

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

Beginning a Discussion

## THE POSITION OF THE ARAB SOCIALISTS ON ISRAEL

... page 6

## McCarthyites and Democarthyites: A Farce-Comedy in Congress

... page 3

AUGUST 9, 1954

FIVE CENTS

# This, for Example, Is Why Moscow Is Winning the War

## U.S. Tolerates the Amazing Spectacle of Warmonger Rhee Stumping the Country for Immediate H-Bomb War... While Kremlin Dictators Are Able to Pose as 'Peace-Lovers'

### Russians' Phony 'Peace' Plan Is Gaining in Propaganda War

The Russian Stalinists have hastened to follow up their victory at Geneva with a thrust at the capitalist alliance in Europe. This was the meaning of the notes delivered by Stalinist envoys to the British, French and American governments calling for a "collective security" system in Europe as the only means of guaranteeing peace.

The Russian notes follow the line they presented at the Berlin conference which made things so hot for Secretary of State Dulles that he was glad to agree to the meeting in Geneva on Asia as a way of ending the meeting in Berlin. It calls for an end to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (or Russian admission to the organiza-

tion which amounts to the same thing); a quiet pre-natal burial of the European Defense Community (and the West German army which was to go with it). These two structures are then to be replaced by a collective security pact in which all European countries will pledge to defend each other against any aggressor, whoever he may be.

**The Stalinist notes repeat everything they have said in the past about outlawing the atom and hydrogen bombs, make a number of bows to reduction of armaments, and put the United States in the pillory as the disturber of the world peace.**

Of course, the Stalinist note has

(Turn to last page)

By PHILIP COBEN

How many times have you read that it is only the Stalinist liars all over the world who paint the U. S. as "warmongering," "aggressive," "bellicose" and itching to get into a shooting war?

How many lamentations have you read in the U. S. press about the success the Stalinists have had abroad in painting such a picture of this country?

When European liberals and socialists (like the Bevanites) express fears about Washington's aggressive potential and urge that the Americans be restrained, the correspondents (with the N. Y. Times' absolutely shameless London bureau in the forefront) bellow about Stalinist influence and Russian demagoguery.

**Well, now—a little strident man is going about the United States proving that this image of the U. S. is not merely one invented by the Stalinists. He, Syngman Rhee, great "friend" of the U. S., great enemy of Stalinism—he held exactly this picture of the U. S. too!**

We are told that Rhee has been disappointed by the cool reception given his pleas for preventive war. Obviously this raving warmonger was under the impression that his modest little plan to start an H-bomb war would be more popular than it is. Perhaps Rhee is the victim of that devilishly clever "Stalinist propaganda" which is supposed to explain what's wrong with Europe and Asia. . . .

Raving warmonger? This isn't particularly harsh language. We can imagine that Rhee would even be proud of the appellation. What else can one consider a "statesman" who is disappointed when he doesn't get cheered to the rafters for saying—

(Continued on page 2)

THE UNITED PRESS SUGGESTS THE REAL REASON FOR WASHINGTON'S BELLIGERENT ATTITUDE—

## Behind the Provocation in the Chinese Plane Shooting

Under the head of "U.S. LOOKING FOR TROUBLE IN CHINA PLANE INCIDENT?" the Chicago *Daily News*—a member of the Knight chain, not noted for liberalism—expresses a big feeling of skepticism about the provocative incident in which the U.S. ordered its pilots to get trigger-happy with the result that two Chinese planes were shot down after Peiping's apology.

In fact, considering the source, it is evident that these conservative editors are expressing the same interpretation of the affair as appeared in our editorial last week. The paper wrote, in part:

"This is not an age in which 'incidents' cause wars. Wars happen because somebody plans them.

"Two very ugly incidents have occurred off the Coast of China . . . [These were the shooting down of the British civilian plane by the Chinese and the shooting down of the two Chinese planes by the U. S.]

"A United Press correspondent suggests that the Chinese are trigger-happy in that area because a big Russian submarine base has recently been constructed in it, and they don't want it inspected by air. He intimates that the real purpose in sending two American flattops to the area was to get a good look at this installation.

"If so, that would make sense of a sort, though it would clearly show that the risk of further involvement was calculated at Washington.

"It does not make sense to send two 22,000-ton aircraft carriers merely to 'cover' rescue operations. That is too top-heavy an umbrella . . .

"Sending the aircraft carriers may have been a way of demonstrating that a couple of white men—Adm. Radford and Secretary Wilson—wanted to prove that they at least weren't being intimidated.

"We are at a loss to understand why our leaders at Washington thought that we alone, without the British, were obliged to make the threatening gesture in reprisal for the shooting down of the transport. After all, it was a British plane—not a U. S. plane . . .

"If it looks to Europeans as if the United States were hell-bent for trouble

on a big scale, it may be because somebody in Washington actually is."

That editorial could never have been written that way unless the Knight editors had really decided that the UP correspondent's explanation was to be accepted as a truthful account of an otherwise mysterious episode. They believe it.

**And this will not be the first time that conservative sources have told us that the U. S. military was faking an "incident."**

Something over a year ago, in March of 1953, there was a big furor whipped up by Washington and by the press when a Russian MIG plane threw some bullets at a U. S. "weather plane" from Alaska. On the floor of Congress, Vermont's Republican senator, then as now a maverick, Senator Flanders, pointed out the suspect nature of Washington's explanation.

The U. S. Alaska-based plane was supposed to be on a "routine weather reconnaissance flight" off Kamchatka. Said Flanders: "The story is preposterous. There is no need to go within 25 miles of Kamchatka to look for weather." He told the senators that he had reliable information that weather reconnaissance flights normally were made from the Bering Straits to Attu, a course that did not come within 400 miles of Kamchatka.

"That reconnaissance bomber just was not there on weather business," Flanders asserted flatly. He added: "It may nevertheless have been engaged on a useful mission." He said the presumed Russian fighter pilots "appear to have been discredited" in warning the U. S. bomber away from Russian territory. He asked whether the U. S. air force would have acted in a similar manner if its planes had met a Russian bomber 25 miles off the coast of California.

"The serious thing about this incident," said Flanders, "is the false report given to the American people by the air force. It tended and probably was intended to influence public opinion by making the incident into an act of aggression . . ."

That was last year. Have the American people been lied to again? Did the American military seize on the Chinese shooting against the British plane to send their own planes in for espionage over the Chinese coast, as the UP correspondent suggested? Did they do this while provocatively yelling about Chinese provocation? Were they willing to risk a war "incident" for the sake of this espionage, thinking at the same time to make demagogic propaganda against the Stalinists?



# SPOTLIGHT

R.S.V.P.:

## A Poser for Hookites

We have a special request to make of our readers, or at least those who are in a position to do something about it. Bear with us while we get around to it.

The present congressional fracas over Flanders' anti-McCarthy resolution reminds us of a question we once asked in this column, and to which we never got an answer; we're getting more and more anxious to hear the answer.

Here's the point: Senator Morse and some Democratic liberals have explained that they cannot press for Flanders' censure immediately because McCarthy has to be given his day in court, in the form of proper charges, hearings, etc. Let us assume that this is *not* merely an excuse to duck out of taking a stand. Let us assume, further, as they claim, that the Flanders proposal for censure really *does* require all of this paraphernalia and procedure, and that McCarthy has *not* had his indictment and his chance for a hearing, and all that.

As Washington columnist Doris Fleece wrote the other day: "Sen. McCarthy is being protected and passionately defended on the floor of the Senate in the name of those democratic principles he has done more to destroy than any other American in his lifetime."

And if the invocation of all those democratic principles were really relevant to the Flanders resolution, we would say that that's a good thing. Let's assume it is relevant. *It is a good thing if this destroyer of democracy is halted before the bar of justice without a single imitation of his anti-democratic practices.*

McCarthy would use democratic rights in order to destroy democracy, but we who believe in democracy must accord him those democratic rights. That is what the liberals are saying. And we agree with the principle.

If that is thoroughly understood, then, we would like to remind our readers of a slight contradiction in the picture.

These same liberals, or many of them, who so profoundly demand democratic rights for this destroyer of democracy are themselves the supporters of the principle that the Stalinists cannot be accorded democratic rights because . . .

Why, because they are totalitarians! So the argument goes, as we have heard it a million times.

No democratic rights for those who would use them to destroy democracy itself: this is a thesis which has practically become official among those liberals who have worked out convenient ways of going along with the witchhunt.

There seems to be a double standard of morals here, doesn't there?

In any case, we would like some earnest, sincere liberal who uses this principle as a justification for curtailing Stalinists' rights (to teach, for example) to explain to us why he is willing to accord any democratic rights to McCarthy, or for that matter, to any avowed supporters or admirers of McCarthy.

Or does this principle become operative only as a pretext for going along with the current hysteria against Stalinists and left-wing "subversives"?

Here's what we would like some reader to do: Present this poser, which troubles us, to any liberal friend of yours who agrees with said principle. We would like some obliging NYU student particularly to ask the chairman of his Philosophy Department about it—name of Sidney Hook.

## That Plot Against The Panama Canal

During the late unpleasantness about overthrowing the Guatemala government on the pretext of its "Communist tinge," a great deal was made about the proximity of Guatemala to the Panama Canal. We forget what the number of miles was, but whatever it is, we were constantly reminded of it, even though Guatemala and the canal are at opposite ends of Central America. "The Communist government of Arbenz is only—miles from the Panama Canal . . ."

It now turns out that if Moscow really took over Guatemala in order to get at the Panama Canal, those Russians are bigger dopes than are the Americans who believed this poppycock in the first place.

A United Press story (N.Y. Post, Aug. 2) says that the U. S. does not even consider

the canal to be a first-class target in wartime. "Not a single jet fighter covers the air above the Panama Canal. Not a fighting ship stands guard at either entrance . . . Why? Because the men in charge of our global thinking have written off the Panama Canal as a 'second-class target.' . . . One officer who asked his name be withheld said, 'Sure, there are no jets, no fighting ships around the canal. We're taking an educated guess we won't need them . . .'"

And anyway, the UP dispatch indicates, it would be child's play to knock the canal out with some strategic suitcase-bombs of the A-type if Russia ever really got serious enough about it to care.

However, maybe that line of propaganda about Guatemala could have been salvaged somehow. For example, did you ever stop to realize how close Guatemala is to that other well-known pro-Communist government, the one in India, and maybe the idea was to develop Africa in a pincer movement between Arbenz and Nehru . . .

## What Hope Could Be Better Founded?

At the American Assembly, the gathering of 60 giant American intellectuals at Arden House in the Ramapos to discuss U.S. foreign policy, great progress has been made. As summarized in the N. Y. Times (Aug. 1), quite accurately, it was the following:

"The hope is that this series of talks and the ideas that come out of it will lead to other series of talks and other ideas."

A couple of days later, a longish summary of the conference's conclusions was published, and it did not improve on the above inspired formulation.

## Note on the American Way of Life

Two news items which made a stir in the past week's papers form a complementary pair.

On the one hand, U.S. Attorney General Brownell, for the Eisenhower administration, has submitted a recommendation to buy turncoats. He proposes that the U.S. offer rewards up to a half million dollars for tips on any agents or other persons seeking to smuggle atomic weapons into the U.S. or manufacture them here.

In addition to the cash, aliens who thus turned informer would get lifetime asylum in this country, regardless of any laws barring them on grounds of moral turpitude, criminal record, Communist membership, etc.

While our American leaders immediately think in terms of buying informers and renegades for ready cash, there was, abroad, the mysterious case of Otto John's defection to East Germany. The head of West Germany's internal-security and counter-intelligence agency going over to the Stalinists! We do not pretend to have any special theory about this, although we note that it was this Otto John who was attacked in the Bundestag by the Social-Democrats as building up a new Gestapo.

But while Brownell proposes to buy counter-spies over the counter, a N.Y. Times dispatch on John blandly explained that he was the type who could go over to the Stalinists because of his . . . "idealism"! So the reporter was told by American officials, who apparently didn't have any difficulty in understanding how an idealistic-type person would naturally go over to the most brutal totalitarians in the world!

The article was nonsense, but how very much it told about the "idealism" of those American officials in Germany whom it quoted!

## 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!

# Warmonger Rhee - -

(Continued from page 1)

"War must come soon and it is necessary that the United States, the champion of the free nations of the world, be saved from a terrible catastrophe. The later it comes the more terrible it will be. The only difference between your president [Eisenhower] and me is that he is trying to save the world from destruction." (N. Y. Times, Aug. 3.)

That last sentence *must* be a language slip, or could this incredible man actually have given tongue to it? It does not matter, for his constantly repeated theme was, in any case, *WAR NOW*.

"Do not think for a moment that anything but force will bring the Communist menace to its knees. Only by force . . . I am appealing to you. . . ." (Ibid.)

Rhee puts bluntly what Washington glosses over. They have no program other than force—war—by which to defeat Stalinism. They have no political program or social appeal to be countered to the Stalinist demagoguery. It is not a newly learned fact for us. But Rhee shows what follows: *It must be war, and the sooner the better*. This is the logic of a bankrupt old world.

Rhee is the most embarrassing thing that has happened in Washington in years, because he speaks out what his American friends believe in their soul but are afraid to say and afraid to do.

Yes, Rhee is right on one point: his American co-thinkers lack his "guts."

"Communism, the small, erect statesman declared, could be halted only by force and the sooner freedom-loving peoples took up arms against Communist countries the better it would be for the cause of liberty and human dignity." (Ibid.)

"The Americans have not got the common guts to face the problem," he told a press interview (N. Y. Times, Aug. 1).

Start the war now! he keeps repeating in speeches: "we must fight the Communists now or later . . . the longer we wait the greater the odds against us," he told the VFW on August 1.

You gutless Americans are afraid of the H-bomb, you're afraid of being atom-bombed, he has been telling American audiences for some days now. But he, the 79-year-old head of the South Korean police-state, has no such cowardly fear of having his life cut short.

He made his proposition concrete in his speech to Congress. Nobody can accuse him of soft-soaping. "The Soviet Union's hydrogen bombs may well be dropped on the great cities of America even before they are dropped on our shattered towns," he told the congressmen, who forgot to cheer the lovable little patriot at this point.

His plan was simple: unleash South Korea's army together with Chiang Kai-shek's Formosan legions in an attack on China, while the U. S. navy and air force (but not ground troops, he says) blockade the coast.

"Would not the Soviet government, therefore, launch its own ground forces into the battle for China and its air force as well? Perhaps."

Perhaps? That is nonsense. According to Rhee's view of the world, the answer is: without any fail. For it is precisely Rhee who argues that overthrow of China would settle the fate of Moscow too. But, with this "perhaps"—which shows that even Rhee loses some of his guts in facing the problem—Rhee continues:

"But that would be excellent for the free world, since it would justify the destruction of the Soviet centers of production by the American air force before the Soviet hydrogen bombs had been produced in quantity."

Get it? Smart, isn't he?—No, he is a raving madman.

The N. Y. Times' James Reston comments: "The silence which followed the delineation of this excellent prospect for the free world was positively deafening. . . ."

So, Reston says, "Dr. Rhee was surprised at the reception he received in Washington."

Read the following entirely unwitting confession by Reston: "Dr. Rhee made two mistakes about the United States: He based his policy on Washington's words instead of on Washington's actions. . . ."

That was Rhee's first mistake, you see. Basing himself on "Washington's words"—i.e., on the U. S. government's statements, declaration, propaganda, leaders' speeches, etc.—i.e., basing himself on the same public material on which any other man in the world has to make up his mind, Rhee assumed that the U. S. was ripe for his brand of warmongering.

But if Rhee could make this "mistake," isn't it obvious that there is a thousand times more reason for the ordinary European or Asian to come to the same conclusion about the U.S.? Isn't it obvious, in other words, that Europe and Asia are richly justified in believing that the U. S. is led by bellicose warmongers?

Isn't Reston admitting that this is a justified conclusion from "Washington's words," if not its actions? Isn't this a confession that Washington's foreign policy, as it is presented to the people of the world, tends to confirm what the Stalinists say and equally convinces the peoples that the U. S. is not a force for peace and democracy but is pushing toward the dreaded end of World War III?

Through the eyes of Rhee, whom we have called a raving warmonger, and precisely because he is a raving warmonger, the U. S. can see itself, as it looks to the world.

It is, to be sure, a somewhat distorted image, but not essentially untruthful in many important respects. It is an image which accurately reflects American dependence on military force and threats, rather than on a political or social program for the world's ills. It accurately reflects the potential that exists within U. S. foreign policy making for preventive-war tendencies. It completely reflects the total absence from U. S. approaches of any semblance of a democratic foreign policy.



# About McCarthyites and Democarthyites — It's a Bipartisan Farce-Comedy

By GORDON HASKELL

The proceedings in the United States Senate touched off by Senator Flanders' motion to censure Senator McCarthy are not likely to go down in history as one of the great or decisive events of our time; but they do illustrate American political life in the middle of the witchhunt era.

If the motion to censure McCarthy, in whatever form it may ultimately be presented, is passed, the result might be to remove the Wisconsin bully from a central role in the struggle for dominance which is going on inside the Republican Party. Thus removed, he would be retired to the political wings either to await another entry onto the main stage of American politics under different circumstances, or to live out his life on the lunatic fringe. But the real issues of McCarthyism would not even be touched by such an action, as the jamboree now going on in the Senate is designed to leave those issues outside the area of debate.

There is little enough likelihood that any form of censure motion will be passed. And it is this which may induce future generations to shake their heads in bewildered disbelief about the way in which Americans ran their political affairs after they appeared to be quite civilized in many other areas.

Textbooks describing the American political system talk about this country having two main parties. One is in power, the other in opposition. This gives the electors the chance, every so often to

make a choice between alternative proposals put forward by alternative political organizations represented by alternative leaders and candidates.

Once they have chosen between these alternatives, the party which has got the majority of the votes is supposed to run things, while the party which was rejected by the majority, and chosen only be a minority, is supposed to assume the responsibilities and play the role of an opposition in both houses of the Congress. The minority party is supposed to vigilantly criticize the government, and thus keep it honest, and also thus build up the record so that (come next election) the people will once more have alternatives between which to choose.

## THE MODEL DOESN'T WORK

That, at least, is the way it is SUPPOSED to be. Of course, no one expects to see things run exactly according to this simplified model. But they are supposed to go approximately that way.

Now, McCarthy was elected to the Senate as a Republican. While his party was in the minority, he attacked the Democrats vigorously, as a member of the opposition is supposed to do. But then his party became the majority. Now it was supposed to run the government, to put its platform into legislation, and translate into life.

But McCarthy had little interest in these functions of the majority party. He had discovered that he could still get more headlines and fame and lecture en-

agements if he continued to attack the former administration and to pretend that he was catching Stalinists who had infiltrated the government, or had written books, or had made a living in any other way which might come to McCarthy's attention.

This activity, though it departed from what the chief job of a member of the majority party is supposed to be, caused little objection from McCarthy's Republican colleagues. But then he began to attack the Republican administration too.

He found that it was just about as lax as the Democrats had been in throwing "Communists" out of jobs. He began to wage a war on his own administration which was much more deadly than anything the Democrats were doing to entitle them to draw their salaries as an opposition.

Finally, one of the members of his own party decided that he had gone too far, and introduced a motion to get McCarthy removed from the powerful committee posts which he had used as fortresses from which to attack the government. This member, Senator Flanders, was soon persuaded that such a motion had no chance to pass. He then introduced a simple motion to censure McCarthy for conduct unbecoming a senator.

At this point, the roof of the august Senate fell in on the head of—Senator Flanders.

Every politically literate person in the country knows that McCarthy is a liar, cheat and scoundrel. The Democrats know, to a man, that if his political logic were to prevail, the whole leadership of their party would some day stand trial for treason. A goodly section of the Republican leadership know that McCarthy has as little use for them as he does for the Democrats, and that when and if he is offered an opportunity he will not hesitate to smash the more liberal wing of their own party any more than he hesitates to falsify records, photographs, figures and anything else falsifiable in his pursuit of power.

## DEMOCARTHYITES

But . . . but the votes for a mere censure of McCarthy are exceptionally difficult to muster. The official leadership of the Republican Party in the Senate is known to be pro-McCarthy. The official leadership of the Democratic Party in the Senate is known not to be too concerned about McCarthy; for the simple reason that a hefty chunk of the Democratic Senate caucus hates the rest of the Democratic Party about as much as McCarthy does.

These gentlemen rely on the same type of reactionary supporter in their home states as does the senator from Wisconsin, especially when it comes to gathering in the campaign contributions. And the Eisenhower administration, which has been one of McCarthy's chief political targets and which recently seemed to be quite anxious to take on the senator in the army-McCarthy hearings—well, the Eisenhower administration has, as usual on this question, been as silent as the tomb.

What is so curious about the whole business? After all, everyone in this country knows that the two major political parties are not really ideological parties, and that they are full of leaders who disagree with official party policies as well as of others who have not the guts to stand up for whatever they may believe in.

Yes, everyone knows it, and yet when the election campaigns roll around, everyone conspires to hide it. The labor leaders will be boosting this or that Democrat, and telling the workers that, by and large, the Democratic Party represents the glorious tradition of F. D. Roosevelt, and hence should be supported by the workers.

The truth of the matter is that even if FDR's tradition were as glorious as they say it is, the Democratic Party represents nothing of the kind. It does not stand for civil liberties, or civil rights, or adequate unemployment benefits, or a program to prevent unemployment or war. In fact, it does not even stand for just plain, ordinary garden-variety decency. Nor do the Republicans.

If you don't believe it, just keep watching how they vote on the resolution to censure McCarthy. They don't stand for anything much except just keeping their own gang in power. That is one reason why we need a new party which is completely unlike either of them.

## THE ECONOMY

# The Optimists Are Getting More Cautious

By L. G. SMITH

During May and June of this year, there was a lot of talk from both government and private economists to the effect that the economic recession had hit bottom and, after stabilizing at the low point, had started a slow rise toward better things.

By the end of July, however, a distinct note of caution had replaced the optimistic tone of the earlier months. The index of factory production (even when adjusted seasonally) took a sharp dip in the first week of July, and kept inching down to levels only a little higher than the low point reached at the end of last March. Industry after industry reported that new orders were slower coming in than current shipments. A larger number of plants than ever before reported July shutdowns for vacations. When there is lots of business, plants try to keep going by staggering the workers' vacation periods.

Such are the flexibilities of the science of economic analysis that some analysts claimed these July shutdowns are a reason for optimism about the economic outlook. Their reasoning: the shutdowns give sales forces a chance to work down stocks of merchandise now on the shelves!

## INVENTORY TROUBLE

Actually, this has been the big hope of the economic school which has substituted talk about an "inventory adjustment" for economic analysis. It is reported, gleefully, that in June inventories were whittled down by \$250 million to a figure of \$44.5 billion. In June 1953 when the boom broke in manufacturing, inventories were at \$46.2 billion.

This means that in a whole year of "inventory adjustment," that is, of a sharp cut-back in production, only \$1.7 billion of the surplus has been worked off, or to put it differently, the surplus production is being worked off at a rate of 3.6 per cent per year.

Aside from the ever-present pillar of the armament economy, the major counter-recession sector of the economy has been in building. The boom there has sustained much of the steel production, as well as that in lumber and other building materials, above rates which could be expected from the general economic picture.

## UNCERTAIN FUTURE

Employment figures for July are not yet available as this is written. But it is quite likely that unemployment will show a sharp upswing in July, even though vacation schedules may have put off the evil day for a large number of workers till August.

What does the future look like? It is highly uncertain. Rumor has it that the military chiefs are going to ask Congress for an additional \$5 billion over and above their present appropriations. The battle is being fought out now in the administration, with Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey reported adamantly opposed to increasing the budget and hence the deficit. If the military wins out, another \$5 billion poured into the economy have a stimulating effect. At least it could be counted on to tend to prevent a deeper slump from occurring this fall and winter.

Aside from that, however, and despite obvious signs that the Eisenhower administration will try to pep things up a little before November by announcing large contracts in various fields, things point to a further down-trend during the rest of the year, or at least continued stagnation.

## THE FIGHT FOR SOCIALISM

by

Max Shachtman

A basic primer on the ideas of Independent Socialism!

\$1.00

Cloth \$2.00

Labor Action Book Service  
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

## LONDON LETTER

# Egypt Ships 'Em Somewheres West o' Suez

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, July 28—Last night Lieutenant Colonel Nasser and Anthony Head, British minister of war, initialed an agreement over the future of the Suez Canal. This news comes after more than a year of negotiations.

It provides for:

(1) British withdrawal of her 84,000 troops in 20 months' time.

(2) British military installations be left intact in the zone.

(3) In the event of an attack on any Arab bloc country or on Turkey (but not on Iran, as Britain wanted), Britain will have the right to "reactivate" the zone.

(4) Meanwhile the maintenance of the Zone will be carried out by British and Egyptian civilian firms, under contract to the Egyptian government.

(5) The new treaty will last for seven years (not ten as Britain wanted).

After the signing of the agreement Colonel Nasser said that it was "a turning point in Egyptian history." Crowds flocked into the streets of Cairo and Alexandria dancing and singing.

On the whole the treaty will be of great advantage to the whole Middle East, although Israel is still wary. It wants to know what will happen if one of the Arab countries attacks it.

Will the British be automatically ready to reoccupy Suez and presumably engage in an anti-Israeli capacity in a "second round" of the war? By the agreement Egypt has undertaken to continue the use of the Suez Canal as an international highway, but she has insisted on the continued embargo of goods to and from Israel.

It is interesting to note that the new treaty recognizes by default the legality of the British base in Egypt. The 1936 treaty had allowed for only a "stationing of troops" there, but did not recognize it as a British military base.

It is also of interest that the Egyptians would not give way on the question of the reoccupation of the base in the case of an attack on Iran. For over a year now Zahedi's regime has been negotiating with the Russians about some disputed outposts on their 750-mile border. Although the Russians did withdraw from Azerbaijan in 1946, this part of the world is still very much a sore spot.

Were a third world war to break out here, the British (and Americans) would presumably have to wait until the Russians reached Iraq or Turkey before re-occupying Suez. I have a notion, however, that they might be a little more impatient than that.

Of the 84,000 soldiers, sailors and airmen now in Suez about half will be sent to Kenya, Malaya, Jordan, Cyprus and Libya. The rest will be sent back to the United Kingdom, many of them by next Christmas. There is also some hope that the period of National Service might be decreased from two years to perhaps eighteen months.

## ULTRA-TORIES FIGHT

Immediately news of the treaty reached London, Captain Waterhouse, the ultra-right-wing Tory, assembled his faithful band of 40 M.P.s to discuss how they would oppose the government's policy. Their numbers are sufficient to overturn the government if the Labor Party voted against the treaty.

There is little doubt that Waterhouse is leading a crusade against the whole colonial and foreign policy of his own Tory government, on the grounds that it involves a "scuttle" of British interests. He is using the Egyptian treaty as a rallying point.

Churchill and Eden had undertaken to defeat the treaty in Parliament before it was signed, so the Labor Party offered the time of a debate on steel denationalization to the government so that Suez could be discussed. This suited the ultra-right Tories who hoped that the whole day's debate would give them time to air their views, and lobby for further support. Churchill, seeing the trap, declined the Labor Party's offer of time.

There is no doubt that the spirit of the evacuation of Suez appeals very much to the Labor Party, but the opportunity of bringing the government down is one that it feels loath to let pass.

The main ground on which the Labor Party finds issue is the question of the security of Israel. It feels that it may be sacrificed. The government is, therefore, very anxious to eradicate Labor's only possible source of discontent.

It is expected that the British government, probably in association with the Americans and French will renew their guarantee of Middle East security in such a way as to make clear their prime interest in obviating Arab attack against Israel. This may pacify the Labor Party and the Israel government, but prognostications about the future of the Middle East are fraught with uncertainty.

Don't miss a single week of  
**LABOR ACTION**  
A sub is only \$2.00 a year!



## THE ZICHRONI CASE

# A Victory Against the Growth of Israeli Militarism

The story of Amnon Zichroni, a young Israeli pacifist, will be of interest to LABOR ACTION readers, we think, for the light it casts on the development of militarism in that country. The following account is taken from an article by William Zukerman in the Jewish Newsletter of August 2.

While LABOR ACTION does not agree with the ideology of absolute pacifism and with individual conscientious objection as an effective method of struggling against war, we do most vigorously uphold the RIGHT to conscientious objection, including political objection. Zichroni's victory is cheering, however optimistic one might be about its lasting effects.—Ed.

### THE CASE OF AN ISRAELI PACIFIST

The story of Amnon Zichroni, a young Israeli pacifist who alone fought and won a remarkable victory against the rising forces of militarism in Israel, is not as sensational as the "little war" in Jerusalem and has nothing to do with it directly. But in a sense, it is a part of the story of the militarization of Israel, without which the picture is not complete. It also is the only ray of hope in the rapidly darkening scene in that part of the world.

Amnon Zichroni, a young man of twenty-three who has conscientious objections to war in all its manifestations, refused to be drafted into the Israeli army when he was called. In most democratic countries in the world, sincere conscientious objections to war are recognized as valid grounds for exemption from military service. They were so recognized in Israel too until about a year ago, before Kibya and the intensification of militaristic spirit in the country. Israel has only about 130 conscientious objectors, organized in a group known as *Agudath Sarvanei Milchama* (League of War Resisters) affiliated with the International War Resisters with headquarters in London. When Ben Gurion was Minister of Defense, he respected their position, and no question about forcing them to do military service was ever raised.

### HUNGER STRIKE

It is typical of the present climate of Israel that the government has recently entered into an open deal with the clericalist parties to exempt from military service 2,000 Yeshiva students on account of their alleged "religious" scruples. It has also yielded to the demand of the orthodox parties to exempt all orthodox young women even from civilian defense work. While thus yielding to wholesale evasion of military service on the part of orthodox youth, the minister of defense, Pinchas Lavon, a Socialist and former secretary of Histadruth (Israeli Trade Union Federation), ruled that the moral scruples of 130 conscientious objectors in Israel did not deserve the same consideration as the "religion" of the thousands of members of the religious parties and that pacifism in Israel had to be eliminated by force. Zichroni was arrested and the entire machinery of the state, army and press was set in motion to break the

spirit of the young man and with him, pacifism in Israel.

But Lavon made the mistake which most aged cynics in power make when they judge young people by themselves. Zichroni proved to be of a different spiritual mettle than the Histadruth bureaucrat expected Israeli youth to be. The young man declared a hunger strike against the combined forces of the army, government and press, and kept up the strike for twenty-three days, clearly determined to die rather than violate his convictions.

### HOUNDED

Throughout the twenty-three days of the young man's ordeal, the entire Hebrew press with one single honorable exception, conducted one of the most vicious and shameless campaigns of incitement against pacifism in a manner reminiscent of Italian and German Fascists in the days of their power. The Socialist *Davar*, official organ of Histadruth, led the hounding campaign against the "traitors" and "deserters" who put humanitarianism above the Vaterland and demanded that Zichroni be made an example to demonstrate to Israeli youth and to the world that the defense of Israel stands above humanitarianism and individual conscience. *Haaretz*, the only liberal independent newspaper in Israel, kept up a lone fight for the young man, as a symbol of conscientious objection, and warned the government that if Zichroni died, Israel would be branded forever as a state that puts force above convictions and militarism as the highest value in the land.

### GOVERNMENT YIELDS

The small group of War Resisters in Israel frantically appealed to President Ben Zvi, another Histadruth stalwart, to intervene with the government, but he refused to do so. They then appealed to the ambassadors of all foreign governments in Israel. The international office and War Resisters in London appealed to Ambassador Elath and Professor Albert Einstein. The combined pressure of liberal public opinion inside and outside Israel, finally had its effect. On the twenty-fourth day of Zichroni's fast when he was already on the verge of death, Israeli's "strong men" yielded: the young conscientious objector was freed, and the threat to crush pacifism was averted, at least for the time being. A single youth who has remained true to an ancient ideal of the prophets defeated a government and a people who have deliberately exchanged the centuries-old faith in the supremacy of the spirit over force for the glorification of the state. In the process, this young man also saved the honor of Israel.

To complete this fantastic paradox, it should be added that Pinchas Lavon, the minister of defense who aspires to and probably will be, the next Prime Minister of Israel, was in his youth, when he first came to Palestine twenty years ago, a member of a pacifist group, *Gordonia*, and preached exactly what Zichroni does now. This is how times and men have changed in Israel.

### MUSTE TO REPORT ON EUROPEAN TOUR

The Peacemakers, a pacifist group, announce that on Monday, August 9, at 8:30 a.m., A. J. Muste will report in New York City on his European tour.

The place is Adelphi Hall, 74 Fifth Avenue (between 13th and 14th Streets).

Muste will return from Europe a few days before that date. He has been in Europe talking with peace and labor groups. The title of the meeting is "Report from Europe's Third Camp." It will be Muste's only New York meeting before he starts on a national tour.

### 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.

# J. B. Matthews Goes After the Catholics

By W. G. RUSSELL

J. B. Matthews has finally found a periodical which measures up to his own standard of writing with regard to finding a "red plot" behind every gesture of social progress or liberal thought.

Under an appropriate magazine cover portraying a superimposed image of Malenkov in front of St. Patrick's Cathedral, the deposed head of McCarthy's investigators now takes a swing at the Catholics, a group which has prided itself in its militant anti-Communism long before it was fashionable to do so.

His latest reckless attack against a religious group is carried in the August issue of the *Police Gazette*, a magazine which has some sort of a record in that it has fostered built-up sensationalism for over a century with little respect for accuracy or truth.

Matthews' latest "exposé" would have his readers believe that there is plot right within the American Catholic hierarchy itself to propagate an ideology which Catholicism has fought since before Marx issued the *Communist Manifesto*.

### LATEST HATCHET-JOB

Apparently his latest piece of research into the underworld of Stalinism and its domestic fronts was a little too much even for the quasi-respectable *American Mercury* to stomach; and that is a magazine of which Matthews is a staff member and which has long had a record of opposition to anything outside of the extreme right. It was in the *Mercury* that Matthews had unleashed his ill-fated attack on the American Protestant clergy, calling 5000 of them "red dupes."

Though it was the protests against this job which cost Matthews his job as chief heretic-hunter for the McCarthy committee, it is doubtful if there will be anything but a meek protest from the fringe of liberal thought in American Catholicism. His attack on members of the Protestant clergy some months ago was hailed with enthusiasm by such bigoted right-wing Catholic sheets as the *Brooklyn Tablet* and *Our Sunday Visitor*, which at the same time delighted in the fact that apparently no Catholic cleric had succumbed to Stalinist-front machinations.

### "RED PLOT"

J. B. Matthews, however, has found an extensive "red plot to trap U. S. Catholics," and, lo and behold, this infernal plan, which is being directed from the "Catholic section" of the Cominform, has as its workers (not all Communists or fronters, mind you, but the end-results of their activities are the same) none other than a prominent member of the American hierarchy and some two dozen members of the clergy, a former secretary of state, and two of the leading and most respected Catholic weeklies in the country today!

These are only auxiliary aids to the real "Catholic Stalinoid" network, however, in that they are fostering "neutrality" or "anti-anti-communism." Focal point of the plot is the Committee of Catholics for Human Rights, a now-defunct organization whose aims were not too different than those of the much-abused Methodist Federation for Social Action or the present ADA wing of the Democratic Party. First credo for the anti-Communist hack, however, is to scratch anything supporting human rights, civil rights, anti-discrimination and "liberalism" and you will find a red.

Big dupes in the Red Plot, according to Matthews, were such prominent anti-Communists as CIO President Phil Murray, Gene Tunney and former Secretary of State Edward R. Stettinius, merely because they had endorsed the work of the committee.

### PRAISES FASCISTS

Chief target for the attack, however, was Chicago's Bishop Bernard J. Sheil. Sheil's sin consisted in being the first recipient of the annual Human Rights award of the committee, plus his attack last April on Senator McCarthy. Matthews does not even suggest that the good Catholic prelate could be a Stalinist sympathizer but nevertheless he has "contributed mightily to the smear campaigns" of the Reds. The fact that he made his speech attacking McCarthy before Walter Reuther's UAW-CIO didn't help him any, either.

Ex-fellow-traveler Matthews (who claims he coined the term when he left the Stalinist jungle) also finds that about the only two progressive Catholic publications in America, the *Commonweal* and the Jesuit weekly *America*, are "wishy-washy, pussyfooting and ill-informed," while he commends the Brooklyn diocesan paper, the *Tablet*—long championed by anti-Semites and the lunatic-fringe fascists in this country, one-time favorite of Father Coughlin—for its "well-informed anti-Communism" ism.

Other Catholic clerics who are named as suggested members or dupes of the plot are two obscure priests who happened to attack the congressional investigations so similar to their church's inquisition of four hundred years ago, one in a book published by the Catholic University of America, and the other simply because his sermon warning of the mounting hysteria and fear of guilt-by-association was reprinted by the *Nation*.

### SMEARS CW

Of course, as might be expected, the "exposé" does not overlook one of the few remaining hopes of Catholic liberals in this country, namely the Catholic Worker Movement. Dorothy Day's *Catholic Worker* is termed a medium of Communist pills with religious sugarcoating, as absurd a statement as any Matthews has made in his red-hunting career.

He substantiates his accusation by quoting one of Miss Day's writings after the execution of the Rosenbergs, in which she called them "children of that race to which the Holy Family belonged." This, according to Matthews, is enough to prove that the *Catholic Worker* must be a Stalinist-line organ. (As a parallel, half of the 5000 Protestants whom he termed "red dupes" were so listed, because of their signing a petition asking clemency for the Rosenbergs.)

Lamenting the fact that Miss Day's publication was a member of the Catholic Press Association, Matthews should have referred further to the *Catholic Almanac*, which he quotes in his article, and read there that the Catholic Worker Movement has as one of its principles "endorsement of the non-violent revolution to secure social justice." And though they have been doing this for over two decades under the approval of the church, this statement should hasten any anti-Communist "exposé" hack to take up the pen, significantly by McCarthy's former expert.

## READ ABOUT INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM

in the series of special pamphlet-issues of Labor Action

10 cents each

No. 1—The Principles and Program of Independent Socialism

No. 2—Independent Socialism and War

No. 3—The Fair Deal: A Socialist Analysis

No. 4—Socialism and Democracy

No. 5—What Is Stalinism?



**LABOR ACTION**

August 9, 1954 Vol. 18, No. 32

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

Asst. Ed.: GORDON HASKELL,

BEN HALL

Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH



## UMT Is a New Step to the Garrison-State

By MICHAEL HARRINGTON

This week the Eisenhower government proposed the formal institutionalization of an installment of the Garrison State as the permanent form of American society.

The move came in a proposal for a universal military training program which would require military service of "all qualified young men" followed by a period of eight years' compulsory service in an active reserve.

The new law has no relation to the draft and to the usual argument of "necessity" for conscription, since it is not scheduled to go into effect until three years after passage. It is the most sweeping plan for peacetime militarism ever put forward in the United States.

Moreover, in the announcement of the program, the administration, speaking through Assistant Secretary of Defense John A. Hannah, stated in the bluntest language yet used by a responsible government figure that war with Russia is regarded as inevitable. Said Hannah: "The whole thing is geared to the day of active war with the Soviet Union," and "Everyone up to the president agrees that we must have an effective reserve to meet the requirements of war with the Soviets. And that is the only war that counts."

### 10 Years' Bondage

As of today, the garrison state is still conceived of as an emergency measure, an unfortunate exception to the normal tradition of American life—or so the official rhetoric runs. Yet now even this pretense is abandoned.

A state of mobilization is declared to be the ordinary and natural state of things; and along with learning how to walk, going to school, becoming interested in sports, and the like, a bondage of almost ten years to the military is seen as an inevitable step in the transition from youth to young manhood.

The way the plan would work out is that all young men would be inducted into a branch of the armed forces. After service (no period of time was stated but the current hitch is for two years) the discharged veteran would be assigned to a National Guard unit which would be under effective federal control. The Federal Reserve would be abolished. If the Guard unit member is not active, he could then be drafted once more for full-time duty. Thus, the military obligation of every "qualified" American youth would last over a period of ten years.

### Zenith of Militarization

The entire program, as pointed out before, rests on the assumption of inevitable war with Russia. Hannah broke down the man-power figures in the following fashion:

(1) A regular military force of 3,047,000 men. This is an increase of 232,000 over regular Pentagon plans. The reason for this is, according to Hannah, that "we require more strength in the Far East."

(2) A Ready Reserve of 3,055,894 men. These are the discharged veterans of the first category who would now be fulfilling their eight-year obligation in a federalized National Guard.

(3) A pool of 750,000 men. These would be soldiers who had gone through both the regular service (category 1) and the Ready Reserve (category 2). They would be called up as individuals.

(4) A draft of 300,000 men a year.

(5) A reservoir of 750,000 draft-age men without prior service to be inducted in the first few months of another big war.

In other words, over seven and a half million American youth would, at all times, be under the direction of the United States armed forces. No peacetime program as sweeping and as militarist has ever been proposed here before.

The catch in the entire plan is that it has little or no relation to the immediate needs of the armed forces. It is not a "selective service" program put forth in a time of crisis. It is a permanent program, an institutionalization of the garrison state, and the government does not even propose that it be put into effect until three years after Congress would pass the law.

### Blunt War Talk

At this point, Hannah's bluntness about war with Russia becomes apropos. Certainly his clear assumption of the inevitability of World War III has been the practical ideology of the American ruling class for some time. Yet there was always a delicacy which was averse to putting it in so many words.

Aesopian terms were used. The line was expressed: "If we are forced to defend ourselves against an unprovoked and dastardly attack from Russia, then. . ." But now the politeness is gone. Hannah calmly speaks of "the day of active war with the Soviet Union."

This new verbal bluntness is not merely a loss of semantic nicety. It is symptomatic of the entire program and its meaning.

The Aesopian language had as its basis the old premise that the garrison state was an emergency form of American society. The new program, in fact, sweeps away that pretense by proposing a total militarization of the youth which is not to take place for several years to come.

It can only be based on the long-run assumption that the cold war will continue as a primarily military struggle until it eventually, and inevitably, issues into World War III. The change in language is another indication of this central fact: that the garrison state is no longer regarded as a necessary exception to normalcy, but is now the permanent institutional form of American society.

### End of a Road

If the law is passed, it will assume that this premise of the permanent garrison state is bipartisan. For note that the Eisenhower program is not to take effect until three years after passage, i.e. until after the presidential elections of 1956. It is therefore conceived as an area of bipartisan agreement, as a basic feature of American society to which all political forces are committed, for it would bind a Democratic as well as a Republican administration in the future.

Under all of this is a further admission. It is that there is no hope—not even a hope—of American society coming up with a non-militarist solution to the cold war. As such, it is the corollary of a completely frustrated American foreign policy which can only rely on force and political reaction.

It is the end of a long road that began with Dean Acheson's "negotiate from positions of strength," and wound through the tortuous maze of slogan—"containment," "liberation," "agonizing reappraisal," "massive retaliation"—until it emerged in all of its present clarity: World War III.

What can be done about this program?

Universal military training of this type is still confronted by a very real opposition. It is one of the few areas of American life where the old traditions of anti-militarism still have a certain political viability. In the past, it has been possible to rally a broad movement against such plans.

The labor movement, for example, which by and large

supports all of the basic institutions of the cold war, has balked at universal military training, precisely because of its permanent character. Liberals who defend the draft for reasons of "necessity" oppose this kind of plan for the same reason. All pacifist groups are united to struggle against it. With these forces socialists can join in a broad effort similar to those which we have waged on issues like academic freedom.

### The Socialist Opposition

At the same time, it must be carefully pointed out that some of the opposition to universal military training comes from the more reactionary political forces in the United States. The conservative elements which made up the isolationist movement in the late thirties, America Firsters and the completely contradictory "get-it-aloners" (anti-conscription and pro-World War III) are in this group. It goes without saying that these opponents of universal military training do not provide any kind of arena for joint activity.

Yet even when working with the labor movement, liberals and pacifists, in a broad struggle against the new Eisenhower program, socialists must make it clear that their opposition is of a totally different character.

With the exception of the pacifists, these groups accept all of the basic premises of the garrison state. In a sense, their opposition is contradictory, since it amounts to a refusal to carry their own position to its logical, and blunt, conclusion. The garrison state is a normal feature of American life. What we have in this program is its institutionalization, an attempt to transform this fact into a conscious reality upon which long-term plans may be made.

It is not enough to simply oppose the institutionalization of the garrison state: it is necessary to oppose its very existence, whether consciously legitimized in so many words of a particular law or not. And at this point, criticism of the existence of the garrison state leads inevitably to a concern over the basic forces within the American war drive itself.

The Young Socialist League has spelled out the complex of causes which issue in American imperialism time and time again. Yet we must do it once more, now in relation to the new Eisenhower program. For it is precisely in Hannah's admission that there is no alternative that the very roots of the garrison state can be seen.

### Strike at the Base

As the YSL has constantly reiterated, capitalism can provide no alternative to the problems of social crisis, and revolution. It can only rely on military force and political reaction. Ultimately, the only "alternative" of American capitalism is, as Hannah himself remarked, "the day of active war with the Soviet Union": World War III.

It is true that liberals, and the vast majority of the labor movement, prefer a more sophisticated version of this reality, one shorn of Hannah's bluntness. They will dress up their acceptance of the garrison state with spirited defenses of a still-born Point Four.

Yet they will not attack the basic problem of the alternative: that in an epoch of social crisis and revolution, only a policy which builds upon the revolutionary forces—the working class, the colonial peoples—can possibly succeed. And this policy is anti-imperialist, be it Russian or American imperialism, it is anti-Stalinist and anti-capitalist. It is the policy of the Third Camp.

It is such an opposition that we socialists will raise in any broad campaign against the new Eisenhower program. We are not simply against universal military training. We are against its root-cause, its basis. We can join with others in a struggle over an immediate issue, yet we cannot still our conviction that this is the only alternative to the garrison state.

There is still hope that this measure can be defeated. Socialists must work vigorously to this end. Yet the very fact that it has been proposed is evidence of how far the United States has already gone.

The administration has reared the image of a regimented society, totally militarized, living in anticipation of the day of World War III. It has declared itself bankrupt, morally, politically, socially bankrupt. And its opponents have no real program with which to counter.

The tiny American anti-war socialist movement has a grave responsibility at such a time. For it is the only voice of a democratic alternative to national suicide; it provides the only intransigent and principled opposition to the garrison state. The Young Socialist League is the only nation-wide youth organization of anti-war socialists. All anti-war socialists belong within its ranks, for its task is huge: we must rally American youth into struggle against the permanent garrison state; we must make clear the full meaning of the Eisenhower program; we must state the democratic alternative of socialism.



# THE POSITION OF THE ARAB SOCIALISTS ON ISRAEL

By CLOVIS MAKSOUD

Controversial problems in any given area ought to be resolved in the light of objective realities. The solution must serve, as far as we are concerned, the interest of the ultimate realization of democratic socialism. To resort to the psychology of choosing between two evils — and the casting of our weight into the "lesser of the evils" — is not only a defeatist attitude and an escape from socialist responsibilities, but it is above all detrimental to the cause of socialism as a whole.

The growth of an ideological movement depends to a large extent on the willingness of the movement to initiate alternatives which are in harmony with the requirements of doctrine. Thus, even when a socialist movement is young and relatively weak, it should not wait until it has grown to make decisive political commitments, but it must realize that its long-run growth is contingent on its readiness and fearlessness in taking clear and correct positions.

How far this attitude will succeed is dependent on the capacity of the socialists to show the correctness of their position and expose the contradictions of the opposing ones. This declaration of position should be preceded by a careful and detached study of the situation and a cognizance of the theoretical implications of their stand.

It is imperative that the post-war socialist tactics should not be allowed to continue. Their unsocialist behavior and policies in many instances have been characterized by confusion, splits, opportunism and a pragmatic anti-philosophic approach to problems.

Their loss of initiative confined their practical usefulness to "throwing their lot" one way or the other. In this respect they drew attention. Under pressure of their left-wing elements, some parties (e.g., the British Labor Party) stated their role as an attempt to "minimize" the excesses of American policy. The Nenni Socialists of Italy fit into the same category. So rather than giving a fresh guide and leaving an impact on history, Western European socialists became, for all practical purposes, unable to provide leadership for mankind that is desperately seeking a new approach.

This must not, and does not, mean hopelessness in the cause of socialism. It is a setback — and a bad one and an unnecessary one. If we have the will, and we do, we must take the debacle of European socialism as an occasion for profound reassessment and self-criticism, to enable us to act as the vanguard of the revolutionary temper that permeates the 20th-century mind.

## The Arab Fight Against Israel

I dwell on the above ideas because I find it necessary to explain the intellectual and political climate that we, the Arab socialists, reject and despise. This introduction serves also as an apology for my venturing to offer a plan for the solution of a controversial problem, a

practice many European socialists look at with skepticism, sarcasm and condescending paternalism.

In offering a plan for Palestine, I am fully aware that its acceptance cannot possibly be immediate. Even in case it is accepted, it will not in all probability be automatically implemented. However, the unforeseeability of immediate execution tends to lead many socialists to dismiss the plan as "impractical." In my opinion what is conceivable in theory is ultimately realizable in practice provided political efforts are made and the will is translated into action.

The practical implications of a socialist theoretical conception are even more feasible under revolutionary situations, as exist in the Near East. In such circumstances, demands for new frameworks are more attractive, insistence on radical changes are more effective. It is not adjustment to given conditions that is sought; the change in the basis of the body politic is the ultimate objective. This is true of the problem of Israel as it is true of the other problems of the Near East.

## EUROPEAN SOCIALISTS' ATTITUDE

Needless to mention here the anti-Arab feeling that has been characteristic of the European socialist movement. Needless to give evidence of the contempt and disrespect that many left-wing elements have treated us with. Needless to expose the false and misleading conclusions they reached concerning the problems of the Near East. Besides the Palestinian question, they supported the military dictatorships in Syria and Egypt notwithstanding the persecution which the socialist and democratic elements suffered from these totalitarian regimes. Needless to show how they engineered a defamation campaign against the Arab socialists, denouncing them as "fascist," "anti-Semitic" or "so-called socialists."

This might be hard to believe. If I did not have the evidence — lots of it — in my files to prove it, I would hardly believe it myself. Yet developments in the East, especially concerning the military juntas (conceived by the Bevanites as a "short cut to progress"), have proved the correctness of our thesis and the error of theirs.

The European socialist movement, in general, has never stopped to make a serious evaluation of the Arab socialist movement. Some of the socialist leaders were, I venture to say, deliberate in this omission. There are few exceptions: G. D. H. Cole in Britain, Claude Bourdet in France, and Djilas in Yugoslavia. (The latter's dismissal was unfortunate. I remember spending with him several nights discussing the need for a theoretical clarification of the socialist position on semi-colonial areas like the near East, when I was his guest in Yugoslavia and when he was in Lebanon.)

It is therefore gratifying to see the Independent Socialist League take such a genuine interest in the problems that confront the inhabitants of the Arab world.

Moreover, its anti-Zionist position, consistent with the theoretical dictates of socialism, is a proof that the political blockade the Socialist International is imposing on us will not prove very effective. Sometimes we think that the latter's blockade and discrimination against us is a blessing in light of its reckless right-wing deviation.

## ANTI-DEMOCRATIC ARAB FORCES

To put the blame totally on the socialists in Europe and America is not fair. The Arabs have in their own way contributed to the misunderstanding of their cause.

When they found themselves isolated from progressive and liberal public opinion, they sought the support of suspect elements. In many instances, the help of some anti-Semitic elements was not solicited. But in the frustration of being isolated from those whom they expected to be their allies against Zionist encroachment, their scope of selection and choice was rendered nil. In what they considered as a decisive battle, pro-

## Editor's Note

With this issue we begin a discussion, unique in the American socialist press and perhaps equally unique in Europe, in which the Arab socialist point of view on Israel will be presented and will be criticized.

This discussion actually began with our June 7 issue, where we published three articles by Clovis Maksoud on "Arab Socialism and Its Parties." There too we introduced Comrade Maksoud to our readers as a spokesman for Arab socialism; he is a member of the executive of the Progressive Socialist Party of Lebanon, now studying in Britain. The third of Comrade Maksoud's articles touched on the Israeli problem; and an accompanying LA editorial, headed "Toward a Discussion" raised the question of whether his point of view went quite beyond mere anti-Zionism and actually called for the wiping out of Israel as a state.

We proposed to Comrade Maksoud that he state the position of the Arab socialists on the problem of Israel-Arab relations in a special article. At this time, we also sent him for his own information the text of the ISL resolution on Zionism, Israel and the Jewish Question (adopted 1951), to which he refers in his article.

This, then, will be the first time that our readers — and most socialists anywhere — will have an opportunity to get acquainted with the thinking of Arab socialists on this vexing question. It will also be the first time we know of that our Arab comrades will see their point of view in a "dialogue" — i.e., a comradesly discussion — with an opposing socialist point of view which is not pro-Zionist. This is the value of the present discussion in our view.

We are therefore presenting Comrade Maksoud's article (which was a good deal longer than we expected and will have to be concluded in next week's issue) in spite of the fact that we quite disagree with its main thesis with regard to the existence of Israel. But certainly we believe that the Arab socialists' view has a right to be heard.

Our reply to Maksoud for our own point of view will follow the conclusion of his article, and among other things it will also discuss his inaccuracy in setting forth the ISL position which he criticizes. —Ed.

gressive criteria for being eligible as an ally could not be easily enforced.

This gave scope to vocal anti-democratic elements in the Arab world to become more vocal. The rational democratic forces, though maintaining the allegiance of the Arab masses, were maneuvered, in the emotional excitement, to abstention (not in the absolute sense). Their European and Western ideological counterparts were in the "enemy camp."

However, the Arab socialists conducted themselves in the manner that any true socialist or progressive would. In periods of passionate involvement, only sensational extremism gets the headlines. The Arab cause was identified with feudal lords and reactionary elements. This in a way is like identifying American politics as dominated by McCarthy.

It is true that in an atmosphere of fear irresponsible extremists become central. They too are demonstrative. Politics in its various phases, or political activity, becomes a reaction to this emerging and noisy lunatic fringe.

But the noisiness, the shallow dominance, and the apparent power of these groups (in the event of socialist and genuine democratic reluctance to overcome this fringe, the apparent will become real) is not in reality a measure of the political components of our society. Their prominence is due to a temporary success in exploiting irrational fear. The continuity of this prominence, which embodies ingredients of totalitarianism, is guaranteed if liberals and socialists fall into the trap of accepting the framework of objectives "though disagreeing with the methods." By setting this hypocritical exploitation of fear as the "extreme end" of a fundamentally valid disposition, one is contributing, knowingly or otherwise, to undermining democracy and socialism.

Thus, by presenting McCarthy as an "extreme" anti-Communist, or reactionary Arab groups as "extreme" anti-Zionists, one is bringing to the fold of a basically sound, though negative, position, elements who are similar in thinking, methods and ideals to the very objects of our fear. It is becoming more and more evident that the most outspoken and the most violent voices are, always, the most insincere. The continued presence of what they appear to fight against is, in reality, their own claim to a *raison d'être*.

Thus the more conscious elements of these reactionary groups have a vested interest in the permanent existence of what they call their "enemy." The imminence of "danger" is the backbone of their eminence. The decisive defeat of the scapegoat is the beginning of the end for the lunatic fringe, unless, by reason of democratic and socialist timidity, they have succeeded in broadening the scope of their destructive activities.

## IT WAS A PEOPLE'S WAR

It is therefore a fundamental error to identify the cause of the Arabs with those who pervert it to their selfish ends. Unfortunately this is exactly what has been done.

The Israel-Arab conflict is to these elements a black-and-white conflict. Israel is presented as the "only democratic country in the area" and the Arabs' insistence on their rights and their apprehension of Zionist activities is merely an attempt by the Arab governments to divert the masses' attention from the real



# Presenting a Little-Known Point of View

socio-economic maladjustment under which they live.\* This has been the line followed by the *New Statesman and Nation*, the [London] *Tribune*, the *New Republic*, the *Nation*, and other left-wing liberal and socialist magazines.

I would state most emphatically that the Arab reactionary ruling classes are, in one degree or another, a contributing factor to the failure of the Arabs to assert their legitimate rights in Palestine and outside of Palestine in the Near East. Where imperialist influence was most pronounced, readiness to struggle against the aggressive threat of Zionism was most reluctant.

The leadership of the Jordanian army was an instrument of British diplomacy in the Zionist-Arab conflict. The Saudi Arabian government hardly contributed any serious effort in the cause of the Arabs. It was the people of Palestine who since the Balfour declaration resisted the designs of the Zionist Agency. It was the volunteers of Syria, Jordan, Iraq and Lebanon who conducted the active resistance movement. In effect, it was a people's campaign. Prominent socialists like Michel Aflak, Akram, Hourani, Salah el Bitar, Abdulla Runciwi, Abdullah Nawwas, and Ali Naser el Deen were among the leaders.

They were not motivated by a hatred of the Jews. (Many Arab Jews played a prominent role in the development of Arab radical thought. Abbou Maddara is the most prominent in the early part of this century.) They were not moved by an anti-Semitic feeling. (Arabs themselves are Semitic). They were not seeking to indulge the Arab people in xenophobic adventures.

Their fight against Zionism was in reality only a part of a much broader fight. It was a struggle against imperialism with its Near Eastern agents—reaction and Zionism. Only in this framework can we understand the validity of the Arab socialist position on the question of Palestine.

## INVALID JUSTIFICATIONS

There are some justifications for the Western socialist support for Israel. But these are justifications only if we admit their theoretical impotency and their incapacity for thorough and scientific examination of the emerging problems.

Support for Israel was a protest against discriminatory practices and the inhuman persecution suffered by the Jews in Nazi Germany and other places. In this respect it is symptomatic of a humanist heritage. In reacting to anti-Semitism we share a common outlook and disposition.

But to conceive of the state of Israel as being the answer is not comprehensible unless we admit the validity of the Zionist concepts. I shall return to this subject later. It is sufficient to state here that lessons drawn from history show how a well-organized entity could maneuver the agony of a persecuted racial or religious minority toward ends that are in the final analysis obstructive to a dynamic rehabilitation of the victims.

A large number of socialists support Israel because of the pioneering achievements of some cooperative institutions there. The collective farms and the cooperatives are a segment of a total picture. To allow an attraction to a part—a small part—to be sufficient ground for active support of the whole is to blind ourselves to the inherent deficiencies of the whole, and in the case of Israel, to its inherent dangers.

It is moreover a romantic rationalization that resolves the crisis of the Western socialist conscience. Because of this, the European socialist closes his mind against seeing the whole picture of Zionism and the even bigger totality of the Near East, in order to prevent recurrence of the crisis.

In a way their conscience in these matters is exhausted. This "exhaustion" will not deter us from pressing the need for a true evaluation of the situation on their part.

## QUESTIONS FOR SOCIALISTS

Have these socialists ever sincerely examined the meaning of the full impact of Zionism in the Arab world? Have they pressed to fight anti-Semitism at its roots — namely, by probing into the economic, psychological and political dislocations in their own countries? Did they ever consider that the transplantation of Jewish technical skill from Europe was the cause of this rapid advancement?

Did they ever challenge, as they should have done spontaneously, the widely held Zionist theory that Arabs were incapable of developing their areas? (I emphasize the term "spontaneously" because it is an elementary socialist attitude that no people is incapable of self-development if adequate opportunities are allowed.)

Have the Western socialists ever stopped to think that it was due to the imperialism of the West that the Arab developmental energies were channeled away in the anti-imperialist phase of our struggle?

We are sorry to say that socialists in general did not do that. That was a case of gross socialist negligence. One of the results was that the Arab socialists were against the resolution that would have brought the Asian socialists into the Socialist International (Comisco). The Rangoon conference of the Asian socialists gave the resolution the rebuff it deserved. This

\*Some connoisseurs use the word "effendis" to show their familiarity with Arab social structure, not knowing that besides the absence of usage of this Turkish term the title indicated the petty-bourgeois and small-civil-servant classes. Therefore the Zionist usage of "effendis" and the Western liberals' and socialists' usage is silly, incorrect, and does not even indicate reactionaries. —C. M.

undoubtedly would allow us in Asia to develop our revolutionary direction free from the utilitarian and "let's be realistic" climate witnessed at the meetings of the Socialist International nowadays.

Let me remind readers of one additional current misconception concerning the Near Eastern question: The fact that Arab governments are trying to outbid Israel in subservience to Western strategic interests. This might lead to certain "advantages" if we believe that Israel was an isolated problem and also the unique serious problem concerning the Arabs. This is not true. Also, this irrational position, taken by certain Arab circles, notably around the intellectuals of the American University of Beirut [Lebanon], does not reflect the attitude of all socialist and democratic nationalists in the Arab world. As a matter of fact, it is prejudicial to our interests and to the unfolding of inherent aspirations and the release of our revolutionary forces. Therefore it is incorrect, and it is being fought vigorously.

Our opposition to the Middle East Security Pact, and the recent shooting by the police in Beirut of two socialist students, are only a few examples of our awareness that our anti-Israel position is but a part of our struggle against imperialism and the bipolarization of power in the world.

## Zionism and the Israeli Issue

Now I shall come to the points raised by the resolution of the ISL on Zionism, Israel and the Jewish question (published in the July-August 1951 issue of the *New Internationalist*) and by the editorial in *Labor Action* on June 7 last. The reflections above are intended to serve for a clearer understanding of what I shall have to say and an introduction to the Arab socialist attitude on the problem of Palestine.

The resolution of the ISL stated that "... the Arab effendis demanded that the Jewish people, hounded in Europe, be deprived of the right to found a new life in the country of their choice."\* This is, in my opinion, a misleading statement for two basic reasons:

(1) It confines the active resistance to Zionism to a certain limited class (see earlier our reference to "effendis"), and denies the broader framework of popular feeling on this problem.

(2) It presupposes several unsocialist hypotheses:

(a) Acceptance of the Zionist theory that there is a basic right for Jews to find life in the country of their choice.

(b) It disregards the means by which this right is to be executed, and it denies the interests of the people in Palestine their sovereign right to admit or refuse these claims. In other words, what is claimed by the resolution to be an act of Jewish "self-determination" is dependent for its fruition on an act of aggression and imposition. Was resistance to this policy of imposition actually an exercise of Arab legitimate rights? Was it in reality an act of depriving self-determination on the part of the Jews? This is where the resolution gets into contradictions.

Self-determination presupposes the existence of a national self. This "self" has the inherent right to determine its destiny, taking into consideration the aspirations of the human components of this national self. Are the Jews a national entity? The socialist answer must be a categorical no.

And even if they were, is it a legitimate act of self-determination that their "choice of a country" means deprivation of the inhabitants of that country of their rights to live in it? But even more important, is it to the best interests of socialist and democratic development in the Near East that a "national" state be set up in spite of the will and interests of the people of the area? Is it correct for the socialists to sanction even the establishment of Israel, even though it is not expansionist, and therefore consecrate the disruptive influences in the Arab world which for the last 40 years' imperialism have been attempting to break the unity and cohesion of the area?

We, the Arab socialists, say no. It seems to us that the "pro-war" position of the resolution (ibid., p. 227) and its advocacy of no embargo of arms to Israel because of the Arab states' depriving the Jews of the right to exercise self-determination is, in view of our definition of the terms, unsocialist and a dangerous precedent that was set up. It was morally wrong. It was, in view of the ISL's anti-Zionist record, a decision that stemmed from an error of judgment and no comprehension of the Arab case. It was, moreover, an acceptance of the appearance of Arab resistance for the real.

## WHAT JEWS ARE MEANT?

Admitting that the ISL was correct in stating that the Arabs were depriving the Jews of exercising their act of self-determination, the question which the resolution did not answer was: which Jews have this right? In other words, what Jews belong to this national self? or what category of Jews? Is it every Jew? *Labor Action*, organ of the ISL, has repeatedly said no. Then what are the criteria that entitle a Jew to belong to the Jewish national self? In the resolution there is no answer.

In reality, there can be no answer unless one is willing to accept the modified Zionist thesis. It is stated that persecution and cultural background are sufficient to draw the ties that constitute a national entity. But cultural unity would draw all Jews into the framework

\*Editor's note: We have taken the liberty here of correcting the quotation as given in Comrade Maksoud's manuscript, where the words "of the right" were inadvertently left out.

of the Jewish nation; persecution of a religious minority does not entitle the minority to form a "national" home. This would be a dangerous precedent and will undermine the struggle for the elimination of the causes that make persecution possible.

If the Jews that are meant are those who were in the Arab world, and who are Arabs, then their claim to residence cannot be challenged and must not be questioned. The Arab socialists do not, and will not, accept the fact that they cease to be Arabs. Any discrimination against them will not be allowed. Persecution of these Arab minorities will be vigorously fought.

Arab Jews are not the only religious minority in the Arab world. Do these Jews (or, for that matter, the Arab Christians, Druzes, etc.) have the right of self-determination (in the manner it was defined in this article)? The answer is also no.

The socialist position on this question cannot be compromised. To conceive of minorities as scapegoats has its roots not in inherent psychological dispositions of a majority but in the political and economic maladjustments. The responsibility of the socialists is not to admit such dispositions as "natural" and therefore seek a "solution" to it outside of the context where the problem arises; the responsibility lies in preventing the recurrence of such tendencies by eliminating their causes.

In stating that the Jews have a right to a country of "their choice," the question arises, in view of the fact that their choice has been Palestine, as to whether they had a right to Palestine. If so, why? In view of the overwhelming impact of Zionist propaganda, the question seems to be irrelevant to many. By accepting this fundamental Zionist premise—and it is definitely a Zionist premise—a socialist anti-Zionist position seems to us untenable.

To accept this concept of a "Jewish right to Palestine" is to bring Zionism to the realm of being an aspect of controversy the solution of which must be based on compromise. This seems to me to be the position of the ISL resolution when it supports the Israeli "defensive war" with no support to political Zionism.

## THERE IS NO ANALOGY

It is on this point that misunderstanding between us and the ISL is most apparent, namely, the insistence on the part of the ISL to distinguish between Zionism and the state of Israel. This is apparent in the *LA* editorial of June 7.

The analogy—of being anti-Stalinist and not anti-Russian—with anti-Zionism is incorrect. Communism (Stalinism) is a system of government; it is a blueprint for organizing society. It is therefore institutional. It has policies and methods which are devised to further their concepts and their ideas. Whether these ideas or the Communist system is valid or not is not for me to discuss here. But the opponents of this system must distinguish between the structural, institutional and methodological features of Communism, or for that matter any other system, and the people who live under that system.

As to the Zionist question, the problem is different. Zionism is not an institutional or organizational formula. It is not a theory of how a state ought to be run or the economy organized. It is a movement to create a state for a "Jewish nation."

In other words, Israel is the fruition — partial fruition — of the Zionist movement. Israel, the sovereign and independent state, is the culmination of Zionism. This is not a philosophy of life or a phase of political and economic theory. It is a movement which considers the salvation of the Jews to be in the creation of a separate Jewish state in Palestine. It is the equation of Judaism with the existence of a mystical myth of "Jewish nationalism." In this respect, it is a threat to the Jews and to the Arabs. It is, above all, from a socialist viewpoint, an escape from political and moral responsibility.

## DANGEROUS CONCEPT

But it is important to distinguish between Jews and Israelis (in the sense of Israel being a state). *LA* in many recent issues has clearly pointed this out, but in its June 7 editorial seems to be seeking to make an exception of the Jews in Israel. In taking a correct theoretical stand, exceptions undermine the correctness.

Though clear opposition to Zionist chauvinism is quite evident in issues of *LA*, the acceptance of the state of Israel in its present boundaries is acceptance of the basic Zionist theory, namely, the need for the creation of a Jewish state. To fight the intolerance and expansionism of the Israeli government is simply to fight the excesses of Zionism, which excesses you correctly conceive as inherent in their movement.

But to struggle against excesses — expansionism, treatment of non-Jewish minorities — is, despite its importance, a relative struggle and a limited one. As a matter of fact, such limitation ought to be welcomed by intelligent Zionists. As long as only their excesses are controversial, and such excesses characterize the anti-Zionist position, then the validity of their fundamental doctrine would continue to remain unchallenged. In this manner they would not only narrow the targets of their critics but in terms of logic it would be difficult to prove that the geographical confines of Israel, given the validity of their basic thesis, are a fulfillment.

Briefly, the concept of a Jewish national self that is seeking realization is a fluid concept. In its fluidity lies its danger. I cannot, therefore, distinguish Zionism from the right of Jewish self-determination.

(Concluded next week: Part II—A Plan for Palestine.)



# Russians Are Gaining In Propaganda War - -

(Continued from page 1)

something to offer everyone in Europe. The French opponents of EDC and German rearmament are offered the neutralization of Germany . . . or at the very least, a postponement of their having to take action on EDC till after the conference proposed in the Stalinist note has been held.

## HOPE OF UNIFICATION

The Germans are offered the hope of the unification of the two sections of Germany in the context of an all-European "collective security" pact, or to put it more accurately, they are once more warned that Russia will not permit the unification of their country if Western Germany goes through with rearmament under United States-EDC auspices.

Before the eyes of all the victims of Nazi aggression in Europe is dangled the spectre of a re-armed, militarized and vengeful Germany plunging the continent into war once more, and the alternative of a peaceful, neutralized Germany in collaboration with all European states.

And finally, the notes lay heavy emphasis on the Stalinist claim that it is they who are anxious for peaceful coexistence with the capitalist world; while the Americans and other supporters of NATO are the ones who want to create "closed military groups" which exclude Russia and are hence obviously directed against her.

Although the initial reactions reported in the American press from Washington, Paris, London and Bonn are negative, it would be a mistake to sell this Russian maneuver short. Of course everyone knows that the real purpose of the proposal to hold a conference on the basis of the Stalinist plan has a minimum aim of giving the French and other opponents of EDC an argument for further postponing any action on this treaty, and a maximum aim of breaking up the American-organized alliance in Europe, or at least weakening it as much as possible. But the fact that the Stalinist aims are transparent does not make their move any the less clever. Often the most transparent and obvious diplomatic maneuver can also be the most effective.

## SO MUCH IS TRUE

The difficulty with the Stalinist maneuver, from the point of view of the State Department, is that so much of what the Russians say in their notes is obviously true.

For instance: The Stalinists point out that whereas in their country they have passed laws against war

mongering, the American "press openly says that the American bases are designed to destroy the industries of the Soviet Union. Particular emphasis is put on such military bases, from which, according to the design of U.S.A. military leaders, atomic attacks could be launched against any major objective in the Soviet Union. Noteworthy are the bellicose statements by a number of prominent military leaders of the U.S.A. who call for the sending of bombers over Moscow and Peking to drop atomic bombs on them, though the venturesome nature of the entire propaganda and all the publicity given to these aggressive plans are evident to every sober-minded person."

That there are indeed people high in the American government who harbor aggressive plans, who are for a "preventive war" is indeed evident to sober-minded people. What is also evident, however, is that in proposing their "peace" plan the Stalinists take for granted the division of the world as they achieved it after World War II, and are prepared to continue re-dividing the world as opportunity makes this possible.

## NOT AMUSING

The ordinary American newspaper-scanner who reads about the latest Russian note tells himself: Here comes another Moscow maneuver. That is the part of the truth which he is insistently told by his favorite news-anglers.

He may even be amused by this absurd Russian insistence on turning out obviously unacceptable proposals. It is a fact of history, which will surely not be overlooked by future historians, that when the Kremlin's diplomats first sprang their proposal for a European non-aggression pact on the Berlin conference, there was a spontaneous burst of laughter from the Western side of the table. Obviously, our capitalist statesmen have a sense of humor as compared with the oft-publicized, if dubious "humorlessness" of Moscow's men. But, to coin a phrase, he who laughs last . . .

With that dogged persistence which is possible when one has a line, the Russians have made their so-amusing proposal into a new bugaboo for Washington and London. It is empty, to be sure; it is a fake, to be sure; and yet it has become more and more impressive to Europe's people.

The reason is simple: the Russians have a proposal for "peace" which can be proved to be hollow; but their rivals have no proposals for peace at all.

Instead, the leaders of America, with their highly developed sense of humor, are showing the world the spectacle of a big national reception for a frothing warmonger, as discussed in the accompanying article on Rhee's ravings.

## CHEAP AT THE PRICE

So the N. Y. Times' Drew Middleton observes that the Russian note "provided wits in Western foreign ministries with plenty of material for amusement. But these gentry do not make up the balance of the population in Britain or on the Continent. To this larger group the Rus-

sian note was not so funny because it touched again, admittedly in slightly phony accents, on two subjects dear to the heart of the common man—peace and security." (Aug. 1.)

So "the Russians appear to be leading the way to peace," and it is their policy which "continues to provide a surface appearance of novelty and energy."

At how cheap a price! According to this view—and it is no overstatement, naturally—the Russian can make this show before the world simply by "touching on" the subjects of peace and security with anything (however phony-looking) that gives the impression of interest in those subjects. Indeed, if the price is cheap it is only because the Western powers do not even "touch on."

Instead, as the Russians press their shopworn but still effective "peace offensive" against EDC, the United States blares it out to the same world that its answer is . . . to rebuild German militarism. Washington counters Moscow's maneuver with precisely that proposal than which nothing is more calculated to prove Moscow's claims, and scare all of Europe, outside of Germany itself—and perhaps also Germany itself.

## SMITH WARNS

None of this would be very amusing in any case, but for morbid minds a note of comedy might be seen in the remarks of Under-secretary of State Walter Bedell Smith, in last Sunday's radio interview. As headlined in next day's papers, the idea was: "SMITH SEES PERIL TO FREE NATIONS IN RED 'SOFT LINE.'"

He has a point, of course, and it is obvious; all of Stalinist diplomacy, soft or hard, is a "peril" to U. S. diplomacy. But in the context of world opinion that we have explained above, his contribution is a typical Washington stupidity, possible only for a government which mainly doesn't give a damn what the rest of the world is thinking.

The rest of the world is thinking that they would like to see the United States take a "soft" line—by which they mean a line which offers some hope for amicable agreement and the famous prospect of "coexistence." The only alternative to a "soft" line that they know of is a bellicose line, a warmongering line. And here Washington's representative in the Geneva negotiations is denouncing the Stalinists because . . . because they are taking a "soft" line. Or so it would seem.

## IMAGE OF U.S.

"Beetle" Smith said, in addition, that it was his "very definite impression" that Mao's China wished now to exploit means other than war in order to achieve their objective of controlling Asia. Or, as the papers put it, he "warned" about it!

It is a fact that most of Europe would be very happy if they were sure that the United States wished to limit itself to non-military means in pursuing its own objective of controlling the world.

Try to imagine Molotov "warning" the world to beware of a soft line by Dulles! The effort of imagination is an index to the reasons why so much of Europe and Asia are convinced that the warmongering is coming from this side of the ocean.

We cannot say too often: This is not all a matter of simple stupidity, though it is impossible to exclude that factor either. These are the results of a government which doesn't even have a glimmering of a notion of what a democratic foreign policy is.

## The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Get Acquainted!

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

the ideas of Independent Socialism and the ISL.

- I want more information about
- 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 .....

## While Rhee Was War-Whooping

While Rhee was shrilling speeches in the U. S. in favor of launching the Third World War now, and denouncing Americans as gutless because they are afraid of the H-bomb, the following appeared in a N. Y. Times dispatch from his capital Seoul:

"On Wednesday an attempt was made by the government here to stage a mass demonstration in support of greater military might and a united front against communism in Asia. Led by a military band, some two-score trucks loaded with civilians, mostly children in their teens and old people, drove through the center of the city.

"The demonstration did not draw as much attention as a nearby diving exhibition by the Olympic champion, Maj. Sammy Lee." (Aug. 1.)

## A Basic Pamphlet —

### SOCIALISM: THE HOPE OF HUMANITY

by  
Max Shachtman

Read it! 19 cents

Independent Socialist Press

114 West 14 Street, New York City