

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

AUGUST 23, 1954

FIVE CENTS

**The Studebaker Wage-Cut:
Discussion of the UAW's Policy**

... page 2

War on Israel?

The Mistakes of the Arab Socialists

... page 6

Eisenhower's Farm Program

Suits the Big Business Farmers

... page 3

In These Words a Congressman Described What Happened in the House on Aug. 17:

"You Could Almost Reach Out and Feel The Atmosphere of Fear in the Chamber"

As the CP-Outlawing Bill Passed Amid an Orgy of Hysteria Led by Yellow-Liberals

Ike Fakes an Economic Report

By L. G. SMITH

On August 12 the Eisenhower administration fired one of the early guns in the election campaign. The "bang" produced was definitely sub-atomic in volume, despite the efforts of the daily press to magnify the sound as much as possible.

This report was not issued over the signatures of the president's official board of economic advisers. Since this board was set up, they have made it a practice to issue mid-year reports and forecasts as well as to prepare the annual economic message of the president.

The chief economic adviser, Burns, was reported to have curtly replied to questioning reporters that no mid-year report is needed, or rather, that in his opinion his committee is carrying out its statutory task.

There is a very strong hint here that even though Eisenhower picked his economic advisers with an eye to men who would make the kind of economic analysis he wants, they had a bit too much academic integrity to be willing to subscribe to this little piece of campaign propaganda in the guise of a scientific estimate of the economy and its trends.

In a word, the president says that things are just jim-dandy, and will be getting peachier as the year rolls along.

True, he indicates there is quite a bit more unemployment now than there was a year ago at this time; and business conditions generally are not nearly as good; production of steel, coal, oil, autos, electrical appliances and the like is down; but then that was the top of the boom, and this is near the bottom of the recession, and one can't expect things to keep going at boom levels all the time. Anyway, there are more jobs and more wages being earned than there was during the first half of 1952, when the Democrats were in power.

The president reported, further, that the second quarter of 1954 found things a bit better than the first. From this he drew the conclusion that the recession has bumped bottom, and the economy is on the way up. Things will be definitely better in the fall, is the word.

PHONY FIGURES

Now, there is an interesting fact about this second-quarter improvement.

As noted in these columns before, the index of factory production rose a couple of points during the first week of April from the low it had hit at the end of March, then remained steady through the second week in May, then rose fairly steadily till the end of June. Thus April,

(Continued on page 3)

By PHILIP COBEN

Literally and physically, on August 12 the U. S. Senate acted out the wild witchhunting hysteria which engulfs the United States.

On August 17 it was followed by the House in a similar orgiastic saturnalia in which the most "liberal" Democrats beat out the McCarthyites in throwing all sense of democracy to the winds.

The orgy was launched by the Senate leader of Americans for Democratic Action, Senator Humphrey of Minnesota.

Every senator down to Lehman of New York, who held back the most, crumbled before the pall of fear that swept over the House, and voted for the measure which only a handful are really for: the bill to outlaw the Communist Party.

Everyone of them—against the known views of even Eisenhower, Brownell and J. Edgar Hoover—disintegrated like yellow dogs at the thought of voting No on an "anti-Communist" measure, be it whatever it was.

In the House, two whole congressmen could be found who stood up even on this point and voted No, when a slightly modified version of the bill came before the chamber. They were Multer of New York (D.) and Burdick of North Dakota (R.).

Congressman Multer told the press:

"Almost every member thought it was a badly drawn bill and unwise bill but nearly everyone was

Super-McCarthyism

As we go to press, the yellow-liberals of the Democratic Party have sunk even deeper into the mud of McCarthyism. Again led by Humphrey, the Senate has insisted on retaining the provision applying individual penalties against CP members, although the House left this part out at the insistence of the administration. And now the House has gone along with this change-back.

Even more incredible is the addition of an amendment by Humphrey (taken by him from a draft by Rep. Martin Dies, the odoriferous Texas witchhunter) which applies the penalties not only to CP members but so loosely as to include every CP sympathizer and lots more. A good many pure-and-simple Fair Dealers could be included! More on this next week.

This super-McCarthyite amendment was put through almost solely by Democratic votes in the Senate, only 3 Republicans voting for it! The vote was 41-39. A veto by Eisenhower is said to be possible.

afraid if they voted against it, their opponents would call them pro-Communist. YOU COULD ALMOST REACH OUT AND FEEL THE ATMOSPHERE OF FEAR IN THE CHAMBER." (N. Y. Post, Aug. 17.)

The picture is well-nigh incredible, even though we are quite well aware of what has been going on in these United States. The scene in the Senate particularly was that of a stampede of cattle, led by the "liberal" Democrats.

For hours no one knew what was happening on the Senate floor as the cattle milled about, and to this day a straight account has to be pieced together. The press has opined that even the *Congressional*

Record will not be able to record the entire hubbub.

All this in order to fire blockbuster bombs against a Communist Party of perhaps some 25,000 members—discredited, weakened, impotent—in a population of 150 million!

The orgy began with the calling-up of the Butler bill before the Senate. This was a witchhunting bill to smash unions which are designated as "Communist-infiltrated."

At first, the strategy of the so-called liberal bloc was to support the substitute by Senator Magnuson (D., Wash.) which set up a commission to study the problem. This, at least, could have been interpreted as a device to get the witchhunting bill out of the way.

IN A BLUE FUNK

On Wednesday evening, however, Senator Humphrey got the running jitters. This miserable ADA leader decided that the Magnuson substitute was going to be defeated, and that something else had to be done. Besides, obviously, he figured on outflanking the GOP red-hunting strategy by proving that the Democratic liberals were as good as McCarthyites as any scoundrel on Capitol Hill.

Thereupon this scurvy "liberal" thought up and introduced his bill to outlaw the

(Turn to last page)

An Indictment

In an unusual "letter to the editor" printed in the N.Y. Times (Aug. 16), the Times' own dramatic critic, Brooks Atkinson, drew up and presented a pithy indictment of the "compulsion toward totalitarian attitudes and practices" in the U.S.A. The text of the letter follows.

To the Editor of the New York Times: We can vote in this country. This is doubtless the principal source of our liberty. There is freedom of speech for citizens willing to take the consequences.

In many respects, however, both the administrative and legislative branches of the Government show a compulsion toward totalitarian attitudes and practices:

The Government refuses passports to citizens it does not like.

It blocks the free exchange of ideas by denying visas to eminent European scientists and writers who have been invited by American citizens to attend professional conferences here.

It has repudiated the scientist who led the world in the construction of the atom bomb because he is not a standardized man.

It maintains an organization of investigators who collect, among other items, facts concerning the newspaper reading habits of citizens and the mail that goes into their homes.

It employs political informers.

It blackmails citizens into informing on each other.

It summons citizens before Government committees to answer for their personal ideas, associations, friends and their relatives.

Government committees presume to give absolution to citizens who confess their political sins and promise not to violate the committees' party line in the future.

The Government has permitted a Senator to set himself up as public prosecutor.

It has accused the national foundations of underwriting revolution, threatened them with tax reprisals and denied them equal rights to defend themselves.

It sacks or rusticates foreign service officers who do not parrot the party line at home.

It tries to consolidate itself in power by denouncing its predecessors in office as traitors.

I wonder if Americans really want it this way.

Brooks ATKINSON.

Should the UAW Have Yielded to the Company's Ultimatum?

Discussion: The Studebaker Wage-Cut

By BEN HALL

In South Bend, at the main plant of the Studebaker Corporation, workers have yielded to company demands for wage cuts. It is an ominous sign for the whole labor movement, for the 10,000 unionists here are represented not by some weak and insignificant organization but by the United Auto Workers (CIO), one of the most powerful in the country.

If these men in this union are forced to retreat, what about the rest of organized labor?

Alarming questions like this are bound to press upon all unionists, especially those in other plants organized by the UAW. This writer would like to present his views on what was at stake in the Studebaker crisis.

The position of all the so-called independent auto manufacturers has become critical in the last year. The Big Three (Ford, General Motors, and Chrysler) have been wolfing an ever-increasing proportion of the auto market, leaving the smaller companies to fight over a remaining two or three per cent.

Pressed to the wall, the independents tried to hold their own by merger: Kaiser merged with Willys; Hudson merged with Nash; and Studebaker is merging with Packard. Each combination tries to hold on by organizing and reorganizing, by cost-cutting and plant concentration.

Studebaker sales have dropped from 124,000 in the first seven months of 1953 to 49,600 in the same period in 1954. The company claims

to be selling its cars at a loss, reporting a net loss of \$8,925,800 in the first six months of 1954.

Wage rates at the Studebaker plant where piecework prevailed were substantially higher than in the Big Three. The challenge was made when the company demanded:

(1) Abolition of piecework and its replacement by hourly rates equivalent to those paid by the Big Three. This meant wage decreases of perhaps 15 per cent.

(2) Reduction of holiday pay, wash-up time and rest periods to similar levels.

(3) Reduction of night-shift premium pay on the same basis.

WITHOUT A FIGHT

The negotiating committee and leadership of UAW Local 5 accepted these demands but a local membership meeting voted by a large majority to reject them. Studebaker then issued an ultimatum: it announced cancellation of its contract with the UAW and abandonment of its plant in South Bend. At a second membership meeting, hurriedly convened to consider the new threat, the membership reversed its position and conceded to the company.

Bluntly put, the union retreated without a fight.

But that fact alone is not enough to condemn it. Not every battle can be won, and even some that can be won should be avoided when the risks or costs of the fight are too high.

In this case, the workers were faced by an out-and-out lock-out threat and had to decide whether or not to begin a

drawn-out counter-strike. And this decision had to take into account some very unfavorable facts.

According to Louis Horvath, president of Local 5, the company work force had declined from 23,000 to 10,000 in a year. The average work week declined to 20 hours and since February averaged 2 days a week, with a take-home pay of about \$35. Over 9,800 workers had already exhausted all unemployment benefits. Unemployment in South Bend was high and rising. "Some of our people are losing what they've bought on the installment plan . . . there's foreclosing on homes, repossession of cars," reported Horvath.

Under such conditions, the local had to decide whether to begin a fight to maintain its wage levels considerably above that of the industry as a whole. (It was not a question, it should be noted, of undercutting the basic wage levels.)

Whatever the causes, the fact that this important section of organized labor felt compelled to accept a wage cut can only cause disappointment and concern to all unions.

OPEN THE BOOKS!

But in our opinion, the question of whether the wage cut was or was not accepted is not as important as another question, namely: How did the union and its leaders analyze the company demands and how did they explain their own actions?

When the workers were in a weakened position, Studebaker pointed a loaded pistol and said: "Accept or else." A union leadership which lives in the foggy land of capitalist make-believe might thereupon tell wonderful tales of labor-management cooperation. It might talk of labor's duty to see that management made a profit; it might murmur of labor's responsibility to maintain the competitive position of the company. In sum, it could swallow all the pap shoveled out in abundance by company apologists.

All this would be worse than the wage cut. It would disorient the membership and teach them to allow their employers to solve the problems of the capitalists at the expense of the workers. We note in this connection that Paul Hoffman, Studebaker chairman, was an invited guest at the recent UAW Educational Conference, where he was introduced as an enlightened and responsible employer. This is the UAW's reward.

On the other hand, a different leadership might say: The company wants a show-down because we are now at a disadvantage. But we do not think a knock-down fight is now advisable. We will capitulate to these selfish, grasping demands of profit-seeking bosses who want to push our wage levels down to keep their own income up. But we will expose them and their motives to the world. We demand "Open Your Books" so that we can see if they are lying. And we will bide our time. When we are stronger and better situated we will strike back.

WHAT OF THE FUTURE?

Whether it was right or wrong in its estimate of the balance of forces, such a leadership would be fulfilling its responsibilities to the worker by explaining the present and preparing for the future. And it would point the way to men in other shops and other industries who might be better able to resist a big push by employers.

How the UAW leadership, local and international, reacted to the Studebaker crisis, we do not yet know.

It might be argued that Studebaker has succeeded in establishing a precedent for wage-cutting to be followed by others; that it would have been better in this case to fight and lose than not to fight at all; that the company might tear down the local but the UAW was strong enough to tear down the company; that in any case, a bitter-end fight would warn other employers against attempting the same.

Undoubtedly other companies will try to take advantage of the Studebaker settlement. But the union is not compelled to choose the least favorable point to make a stand; it should and can choose the best.

We note that the UAW maintains a strike after 100 days against the Kohler Company of Sheboygan, Wisconsin, demanding that the company meet the wage standards of the auto industry.

"... there is no illusion in auto management circles," reports *Business Week*, "that the union is ready to lower wage scales generally."

NO LIES

From an opposite point of view it could be argued that the company is, after all, losing money, and "we must cooperate to keep it in business to save our jobs."

But we have no way of knowing whether the company is lying or not. If it is losing money, why? There is no proof that high wages is the cause; there is no proof that lower wages is the cure. By its own estimates, according to *Business Week*, Studebaker counts on reductions of only \$60-\$75 per car. Will that solve Studebaker's crisis? can it offset the big automation plants of the Big Three? can it overcome the problem of trade-in?

The UAW cries to all the heavens that the way to avoid depression is to maintain and increase purchasing power. One thing is certain: an employers' wage-cutting spree is guaranteed to magnify the current recession.

In this case, the union may have been compelled to accept Studebaker's demands. But it is not compelled to accept, to endorse, or to peddle the sanctimonious lies of the company.

Reston Points to Gov't Lies on Spies

The government has been accused of filling the press with lies by no less an authority than the N. Y. *Times'* leading Washington correspondent, James Reston.

Moreover, these government-sponsored lies of which he speaks are those which are printed when "our agents [U. S. spies] are captured and our planes shot down from time to time in circumstances that cannot be put into the press without great benefit to the Communist cause."

Coming so soon after the Chinese plane-shooting incident, it is quite certain that the words apply to it too, as well as to previous events.

Following the above words, where Reston points out that the government obviously cannot tell the truth about the affair, he adds:

"There is a growing tendency here [Washington], however, to expect the press to go beyond this: not only to leave things out of the papers but to put things in which may be advantageous to some particular agency but which are not true."

The "particular agency" under discussion in the whole of this column by Reston (Aug. 15), is the Central Intelligence Agency, which directs U. S. espionage operations abroad.

In *LA* for August 9, we also quoted a Chicago *Daily News* editorial on the Chinese plane-shooting which indicated that the editors of that conservative paper also believed that the U. S. was engaged in espionage in that affair.

RASTVOROV A DUD

This same column by Reston has some other interesting features. It is primarily on the trotting-out ("surfacing") of the Russian spy Rastvorov who went over to the U. S. camp recently. Reston ridicules unmercifully the State Department denial that Rastvorov was exhibited at a press conference in Washington in order to counteract the effect of the Otto John press conference in Berlin. He also makes abundantly clear that the Rastvorov conference was a farce, and that "if Washington and Moscow are to go on throwing defectors at each other, the art of 'surfacing' in Washington has clearly got to be improved."

Of course, the trouble in Washington did not lie in weakness in this "art." Rastvorov just had nothing to say of any political interest. He simply told reporters that he had switched sides in order to live a "decent life," and gave biographical details of Moscow persecution of relatives.

The striking difference between the Rastvorov and John "surfacing" was that the Rastvorov dud was so unpolitical. And in this one sees all over again one of the big differences between the two rival war camps, and why the Stalinist totalitarianism is winning the cold war.

ANOTHER VIEW ON STUDEBAKER:

The UAW Is Making a Mistake

A letter received from a Midwest trade-unionist argues vigorously against the acceptance of the Studebaker wage-cut. Following are some passages from his letter bearing on the case—Ed.

To the Editor:

... A big point is made of the contention that Studebaker wages had to be cut down to the Big Three level so that it could remain competitive. But why must contracts like that in GM be the model? Instead of giving up the 10 per cent night bonus, Local 5 should insist that the UAW fight to extend it in the new 155 contracts. The same goes for triple time for holidays. The GM contract needs substantial improvement. In many respects it is far inferior to the provisions prevailing in smaller companies. Why should locals give up gains just because they have not yet been achieved in Ford or GM?

With the nation-wide publicity given to the Studebaker affair, the UAW will face serious trouble. A rush will begin among all employers who have given more to the union than the Big Three, demanding that the working conditions in their plants be cut down. . . .

As far as present information goes, the international office of the UAW adopted a strict hands-off policy in the Studebaker case. It seemed to take the position that everything was up to the Local 5 leadership and membership. But the decision at Studebaker was one of the most important before the whole UAW.

If a wage cut can be granted after such a demand from Studebaker, then who is next? In South Bend, a UAW farm-implement shop, the Oliver Corporation, is in much worse shape than Studebaker. Will it sit idly or will it too demand the same concessions? Are they too entitled to eliminate clauses from their contracts which are superior to GM? . . .

How will this affect the competitive-shops' department of the UAW which chases after run-away shops? How many times will the Studebaker case arise to plague union organizing teams? . . .

The UAW must face the issue. It was rough sledding when Briggs merged with

Chrysler, Hudson is moving out of Detroit. Packard is quitting its assembly plant. Ford is decentralizing. Kaiser is out of Michigan. The marginal company is a problem that the UAW cannot run away from. If Studebaker is doomed, it would be idiotic to abandon wage increases and contract clauses won in the past.

FOOLISH CONCESSION

Production piecework standards at Studebaker brought wage rates 15 per cent higher than in the Big Three. Piecework has become expensive for some companies. GM and Ford, with their carefully measured rates of production, get as much per hour out of their workers as Studebaker, and at lower wages. In Studebaker, as in many other piecework plants, the semi-skilled worker could make as much or more than the skilled. And the unskilled, because of a special pooling system, got as much as 25 cents per hour more than in the Big Three. There can be no doubt that conversion to day work, at present production standards and Big Three wages, is a wage cut pure and simple. . . .

What has happened to the '46 fight for "Wage Increases without Price Increases"? One of the big arguments in the 1946 GM strike was that wages could be increased without price increases. Wages, it was pointed out, were not decisive in the total price picture. Now, if Studebaker's argument that it will be forced out of business by high wages is accepted, what becomes of the union's stand? Wouldn't this be a foolish concession to capitalist propaganda which blames everything on high wages? . . .

But will wage cuts really keep Studebaker in business? It seems that the bargaining committee accepted what should have been challenged. It should have demanded: "Open the Books." An open and impartial audit would show that the wage figure when related to the number of cars produced was not the critical factor. A basic number of cars must be sold to break even. That is Studebaker's problem: a drop in sales from 49,600 for the first 7 months of 1954 compared to 124,300 in 1953 is the key, and wage cuts will not solve it. . . . K. H.

Eisenhower Farm Plan Suits The Big Business Farmers Fine

By SAM TAYLOR

In an election year the rush of legislation in the closing days of Congress is passed with both eyes on the November election. The administration goes heavy on the whip to push through "vital" legislation, and the opposition party comes down where it believes it can argue with most effectiveness in that period of mid-autumn madness. Congressmen who sat through two years of more or less amiable agreement suddenly discover with the falling of the leaves that they have differences, almost irreconcilable ones. The easygoing backslapping, "I'll scratch your back if you will scratch mine," is put aside till the second week in November.

The present wrangle over the passage of the Eisenhower farm program takes place in such a pre-election atmosphere. The impression is almost conveyed that a fundamentally new farm bill is in the process of enactment. Nevertheless it does show many of the class tendencies at work in an important area of American capitalism.

The economy at present is going through a period of a shakedown of the weak, small and marginal producers. A marked trend has developed toward the merger and consolidation of many of the largest producers in areas of the economy which have been bearing the brunt of the present recession. In automobile, all of the independents have had at least one merger in the past year or so and more are in prospect; also in textiles, coal and even in the steel industry.

SHAKEDOWN

In agriculture, this shakedown of the small producer has to a large extent been held back by the existing laws providing for high parity prices on the major crops and dairy products. One of the most important drives behind the push for the flexible farm-parity program of the Eisenhower administration is to accomplish this long-desired thinning out of the ranks of producers of these major crops, now covered by the parity program—cotton, corn, wheat, peanuts, rice, tobacco and dairy products.

The hue and cry for flexible price-supports revolves around the presence of the tremendous "surpluses" of agricultural goods that have accumulated in the years since the end of the Second World War. At the present time, it is estimated that the government has something over \$6 billion worth of these "surpluses," and with the end of the harvest season at hand the amount will go even higher.

What to do about these "surpluses" has been one of the trickiest problems for American capitalism, especially since there is no end in sight, and it is incapable of utilizing the great productive capacities of the American economy for the benefit of the people throughout the world—or for the full extent of the needs of the American people.

The high-parity support for farm

products was started during the Second World War as an effort to stimulate production. It guaranteed that the federal government would buy everything that could not be sold above 90 per cent of parity. This had the effect of bringing into production all kinds of marginal producers as well as land which had never been used to farm the "basic" crops. And it was largely successful.

After the war, the program was used as a means of maintaining farm prices. The government would buy large portions of the output of these "basic" crops to keep them off the market, and when prices fell below parity, the government was also obligated to buy. In this way, \$6 billion of farm "surpluses" accumulated.

The flexible-support program being pushed by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson is put forward with the claim that it will be able to cut down these "surpluses." That is, by lowering or raising the support price, it will be able to cut down these "surpluses." That is, by lowering or raising the support price, it will be able to raise or lower production. This idea has been attacked by the opponents of the Benson plan for the nonsense it is, but not on the way, the plan is really supposed to work.

PRICE ARGUMENT

It has been pointed out that there is no reason to suppose that a drop in support prices, down to the 82.5 per cent of parity as written into the new law, will have any significant effect on production. The farmers will do as they have always done—increase production in the attempt to compensate for lower income. This has been the experience with the acreage-control program; the cut in acreage resulted in more intensive farming on the remaining acres.

Nor can much of an argument be made that flexible supports will lower food prices to the consumer and therefore increase consumption of food. Slight reduction in food prices will not necessarily mean that the lower-income groups will buy more food, since the greatest part of their income is already spent for food and the preference is to buy other things. But in addition the argument falls even flatter on its face because a decrease in agricultural prices paid to the farmer does not necessarily mean a decrease in food prices paid by the consumer.

The report of the House Agriculture Committee headed by Rep. Clifford Hope of Kansas, an opponent of the Benson plan, demonstrated this. The prices received by farmers have dropped 20 per cent since 1951, while retail food prices remained at the peak high of 1952. In 1948 the price of a bushel of wheat was \$2.81 and the average price of a one-pound loaf of bread 13.8 cents. Today wheat is \$1.91 a bushel and bread 17 cents; the price of wheat has declined 32 per cent while the price of bread has increased 23 per cent.

It seems clear that the food processors and the middle men in the distribution have not lowered their prices as their costs have dropped. This is one area that has always been threatened with a real congressional investigation but the investigation never seemed to get to the bottom of the problem.

SECTIONAL ANGLE

However, these arguments for the Benson plan are not the real basis for its existence. The Benson plan aims at reducing the agricultural "surplus" not in the expectation that at lower prices farmers will produce less, but that lower prices will drive some producers of the "basic" crops either out of business or into producing other crops. If they go into other crops, the likelihood is that the "surpluses" would soon be accumulated again, and the problem would be back where it started.

This fact behind the Benson plan is seen in a place like Kansas. In a New York Times article on July 11 surveying how farmers feel about the Benson plan, it is reported that "In Eastern Kansas, a diversified area [of farming], high support prices are more popular. In Western Kansas, with wheat as the main crop, sentiment tends toward lowering supports so marginal wheat farmers in the East will be pushed into raising other crops."

The Salina (Kansas) Journal is quoted, "Another evil of the present plan is that it encourages farmers to grow

wheat in the farms of the South and East, where wheat production isn't economical. So Kansas Wheat Belt farmers are penalized the more."

The effect of this Benson plan would not necessarily be to drive out South and East producers, but marginal producers everywhere. This is why it is a struggle not only of sectional interests but also of the big versus the smaller farmer. And the large farms in this country are often run by large corporations, "factories in the field," which are little different from industrial capitalist enterprises. It is little wonder that the American Farm Bureau Federation, the spokesman of the large agricultural interests, is hot for the flexible program.

THE FORCES BEHIND

The bill incorporating a flexible price range of 82.5 to 90 per cent of parity is only a compromise. The Benson-Farm Bureau proposals were for a 75 to 90 per cent range, which would have gone much further toward driving out the small producer. It is as Rep. Hope of Eastern Kansas said, the bill "could be better and it could be worse."

It is not that the large agricultural capitalists are opposed to receiving high parity prices for their wheat, corn or cotton, but they realize that the present farm program which is building up the gigantic "surpluses" is one that is untenable and unjustifiable. They look forward to retrenchment in agriculture at a lower level of production, and while they might have to lower production as they now do under the acreage-control laws, if they can drive out the marginal producers then they will be able eventually to have a larger part of the total production.

The other major support for the Benson plan has come from the Republican-controlled big-city newspapers and business magazines, that is, the industrial capitalists. They have been interested in cutting down the high parity prices because it offers a means of cutting federal government expenditures for the purchase of farm "surpluses," and it offers the hope of lower food prices (at least so they hope) some time in the near future. The concern is over wage negotiations with the unions which have been tied to the cost-of-living index in recent years.

The Eisenhower administration for its part has to tread lightly in the carrying out of this new farm program. It has to be careful lest too sharp a drop in parity prices cause a precipitous drop in farm income and have disastrous consequences

Ike Fakes a Report — —

(Continued from page 1)

May and June looked definitely better than the previous three months when the index had been falling steadily.

The trouble, for the president and a lot of workers, is that second-quarter figures are already outdated.

In the first two weeks of July the index lost everything it had gained in June. It steadied during the last three weeks at about the April level, and in the first week of August it dropped again to just about where it had been at the end of March.

This is not the only significant index of business activity, of course. But it is a fairly representative one. If it remains low for another week or two, it will mean that the third quarter, instead of being better than the second, will be worse—hardly what Eisenhower hopes for.

In this attempt to review the economic arguments the Republicans plan to use in the fall elections, the president said that "the standards that our generation apply to the performance of an economic system are very different from those that our fathers applied and even different from those that we ourselves applied only a few years ago. It is a good thing that our standards are higher. Great economic and social achievements will not be made unless we are sensitive to the need for making them."

In other words, the Republican election argument will run: It is true that things are not as good as they were at the top of the boom. Unemployment has remained steady at the three and a half million mark; the small manufacturers are having a tough time of it, and the

Who's Getting It?

The latest figures on the cost of living issued by the Department of Labor show that between May and June of this year food prices led the way in boosting the cost of living by a tenth per cent. It was the third consecutive month that food prices had advanced. At the same time the farmer was getting less for his products, his cash receipts dropping from \$258 million in May to \$248 million in June.

The same picture is presented by a special-staff study made for the House Agricultural Committee. According to this, retail food prices have gone up about 1 per cent since 1951, even though prices the farmer receives dropped 18.8 per cent. Increased marketing and processing costs were blamed.

"Thus far," said the report, "almost none of the lower prices received by farmers since 1951 has been passed on to consumers in the form of lower retail food prices."

"Consumers can expect little benefit, however, from these lower farm prices unless recent tendencies to increase marketing and processing charges are curbed."

The city housewife, said the report, is "paying the highest prices on record for bakery products and cereals, yet farm prices for wheat products are down to 1949 levels again."

While net income for the farmer goes down, profits for the food processor and chain store are standing up handsomely. Thus, while the farmer's share of the food dollar has dropped ten cents during the past nine years, the net income of leading corporations processing agricultural products has stood up well and even increased between 1952 and 1953. Since 1951 farm proprietors' income has dropped over \$3 billion or 20 per cent.

Yet, while lots of people would like to know just where the difference is going to, Congress last year killed an appropriation for such a study, and even went so far as to forbid the Federal Trade Commission from continuing it.

in the rest of the economy. Therefore it has written into the bill a gradual drop in parity prices as well as other means of easing the immediate effects.

The passage of the farm bill appears certain. It is not a victory for the Eisenhower administration but merely the opening of the door to the conservative "solution" to the farm problem. If they wanted to go further in this direction at this time, then the president could veto this present bill, and then let the flexible price supports program automatically revert to the 75 to 90 per cent range on January 1, 1955, as the old law provides. But this is an election year and they do not want to alienate too many small farmers at this time. Next year they will push for a little more.

weak ones are going to the wall. But then, remember that things under capitalism have hardly ever been better than they were during the height of the last boom. For long stretches we have had more unemployment than we have now. So count your blessings, even in this recession, and re-elect us to power.

If the Republicans wanted to be really vicious they could add another gambit to that one.

They could point out that the labor and liberal Democrats always described the era of F. D. Roosevelt as the golden age of American enlightened pro-labor government. But at no time during Roosevelt's first two terms did unemployment reach anything less than double the present volume, and at that time there were about twenty million fewer people in the country than there are now!

Of course, the Democrats would yell that such a comparison is unfair, because during Roosevelt's first two terms the military budget was infinitely smaller than it is now, and anyway he inherited the depression from Hoover.

They would both be right in making campaign speeches along such lines.

All they would be proving, in reality, is what socialists have been saying for a long time: under present-day capitalism no way has been found to maintain full employment without an enormous military establishment. Even with it, the job is not an easy one, as Eisenhower is finding out. But this is a horrible indictment of a type of social organization; it can keep its population productive only when it is preparing to blow them or others to bits.

'90% COMMUNIST'

The course of the debate over the Eisenhower farm bill became so involved at one point that it must have become difficult to tell the players apart without a scorecard.

Senator Young of North Dakota, an opponent of flexible parity prices, called attention to a "new publication" called "The Low-Down on Farm Affairs in Washington," which he said he had "reason to believe" was sponsored by an officer of the American Farm Bureau Federation, a supporter of flexible prices.

"To show you how low some people will stoop," he said, "let me point out that this publication associates" several members of Congress "with the Communist movement, just because we are in favor of 90 per cent supports."

The next day on the floor of the Senate, Joe McCarthy got up to announce that he was for flexible supports but between 90 and 100 per cent of parity.

It seems like a clear case of McCarthy getting the "Indian Charlie" treatment.

LONDON LETTER **What's Wrong with the Left?**

Bevanites Are Cooing over Eden and Mendes-France

By ALLAN VAUGHAN

LONDON, Aug. 11—Labor's left wing is certainly heading for some heavy weather. Just at the time when clarity on fundamental matters is required, the leading representatives of the party's left wing are obscuring the problems facing the movement.

There is not a single sentence in the long and involved editorials written by the Bevanite *Tribune*, for instance, on the Geneva Conference which could be supported by a left-winger with an ounce of socialism in him. Instead of a careful, methodical analysis of the real reasons for the relative "success" of the Geneva Conference, we are treated to a tribute to all the "great statesmen" who made possible the carve-up of Indochina by their tact, desire for compromise and diplomatic skill—i.e., Anthony Eden, Mendès-France, Molotov and Chou En-lai.

And this is written by the best (!) of the *Tribune* crowd—Michael Foot.

The "peaceful coexistence" theory has now established for itself firm roots, not only among the sober European bourgeoisie (which is perfectly understandable) but also among the leading representatives of the Labor Party's left wing.

In this atmosphere the Stalinists are certain to make headway, that is, with their newly varnished Popular Front or National Front ideology. The CP proper may not grow itself, but its influence over important sections and fields of left Labor thinking will be considerably augmented.

It is obvious that *Tribune* wants Aneurin Bevan to be Labor's next prime minister, but judging from the eulogies of Anthony Eden in *Tribune*, there seems

to be no opposition to Eden as Labor's next foreign secretary!

Tribune is quite happy with Mendès-France, as if he were a French Bevanite. The fact that the only obvious candidate for the role of a new conservative Bonaparte (senile or only semi-senile), Marshal Juin, is giving his support to Mendès-France does not trouble *Tribune*, not even Fenner Brockway (who ought to know better).

Nehru is another *Tribune* god. And as far as the United States is concerned, the candidate they would like to see in the presidency of the most powerful country in the world is . . . Adlai Stevenson or Walter Lippman (the latter a favorite of Michael Foot's). As far as China is concerned, there is nothing wrong with Chou En-lai or Mao Tse-tung. Or if there is, it has never seen the light of day in the columns of the *Tribune*.

That is the truth about the political "rearmament" of the Labor Party that is going on at the present day. Frankly, it has little if anything to offer as an alternative to the policies of the right wing.

As far as socialism is connected with the *Tribune* policies, its connection is largely limited to the undoubted militancy, the undoubted desire for a socialist path that exists among large sections of the rank and file of the party and trade unions.

No greater disservice could possibly be rendered to the left wing of the party at this stage than to underestimate the cleavage that is ever-widening between socialism as based on the principles of the class struggle and the apology for socialism that is now being made available in large doses through *Tribune* and *Forward*.

But this is no immediate cause for despondency. Socialists may at the best be swimming with a left current against some very dangerous cross-currents (anti-German chauvinism, Popular Frontism, etc.). At the very worst, they will be swimming against the stream for a whole period. However, so long as the democratic structure of the movement is preserved during this period, there is every chance that a genuine socialist tendency will arise which will not only bring down the policies of Transport House but also dispel the unsocialist ideas peddled by the Bevanite leaders.

SPANISH LABOR TELLS AMERICA: 'We Won't Defend Any Nation That Allies Itself with Franco'

By RODOLFO LLOPIS
General Secretary of the Spanish
Socialist Party (in Exile)

It is several months since the president of the democratic United States of America and the Spanish dictator signed a military and economic pact after more than two years of negotiations between the two countries. Franco ceded certain parts of Spanish territory in exchange for a certain amount of dollars. The United States accepted as its ally a dictator who has been keeping the Spanish people in slavery for the last fifteen years.

All in the name of the defense of freedom!

The Spanish-American agreements followed close upon the heels of the concordat between Spain and the Holy See. While the concordat secured Spain's spiritual subjection, her pact with the United States brought about her military and economic enslavement. Franco has rendered Spain a province of the Vatican as well as an American colony. . . .

"A" IS FOR SPAIN

The determining factor in the provision of economic aid [to Spain] will be American, rather than Spanish, interests. When the text of the agreements was published even the Franco press was worried about the conditions imposed upon Spain and the prerogatives granted to the United States.

The latter will have the right to control Spanish trade with states "which threaten peace." Furthermore, within an agreed period of time, Franco will be obliged to sell certain goods required by the U. S. A. because of shortages or for the purpose of increasing stocks in America, under "reasonable conditions of sale, exchange or compensation." (It will be a question of iron ore and mercury in particular.) Franco has also undertaken to import "goods, materials and equipment" from America duty-free, and American investments and expenditure in Spain—for common defense purposes—will be exempt from taxation.

The clauses of the military agreement are rather obscure. But it is certain that the American government, in conjunction with the Spanish regime, may use, maintain and extend certain bases on Spanish soil for military purposes.

There is no indication of the number or location of these bases, but one day we shall surely be told that the ports of El Ferrol, Cadiz, Carthage and Mahon, as well as the airfields of Seville, Madrid, Albacete and Barcelona belong to them. We may then also be officially informed that Franco has promised seven fully equipped divisions. One day, no doubt, we shall also learn that certain strategic areas have been handed over to the U. S. for use in atomic warfare.

What France, Britain, Denmark and Norway refused to do, Franco Spain has undertaken for a handful of dollars. Thus the first blows from a possible aggressor will fall upon Spain. For any aggressor will choose the strategic points from where atomic bombs might be launched against him as the first target of attack.

DEFENDER OF 'FREEDOM'

The significance of the Spanish-American agreements, both for Spain and for the world, is clear. It proves America's distrust of the possibility of defending the countries between the Elbe and the Pyrenees, and it is therefore bound to have an adverse effect on the future soldiers of these countries.

A recent statement by the Spanish Foreign Minister Artajo in the Cortes threw light on the entire situation. This is what he said:

"Our alliance with the U. S. A. serves yet another aim—the defense of Europe and of world peace. Spain now takes her place in the European defense lines. And she will not be guilty of the widespread indifference toward the enslaved countries in which the Catholic Church is so cruelly suppressed. Spain demands the liberation of these countries, of the peoples who are suffering under an intolerable tyranny."

A man who is guilty of oppressing his own people yet parades in this way as the defender of oppressed nations must be an out-and-out cynic. But the political importance of Artajo's appeal for a crusade should not be underestimated. . . .

And the Spanish people—what of

them? They have not been consulted, and they have no voice. But I am sure that they reject with indignation the shameful deals into which the dictatorship has entered. When negotiations for the pact began, my Spanish comrades—Socialists and trade unionists—wrote a letter to President Truman which was handed to the American ambassador in Madrid and which said:

"The American government is mistaken if it believes that Spain can assist Western defense so long as her people are enslaved by Franco.

"We remind it that General Eisenhower himself, only a few days ago, stressed that peoples will only fight in defense of their freedom or social advance.

"Do you really believe that the Spanish people will fight under Franco, knowing that all they can expect is a continuation of poverty and oppression?"

"The Spanish workers would fight with enthusiasm alongside of the democracies if they were allowed to live as a free nation.

"As long as Franco remains in power we shall not defend any democratic country which allies itself with his totalitarian regime."

NO HOPE IN AMERICA

We have no doubt that the 226 million dollars, promised as the first instalment under the Spanish-American agreements, will arrive in due course and that further instalments will follow.

But what real difference will this make to the desperate economic position of Spain, the result of inability and corruption? Of the 226 million dollars, 141 are earmarked for military purposes, but the remaining 85 million, which are provided under the "mutual aid" arrangement, will, in fact, also serve the same ends.

Factories will be built and workers will find employment in the production of war material. But huge profits will accrue to a vast army of unscrupulous traders, entrepreneurs and middlemen. The Cortes, significantly, rejected a recent bill demanding that "unlawfully acquired fortunes" should be closely investigated.

Many people are trying to comfort themselves with the hope that the Americans will exert pressure on Franco to induce him to modify his regime. This is nothing but self-deception. Franco knows that for him to allow freedom in Spain would mean to commit suicide. Moreover, he has no reason to think that he must change his regime in order to obtain concessions from the Americans. Furthermore, the Americans are usually reluctant to intervene in other countries' internal affairs—except, of course, when they want to help such people as Chiang Kai-shek or Syngman Rhee.

Despite America's fatal attitude toward Franco, despite the acquiescence of so many other democratic countries in the American deal with Franco, we shall continue to fight against his dictatorship and for the Spanish people's liberation. All groups of the Spanish emigrants have signed a joint declaration to the effect that they consider the agreements concluded with the dictator null and void—and we are sure that one day this will be confirmed by the entire Spanish nation.

Hoodlumism on Both Sides in N. Y. C.

New York City is seeing a routine police roundup campaign turning typically into a mass violation of constitutional rights.

Recently city Police Commissioner Adams has been campaigning for more police. Dramatizing this campaign the police started mass arrests of so-called "undesirables" and hoodlums—usually young boys and teen-agers.

At the beginning it is likely that some genuine hoodlum elements were taken in, but these soon made themselves scarce. The continuing roundups simply swept some streets of floaters, bootblacks, alco-

holics, etc., without any meaningful results whatsoever.

The New York Civil Liberties Union, however, has protested against the "dragnet" tactics of the police as "a violation of the constitutional rights of citizens." The protest was contained in a letter to the Police Department.

"While we wholeheartedly support the department's aim of curbing and preventing crime, and the arrest of persons against whom a crime can be substantiated," the letter stated, "we deplore the use of procedures which weaken the fundamental principles upon which our government is based.

"The arrest of persons because they may commit a crime at some future time, or of those who have already paid their debt to society because of a past offense, is completely alien to our free society," the letter continued. "There can be no question but that such high-handed methods violate the due process provisions of the United States Constitution."

The letter pointed to the police roundup prior to the elections in 1950 in which 704 persons were taken into custody between October 24 and November 4 in an effort to rid the city streets of "hoodlums" by election day. "Most of the 145 persons who pleaded guilty reportedly were alcoholics," the letter continued. "Of the others—who elected to fight by pleading innocent to any offense and standing trial—only three were convicted. All were placed in jeopardy by arrest, by the requirement of furnishing bail or spending time in jail, and were put to the needless expense of obtaining a lawyer to defend them," the letter concluded.



LABOR ACTION

August 23, 1954 Vol. 18, No. 34

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

World History—Year by Year

The bound volumes of LABOR ACTION

are an invaluable record of the social and political issues of our day, and a socialist education in themselves. Completely indexed from 1949 on.

1950-52.....\$3 per vol.

Bound volumes of LA are also available back to, and including, 1942, at somewhat higher prices depending on the year. Prices on request. A complete set of bound volumes for the 11 years from 1942 to 1952 is available for \$40.

Independent Socialist Press
114 West 14 Street, New York City

AFL Foreign Policy Statement Illustrates Labor's Dilemma

By EDWARD HILL

The current issue of *U.S. News & World Report* contains a long direct quote from a statement of the AFL Executive Committee on world politics. It is an extremely interesting document from the point of view of revealing the contradictory elements involved in the politics of American labor: support of American imperialism, coupled with concern for the rights of labor which should logically place the labor statesmen in opposition to that imperialism.

The committee begins with a rejection of coexistence and of preventive war.

"The Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor rejects the notion that the free world must choose between 'coexistence'—the policy of successive or massive appeasement of the Soviet aggressors—and a policy of waging a preventive war against the Moscow-Peking axis. We sincerely want peace with freedom. We, therefore, reject both of these policies. The policy of 'coexistence' can lead only to another world war—under conditions in which the democracies would, morally, materially and militarily be far less able to resist, let alone defeat, the Communist enemy."

So far, all well and good. The AFL position, in rejecting neutralist notions of existence, is somewhat more sound than their European counterparts who, whether from Stalinoid illusions or an emotional reaction of a justifiable anti-Americanism, chase the will-of-the-whisp of coexistence as a solution to the crisis of our time. Indeed, the AFL statement goes on to draw a conclusion from this which, in the abstract, might even sound like a call for a democratic foreign policy.

They hold that "Instead of helping the Communist dictatorship to overcome the serious economic and political difficulties now besetting the Soviet orbit, instead of providing these totalitarian aggressors with the commodities and credit they need for strengthening and streamlining their already powerful and dangerous war machines, let the democracies propose a positive program to aid freedom and peace through building up their own unity and ever-greater strength."

HODGE-PODGE

But when the Executive Council begins to spell out what it means by a "positive program to aid freedom and peace," any idea that this is a call for a democratic foreign policy vanishes. What emerges is a strangely compounded hodge-podge of support for American imperialism at times even tougher than that urged by moderate conservatives, an occasional progressive demand, and a general tone of the old Acheson "negotiate from positions of strength" argument.

The first AFL recommendation is "Complete rearmament—military, economic, political and social..." What is meant by military rearmament is clear enough. It is support of the same kind of policy that has been in effect for over five years: an emphasis on military coercion against the military and political threat of Stalinism. What is meant by "economic, political and social" rearmament is somewhat more complicated.

For example, the AFL calls for "Setting a definite time limit for granting independence to the colonial and semi-colonial peoples, as the U.S. did in the Philippine Islands." If we grant that such a step on the part of America's allies could not take place within the context of their present relationship, a relationship which the AFL does not denounce, this point is still a good one. It is typical of the kind of points which American labor continually raises: a progressive demand, but within the context of support for an over-all reactionary policy which makes the actual carrying out of that demand impossible.

A similar point is made when the Executive Council calls for "UN-supervised democratic elections in all areas of con-

flict (Germany, Korea, China, Indo-China)..." Unfortunately, one of the few things the "free world" has been unanimous on lately is to postpone the elections in Indo-China as much as possible—because French "democracy" admits that it can't win such an election. The AFL demand is good in itself, abstractly considered, but the politics of American imperialism are not abstract. Labor's continual refusal to break with that over-all imperialism reduces these occasional progressive demands to the status of contradictions.

BRIDE OF IMPERIALISM

That American labor—or at least the AFL Council—is wedded to American imperialism is made abundantly clear in other proposals which are made. Thus we have this plank:

"Rigid and permanent opposition to admitting into UN membership the Mao Tse-tung regime or any other government which (a) has been imposed on a nation by a foreign power; (b) which exercises effective control of the country by denying its people the human rights specified in the UN Charter; and (c) which is engaged in, or has been guilty of, aggression against the UN."

One could suggest to the AFL that it take a brief survey of the "free" world, or for that matter the entire membership of the UN, on the basis of these criteria. Under (a) one could include Greece, under (b) dozens of countries, and under (c) the United States of America for its role in the Guatemala aggression.

For the AFL, this is, of course, beside the point. The American liberal and labor movement is forced into these euphemisms for imperialism because they do not have a criticism against the major basis of American foreign policy: the defense of the interests of American

(Turn to last page)

Army Announces There'll Be 'Less Democracy' in It Now

By MICHAEL HARRINGTON

A revealing admission of trends within the United States army—and the cause for them—has just been made by the special panel of the army's organization and training division.

The conclusion: More toughness, "less" democracy, and the candid statement that American youth have no stomach for service.

This is how the army officers summarized the situation: "We're going to have to tell the people who come into the army that they aren't coming in for a feather bed. We aren't going to call them 'boy' and lead them around by the hand. They've got to learn to be men."

In connection with this attitude, there was a re-evaluation of the army attitude on the non-firer. The non-firer is the combat soldier who does not shoot even when he is being shot at.

Previous studies by Brigadier General S. L. A. Marshall had determined that over half of the American troops in World War II fell into this category. Marshall had proposed an indoctrination system based on the proposition that ethical reluctance to killing must be broken down by making officers "father figures," by promoting the notion of "group ethics," and by turning the soldiers into a mob.

RUSSIAN PARALLEL

The new report comments on this attitude: "There has been a lot of talk about failure to fire. You assumed that this failure to fire was the end result of an American soldier's unwillingness to kill, which had been taught to him from childhood. Did you ever think that this failure to fire may result from his abhorrence of getting killed by sticking his head up?"

I have no intention of intervening in this dispute between the pot and the kettle. The important point is the conclusion drawn from the new theory: tough-

ness, discipline, a hard line—and "less democracy."

The army attitude on democracy as revealed in the panel report is extremely interesting, not only for its conclusion, but also because of the peculiar historical reference which is used to back this up. This is a top level army committee on military organization speaking. They take, as their example, the development of the Russian army.

This is the historical analysis: "The Russians experimented with friendly co-operation (in the army after World War I and the Revolution). They abolished the salute and, except for actual duty hours, everybody was treated the same. Fraternalization between officers and men was encouraged. It didn't work. They got their tails whipped off in the war with Finland. They had a big shake-up and now they have the most rigidly disciplined army anywhere. We don't intend to go that far, but our experience has been on that order."

The first interesting aspect of this analysis is the reading of history. The Red Army of the first years of the Revolution is assumed to have been the model for the Russian army which went into Finland.

The army's panel of experts on military organization have evidently not heard of what happened to the Russian army during the 1930s. They simply skip the entire process of Stalinization, the purges, the turn to the nationalistic and military past.

Secondly, they do not mention the one Stalinist-led army which did operate on something like the plan which they describe, the Eighth Route Army in China which was so impressive to various American military observers.

But thirdly, the whole historical analysis is an obvious sham whose only purpose is to lead up to the conclusion: more discipline in the United States army—specifically, increase in power for the non-commissioned officer. This is a concrete reality of military organization, not a fier into military strategy.

NO PATRIOTS?

The real reason for it is revealed in yet another statement by the army experts. The panel notes:

"The calibre of men we get now differs from World War II. These people who are drafted into the army now feel the government owes them something and they owe nothing. I guess that goes back to the home, the school, the church and there isn't much we can do about it. Nobody wants to serve and if they have to, they feel they should do as little as possible. You can't build an army on that attitude. Patriotism has no place in their life."

This statement contains the routine army attitude toward social welfare measures (the business about "owing" and all that it implies). But it also contains an important admission.

The American soldier of World War II days fought under a progressive mythology, at the least. The struggle was dressed up in terms of an anti-fascist crusade, as the fight for democracy against totalitarianism. There was patriotism and its image had a considerable amount of social content even though it hardly mirrored the reality of a military coalition of Stalin, Chiang, Churchill and Roosevelt.

Today it is different. There is an attitude of frustration rather than of patriotism. American youth is not summoned to an anti-fascist crusade but rather to all

(Turn to last page)

You Still Can Register for THE YSL CAMP-AND-SCHOOL

The first national Summer Camp of the Young Socialist League will take place at Mountain Spring Camp, Rt. 1, Washington, New Jersey, from the supper meal on Friday, August 27, to after lunch on Friday, September 3.

The rates for the camp are remarkably low in this period of high vacation prices: for cabins or rooms \$38 per person per week; for dormitory, \$35 for the full week. For the weekend, the rate is \$12 for a cabin, \$11 for dorms. Registrations should be accompanied by a deposit, \$5 for a full week, \$3 for a weekend. Send reservations to the YSL at 114 West 14 Street, New York City.

The camp will feature socialist education, socialist socializing, and the transitional forms of swimming, baseball, volleyball, badminton, etc.

On the educational side, Hal Draper, editor of *LABOR ACTION*, will give one class on "Stalinism" and another on "Imperialism and the Third Camp." Gerald McDermott, noted socialist scholar, will give three sessions "A Socialist Views American History." And Dave Dellinger, a well-known pacifist leader and militant of the Peacemakers group, will speak, although his topic has not been decided upon yet. Max Shachtman of the Independent Socialist League will be a guest speaker.

If you are coming, bring a towel, toilet kit, old clothes, bathing suit, flashlight, raincoat, guitars, banjos, etc. athletic equipment, cards chess sets, etc.

Remember: the camp starts on August 27.

Young Socialist League
114 West 14 Street, New York City

I would like to make the following camp reservation:

- A. single couple family (how many?.....)
- B. full week weekend Full days (..... to)
- C. cabin room dorm
- D. I enclose.....deposit. (Deposit per person: full week \$5; weekend \$3.

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY ZONE..... STATE.....

A REPLY TO CLOVIS MAKSOU ON THE ISSUE OF ISRAEL AND ZIONISM

The MISTAKES of the ARAB SOCIALISTS

By HAL DRAPER

In the last two issues of LABOR ACTION we have published an article by a representative Arab socialist spokesman, Comrade Clovis Maksoud, giving the Arab socialist position on Israel as he sees it. That article was, moreover, written at our invitation. And we welcome this opportunity for such an exchange of views.

The fact that we disagree quite vigorously with its central thesis on Israel does not, to us, lessen the value of bringing such a discussion out into the open.

It is easy to understand Comrade Maksoud's resentment at the treatment of this question by most European and American socialists. It is not simply that the latter often tend to be pro-Zionist. That is a point of view to which they are entitled. But Comrade Maksoud writes us, and he has indicated in his article, that it has been virtually impossible for the Arab socialist viewpoint to get itself heard in these quarters. Their press has refused to print any articles by him or his comrades. The Arab viewpoint has been dealt with by simple suppression. This applies to the British Labor press as others, he charges.

It is no surprise to us that the press and leadership of the social-democracies behave this way, for all their talk of being "tolerant" "democratic socialists" who have a very special horror of "Bolshevik" suppression of opinion. On the contrary, it is typical. They will often give space to minority points of view when these represent internal forces strong enough so that they cannot be ignored. But they have no or little concept of the inherent educational value of an open counter-position of views.

The attitude of LABOR ACTION and the ISL on this matter has always been different, almost distinctive. We have gone out of our way, when in our opinion the ends of political education would be furthered, to publish points of view with which we disagree. To be sure, we have always stoutly defended our own position against these; and we always will, because we are not a characterless "open forum" but a socialist movement; but the openness of our columns to political dispute and disagreement of an educational nature is a nearly unique feature.

In view of the Arab socialists' experiences with the European social-democracies and laborites of the Socialist International, we make the above clear in order to leave no uncertainty as to why we have given their position so much space, and also why we believe it necessary to criticize it.

Our Alternative to Chauvinism

In fair-sized passages throughout his article Comrade Maksoud felt it necessary to devote a good deal of attention to the attitudes of European socialists, as he found them, even though these remarks did not bear directly on the mooted question of Israel. We quite sympathize with his feeling that the Socialist International is shot through with opportunism, confusion, and unsocialist policies and practices. In our resolutions we have ourselves expressed the hopes which we have for the further progressive development of the Asian socialists who federated at Rangoon, separate and apart from the effete reformists of Europe. We would share the resentment which he expresses at the condescending paternal attitude of the Europeans to most Asian socialists—we would call it bluntly chauvinistic. Comrade Maksoud's general remarks on such questions as "practicality" (when he polemized against the European socialist attitude) were in our eyes absolutely sound and indeed elementary precepts of genuine socialism.

In Britain, where he is now studying, Comrade Maksoud has clearly gotten a heavy dose of that thoroughly chauvinistic attitude toward other peoples (including the socialists of other peoples) which is so heavy an element in British Laborism as in continental reformism and in other types of social-democrats, who have always been alien to Marxist internationalism.

Thus, he is absolutely correct in pointing with special indignation to the pro-Zionist argument that "Arabs were incapable of developing their areas," presumably inherently, and that therefore a Jewish state was necessary to "civilize" the Middle East. This is absolutely nothing else than a Zionist version of the notorious white-man's-burden theory; and if it was so easy for European social-democrats to agree with the Zionists on this, that was so because of their common ground in imperialistic chauvinist attitudes.

In our present discussion of (and argument against) the Arab-socialist view, the whole basis of the question will, I think, be quite different from that which Comrade Maksoud and his comrades are accustomed to meet and deal with.

As we see it, for one thing, ours is an attempt to develop a position from a Marxist internationalist standpoint. And above all, we approach the problem as opponents of Zionism and of Zionist ideology and politics.

As I read Comrade Maksoud's article, my feeling is that he has not appreciated the full force and potentialities of a socialist anti-Zionist position like ours, perhaps because of its unfamiliarity; and we will have to devote some space to presenting it as an alternative to the Arab socialists' grievous mistake in calling for the overthrow of the state of Israel.

That is what is in question here, and nothing else; although of course there is a long list of related ideas in dispute that lie behind such a conclusion.

Theirs Is No Solution At All

Comrade Maksoud's conclusion is to demand "the emasculation of Israel's sovereignty," to do away with this state's "sovereign, separate, isolated and independent existence." Instead, the Palestinian Jews are to be given merely "cultural autonomy."

Plainly, it would be simpler to make clear that the state of Israel is to be conquered and crushed, by force of arms in a war, annexed to some Arab state or group of states, and thus wiped out. This is the "solution" to the Israel question of which Maksoud speaks.

We will argue that it is no "solution" at all, since it will solve nothing and mean merely the continuation of the present impasse in a different form. That it cannot bring the peace of which Maksoud speaks. That it will not save the Arab peoples from being pawns of imperialism. That it will not be the key to unlock the revolutionary energies of the Arabs, as Maksoud thinks.

In fact, we have here, I think, a typical example of bisymmetric mistakes. Maksoud has this in common with the Zionist ideology: the insistence that the fate of Israel as a state is inseparable from the fate of Zionism. His insistence that Israel must be forcibly overthrown is the "other side of the coin" of the Zionist-chauvinist concept of the "Jewish state" and policy of persecuting the Arab minority.

At any rate, that's the way we see it, and so will we argue. This bisymmetric pattern has certain inevitable consequences. It is well-nigh inevitable that we will be denounced by Zionists for even printing Maksoud's article. And I'm afraid, under the circumstances, that it was just as inevitable that Maksoud should wind up by charging that we are not really anti-Zionist (because we won't go for the overthrow of Israel); that we may be against Zionist "excesses" but accept "basic Zionist theory."

Thus Maksoud hurls into the same (Zionist) camp all those who would oppose his "solution" of war against Israel.

That is not an advisable thing for him to do.

If the Arab socialists insist that pro-Zionism is the only alternative to their call for war against Israel, they will surely help to convince a great many waverers that the Zionists are the preferable side.

Thus bisymmetric mistakes always feed on each other. (It works the other way too. When the Arab socialists meet only chauvinistic arguments against them, they are reinforced in their mistake.)

Here then is the central point at which we differ:

We draw a firm line between (1) fighting Zionism, its ideology and politics; fighting against the Zionist policies which are the official policies of the state of Israel, and against the Zionist leadership which is the official government of the state of Israel; and (2) fighting to overthrow the state of Israel as such.

Now, this distinction is simple as ABC. It may be wrong in Maksoud's eyes. It may be a mistake in his opinion. He has a right to argue that we should be against both, both Zionism and the state of Israel as such. But he should not close his eyes to the fact that this distinction must be made.

Yet he insists on doing so. On June 7 last, we had explained the difference by referring to an analogy with Stalinist Russia. We stressed that there was a big difference between being anti-Stalinist and anti-Russian. (Or being anti-Nazi and anti-German). So also, we said, one must not mix up anti-Zionist and anti-Israel, in exactly the same sense.

In each case, it is plain, you have a political movement (with its accompanying ideology, philosophy, program, institutions, "organizational formulas," economic theories, etc.) and at a given time this political movement (Stalinism, Nazism, Zionism) is in control of a state—to the disadvantage of the people of that state.

Everybody knows how easy it has been for reactionary varieties of "anti-Communism" to pass over into anti-Russian fulminations. It was easy for anti-Nazism to mask a chauvinistic anti-Germanism, and it does so to this day all over Britain and France and in the British Labor Party. It was easy for reactionaries, in the U. S. after Pearl Harbor, to whip up lynch sentiment against all Japanese people, even against Japanese-Americans, with filthy phrases like "yellow monkeys."

In the case under discussion, we also have a relationship between a state and a political movement which dominates and controls its government today. As we said, this political movement Zionism (like the analogy of Stalinism) has its own distinctive "philosophy," program, etc.

Basic Distinction

Maksoud rejects the comparison. I confess that I cannot even follow his reasoning at that point. With regard to Communism (Stalinism), he agrees that—

"... 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."

But it is "different" for Zionism, he argues—

"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.'"

But Stalinism is not an "institutional or organization formula" either—not simply, and not even mainly. To be sure, it has its characteristic "institutions" (like the MVD) and its characteristic "organizational formulas"—but Zionism has its characteristic institutions, etc., also.

Above all, Stalinism arose as a political movement, with a certain political "philosophy," which captured a state. It proceeded to "create" a new state in its own image.

Of course, there are several thousand differences between Stalinism and Zionism which could be mentioned to confuse the analogy; but none of them are relevant to the very, very simple point:

It is possible to be anti-Stalinist without being anti-Russian. It is possible to be anti-Nazi without being anti-German. It is possible to be anti-Zionist without being anti-Israel.

When Comrade Maksoud denies this, then we feel that he is failing to see the very problem, let alone the correct socialist solution to it.

If he denies that it is even possible to be anti-Zionist without being for the overthrow of Israel, then it is indeed difficult for him to grapple with the issues as they present themselves to the minds of most socialists, and not only those with a pro-Zionist bias.*

In our view, this distinction between being anti-Zionist and anti-Israel is the nub; but we must still

*In fact, one could raise a question about what Maksoud means by Zionism. In his article in LA for June 7, he wrote: "Zionism is a movement which seeks to make religion the rallying factor of a nation. As such it is self-contained, mystical and intolerant of other religions or races (cf. the treatment of Arab minorities in Israel)."

It is just not true that Zionism makes religion the "rallying factor." Surely Maksoud must know that for the majority of Zionists it is a secular movement; many if not most Zionist leaders have even been atheists or agnostics, or at least quite unreligious; etc. Here Maksoud misses the whole point about the Zionist mystique and the Zionist form of Jewish nationalism: the Zionist looks on Jewry as being united not by their religion (if any) but by their inherent Jewish "nationality," and this goes for all Jews everywhere by virtue of birth and "tribal" blood.

And Zionism is not necessarily intolerant of "other religions or races." Within Israel it does not advocate discrimination against Christians, for example. The one religion of which it is most intolerant is—reform-Judaism (and not Islam)! and that basically for reasons of state and not theology. Its disgraceful and criminal persecution of the Arab minority is based on political reasons; it is a political and social persecution, not a religious persecution.

Maksoud here sounds as if he thinks the Zionists are religious fanatics or zealots! Nothing could be further from the mark, or be a grosser misunderstanding of what the fight is all about.

Their Call for War on Israel Is a Grievous Error...

go on to discuss Comrade Maksoud's positive reasons for being in favor of wiping out Israel as a state. The first of these is bound up with his argument that Israel had no right to existence in the first place.

At this point Comrade Maksoud's article presented a rebuttal to the ISL resolutions, which we had sent him for his information. But his presentation of our position was both inaccurate and inadequate, we think. In any case, it will be useful to sketch our point of view in at this stage of the argument. As we see it, Maksoud's error will be most apparent when it is seen on the background of our own approach to the question.

Zionism and Imperialism

We have always been opposed to the Zionist program of setting up a "Jewish state" by carving it out of another people's country (Palestine) against the will of the latter.

During most of the history of Zionism, it has sought to become the willing tool of some imperialist exploiter who would foist the Zionist aim upon Palestine for its own imperialist reasons. Zionism began in the 19th century by offering itself to Turkey in that role. After the Balfour Declaration it willingly prostituted itself to British imperialism, in the hope that the lion would set up its "Jewish state" as a fortress for the empire.

During most of its history, what it had to aim at was the setting up of a rule by a Jewish minority over an Arab majority, the Jewish minority coming into power and staying in power as the tool of an outside imperialist force.

Therefore our resolution spoke of "the criminal policy of Zionism toward the Arabs, a policy which was based on the aim of minority rule by the Jews in Palestine under the wing of British imperialism."

This political character of Zionism was not changed by the events of the last two decades; but at the side of the Zionists' reactionary aspirations there also developed a different, a new, an accompanying factor which did not owe its motive force and impact to Zionism.

Our comrade Maksoud sees only the impact of Zionism. We would like to call his attention to this other explosive development.

This was the exterminationist fate which loomed before a whole people in Europe, the Jewish people.

The Fate of a People

First, there was the wholesale persecution of the Jews before the war. During the war there took place an event never before seen in the world—at least not in our civilized days—the unprecedented physical extermination of 6 million Jews. This was the Nazi "solution" of the Jewish problem. Not only Germany became untenable: mass anti-Semitic persecution was spreading to Italy and to France under the Nazi occupation. Then after the war, a new wave of anti-Jewish persecution arose in and engulfed the Stalinist empire, the satellites as well as Russia itself.

A whole people was being murdered and driven out of Europe. Driven—where? Where could they go? Even fleeing for their lives; where could they flee?

Why to Palestine? asks Comrade Maksoud in effect. This is a problem for the whole world, not just our responsibility. Why should we have to bear the burden alone?

He is absolutely correct.

The one country that was indicated in the first place as a haven was not Palestine but the United States; not the Arabs' land but ours. Any socialist, any half-decent democrat, who failed to cry this out—Open the doors of the U. S. to the Jewish refugees!—was a fraud. Our resolution said:

"The elementary democratic demand of free emigration and immigration, long part of every genuinely democratic program, must be most vigorously fought for in the specific case of the European Jews. All barriers to immigration to the countries of their choice must be broken down. For socialists in the U. S., the richest country in the world and the one capable of absorbing the largest population, this means the struggle against the exclusion of the Jews from this country. For this reason, independent socialists raised and continue to raise the slogan 'Open the doors of the U. S.!'"

Socialist Position on Immigration

We should like Comrade Maksoud to note that it has always been the elementary democratic duty of every genuine socialist to fight for this untrammelled right of free emigration and immigration, by anyone to "the country of his choice." It has been called into question in the socialist movement, historically, only by the extreme chauvinist wing.

The American socialist movement has gone through this. Before World War I, to its everlasting shame and disgrace, the American Socialist Party took the position of supporting the Oriental-exclusion laws. The same socialist leaders who led in this move were those who betrayed socialism in the later war, and who betrayed socialism daily in their reformist politics. They were chauvinists.

At that time the Socialist International repudiated the American SP position and called for the genuine socialist position. We stick with this socialist position.

We had another reason for raising the demand "Open the doors of the U. S." Not only because the U. S. is the richest country; but also because it happens to be the country we live in. Every decent socialist in (say) Britain would be equally duty-bound to demand "Open

the doors of Britain," even though Britain is not as rich as the U. S. The same goes for every socialist in the world, bar none.

It is no argument to prove that the influx of such immigration might harm the standards or otherwise impair the situation of native labor. That was the rationale of the American SP chauvinists (mentioned above) and they were right up to a certain point. They were chauvinists nonetheless. If such immigration did not create such problems, then anyone (and not only socialist-internationalists) could easily come out for a humane and internationalist position.

We trust, then, that Comrade Maksoud now understands what we (at least) mean by the right of the Jews to go to "the country of their choice." It is a right we would fight for, for anyone, anytime. How much more so in view of the explosive situation we have barely sketched, the extermination of a people?

The Post-War Dynamic

In this writer's opinion (though it can be mooted) by far the greatest portion of Europe's persecuted Jews would have preferred to come to the U. S. and not to Palestine, given free choice. The influx of Jews to Palestine was not primarily due to a sudden increase in the pro-Zionist sentiments of Jews, out of love for Zionism. But the U. S. banged its doors shut, while pretending to express its horror at the anti-Jewish crimes of others. Other countries banged the door. A steel ring of national boundaries encircled the Jews, while, for many of them, the need for sheer survival forced them or seemed to force them outward.

Something had to give.

International reaction forced the fleeing Jews into the bag set up by the Zionists. Here was one direction in which they could go with some outside help—the help and machinery set up by the Zionist movement. It was the path of least resistance for them, and the pressure could relieve itself (partly) only in this direction.

This is what set up the dynamic push behind the post-war influx of Jewish immigrants to Palestine.

It is in this connection that we come to the passage in our resolution part of which Maksoud quoted, with obvious misunderstanding. The part which Maksoud quoted is italicized:

"The post-war influx of European Jews into Palestine greatly exacerbated Arab-Jewish relations in the country. The Zionist leaders looked upon this influx of refugees as a means of imposing all-Jewish rule upon the whole country. *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.*"

It should be clear to Comrade Maksoud now that what we are talking about is the right to free immigration. Just as we raised the demand "Open the doors of the U. S.," so also we believe it was the duty of socialists to support the right of Jews to immigrate to Palestine.

For Arab-Jewish Unity

In our view, as in Maksoud's, it was a misfortune that the Jewish exodus was channelized into Palestine to the extent it was. That is one of the crimes for which world capitalism and imperialism ought to answer some day. But it was a fact, and not a Zionist plot.

The Zionists were able to take advantage of this anti-Semitic windfall—in general, Zionism has always fed on anti-Semitism—but the problem that was created had to be faced by socialists and everyone else. It could not be faced merely by yelling against Zionism.

We had a program. It was a proposal for a revolutionary solution. It was what we counterposed to the Zionist solution, on the one hand, and to the Arab states' policy on the other.

As concisely summarized in our resolution (directly following the last quotation given), it was:

"The Marxist, firmly opposed to both, advocated a policy which would bring together the Arab and Jewish peoples in a joint fight against British imperialism in the first place, and, necessarily bound up with this, against Jewish capital and Arab landlordism, for a Palestine freed from all foreign rule and governed by a democratic Constituent Assembly based upon equal and universal suffrage.

"Such a fight was desired least of all by the Jewish and Arab upper classes. In the course of a joint struggle from below, cemented by common national-revolutionary aims and common social interests, Marxists aimed for a free and independent state of Palestine, based on the coexistence of two equal peoples, with national and cultural rights and autonomy safeguarded for both. This was the only progressive solution of the Palestine question. It looked not only to revolutionary struggles in Palestine but to the upsurge of anti-imperialist, and revolutionary strivings in the whole Near East, on the road to a Near East Federation of socialist republics."

This is highly compressed, and we shall have to come back to some points, but certain things should be immediately clear.

Against a "Jewish State"

In the first place, it should be plain that we oppose, above all, the basic idea of Zionism of building a "Jewish state." The idea, the concept-aim of a "Jewish state" and all that it implies is central to the Zionist ideology. As long as the people and government of Israel, follow-

ing the Zionist road, continue to try to build Israel as a "Jewish state," there can be no peace between Jew and Arab. So we believe.

For this period when Palestine's imperialist controller was still Britain, which stood over both Jew and Arab, the class-oriented revolutionary proposal which we made was one which would have necessitated freeing the Jewish workers from the bonds of the Zionist ideology as well as mobilizing the Arab masses free from Arab landlordism.

There was an Arab majority in Palestine. A democratic Palestine ruled under universal suffrage meant a Palestine whose Arab majority would decide. This was anathema to every Zionist, and exactly what he would never accept. But on the other hand, it could be accepted by the Jewish masses only in the context of an entirely different relationship between the two peoples. Both sides would have to view the new independent state as the home of two peoples in which both were free.

As we saw it, such a development could come about only through the rise of revolutionary class-consciousness from below. As Maksoud well says in his own article, it is in times of revolutionary stress and uplift that men begin to think differently, and then everything is possible.

Of course, we did not have any illusions about the immediate "practicality" of this program. We knew very well that on both sides the minds of the people were stuffed with chauvinist antagonisms. It was long plain that some reactionary "solution" was more in the cards, and not a revolutionary solution that could have been possible only with the existence of advanced revolutionary-socialist movements in the region.

After Partition . . .

The "solution" that was pushed through was partition.

We were against the partition as a "solution." Our resolution said on this point:

"For the Marxists, the partition was and is no solution for either the basic problem of Jewish-Arab relations in Palestine, or, still less, for the Jewish problem in the world. As against partition, we advocated a different course . . ." (as already discussed above).

" . . . As compared with the program we advocated, partition represented a setback on the road to greater understanding and cooperation between the Jewish and Arab peoples; it did indeed lead to a bloody fratricidal war in which and after which national feelings were inflamed even more and state-boundary walls were set up between the two peoples."

And we were right, we believe, in our view that the partition was no solution. Time has shown that. But then our resolution proceeds to make a point which we cannot emphasize too strongly to Maksoud:

"But, if partition and the subsequent setting up and consolidation of the new state of Israel did not and could not solve the basic problem, or advance its solution, it did pose entirely new conditions under which that solution had to be sought."

From my point of view, I would repeat that to Maksoud a thousand times:

Partition was no solution. The setting up of Israel was no solution. Your program to destroy Israel would be no solution. The problem is how to bring together the Jewish and Arab peoples on a revolutionary democratic basis, and this problem has to be dealt with on the basis of the conditions that exist. Israel is a fact. Nothing will be gained by an Arab-Jewish war against it, whether it wins or loses. There is a way to bring peace and a united life to the Near East, but it is not as simple a way as the mere proposal, "war against Israel."

We have outlined the point of view of our resolution as a background for taking up Comrade Maksoud's arguments for war, and as the background for counterposing this other solution of which we speak.

(Continued next week)

WHAT IS INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM?

In five special pamphlet-issues of Labor Action, the basic idea of Independent Socialism are vividly and simply explained.

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?

10 cents each
Copies are still available.

Fear in Congress — —

(Continued from page 1)

CP outright—a proposal which the administration has fought because it frankly gets in the way of their own pet scheme on how to outlaw the CP WITHOUT passing a law to that effect.

According to William Shannon of the N. Y. Post, the Magnuson strategy had had a 50-50 chance before Humphrey panicked. But Democratic leader Johnson seized on the Humphrey bill and decided to line his flock up for that measure. The Magnuson bill was defeated 56-31, with the Democratic bloc defecting.

Humphrey's yellow strategy was co-sponsored by some of his fellow "liberals," including Wayne Morse and Herbert Lehman.

At first this "outlawing" bill was offered as substitute for the Butler anti-union bill. One presumes that the yellow liberals figured that they were going to "save" the trade-union movement by throwing the CP to the cops.

But then another Democrat ruined even this brilliantly stupid tactic. Rep. Daniel, Democrat of Texas, managed to tie the two bills together into one. When the Senate finally voted, both were passed.

HOUSE OF BABBLE

But first some obscenities were made to labor. Amid indescribable confusion, the Butler anti-union section of the joint bill was toned down by amendments.

The scene must have been indescribable because no correspondent has yet managed to describe it without breaking down in confusion himself. Here is how the upper house of the world's most powerful country looked as it tumbled all over itself to outlaw a handful of Stalinists. Shannon describes what happened when the Humphrey measure was offered:

"The Republican leaders were caught by surprise and divided among themselves as to what to do. The Senate finally, in effect, threw up its hands and simply passed both bills and every amendment that was offered.

"Confusion ran high. Several amendments were passed which contradicted one another. At times, the babble of voices grew so loud in the chamber that amendments were passed on voice-votes without being read, explained, debated, or understood." (N. Y. Post, Aug. 13.)

A Republican, Ferguson of Michigan, argued that the Butler and Humphrey bills were mutually contradictory. Others muttered that it was unconstitutional, as it is. Others (including the reaction-

ary Senator McCarran) pointed out that it contradicted the McCarran witchhunting law. It didn't matter. Everyone voted for the monstrosity anyway.

After the Senate vote, the N. Y. Times reported: "House leaders appeared to be somewhat aghast, a condition that seemed to prevail also among Senate leaders. . . . Just what was passed without a Senate dissenting vote remained for further study to determine." (Aug. 13.)

Although the Senate and House have gurgled over with committees investigating anti-subversive questions, always presumably with the idea of recommending legislation, the laws that were stamped through were ones on which there had never been any Senate hearings or legislative reports. Humphrey had drafted his bill between midnight and 1 a.m. the night before it was passed.

"Democrats and Republicans alike privately expressed the hope that something would happen to prevent its final enactment." (Times, Aug. 14.)

THE STAMPEDE

As we write, we see for the first time that the N. Y. Times reported "one Democrat at a key post" as using the same metaphor that has already appeared more than once in this article:

"It was time to show them [the Republicans] up and put them on the record. We [Democrats] called them and raised them and they fell into line like stampeding cattle."

Stampeding cattle—it turns out that the phrase is not merely an emotional description of our party.

Senator Lehman, the liberal of liberals in the Senate, stoutly defended his cowardly vote in public. The "outlaw" bill is a "frontal, honest attack," he claimed.

He has a point only as compared with the reasons for being against the measure which are held by Eisenhower and the police-state keepers of the FBI and Brownell's office. These gentry opposed the outlawing measure only because their Smith Act and McCarren Act procedure was designed to achieve exactly the same end—though more slowly—without risking unconstitutionality and without a frank declaration of outlawry. Before the House voted, the little difference in tempo was adjusted. The House bill merely left out the penalties provided for individual CP members, as if that mattered.

Multer, who voted no in the House, said: "I told the House that I was obviously in the majority in believing it was a bad bill

and just as obviously in the minority in being willing to vote against it."

Burdick, the Republican nay-sayer, told the press: "Congress is treading on dangerous ground when it is outlawing what a man may think." This Republican thought the Smith Act was enough.

In spite of the leading role taken by ADA senators in the stampede, not all liberals will go along. This is certain. The whole thing is so painfully humiliating, so stupid even from the witchhunters' point of view, so crude, so undeniable a manifestation of panic fear before the world, that there will be voices talking up, even in the pall of fear that hangs over America.

The N. Y. Post, for example, has had a couple of vigorous editorials lambasting the rout! "Cowardice in the Senate Becomes a Clear and Present Danger," was the heading over one. The Post editors even pointed out how the event proves the ground won by McCarthyism.

But will Americans for Democratic Action speak up? There is a curious parallel likely to be enacted at the next meeting of ADA's national board. It is not a risky guess to assume that a majority of that board will be holding their heads over the affair. But will they dare to vote to repudiate the ADA leader, Senator Humphrey?

BLINDING FEAR

It is truly an incredible thing, even in this American age of the informer and witchhunter, when a congressman can say of a vote in the House of Representatives:

"You could almost reach out and feel the atmosphere of fear in the chamber."

Of what other legislature in a presumably democratic country could this ever have been said?

It could apply to the Reichstag crying "Sieg Heil" under Hitler. It could apply to the heel-clickers who meet as the Moscow parliament. But how can a climate of fear so thick have brought the U. S. Senate and House to vote against the opinions of its members?

Fear of what?

Fear of McCarthy?

Not really fear of the man. It was fear of the blind and foul miasmic forces of red-hunting hysteria which McCarthy has lived on, which before him were unleashed by the Truman administration, which are approved by Eisenhower's loyalty-oath and subversive-list cadres of the police-state type.

It goes further and deeper than that. It symbolizes the panic fear which these great United States feel of the Stalinist forces in the world—fear not of the insignificant CP of this country but of the ability of the Stalinist tyranny everywhere in the world to appeal to the peoples with its demagogic program.

This embattled capitalism, fortress of an old and dying system, knows no way to counter the allure of the rival imperialism which offers an end to capitalist exploitation—and which is able to dupe people who do not yet know of the rigors of Stalinist-type exploitation.

This embattled imperialism of the West has no program, no political weapons, with which to fight the dynamic lure of Stalinism.

It sees Stalinism advancing everywhere, and loses its head. Its representatives view the future with uncertainty, ignorance and fear. It was that fear that was acted out on the Senate floor, just as a tantrum may act out a trauma.

AFL Foreign Policy — —

(Continued from page 5)

capitalism. On some issues—free elections, colonialism, the rights of a free labor movement in a country like Thailand—the labor movement will come out for progressive demands within the framework of commitment to a reactionary policy. On other issues, they support the reactionary framework as such.

One final category is present in the AFL statement. It is a certain verbal adherence to bourgeois rationalist solutions exemplified by statements such as "increased emphasis on advancing the cause of peace through promoting a genuine disarmament program . . ."

The only thing to be pointed out here is that this kind of demand is always mentioned more or less as an afterthought, as a pious bow to the totem of nineteenth-century peace planners and rationalists.

The conclusion which I would draw from this discussion is that the politics of the American labor movement today are complex, contradictory, and not easily categorized. On the whole, it is obvious that the AFL (and the CIO) back up the basic premises of American imperialism. Within that support, there are, how-

ever, contradictory elements, now support for Tunisian nationalists in the UN, them a veiled to the contrary over Guatemala, and this AFL call for the end of colonialism.

However, these contradictory elements can only become really meaningful if they become the starting point for a questioning of the over-all premises. There seems little likelihood that this will take place. Yet, it is in these kinds of elements, in the fact that even a conformist labor movement cannot simply stand by when foreign labor is attacked, that the hope lies for a development in the future.

As it is, the AFL document presents the chaotic and contradictory nature of American labor politics within the commitment to American imperialism. This is hardly a "positive program."

Army Announces —

(Continued from page 5)

of the confusing twists and turns of a bankrupt American policy in a time of world crisis. There is a tremendous feeling that the Korean war led to nothing. There was even a popular resistance to the idea of intervention in Indochina. The danger in such a situation is that the frustration will lead to a policy of final commitment—World War III.

But the immediate result among the American youth is the one described by the panel of army experts: there is no enthusiasm for service, no patriotism. There is a contractual attitude, i.e., we got pushed into this thing and they are going to have to push us every step of the way.

On one level, the significance of the army report is, at bottom, one more symptom of American foreign policy's inability to mobilize enthusiasm for its

defense of capitalist imperialism. Here is the terrible feeling of mass frustration, the rudderless character of so much of American political life. Yet there is an ominous element in what the army proposes to do.

As a result of the development of the domestic witchhunt, specifically the army-McCarthy dispute, the services are being pushed toward a "hard" line: violent anti-subversive measures, anti-civil-libertarian actions which are extraordinary even for the autocratic military, a deep reactionary mobilization of the American youth. The new policy obviously fits into this general approach.

Following hard on the heels of the announcement of the eight year obligatory reserve and the push for UMT this is another indication that the militarization of American life is being increased at a rapid pace.

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

SUBSCRIBERS—ATTENTION!

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

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

18-34

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

RENEW NOW!