabinet, tax-gifts to the rich, falling farm prices, rising food and rent prices, and so on and so on. The masses who poured out to elect Ike are either apathetic and will stay home this time, or have learned that just making any old kind of change is not necessarily the height of good judgment in politics.

EVIL CHOICES

Thus, the Republicans have been fighting an uphill fight. They have been doing it with forces which have been divided ever since they took power. And to their misfortune the division in their ranks came to a head at just the worst time for the Grand Old Party as a whole.

McCarthy has been on the sidelines, licking the wounds of his inner-party fight, and getting himself in shape for the next round. In desperation, Nixon has been pushed into the breach to carry the ball as a sort of second-strong McCarthy, and though he has shown great promise in this capacity, the burden has perhaps been a little too great for his abilities.

In other areas, the Dewey-Ives team in New York opened up with a transparent scheme to discredit Harriman on the basis of some old business deals and a patently phony charge that he lacks the residence qualifications to hold office in the Empire State. These slick tricks show the authentic Dewey touch—that is, the heavy hand which brought him to certain defeat in big-time campaigns in the past.

In fact, the Republicans have engaged in so much cheap trickery in this campaign that they have made all too apparent their contempt for the citizen who will cast his vote. They are likely to find out that though trickery may win you a few extra votes when the tide is running in your direction, it simply exposes your weakness and desperation when the tide is running out against you.

The "arguments" in this campaign will not be long remembered, and future historians will scratch their heads over a way to describe the "issues" in their textbooks. If tomorrow's results show a powerful movement toward the Democrats, it will not be because they have demonstrated to the people either by their conduct in opposition or by their program for the future that they are far better than their opponents. It will simply mean that the Republicans have convinced a new generation of voters that, bad as the Democrats may be, the GOP is even somewhat worse.

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!

Failure in Foreign Policy — —

(Continued from page 5)

The strength and appeal of Stalinism is tied to its anti-capitalism. It builds upon the real experiences of oppression and poverty that the people have known under capitalism. It builds on the daily observable fact that everywhere the United States is the defender of the status quo, and that it is the prop that holds up most of the reactionary non-Stalinist regimes (all in the name of building a military alliance against Russia). It makes its appeal in the name of the long democratic traditions of socialism, and the promise of a better life free of exploitation and poverty. The tragedy is that many people are unable to see through the Stalinist demogogy until they have actually lived, under the oppression of Stalinist rule.

STALINISM'S APPEAL

It is important to understand the appeal of Stalinism as anti-capitalist because this explains why the United States cannot and does not make a progressive appeal in the world. Stalinism is first and foremost a political and social problem and one that cannot be solved by building another military alliance backed up by the finest of atom bombs—not when it is the reaction to the status quo, to capitalism, that is the strength of Stalinism.

In this country the liberal supporter of United States foreign policy is dimly aware of this fact when he stresses the importance of economic aid to Europe and Asia, or the need for a Point Four program. But experience with the economic aid that the United States has sent overseas has not won over large democratic movements to the Western side. Because the United States is primarily concerned with a military approach and the defense of the status quo against the revolutionary aspirations of the colonial peoples and the socialist drive of the European working class, this economic

aid has gone to the preservation of the existing social order.

THERE IS A WAY

The living standards of the European worker have not risen because of the Marshall Plan nor has Point Four bettered the lot of the people in the underdeveloped areas. Instead it is the capitalist and feudal rulers who have benefited and siphoned off the profits of American aid.

What has been apparent to the peoples of the world is that United States economic aid has bolstered the reactionary ruling classes, that the United States is pushing for the militarization of their countries, that the United States uses the power of its economic wealth and its military power to bludgeon reluctant allies into all sorts of policies against their will. They see American businessmen using the power of the United States to guarantee their foreign investments on a favorable basis; they see American military bases all around the world and American soldiers in their countries; they see the United States talk democracy and at the same time back the imperialism of its Western allies against the colonial peoples—in short they see the operation of American imperialism.

Is there any alternative to the foreign policy of the cold war? Must American policy for Europe be dominated by a frenzied attempt to rearm Germany? Are the problems of Southeast Asia met by the organization of a military pact; and was there a democratic alternative to the disastrous policy in Indochina that almost led to the outbreak of a new Korean-type war? And must anti-Americanism spread until the United States becomes the most hated nation in the world?

The Young Socialist League believes that this reactionary and undemocratic foreign policy can be reversed, and we

believe that there is a way to defeat Stalinism without a world war. We do not believe that America's best defense is its stockpile of hydrogen bombs, nor that its most reliable allies should be Franco, Chiang, Rhee and Adenauer.

There is a vital need for a democratic foreign policy. The need is for a foreign policy that fights Stalinism with a dynamic democratic appeal, one that places the United States on the side of the working class and colonial peoples throughout the world and not on the side of the reactionary ruling classes.

Such a policy would mean no support of any kind to the colonial powers in their attempts to retain their imperialist empires. It would mean complete support to all democratic movements in the colonial and oppressed countries; no military alliances with reactionary regimes such as Franco and Chiang; an end to the military occupation under whatever guise in countries such as Germany and Austria and the granting of full national sovereignty and independence to them.

The United States as the wealthiest country in the world has a special obligation to use our tremendous resources to raising the conditions of life in the underdeveloped countries. We have to develop a world-wide program of aid and technical assistance that does not benefit the reactionary ruling classes. It means placing our faith in the ability of the people to work out a democratic alternative to Stalinism, and not in a system of military alliances.

YOU'RE INVITED

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

Get Acquainted!

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

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

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

The Handy Way to Subscribe!

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

- Please enter my subscription:
- 1 year at \$2. New
 - 6 months at \$1. Renewal
 - Payment enclosed. Bill me.

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE