

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

SEPTEMBER 6, 1954

FIVE CENTS

**The "Anti-Communist" Law:
Liberals Look at Their Leaders**

... page 3

Brazil: Economic Crisis is Decisive

... page 7

Eisenhower and the Poor Fish

... page 2

EDC Death Ends an Era in Europe

GERMANY:

The SPD Could Take the Initiative

By GORDON HASKELL

American foreign policy has been dealt another stunning blow by the final rejection by the French Assembly of the European Defense Community. Still reeling from the collapse of its main line in Asia a few weeks ago, the administration now confronts a similar collapse in Europe.

The death of EDC is a victory for the Stalinists. But it is not the kind of victory which can be counted on to immediately bring them more territory, or even the support of additional sections of the population in any country in Europe. The end of EDC is not a positive achievement for them. Before it could be transformed into such an achievement, the Stalinists will have to win a number of victories in the process of the political-military reorganization of Europe which must follow the end of EDC.

It is quite evident that such a reorganization is now inevitable, in one form or another. For over two years every political movement in Western Europe has been compelled to take up a stance with respect to EDC. American pressure for the treaty was constant in European politics, as was Stalinist pressure against it. Every political movement had its policy on foreign affairs channelized to one degree or another between the forces of up by these pressures.

Since the specific object of these pressures has now disappeared for all practical purposes, the pres-

ures themselves will have to be directed to new political goals. For the problem which was to be solved by EDC still remains just as crucial for Europe and hence for the cold-war colossi as ever: That is the fate, the future role of Germany.

The most serious and drastic effect of the end of EDC will no doubt be felt at the epicenter of the storm, in Germany herself. (With regard to France, see A. Stein's articles elsewhere in this issue of *Labor Action*—Ed.). The immediate consequence of the de-

(Turn to last page)

FRANCE:

Bitter Political Breach Not Healed

By A. STEIN

By a vote of 319 to 264, the French National Assembly has finally rejected the European Defense Community treaty. The eighteen months of political intrigue, wrangling and maneuvering around this question, which split practically every political party and created a state of creeping paralysis in the National Assembly, has now come to an end. Again, Premier Mendes-France has fulfilled another of his promises; this time, that he would "bring this question to a vote and heal the deep division that is poisoning French political life." But though the debate has ended and the vote taken, the bitterness and party divisions still remain and have been even further aggravated. The death of the EDC treaty in the French Assembly has not ended the internal French struggle over German rearmament and the creation of a West European coalition sponsored and backed by the United States.

One immediate result of the voting in the National Assembly was to sharpen the split in the French

Socialist Party. The National Council of the SP has expelled Jules Moch, Daniel Mayer, P. O. Lapie and Max Lejeune for violating party discipline and voting against the EDC treaty. While the Executive Council did not expel the other fifty members (half of the SP Assembly fraction) who followed the four leaders mentioned above in voting against EDC, it declared they could not represent or speak for the party. This immediately raises the possibility that Moch and Mayer, the acknowledged leaders of the "neutralist" faction in the SP, may try to lead their fifty followers out of the Socialist



London *New Statesman and Nation*
MENDES-FRANCE

Party and establish an independent political grouping.

By forcing the EDC treaty to a vote, Mendes-France hoped to dispose of an issue on a program of domestic reforms. In this manner he hoped to create a stable parliamentary majority on which his regime could rest.

SPLIT IN THE SP

However, as the aggravation of the split in the SP shows, the dis-

(Turn to last page)

For a discussion of the background of French politics which have led to the defeat of EDC in the Assembly, and of the social forces lined up with and against Mendes-France, see A. Stein's feature article on p. 6.

Labor Politics: How NOT to Do It Libs.-Dems. in New York Deal

By PETER WHITNEY

Although the Democratic Party has not yet named its candidate for governor of New York State, the Liberal Party has already given its blanket endorsement to the Democratic ticket. Chief contenders for the post are Franklin D. Roosevelt Jr. and Averell Harriman, both now vying in their furious denunciations of the present incumbent, Republican Thomas E. Dewey.

The Democratic-Liberal coalition was engineered by Tammany leader, Carmine De Sapio, and Alex Rose, Liberal Party Vice Chairman—fresh proof that politics makes strange bedfellows. The Liberals have savagely attacked Tammany and refused to support its candidates in several city elections, most notably when they ran Rudolph Halley as an independent candidate for mayor against Robert Wagner Jr. last year.

The Liberals have justified their separate and independent political organization by pointing to the reactionary and corrupt stranglehold of the Tammany crew in New York. All this is forgotten, however, before the threat of another Republican victory in New York, with the prospect of the presidential election in 1956.

Ironically enough, Mayor Wagner's name has been bruited about as a possible "compromise" candidate for the Democrats. Should he run, it would neatly illustrate the dilemma of the Liberal Party. Just how could they support him for governor in 1954 after campaigning against him for mayor in 1953. Such a situation would not be unique for the Liberals. It has happened before and will continue to happen again, so long as the conflicting tendencies within the Liberal Party, are not resolved.

While the Liberals boast of their increasing power and influence on the Democratic Party, the payment received for their blanket endorsement seems modest enough. In return for Liberal support for the bulk of the Democratic candidates for state-wide posts, the Democrats gave their generous support to one—yes, one—Liberal candidate.

Was this perhaps the candidate for lieutenant governor or for Congress or even for the State Legislature? With such a candidacy wrested from the Democrats, the Liberal leadership might have argued that it was a fair return for its promise of a half million votes on the Liberal line for the Democratic ticket—not to speak of its effectiveness at the bargaining table.

But just how strongly could the Liberal leadership push their

(Continued on page 4)

Our National Security May Hang on the Tale of

EISENHOWER AND THE POOR FISH

H. W. BENSON

In the cool rushing water of the South Platte River, high in the Rocky Mountains of Colorado, President Eisenhower one day hooked and netted an enviable mess of rainbow and brown trout. How many? Some people say 15, others say 25. True, the daily legal limit is only 10; yet there exists that contemptible type of fisherman who, hoarding an over-bulging creel, sneaks away from the stream, quiet and a little shame-faced, to the scorn of his fellow anglers; and anyone caught carting away an illegal load is fined at least \$15 for every trout above the limit. The president, however, perpetrates his transgression before cameras and crowds and no eager conservation inspector taps him on the shoulder to ask, "Do you mind if I look in your pack?"

But, let us not quibble. In a world of dog eat dogfish, where the harmless minnow is swallowed by the voracious gamefish, where inequality and injustice reign supreme, the Eisenhower Trout Incident seems like small fry. Besides what can we do about it? Fine the president \$200? Only the taxpayer would pay in the end.

But let us drop this line of thought. Honest indignation carried us away. Fishermen can decide what to do as fishermen at the polls in 1956. What we really meant to raise is a far more serious matter, namely: how did he manage to catch so many trout? This question continues to plague us, raising grave suspicions particularly alarming in these times of national danger. Remember that Alger Hiss was at last trapped by a careless but fatal admission to a Congressional Committee that he had once spied a rare wild bird while hiking through the woods. Eisenhower is not a Hiss. The latter paraded as a Democrat, the former is a Republican. Yet, his fishing trip like Hiss' hiking trip is very interesting.

TOO MANY RIGHTS

SALT LAKE CITY, Utah—When the Western States Conference of Machinists met in Salt Lake City recently, Arizona delegates just couldn't attend. They were burdened by too many "rights."

That was the complaint of business representative Earl N. Anderson of AFL Machinists District Lodge 49 at Phoenix. In a letter to the delegates, Anderson explains what happens when you're saddled with too many "rights." He wrote in part:

"Brothers, if there is any doubt in your minds as to a depression, we invite you to Phoenix.

"We are sure that you are fully aware that we enjoy wonderful 'state's rights' here in Arizona:

"We have a 'Right-to-Work-for-Nothing' law.

"We have a 'Right-Not-to-Picket' law.

"The right to inadequate unemployment compensation.

"The right to inadequate workmen's compensation.

"The right to work under unsafe job conditions.

"The right for scabs to take our jobs."

—From RWDSU Record

How did he get all those trout? Maybe, it will be said, it was just dumb luck. Or great skill, perhaps. A man like Ike who got to be president must be blessed with one or the other. But no, this theory must be dismissed immediately. (We do not stress the fact that he lost his first fish, hook, line and all; and that he later dropped rod and reel into the river. That might happen to anyone.) To appreciate the mystery and its possible sinister implications, we must first understand something of trout fishing in general and the Eisenhower method in particular.

TROUT HIGHLY PRIZED

Trout like to live in fast-moving waters; they are highly prized as gamefish because they fight spectacularly when hooked and are supposed to be wily and canny, lurking and leaping. Some people go after them with hook baited with minnows, grasshoppers, hellgramites, grubs, nightcrawlers or other creations of nature living naturally near the water and serving uncomplainingly, if not enthusiastically, as natural fish food.

But the more refined devotees of a highly specialized form of the sport spurn such gross natural offerings with repugnance and contempt. They insist upon deceiving their prey with man-made lures, presented with artful flicks and practiced technique. Such imaginative artifacts, created from bits of string, feathers, animal hair and what not are known as "flies"; they are carefully concocted to imitate real insects that flit about running streams. To fool poor fish with cheap imitations of the real thing has a fascinating appeal to the instincts of a certain type, for example, Republican politicians. In other words, Eisenhower last week was a "fly" fisherman. Bear that in mind as a critical point of fact.

Now, fly-fishing may be a noble form of the sport but it must be admitted that it is a very tricky and unpredictable one. The water must be just right: not too warm, not too cold; not too high, not too low; not too muddy, but not crystal clear. The weather also has to be right: not too windy. Above all, insects must be hatching from and around the waters to lure unsuspecting fish into the area. And so, true fly-fishermen are content to return home with a trout or two, accustomed to hours of fishless searching for perfect conditions, happy in the knowledge that they have left many a fish behind to be sought in vain on another occasion.

PACKED LIKE SARDINES

But fly-fisherman Eisenhower! In five minutes he hooked his first fighting trout; five minutes later, another; and in a few hours he had 25 victims packed like sardines in a wicker basket. (Luck? That reminds us of the naive fellow who, when Stalin was elected with unanimity, commented: "The lucky so-of-a-gun; he made it again.")

Eisenhower's efforts last year too were crowned with such dreamed-for success. And at last the truth is out. One of the folks in the neighborhood this year told reporters that the stream was stocked with 400 adult trout the day before Eisenhower descended upon it to try his luck. Not the clever, wild trout wise to ways of man and beast, but the poor inexperienced effete hatchery trout undoubtedly

starved to a desperate hunger that drove them to swallow sand and stone. (This, too, clears up a year-old puzzle. Last year, Eisenhower returned, limping, from a day's fishing, explaining that he had slipped on a rock. Truth, more likely, is that he tripped over a swarming school of planted trout and bruised himself on a fin.)

But where did all these sacrificial trout come from? The Colorado State Game and Fish Department insisted that it never stocked a stream for the president. "As we understand it," said one official, "Mr. Swan [Eisenhower's friend] always buys his own fish and stocks it." WHERE DID HE GET THEM?

That is what is disturbing about the unexplained, even ominous, failure of the president to take a clear position on a vital piece of legislation before the recent Congress. After two whole days of full-dress debate, the House of Representatives finally passed a bill requiring that all foreign trout served in restaurants be tagged and that menus clearly state whether the trout being served are 100 per cent American or 100 per cent alien. Eisenhower refuses to commit himself on this law, so clearly in accord with the spirit of the times.

The trout is an elusive fish and bears watching, if possible. Who knows what spy, what saboteur, what subversive slitherers into our American waters disguised as a fish? Fearless Fosdick, at last report, was pantingly leaping behind one brook trout suspected of being No Face the arch

criminal. The least we can ask of any alien trout seeking admission to this country is a simple statement on loyalty to the constitution and if he refuses to speak up, we need only label and tag him before the whole world.

Why is Eisenhower silent? Were the trout he caught last week untagged un-Americans? Is the White House occupied by a secret sympathizer of alien ichthyophagists or a defender of foreign piscatologists? These questions must be probed so that America may rest.

FLASH—!

NEW YORK, August 31 — The early morning news broadcast brings further confirmation of the ominous suspicions raised by H. W. Benson in the above article.

The radio reports that on leaving Denver for an undisclosed destination in the Rockies in the company of Herbert Hoover, President Eisenhower stated that he was on his way to keep "a very important appointment with some finney comrades."

Eisenhower's expression was, no doubt, a slip of the tongue. Yet it is well known that it is just through such slips that the darkest intrigues are often brought to light.—Ed.

LONDON LETTER

German Rearmament to Be Debated at TUC Conference

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, August 25—The economic report of the General Council of the Trade Union Congress is published today.

It is seriously concerned about the great increase in dividends which has not been associated with a rise in wages. "Since 1951 incomes from rents, dividends and interest have been rising more rapidly than wages and salaries.

"Trade unionists cannot be expected to stand idly by while improvements they have secured are whittled away by action or inaction on the government's part, or by attempts by the richer sections of the community to improve their already privileged position."

"The chancellor can hardly be satisfied with the response to his appeals for restraint in dividend distribution, but it must be emphasized that these higher dividends have largely resulted from reductions in company taxation and from the general laissez-faire policy of the present government."

RELAXATION OF CONTROLS

So far the relaxation of controls in a favorable world market has not seriously affected British economy.

"... the longer we wonder about trusting to luck and to market forces to guide us out, the longer it will take."

"What is more, if the doctrinaire supporters of free enterprise are to be allowed free scope they will have only themselves to blame if trade unionists join in."

"In particular, increases in dividends are bound to act as a continual irritant and to weaken the influence of those who recognize the often temporary nature of the advantages that money wage increases bring."

The report of the general council draws attention to the unhappy position of old-age pensioners who now receive \$4.40 a week. It thinks that this figure should be raised to at least \$5.80. This increase should be obtained first of all by restoring the Exchequer grant (which had been cut by \$70,000,000 in 1951) to its original figure. Despite this, the TUC feels that "it would be unreasonable to oppose some increase of contributions on an actuarial basis, in order to secure increased benefits."

ON GERMAN ARMAMENT

On the armament of Germany the

TUC does not adopt the chauvinism so characteristic of discussions on this question; it does not distrust Germany. It believes that Germany should be rearmed with guarantees for peace ensured by collective security pacts.

While recognizing the fear of a resurgence of the German military machine it points out that many of those in control of Germany politically and in the trade unions were former inmates of concentration camps.

"A truly democratic Germany can best be developed in an international atmosphere devoid of fear and suspicion toward her. To assume a lack of desire, or the impotence of the democratic forces in Germany is to discourage and discredit them."

"That is the surest way to foster a resurgence of . . . rabid nationalism or even to compel them to find their friends where and how they can."

There is no doubt that the question of German rearmament will be the most hotly discussed at the forthcoming TUC conference.

THREE AMENDMENTS

There are three important amendments:

The Chemical Workers Union suggests that employers be made to pay the railway and bus fares of their employees.

The Amalgamated Engineering Union as part of the powerful Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions calls for the nationalization of aircraft, machine tools, heavy electrical equipment, heavy motor vehicles, mining machinery and railway wagons.

The Foundry Workers go farther. They have proposed nationalization of all industries.

Except for the last three proposals, the report of the TUC is hardly an inspiring document. Its admonishes a Conservative government for looking after its supporters. It is pleased with the Conservative's handling of German rearmament. Yet all-in-all, it says nothing new, proposes nothing, has no perspective, and waits for an American slump. Perhaps its suggestion about raising pensions is the soundest section of the report, but unless the idea is backed more vehemently, it will remain a solitary say in a mass of verbiage.



LABOR ACTION

September 6, 1954 Vol. 18, No. 36

Published weekly by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone: WAlkins 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

Read about Independent Socialism

in the special pamphlet-issues published by LABOR ACTION—

10 cents each

The Principles and Program of Independent Socialism.

Independent Socialism and the Third World War.

The Fair Deal: A Socialist Criticism.

Socialism and Democracy: The Independent Socialist View

Order from:

LABOR ACTION

114 West 14 Street, New York City

ON GERMAN ARMAMENT

On the armament of Germany the

In the Wake of the Great Madness Liberal Reactions To Liberal Leaders

By L. G. SMITH

The reactions to the political orgy in Congress which produced the so-called "Communist Control Act of 1954" have been extremely varied. They have reached from Eisenhower's alleged comment that this bill was the "worst can of worms" that had ever been handed him (an observation which, of course, in no way deterred him from setting his signature to it and making it law) to the vehement protests of the liberal and part of the labor movement. The most interesting thing about these protests is that they have not, by and large, sought to gloss over the fact that the law was whipped through Congress under liberal leadership, that it represents the political low-point of liberalism in Congress, that the fact that not a single one of the prominent liberal leaders stood up against this abomination will remain a disgrace to liberalism from now on, etc.

The Chicago Daily News editorialized on August 16:

"The introduction of Sen. Humphrey's bill is not the first time that the Democratic liberals have sponsored more repression than the 'reactionaries' on the other side had previously sought.

"Democrats like Douglas fought the bill requiring the registration of Communist-front organizations and their members under the McCarran anti-subversive act. But in the windup, they tacked on a provision to create concentration camps where the government might lock up everybody suspected of communism if we appear to be in danger of war with a Communist nation.

"Liberalism, in its noble and historic sense, did not have one spokesman in the Senate last week. The self-styled Democratic liberals could think of no answer to their detractors except to outdo them in the sponsorship of repression."

GROTESQUE DETAILS

On August 20, the New York Post editorial said, among other things:

"Some of the grotesque details of the statute will be discussed here in detail in future days. [The Post, like all other papers, was compelled to defer discussion of the details of the bill for at least one reason: no one, literally no one, knew exactly what was in the bill till after Eisenhower had signed it. The confusion in Congress was such that the legislators did not know just what they had voted in or out. The newspapermen were not able to get a true copy till after it had been signed . . . and it is well known that Eisenhower finds reading of such heavy material an almost intolerable strain. But to get back to the Post editorial.—L. G. S.]

"But on preliminary examination of the loose, sweeping language employed in defining membership in a proscribed group, we think it is questionable whether Humphrey himself can avoid registration as a subversive. He is, after all, a vice-chairman of Americans for Democratic Action, which favors more public housing, more public health and more public power—all 'objectives' allegedly sought by the Communists and therefore plainly within the scope of Section 12 of the act.

"Admittedly such complexities must await further inquiry, and conceivably both Humphrey and Morse can beat the rap.

"Whether or not they survive, the legislation they have devised is an outrageous affront to free society. It caricatures everything they have said in the past about the perils of hysteria. These frantic fellows have obviously yielded to the wild political temptation to try to excel McCarthy. Such nonsense won't disarm their enemies but it may persuade their friends to go fishing on election day. . . ."

The mention of the ADA in the above editorial reminds us of the conjectures about the reaction of that organization of which, after all, Humphrey is a vice-chairman, and Lehman a patron saint, in the August 23, issue of *Labor Action*.

WHERE WAS LEHMAN?

[To digress again, for just a moment. We cannot help but notice that in the editorial of the New York Post quoted above, Lehman's name is altogether omitted. Humphrey and Morse must seek reelection in Minnesota and Oregon, places where the fishing may be excellent, but the Post's influence is minor. In New York, however, where the Post has plenty

of influence among liberals, and where Lehman also has plenty of influence, the Post centers its attack on Humphrey and Morse, but does not mention Lehman at all. Well . . .?—L. G. S.]

The ADA executive committee met, and split right down the middle on whether to condemn Humphrey and Co. directly. They then sent Eisenhower a telegram urging him to veto the bill, but stating that "ADA" does not take a position on the question of outlawing the Communist Party. . . . The ADA is against the loose wording of the bill, the fact that it could be used against non-Stalinist unions, and the like. It advocates the setting up of a commission to "study the nature of the security problem presented by this conspiracy and to review existing law to determine whether maximum security is being provided and individual liberty is being protected." They end up, these "non-partisan" liberals by attacking, not the democratic authors of this repressive legislation, but the Republican leadership:

"We deplore the fact that internal security legislation was not brought before the Congress earlier in the session. The scheduling of such politically charged legislation in the closing days of an election year session has not been to the credit of the Congressional leadership."

HUMPHREY & McCARTHY

The telegram from the ADA was signed by Arthur Schlesinger Jr., co-chairman of ADA. In his column in the New York Post for August 22, Arthur Schlesinger Jr., private citizen, had a few less restrained words to say about the bill and its authors:

"In the end, a less sweeping bill was passed. It is not as strong a blow as Hubert Humphrey would like to have struck, said Hubert Humphrey who, like McCarthy, is evidently beginning to refer to himself in the third person; but he decided to accept it anyway. Still, if not strong enough for Humphrey or for Wayne Morse, it is quite strong enough for a Herbert Brownell to use with effect on some of their friends. . . ."

"It will be hard for Democratic campaign orators to talk about 'responsible opposition' with a straight face now. A fine record on the serious issues of this session has largely been kicked away by a collection of hotheads running wild like kids after their first glass of beer on a picnic."

Will these remarks deter Schlesinger, or the ADA, from urging labor to continue to support the Democratic Party, and within it in the first place these middle-aged "political children"?

The reactions to this law will continue to mount, and there will be further occasion to comment on their political meaning in future issues of *Labor Action*. This time we close, however, with a passage from Murray Kempton, New York Post columnist. Kempton seems to have been touched to the quick by the actions of the liberal heroes. In fact, he was so touched, that he wrote almost as if he had never been associated with them in any way, or at least as if he is breaking his ties to them forever. But let the man speak for himself:

" . . . most of the senators who pushed the bill through appear to be ashamed to talk about it yet. . . . But their apologists will be around before long, and we can assume in advance that they will be peddling real politik. That is as it should be. Real politik has all but killed the liberals in this country, and we might as well drink the death brew at the wake. . . ."

"Liberal politicians have generally had a sorry record on civil liberties. . . . When you set aside Joe McCarthy, who is really a transient diversion, the recent record of the Democratic Party on civil liberties is at least as bad as that of the Republicans. And liberals are its architects. Last year, Democratic National Chairman Mitchell fired a research man for no other cause except membership in a Communist front in 1937. . . ."

"These are cowards and I for one would not argue today that the Republic would be destroyed if they were all retired to private life tomorrow. We had radicals in this country once who rated personal survival very low in the scale, and were consumed and are now forgotten. We had fewer senators then, of course, but the air was a little cleaner, too."

Labor Blows Hot and Cold On Vicious Anti-CP Law

The *Advance*, official publication of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers has come out with a slashing attack on the Humphrey bill outlawing the Communist Party. "Many of the senators and representatives voting for it have long stood out as champions of civil liberties. If, as some observers have suggested they joined in the stampede for political expediency, their actions were heinous," states an editorial in its Sept. 1 issue.

"Heinous" is a strong word; still, *The Advance* is too mild. The record of the Democratic Party liberals hardly stamps them as "champions of civil liberties" in the past. And in this case, far from having "joined in the stampede" they initiated the wild spree of cutting away at democracy. Of course, we hail the editorial as a simple, honest, and correct denunciation of the so-called liberals on this issue. This is a rare event in a labor movement which, on matters not purely trade union, is content to whitewash the miserable acts of phony liberals. We are glad to reprint the editorial in an adjoining column.

Only a few labor papers, to our knowledge, have already commented on the unprecedented move against democracy. Sad to say, these are nauseatingly non-committal at best and pitifully apologetic at worst, in their customary fashion.

RELUCTANT REPUBLICANS

The *CIO News*, on August 23, printed a purely "news" report which nevertheless portrays the Democrats as sincere

anti-Communist fighters pressing reluctant Republican compromisers forward. "Charging that the bill is the 'culmination of a very unfortunate situation' for which the Republicans are responsible, Senator Kefauver warned that the measure is so broadly worded the Justice Department now can crack down on one of the major parties if it chooses to do so. 'Certain people in the Republican Party,' he said, 'brought this on themselves by bringing accusations against practically every Democrat' of softness toward communism." This is reported without comment. Apparently the Republicans bear the real responsibility for the crime. Why? Because they goaded the Democrats into committing it!

The CIO-PAC in its weekly letter simply records a few odd facts about the bill without hinting at its own opinion. But the CIO Legislative Department in its latest "Report on Congress" boils everything down to its most trivial essence. "As a practical matter, the Democrats were fighting to kill the Republican '20 years of treason' charge once and for all. Republicans were fighting to retain it." The implication is clear: our clever Democrats had a little success with smart tactics. Still, none of these CIO publications is ready to give the Humphrey bill a clear-cut endorsement.

We have to wait and see what attitude dominates in the official labor movement—the standpoint of *Advance* or the apologetics of the copyclerks who issue the CIO bulletins.

"Advance" on The Anti-Communist Bill

The nation and the rest of the world have been treated in recent days with one of the most amazing acts of demagoguery any Congress has put on display. It pleased the lunatic fringe in America equally as much as it did the communist world for propaganda purposes. It brought only nausea to the saner elements at home, and perplexity, if not outright fear, to our friends abroad. The sorry spectacle was the Senate and the House falling all over themselves in a sudden stampede to pass a harsh anti-communist law.

Unlike legislation of far lesser importance that is studied and debated at times for months on end, the anti-communist bill was called up without prior warning, rewritten and amended on the floor in such haste that even the proponents were breathless and for a while uncertain just what the bill actually called for. A joint committee subsequently ironed out differences in the Senate and House versions by deciding to outlaw the Communist Party and declining to make it a criminal offense to be a member. (Ironically, the self-styled communist-hater, Joe McCarthy, voted in the Senate against making party membership a felony.)

It should be pointed out that persons close to the president have said that he has pondered implications of the bill, thus posing a possibility of a veto.

Frankly, we are at a loss to understand how the bill traveled so far without defeat. Many of the senators and representatives voting for it have long stood out as champions of civil liberties. If, as some observers have suggested, they joined in the stampede for political expediency, their actions were heinous.

We do know, however, that the bill, as it now stands, is a severe blow at civil liberties—the freedom of speech, of thought, of assembly as all Americans are guaranteed by our Constitution. If the Kremlin itself had written the legislation it could not have done a better job of stripping the citizenry of its freedom. In fact, the anti-communist bill has all the elements of police-state thought-control as practiced behind the Iron Curtain. And it drags America, to which the free world looks for democratic leadership, further away from the principles of democracy upon which we have built.

In the last few years, we have warned repeatedly that our country, stirred and harassed by a lunatic fringe of professional flag wavers, was moving rapidly toward the crossroads of America's future. We have now arrived at that point. Will it be along the road of restrictions on freedom? If so, no individual, no group, no organization will be safe from more and more laws outlawing them. We, who have vigorously fought communism and totalitarianism in all its forms, choose the road of democracy, for once freedom has vanished then no man is safe.

—*Advance*, organ of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, September 1, 1954.

BOOKS and Ideas

F. D. Roosevelt: A Look Back at "The Patrician as Opportunist"

By MICHAEL HARRINGTON

The central figure in the mythology of American liberalism is, of course, Franklin Roosevelt. He is seen as a social revolutionary (albeit not a radical), as a latter-day Jackson in Arthur Schlesinger's version of the Tennessee president. However, a dissenting opinion has now been made available with the re-issue of Richard Hofstadter's *The American Political Tradition* in a 95-cent Vintage Book edition published by Alfred A. Knopf.

Hofstadter's portrait of Roosevelt is the last in a series of studies of American political personalities (Jefferson, Lincoln, Wilson, etc.). The chapter is subtitled "The Patrician as Opportunist." And the major point in the interpretation is that Roosevelt had no ideology, except an assumed pro-capitalism, no conception of himself as a revolutionary of any sort, and that ultimately the contradictory complex of ideas referred to as the "New Deal" were incapable of solving the problems of domestic crisis just as Roosevelt's benevolent imperialism failed in foreign policy.

In domestic policy, Hofstadter sees Roosevelt as the architect of two "New Deals." The first was roughly confined to the first term. "It was a series of improvisations, many adopted very suddenly, many contradictory. Such a unity as it had was in political strategy, not as economics." The main elements of this phase of the Roosevelt program were the NRA and the AAA. Hofstadter writes of them, "Reform elements and humane measures of immediate relief were subsidiary to the organized and subsidized scarcity advocated by the Chamber of Commerce, the Farm Bureau Federation, and the National Grange, and incarnated in the NRA and the AAA. These great agencies, the core of the first New Deal . . . embodies the retrogressive idea of recovery through scarcity."

The NRA was, of course, a system of legalized monopoly geared to "high prices and low production." In the liberal mythology, one of its most vaunted features is Section 7(a) which guaranteed the right of collective bargaining. One can easily discount the liberal theory that Section 7(a) "organized" the American labor movement. But even more interesting is Hofstadter's account of Roosevelt's actual attitude toward this piece of legislation.

COMPANY UNIONISM

To begin with, Section 7(a) was completely compatible with company unionism, individual bargaining and the open shop. In actual administration, General Hugh Johnson and Donald Richberg used the law for anti-labor purposes, and Roosevelt's last appointee was a "notorious foe of labor," S. Clay Williams. By 1935, even the AFL was at the end of its tether. Hofstadter quotes a New York Times dispatch of February 3, 1935, headlined, "Labor Unions Break with the New Deal." The article reported that labor leaders were "almost in despair of making headway toward union recognition in the face of powerful industrial interests and an unsympathetic administration."

However, during 1935 several important events occurred. The NRA was declared unconstitutional. Huey Long was making headway with his "share the wealth" campaign. Roosevelt responded to this situation of his own political bankruptcy by starting the "second" New Deal and added the Wagner Act and a progressive income tax to his program. About the only thing left of the first New Deal was the AAA, a program of controlled scarcity and favoritism to the big farmer.

Hofstadter reports an interesting bit of history concerning the Wagner Act. It had not been a "Roosevelt" piece of legislation: For more than a year it had failed to gain his support. Hofstadter quotes Frances Perkins as saying that Roosevelt "was hardly consulted about it," and that "it did not particularly appeal to him when it was described to him." He was "startled" at some of the pro-labor administrative decisions which were reached under it. Yet it became the

political dynamic of the second New Deal, and Roosevelt then described it as "a good democratic antidote for the power of big business."

THE '37 SLUMP

Early in 1937, the business index had climbed almost to 1929 levels. The Federal Reserve tightened credit and Roosevelt called for economy; the WPA roles were cut in half. (Roosevelt believed in the balanced budget.) The result of this break in pump-priming was a depression. The "consumption recovery" had not solved the basic crisis. At this point, Roosevelt was forced into a pragmatic Keynesianism which he finally admitted in his budget message of 1940. He also returned to that hoary device of American progressivism: trust-busting.

Hofstadter characterizes the situation: "Roosevelt's sudden and desperate appeal to the ancient trust-busting device, together with his failure in the fall elections of 1938 to purge the conservative elements in his party, augured the political bankruptcy of the New Deal." In his Annual Message to Congress on January 4, 1939, Roosevelt declared the crisis to be over. "What would have happened," Hofstadter asks, "to the political fortunes of Franklin D. Roosevelt if the war had not created a new theater for his leadership?"

Thus Hofstadter on the New Deal: two phases, one overtly reactionary, the idea of "recovery through scarcity," the other containing some progressive measures (TVA), pro-labor to a certain extent, yet inspired almost completely by political expediency, and ultimately, in the face of the continuing economic crisis, bankrupt. The liberal mythologers could profit by reading this essay.

In treating of Roosevelt's foreign policy, Hofstadter is rather brief. Yet his controlling image, of the "Patrician as Opportunist" continues, this time with regard to imperialism. For example, it is true that Roosevelt expressed a certain sympathy with the colonial peoples. ("If only we had followed him on Indochina," say the liberals, "we wouldn't be in this mess.") Yet, as Hofstadter points out, this attitude was not unmixed, and one of its elements was a desire for a "benevolent" imperialism in which American business would gain the upper hand.

SILKEN-CHAIN THEORY

Thus it was that Roosevelt, in the midst of the war, sought for American business concessions in Morocco. This kind of attitude is somewhat similar to that which lay behind the Marshall Plan and the early "idealistic" phase of Point Four. It is a silken-chain theory, yet the chains are there nevertheless.

This is Hofstadter's summary: "Roosevelt appears to have believed that the ruthless imperialism of the older colonial powers might be replaced by a liberal and benevolent American penetration that would be of advantage both to the natives and to American commerce." This was the practical, hard-headed, un-social-revolutionary Roosevelt speaking, the one who is left out of the liberal mythology and who told his doctor, "What helps is that Stalin is the only man I have to convince. Joe doesn't worry about a congress or a parliament. He's the whole works."

One passage of Hofstadter's which characterizes Roosevelt's imperialism could be transposed to the liberal notion of Point Four. "All this seems characteristic—the quick sympathy with the oppressed colonials, the ideal of liberation and welfare, and yet the calculating interest in American advantage. Just as the Chamber of Commerce's NRA idea had been clothed in the language of the liberal social planners . . . so a new American conquest of world markets might well go forth under the banner of international welfare work."

Hofstadter's final summation is his attempt to balance all of these elements. After conceding the good which Roosevelt did, he writes, "it would be fatal to rest content with his belief in personal benevolence, personal arrangements, the sufficiency of good intentions and month-to-month improvisation, without trying to achieve a more inclusive and systematic conception of what is happening in the world."

And this could well be an epitaph for American liberalism today. An epitaph because, though the Great Father is gone, his fundamental bankruptcy has remained behind.

Lib.-Dem. Deal — —

(Continued from page 11)

claims for proper recognition within the Democratic alliance, from their point of view; in light of their general policy to accept whatever the Democrats dish out on a national and state scale? Thus, their reward was in line with their policy: the Democrats condescended to endorse Harold Baer, Liberal Party stalwart and chairman of its Municipal Affairs Committee, for one of two vacancies on the City Court bench.

In return, the Liberals endorsed most of the Democratic candidates for the State Senate and Assembly, as well as most of the state-wide posts. The Bronx Democrats, following the policy set by their late boss, Edward J. Flynn, refused to permit Liberal endorsement of their local candidates, forcing the Liberals to run their own candidates again.

VIGOROUS DEBATES

In Queens, where the Democratic Party is split by a power fight against its present leader, James A. Roe, the Liberals endorsed mostly anti-Roe Democrats. Several vigorous debates within the various county committees reflected many questions and doubts about the Liberal policy. In some instances liberal Republicans were endorsed rather than "reactionary" Democrats while in other instances, independent Liberals were nominated despite county leaders' objections.

In a few other cases, Republicans were endorsed (Javits in Washington Heights) and in still fewer cases, desperation drove the Liberals to run their own men, unable to find an acceptable Democrat or Republican candidate. By and large, however, the Liberals are supporting the Democratic candidates. Another bone tossed to the Liberals: some of these candidates have agreed to list themselves, if elected, as Democrat-Liberal.

This Democratic-Liberal coalition was forged without any discussion either in the rank and file of the Liberal Party or even in the county committees. Too often the assembly clubs held no discussions at all on the local candidates and received their orders from above. Even the county committees, nominally meeting to vote on the nominations, were often faced with the situation that Liberal leaders had already proclaimed the party policy with respect to the candidates and were scarcely in a position to freely discuss candidates.

This undemocratic procedure is in sharp contrast to last year's pre-nomination discussion about mayoralty candidates. At that time club meetings and city-wide meetings were called to sound out rank and file sentiment on Halley—an excellent innovation that should have been continued.

Labor Leader's Politics

A significant intervention on the part of labor leaders took place with respect to the Democratic consideration of the candidate for lieutenant governor. Over twenty union leaders from both the AFL and the CIO called on the Democratic Party leaders meeting in New York City to urge the nomination of Charles Halloran, Fire Commissioner of Buffalo, for

that post. The nomination of a labor leader like Halloran, they pointed out to the Democrats, would help them win the backing of over 3 million unionists in the state.

This unusual action brought together leading officials of the state AFL and CIO, including Harold Hanover, secretary-treasurer of the state AFL; Joseph Maloney, United Steel Workers State Director; James Burke, Rochester AFL Council President; Joseph Tuvim, International Ladies Garment Workers Union; and Charles Kerrigan, UAW regional director.

These labor leaders were politely received by the Democrats and politely informed that their request would be submitted to the proper authorities and duly processed. While there is no chance of Halloran's nomination, this action is a harbinger of what united political action along independent labor lines could do. These same forces, united not for some episodic purpose like begging the Democrats to name one of their men on the Democratic ticket, but for the purpose of using their strength and influence to run their own men on their own ticket could mobilize not only their three million unionists but millions more.

ROSE ASKS UNITY

It is equally significant that while these labor leaders were calling on the Democrat leaders, hat in hand, Alex Rose, addressing the convention of the Luggage and Handbag Workers Union, called on them and other trade unions to join the Liberal Party and unite their political strength as they have on the economic field.

Rose utilized the occasion to extend a public invitation to the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union, CIO, which had been a strong factor in the American Labor Party before the CP captured the ALP, to re-associate itself with other needle trade unions in the Liberal Party and build a strong political front. Rose urged the political alliance of labor before the reactionary attacks on it and urged affiliation to the Liberal Party.

Louis Hollander answered Rose at a meeting of the Amalgamated's largest board, Local 25, by denying that the time was now "ripe" for independent political action by labor. Such action, he argued, must be on a large scale to be effective and must embrace all of labor; otherwise, it is "political ghettoism." Hollander contended that the policy of labor working within the Democratic Party was a great success and as proof pointed to the election of Mayor Wagner in 1963 in New York and the "extent that the Democrats give ear to the demands of the unions."

CHEAP PAYMENT

"Giving ear" is cheap enough payment for the yeomen service performed by the Hollanders in mobilizing labor behind the Democrats. Would Hollander, on the trade union field, point with satisfaction to the fact that the employers "give ear" to the union demands? Doesn't he prove the validity and power of his union by the concrete realization of their demands in pay raises, improved conditions, and other economic benefits? Why not apply the same yardstick to the political field?

As for "ripeness," the Amalgamated was not always its present size. At one time, it was proud of its reputation as a pioneer in fighting for the interests of labor and achieving "firsts" in the field of economic benefits. That honor now awaits the Amalgamated, as well as other unions, in the field of the political advancement of labor.

As for "political ghettoism," that is the last thing labor need fear once it decides to forsake the back-alleys which lead only to the servants' entrances of the mansions of the Democratic Party, and to strike out on the broad highway of the formation of its own political organization. After all, is it not true that the interests of labor are the interests of the great mass of the American people, and that this mass will recognize that their interests are being truly represented when labor frees itself of its service bondage to a political machine which represents corruption and exploitation?

NOT IN THE HEADLINES . . .

A year's subscription to LABOR ACTION brings you a living socialist analysis of news and views on labor, socialism, minority groups, national and world politics—for \$2.00 a year.

A Labor Action sub is \$2 a year
Get it EVERY week!

On Teaching "Communism" in Our Schools PROFESSOR HOOK PERFORMS "A RITUAL OF SILENCE"

By EDWARD HILL

It is indeed rare these days that an anti-war socialist finds himself in agreement with what Professor Sidney Hook says. For Hook, more than any other American liberal or social-democrat, has been the ideologue of the capitulation to the witchhunt and the reactionary demands of American foreign policy in the cold war.

Yet there is little to which exception can be made in Professor Hook's article in the *New York Times Magazine* Section (August 29, 1954) "Should Our Schools Study Communism?" What Hook says is, on the whole, good, the call for a free, democratic understanding of the nature of Stalinism. But with what Hook does not say, with his silence about the reality of the proposal, the socialist must quarrel. For this article, in failing to take into account the actual situation in the United States, renders itself utopian, or ritualistic, to use a Hookian term—and worse, illusory, for it fosters the notion that these kinds of proposals are still possible in the very unritualistic United States of 1954.

The take-off point for Hook's article was the resolution of the American Citizenship Committee of the American Bar Association (reported on previously in *Challenge*) calling for the study of Communism in the American school. The House of Delegates of the ABA tabled the proposal, of course. Hook sets himself the task of discussing its wisdom. Should our schools study communism? His answer is a resounding, Yes.

WHO SHOULD TEACH

Hook's arguments as to why Communism should be taught are predictable, and, on the whole sound. "Hatred and fear of Communism are not enough. For they cannot tell us what to do to meet threats and reduce fears." It should be noted in passing that this educational purpose is advocated by Hook in the context of agreement with American policy in the cold war, i.e., it is to preserve the "free world." Yet it is still a position with which the socialist can sympathize, disputing the particular political assumption upon which Hook bases it.

On the question of who should teach the course in the theory of communism, Hook is again on solid ground. "The only qualifications for teaching about communism are intimate familiarity with the subject-matter, pedagogic skill, and respect for the truth." He specifically interdicts the notion of a propaganda course, and even adds, "It may be hard to swallow, but the teachers must be free to recognize the truth even when the Communists say it, rare as those occasions are. Communism pretends that it carries to fulfillment the valid ideals of other social philosophies. One should recognize the validity of these ideas and then examine the extent to which the Communists have lived up to them or betrayed them."

This is, of course, an extremely sound method of treating Stalinism. It reveals Hook's social-democratic leanings especially in its call to recognize the "validity of these ideas," of conceiving Stalinism as a betrayer of socialism and democracy rather than their heir. Such a position would only be taken by one in some kind of sympathy with the ideas which the Stalinists have betrayed. Again, we are in sympathy with Hook.

But then this is even more particularized by the author of *Toward the Understanding of Karl Marx*, and *From Hegel to Marx*. He writes, "The study of Communism should teach students the world of difference between democratic socialist regimes, which can be our staunchest allies against Bolshevism, and Communist regimes, open or disguised in the form of a coalition. They should learn that Marxism and Communism are not synonymous and that the Communists to-

day in practice follow ideas which Marx spent almost a lifetime in attacking."

DEFENSE OF MARXISM

Given the inevitable bias—socialist regimes are good partly because they can become "our" allies against "Bolshevism"—this is still fundamentally sound. I am especially glad to see Hook make the public defense of Marxism which he does here. Some liberals could profit by this reference of an unimpeachable supporter of the United States in the cold war.

All well and good in what the article says. But what about what it does not say? In socialist terms, the "utopian" has always been the one who produces the reasonable blue-print without any reference to the actual conditions, social forces, real possibilities, etc. And here, in his thunderous silence, Hook has the classical qualifications of a utopian. He has produced a relatively reasonable, intelligent and democratic proposal which should be adopted. He refrains from mentioning that this adoption is, in the context of the American scene today, impossible.

Where are the schools going to get an atmosphere of such a nature that "the only qualifications for teaching about Communism" are intimate familiarity with the subject-matter, pedagogic skill, and respect for the truth? Quite a few members of the Young Socialist League have qualifications. Would they be allowed to teach about Stalinism? What would happen, today, if a teacher started talking about those areas where the Communists have the truth?

IN WHAT COLLEGES?

But even more pertinently, where could a teacher defend Marx from the abomination of the Stalinists? The colleges in which this is still possible are limited. And in the case of high schools and grammar schools, how many places are there where a teacher can mention Marx without parenthetically noting that he beat up little children?

To what extent can we take a man seriously who offers a plan which is in contradiction to the social possibility which he faces? Yet it is obvious that Professor Hook cannot be dismissed as ignorant. His silence must have another source. And here, one need not go far. Sidney Hook is committed to the empirical view that the fury of the witchhunt is the invention of the "ritualistic liberals." Excesses, he will admit. But the deep, fundamental movement of American society away from even bourgeois freedoms he cannot recognize. If he would recognize this process, his whole attitude of support for the American war camp would have to be re-examined. And then, who knows what would happen?

This is nowhere more visible than in one sentence in this article. Hook writes, "Timid souls who fear the effect of teaching about Communism should, to be consistent, insist that all study of the modern world be dropped from the curriculum—which no one really proposes." "Which no one really proposes," Professor Hook? The lunatic right-wing which is currently riding the crest of the reaction proposes exactly that. The refusal of the American Bar Association to take up the proposal is one more example of such a direction. The attacks on libraries, villification of UNESCO, firing of teachers (see an article elsewhere on this page for the latest incident), are moving precisely in that direction. In the real and unritualistic world of America, 1954, the modern world is still taught, but less and less.

Silence about these facts has become a ritual with Professor Hook. Until he speaks out on them, we cannot take his proposals seriously. We must characterize them as utopian—or rather, ritualistic.

School Segregation Battle Has Just Got Under Way

The decision by the United States Supreme Court banning segregating in public education was historic. Yet at the same time, it created tremendous problems. So far the court has not formed the implementing decrees, but this fall, the actual working out of integrated education will begin in Arkansas, West Virginia, Missouri, Maryland, Delaware and the District of Columbia.

In the other Southern states, nothing is being done until the court formulates its decrees. In some of them, die-hard racists are moving to abolish the system of public education rather than submit to integration. However, a recent United Press story (of August 28) gives an interesting account of the problems being faced in those states which are beginning to do away with segregation.

In some cities, the plans for integration have been made public without a hitch. In Wilmington, Delaware, for instance, the program is being confined to elementary schools, but transfers to the school of the parent's choice will also be permitted.

In West Virginia, six out of fifty-five counties have full integration scheduled for this fall. It was in this state that the first public demonstrations against integration occurred. At a meeting of the Board of Education at Philippi (the historical analogue is ironic even if coincidental) police were called out. The parents of twelve white children assigned to a predominantly Negro grade school were among those present. The meeting finally ended without any violence, but the board backed down in a secret meeting and assigned the twelve children to white schools. Still, integration in areas where there had been no protest was affirmed by the same board.

In Washington, D. C., a general integration program is scheduled for the opening of the school year. Students entering school for the first time will attend the school in the zone where they live. And about 3000 Negro pupils are

being transferred to formerly all-white schools. According to the school superintendent, integration in the District of Columbia will be complete by 1955.

PROGRESSIVE STEPS

These are obviously progressive steps. It is heartening that thus far there has been no violence—although the places which have begun integration are not "deep" South. Yet the report on St. Louis, Missouri, emphasizes the limited nature of the integration program, progressive step as it is.

In St. Louis, integration will begin where it will be most easy, and most effective. The two teachers' colleges are to be combined on one campus (which had been all white). The plan is to work down through the entire school system with integration complete in the fall of 1955. There is a precedent in St. Louis where Catholic parochial schools were unsegregated several years ago by Archbishop Joseph Ritter.

Yet, with the exception of the teachers college, the St. Louis plan will be according to zones. Integration will be considered accomplished when children are able to go to school in the area in which they live. In St. Louis, and in most Southern cities, this places a tremendous limitation on the possible effectiveness of the integration program.

ZONING AND THE GHETTO

For in the cities of the South, the Negro lives in a ghetto, and school zoning will, in many cases, result in segregated schools because of the practical segregation of housing. It can hardly be expected that all Southern school boards will refuse to follow the example of so many of their Northern colleagues who have conveniently drawn residence zoning lines so that they conform to the ghetto boundaries rather than cut across them.

From this viewpoint, it is obvious that it is impossible to conceive of the integration of one area of life as a complete victory over racism. Real educational integration can only become meaningful with integration in all other areas of life, particularly housing and employment. Until these ghettos are destroyed, the process will remain incomplete—or worse, grotesque.

For what happens in these Southern cities when a Negro child who has experienced integrated education graduates? Will this mean a graduation back into segregation? A return to the ghetto after a youthful fling with equality? It is obvious that such a situation could have profound effect on the child subjected to it. Again, it highlights the paradox of fragmented integration in an area of society which is still fundamentally racist.

Yet these objections have been obvious for a long time. What is important is that, so far, the violence which many feared has not materialized. A real effort in the border states to accomplish voluntary integration could well have a tremendous consequence as a precedent for the more difficult task involved when the compulsory decrees come down. Limited as the success may be, an important victory for civil rights may well be won in the schools of the border states this fall.

Another Breach of Academic Freedom

Challenge has reported previously on the academic freedom cases at the University of Michigan. These recently came to a head. Two of the suspended professors were dismissed, and one re-instated.

The criterion used by the University was two-fold: (a) refusal to testify to a House subcommittee headed by the notorious Klt Clardy; (b) refusal to discuss politics with the University officials. Professor Clement L. Markert, who refused to talk to the committee, admitted past Stalinist connections to the university officials. He was re-instated.

But Professors Mark Nickerson, of the medical school and Dr. H. Chandler Davis, a mathematics instructor, were fired. In the case of Davis, it was made clear that the specific reason was his refusal to discuss his politics with the school authorities. Professor Mark Nickerson was rewarded the John Abel Award of \$1000 in 1949 for "the most outstanding work in the United States" in the field of pharmacology.

The Young Socialist League has always insisted that academic competence should be the sole criterion for hiring and firing in a university. If a teacher's Stalinism makes him a bad teacher, then he should be fired for his incompetence, not for his politics. In the available reports on the Michigan incident it appears that the firings grew out of extra-academic conduct, i.e., refusal to testify on constitutional grounds. As such, we can only regard this as another breach of academic freedom.

MENDES-FRANCE: MAN ON A TIGHTROPE

Neutralist-Stalinist-DeGaullist Coalition Killed EDC, But Premier Cannot Rule France With Their Support

By A. STEIN

The great debate on the EDC Treaty has finally begun in the French National Assembly. In the heat of the battle, tremendous pressures from the outside world are being brought to bear on the French parliamentary struggle now unfolding. The myth about the right of a people to make its decisions free of unwarranted outside interference has been conveniently forgotten.

From the United States, Adlai Stevenson, the Democratic Party's 1952 presidential candidate, has sent an urgent message to Premier Mendes-France. Stevenson has informed the French premier that the American people, its government, and both major political parties stand united in favor of the EDC treaty, since it will enable the "Western Democracies" to more effectively defend themselves. (Why hasn't Stevenson ever expressed himself as strongly in favor of France's granting freedom to her colonies? Wouldn't this contribute a thousand times more than EDC to the strengthening and extension of democracy throughout the world?)

Churchill and his Conservative ruling party in Great Britain have rejected any revision in the treaty and demanded that France sign "or else." And from Western Germany, the Christian Democratic Party of Chancellor Adenauer has called on Mendes-France to "save Europe" by supporting the treaty in its original form.

On the other side of the fence, Russia has spoken through her satellite, Poland, offering France a mutual security pact against future German aggression, if the EDC pact is defeated.

Political Turning-Point

There can be no doubt the outcome of the debate will mark a turning point in contemporary world politics. On it depends the entire design of American political and military strategy in Europe and Asia. In that strategy France was to have provided the staging ground and reserves for the European army, while Western Germany contributed the armored shield and spear pointed at Russia's Eastern Europe. Should the treaty go down to defeat, the strategy of withdrawal from Europe, of neo-isolationism, will receive a mighty impulse in American politics and military thinking.

Despite the excitement that surrounds the French debate, the parliamentary struggle was in a very real sense a shadow play, a mere formality. The fate of the treaty was actually settled when Premier Mendes-France traveled to the Brussels Meeting of the six foreign ministers to propose his drastic amendments. These revisions were designed to destroy the supranational character of the West European Army. By this act, Mendes-France placed himself in the camp of the anti-EDC forces in the National Assembly. And on his return from Brussels and his unsuccessful visit with Churchill, Mendes-France further solidarized himself with this coalition by forcing the debate on the treaty to begin. The failure of EDC was finally assured when Mendes-France stated he would not stake the future of his regime on the outcome of the vote on this issue. By refusing to demand a vote of confidence on the treaty, the premier cleared away the last obstacle in the path of the "neutralist" coalition in the Assembly. For this coalition commands the majority needed to defeat the treaty either by postponement or an immediate show of hands. And now the "neutralists" can administer a crushing and final blow to EDC without precipitating a parliamentary crisis and forcing Mendes-France to resign.

Nothing would be changed were Mendes-France to agree to resume negotiations with his Americans with the other nations associated with the treaty. Mendes-France will not sacrifice the "independence" of the

French armed forces, nor cease demanding the right to an unlimited veto in the EDC's Council of Ministers. While the first demand secures French military "sovereignty," the second denies it permanently to West Germany.

Were Mendes-France to make such a face-saving concession to certain pro-treaty members in his cabinet and the Assembly, it would be because more is involved in the present parliamentary debate than the EDC treaty. The pro-EDC coalition may not have the strength to force ratification of the treaty, but it can bring about the downfall of Mendes-France in the immediate future on other issues. What is therefore also at stake is the future of Mendes-France and his program of "national renovation."

The "neutralist" majority in the Assembly will support the premier in defeating the treaty in its present form. But this same coalition is not committed to supporting his domestic program. The largest groupings in this strange political coalition are the totalitarian Stalinists and the dissident followers of the authoritarian De Gaulle. The Stalinists refused to vote for giving Mendes-France broad, undefined, decree powers to carry out his economic program. At least half the Gaullists are hostile to the premier's conciliatory attitude toward the nationalists in the French North Africa colonies.

Need Each Other Badly

To carry out his program of domestic and colonial reforms Mendes-France must have the support of the left-wing of the Popular Republican (MRP, the Catholic center party), and the Mollet wing of the Socialist Party. But both these groups are firm adherents of the EDC treaty. How can they justify their continued support to the premier before their followers when Mendes-France has in effect become the standard bearer in foreign affairs of the enemies of the Fourth Republic—the Stalinists and the De Gaullists? To allow these groups to beat a graceful retreat, Mendes-France may adopt a face-saving formula on the treaty which they would gladly accept.

For the truth is, they need Mendes-France as much as he needs them. They look upon the premier as the savior of the decayed and crisis-ridden Fourth Republic, the architect of a future French "New Deal." The fear which haunts both the supporters as well as the opponents of the EDC treaty is that if Mendes-France falls, if parliamentary democracy shows itself incapable of solving any problem which confronts the country, the Fourth Republic itself may be put to the question. Like a certain French king, Mendes-France can say: "after me the flood."

Not long ago, the conservative paper, *Le Monde*, dramatically declared, "We are not yet back to 1935, but we are approaching 1934." And while still a deputy, Mendes-France rose on more than one occasion to warn the National Assembly that "we are in 1788." If we cast aside the historical mask which the French are fond of assuming in their political debates, we find a simple diagnosis: paralysis is not a form of political life. The politics of postponement followed by the Right-Center coalition which has ruled France since 1951 has not led to the postponement of politics, but its aggravation. Either the *crisis* parliamentary democracy will resolve the burning issues which rend French society or it will be shattered in the process.

Parliamentary democracy presupposes a solid social and political base in the middle-class and sections of the workers. Yet it is these very classes who are today in revolt against the state, that is the Fourth Republic. Without the support of the small farmer, the shopkeeper, the small businessman, and the better-paid workers it is impossible for the bourgeoisie to continue to govern through the mechanism of parliamentary democracy. Such is the case in France today.

The First Shock

The first shock came last August when the workers of the Socialist *Forces Ouvrières* and the Catholic CFTC employed in the nationalized industries rose up spontaneously in revolt against the Laniel decrees which threatened the pensions of state employees. The second shock came in late August and October of 1953 when the farmers followed in the footsteps of the workers and took direct action to enforce their demands for government subsidies and price supports. The revolt of the farmer in the countryside has its counterpart in "a-civic" spirit of the urban lower and medium middle-class, of the shopkeeper, merchant and petty industrialist. These social strata are in permanent revolt against the attempt of the government to effect serious tax reforms and end their wholesale evasion of tax payments.

The major portion of the tax burden is borne by the working class, and since this revenue is insufficient, the state must resort to the poisonous device of the budgetary deficit. Against the virus of inflation bred by this diseased condition, these same classes have only one defense: higher prices. But given the poverty of the masses in France, this leads in turn to a contraction of production and once more inflation.

As the stagnation and decline of the economic system grows more intense, each social class in a layer seeks to protect itself as best it can, and directs its fury against the state. This process of social decomposition and dis-

integration is reflected in the fragmentation and disintegration of parties and groups in the French National Assembly. In turn, this political fragmentation makes impossible the creation of a stable government which can command a solid parliamentary majority. The state itself then becomes the obstacle to any solution of the social crisis.

The most striking recent example of this frightening paralysis was the inability of the National Assembly to choose a president in December, 1953. No less than thirteen ballots were required before a compromise candidate was found in René Coty. However, politics by compromise and postponement has become dangerous for the French ruling class. Domestic social rot, the disaster in Indo-China, unrest in North Africa, the challenge of a resurgent Germany, and the pressure from Washington and Moscow, all demand solutions . . . one way or another.

No Attachment to Democracy

The French ruling class has never shown any profound attachment to the democratic way of life. During the social crisis of the middle thirties, it began to move slowly toward constitutional dictatorship and decree law as the prelude to a Fascist coup. The outbreak of the Second World War and the humiliation of military defeat abruptly ended this experiment and made it unnecessary. The French parliament of the Third Republic voluntarily ended its life on July 10, 1940 by a vote of 509 to 80 out of a total of 666. A little later, the Vichy regime was accepted by the Chamber of Deputies 393 to 3, and by the Senate, 225 to 1. The substance of its class rule was more important than the trappings of democracy.

If it has not sought the overthrow of the Fourth Republic, part of the answer lies in the fact that a period of time was necessary for the big bourgeoisie to rehabilitate itself after the Vichy episode and its alliance with Hitler. In addition, despite their social vulnerability, the big industrialists are the one group that has prospered and grown under the Fourth Republic. But that very prosperity and growth have created the conditions of general social stagnation which now threaten their interests.

If today the French bourgeoisie has not turned toward the subsidization of fascist bands on a grand scale, or launched a serious movement to bring a dictatorial "savior" like Marshall Juin, the darling of the North African colonies to power, it is because there is no danger from the left. Although the French CP has declined in numbers and prestige, it still commands the votes of the working-class and the disgruntled petty-bourgeoisie, and will continue to do so as long as there is no other way for the dispossessed in French society to express their disgust with the status quo.

However, the French CP is no danger to the bourgeoisie and its political representatives while they follow a "neutralist" foreign policy. As for the Socialist Party, reduced in size and torn by factional strife, it is no longer the party of the working-class. It represents the government functionary and white-collar employees, and will support any figure who offers a possible "democratic" way out of the present impasse.

Benevolent Bonapartism

Under these conditions, French big business can afford to try the Mendes-France experiment which proposes to break out of the political and economic blind alley without threatening the big vested interests. Furthermore, Mendes-France must move toward creating a "strong executive" rule by constitutional dictatorship and decree law, if he is to be successful. The trend toward a benevolent, democratic Bonapartism cannot be displeasing to the bourgeoisie, since it can then turn toward a dictatorship of the right if Mendes-France should fail.

It is no accident that Mendes-France asked for and received decree powers in the economic sphere. These powers were voted by the entire Socialist Party fraction, the left-wing of the MRP and his own Radical-Socialist Party. And again we witness the defenders of parliamentary democracy surrendering their delegated power in order to "defend the Republic."

These frightened defenders of the Fourth Republic have already forgotten Article 13 of the 1946 Constitution, which reads: "Only the National Assembly votes laws. It cannot delegate this right." In return for receiving these powers to rule by decree, Mendes-France promised very little to the workers and white-collar employees, to the small farmer and the shopkeeper. And how can this be otherwise when his finance minister is Edgar Faure, the high priest of orthodox finance, who has survived from one right-wing cabinet to another?

On the burning question of wages, Mendes-France has given nothing, promising only that wages would go up as productivity increased. On housing, the proposal originally advanced to build 240,000 houses a year has been dropped. And Mendes-France has not yet indicated how the plan to modernize industry is to be financed. Will the government attempt to impose and collect taxes from the middle-class or will it pursue the old method of budgetary deficits, bringing in its wake inflation and rising prices? In any case, it is the masses who will have to pay the price for Mendes-France's program of "national renovation."

Background of the Anti-Vargas Struggle

Brazil: The Economic Crisis is Decisive

By J. R.

RIO DE JANEIRO, Aug. 25—The suicide of president Vargas has no precedent in the history of this country, where political life is completely different for that in the Hispanic republics of America; where all political problems and political struggles have been resolved in an evolutionary manner, including the passage from colonial status to the independence of Brazil, from monarchy to republic, and from the slavery of the Negroes to their emancipation.

The present political crisis is composed of very heterogeneous elements. There is the old controversy between the dictatorship of President Vargas and the democratic camp of the bourgeoisie; the fight between traditional liberal capitalist forces and the totalitarian camp of the ex-dictator composed of the new bourgeoisie, the nationalist middle class, the government bureaucracy and the backward workers and peasants.

Twenty-five years of the Vargas government, of persecutions, prisons, arbitrations, of crushing and breaking Vargas' political adversaries has created in this peaceful country a climate of political vengeance, of passionate political struggle, which is so alien to all the political traditions of Brazil.

Day after day the newspapers of the opposition have accused and attacked the president for his dictatorial methods, for an anti-democratic and authoritarian method of government, of political dishonesty, including political crimes after the assassination of an opposition journalist.

THE END—TRAGEDY

But the dictator, lacking the normal political sensitivity which is a characteristic of every parliamentary leader, placed his confidence in his majority in the Congress and his support by the people, ignored public opinion and the weight of the opposition, and thus demonstrated his authoritarian political blindness which could end only in tragedy.

Of course, the background of this political struggle is formed by the economic problems of the country. Of primary importance is the growth of Brazilian industry, that is, of the capitalist economy and hence of the present economic crisis.

Industry is growing rapidly in Brazil, because European and North American capitalists, in the face of the world crisis and the "Russian danger" prefer to make investments in a country which is far from the war centers, and where manpower is cheaper than in either Europe or the U. S. A. Further, the country is very rich in raw materials, has a considerable internal market of its own, and enjoys a degree of political stability which is greater than that of any other Latin American republic.

The struggle is over the question: which road for Brazil's young capitalism? Shall it develop as the economy of a semi-colonial country, dependent on imperialism, that is, in the traditional "democratic" way which will open the door to imperialist penetration with low wages and low prices for Brazilian raw materials and Brazilian export products? Or shall it grow under

the control of the Brazilian state, that is, as a national "state capitalism" with protective customs, high prices for Brazil's exports, with decisive political power in the hands of the Brazilian state bureaucracy and the nationalist bourgeoisie and middle class?

COFFEE AND POLITICS

Thus, the coffee problem is only a reflection of the basic problems of Brazilian economies and politics and of world inter-capitalist relations. The drop of coffee prices on the New York market has intensified the political crisis in Brazil and accelerated the dramatic fight between the opposition and the president's administration.

The political antecedents of the ex-dictator are well known: he began his political adventure with a totalitarian revolution 25 years ago, and founded a corporative "Estado Novo" (New State) imitating Hitler and Mussolini. After the defeat of Nazism he was deposed by the armed forces in 1945.

But his political career was not ended, and he came back to power as the representative of the people, as the leader of the "democratic majority." But by this popular election, there was created a very peculiar situation: the ex-dictator was now supposed to be the leader of the democracy, and was supposed to govern under the control of public opinion. But he never accepted democracy as the way and the manner of government. He completely ignored the clamor and the weight of the political opposition, but relied simply on his mechanical majority in Congress. In a country like Brazil, this situation provoked a climate of political hysteria which culminated in the present crisis.

ECONOMIC CRISIS

The most important element for an understanding of the situation in Brazil is the economic crisis which shows up in the high prices of a protected industry, in the high cost of living, high rents, inflation,

and low wages. This situation has been aggravated by Vargas' policy which was to accelerate the rhythm of capitalist accumulation by erecting a high customs barrier and by keeping prices high.

With these policies, he worked against the people who had elected him with the hope that he would defend their standard of living. The high price of coffee and other goods exasperated the people and weakened the popular support of the government, thus opening the way for the opposition to attack it.

The growing opposition of the people, and the increasing isolation of the government suspended the regime in a vacuum, and permitted the political power of the armed forces to become the arbiter between the government and the opposition.

POLITICAL INSENSIBILITY

The vigor of the opposition's attacks grew daily, and the president answered only with political insensibility, ignoring the importance of the opposition... and with individual terror against the journalists of the opposition, carried out by his agents. The old authoritarian leader demonstrated absolute political blindness as he tried to solve the political crisis by totalitarian methods when he had become a democratically elected president and was thus obligated to seek democratic, parliamentary solutions. The first assassination of an opposition journalist provoked indignation in the country and intensified the attack of the opposition in the press and in Congress.

But then, one day, another reporter, Lacerda, was also attacked by the president's agents. He saved himself by an accident, but Vaz, an air force major who had nothing to do with political struggles, was killed beside him. This event fed the flames of the political struggle, and the opposition accused the president as the "intellectual author" of the crime, and demanded his resignation.

This time, the armed forces, af-

ter some days of crisis, presented Vargas with an ultimatum and forced him to give up his power. The old ex-dictator resisted the attack vigorously, and declared that he would abandon power only as a prisoner or a cadaver (arrested or dead). He felt himself strong on the basis of a popular majority and his majority in Congress. But he ignored the strength of the opposition and the fact that the popular majority was now against him. That is what had opened the door to the attack by the opposition, to the military ultimatum, and to his final tragic end.

PRISONER OR CORPSE

Under the pressure of the ultimatum, the ex-dictator accepted a leave of absence for 90 days. But the generals demanded the definitive abandonment of power. The old political leader, ambitious and vengeful as he was, had no other political solution, after he had given his word that he would go out only as a prisoner or a corpse, but to kill himself.

He left a letter as a political testament in which he declared that he sacrifices his own life for the people and the country; that he offers to his enemies his grave, but to the people a banner of struggle; he is "leaving this life to win victory." Thus finished the dramatic struggle between the old totalitarian politician and the opposition in the country.

As we have written, the economic problems of Brazil form the background of this struggle. There is also the class struggle of the growing working class, divided at present among the camps of Vargas, the opposition and the Communist Party. None of these camps represents the true interests of the country, nor does any of them have a political solution to its problems. That belongs to the future, that is, to the working class and to socialism.

It also belongs, we must add, to other articles which will follow in due course.

Unemployment in White-Collar Field Too

By LARRY FOSTER

In the recession taking place in the United States today, people are bombarded day in, day out with statistics on unemployment, total labor force, the decline in steel production and just how many percentage points the economy is off from the levels of 1953.

To those who are employed, all this may be of great interest in an abstract, academic sort of way. But to the man out of work, trying to make ends meet on his unemployment insurance check, the battle of the statisticians is far less important than his personal battle to get back on a payroll.

The greatest attention has been paid in the present slump to the industrial labor force, whether they be unskilled, semi-skilled or skilled, in such industries as automobiles, steel, rubber, and the like. But little has been said about the white-collar worker who is experiencing tough sledding in his own field.

In his first week and a half of unemployment, the present writer sought work with some 26 firms in New York City, among them some of the largest concerns in the banking, publishing, textile, insurance, office machine production and chemical fields. Here is the employment picture, for bookkeepers and other skilled office workers, as given him by personnel managers and personnel staff workers in these fields:

In banking, he was told that the large banks had taken in a number of high school youngsters in June who work just for the summer at low wages. As far as the regular personnel were concerned, there is less of a turnover on the job than usual, which shows that people are thinking twice before leaving their positions because of the general conditions on the labor market and the way the economy is going.

In the publishing field, many houses have cut back on personnel, cutting down expenses, attempting to hold their own. It is true that the summer is, as a rule, a slow season in publishing, but this has been the trend most of this year. When people are out of work, or working less than a full week they are not very receptive to the idea of putting down five dollars for a book. Around the city can be seen in many stores special sales on books with as much as 40 per cent to 50 per cent off on so-called publishers overstock. In textiles and industrial companies, with some slight variation, it is more or less the same.

Two things about the white-collar field stand out from this entire coverage: One is that something which happened in industry over a hundred years ago, and which played havoc with many of the skilled crafts of that time is now happening to the skilled white-collar trades. That is the increasing mechanization of the office.

To give a concrete example, and one that touched home with this bookkeeper: Up until 15-20 years ago a bookkeeper was considered a responsible employee compared to many other office workers. A man would take charge of a full set of books in a small firm, or of a whole section in a larger one such as Accounts Receivable, Sales Journal, and the like.

Today, with bookkeeping machines being produced by IBM and National Cash Register, much of the work has been so simplified that it no longer requires any great amount of skill. Girls today are chiefly working these machines, and it only takes a few weeks to learn the job. In fact, many of the manufacturers of these units operate their own schools and a training course only takes four to six weeks. This brings on the lowering of wages, and makes for technological unemployment among bookkeepers.

The second point that stands out is that now as far as accountants are concerned (not CPAs), in many companies there are still some openings. But you have to have a college degree to get the jobs. Thus the medium skills are squeezed, and the requirements for the higher ones raised. But the vast outpouring of graduates from colleges who have majored in accounting, business administration and advertising points to a glut on the market for white-collar workers in these fields too.

SPD and Germany — —

(Continued from page 7)

feat of EDC in the French Assembly was an approach by Chancellor Adenauer to the Social Democratic Party (SPD) with the request for cooperation in working out a new foreign policy for the West German Republic!

NO BI-PARTISANSHIP

It may be a little difficult for Americans to grasp the significance of this event. We live in a country where it is customary for everyone to demand bi-partisanship in foreign policy, where a thousand editorials a year are written on the theme that "party strife ends at the water's edge," or at least that it *should* end here. The fact that the issues of foreign policy keep breaking through this pious wish for unity does not dampen the ardour with which it is hoped for.

In Europe the notion that everyone should agree on foreign policy, no matter what their quarrels on domestic affairs, is one reserved pretty rigidly for periods of extreme crisis, such as actual shooting wars. And in Germany, one of the chief issues which has embittered relations between Adenauer's right-center bloc and the SPD has been the chancellor's absolute commitment to EDC and the rearmament of Western Germany which was an integral part of it.

It will be recalled that the SPD sought to block West German ratification of the EDC treaty by every parliamentary and juridical device at its disposal. It claimed that the West German constitution has no provision for the raising of armed forces, and sought court action to have the rearmament of West Germany declared unconstitutional. Adenauer rammed the vote through the Bundestag authorizing rearmament as soon as he got his two-thirds majority at the last elections, with scant regard for the violent protests of the opposition.

FOR GERMAN UNITY

The opposition of the SPD to the rearmament of West Germany under EDC was rooted not only in their apprehension over the fate of the labor movement and of democracy in general in Germany if the generals were once more permit-

ted to build up a powerful armed force. It was based also on their demand that Germany be given full equality with the other nations of EDC and NATO before she be required to raise an army to defend them all. But towering above these objections was the SPD's demand for the re-unification of the country which was coupled with propaganda for the formation of broader political and economic ties in Europe than those envisioned by the "little Europe" ideas of EDC.

In practice, the SPD's position has been to demand four-power negotiations for the re-unification of Germany, and to talk vaguely about greater British participation in any European "security system." Although the SPD has also repeatedly stated its basic allegiance to the "West," they have never made it clear to others or to themselves just how they expect the Russians to give up Eastern Germany unless they get, at the very least, a firm guarantee of the neutralization of the country for a considerable period of time.

Yet every demand for four-power negotiations as the method of German re-unification must either include the idea of accepting a neutral status for the country, or it is demagogic, for it leaves out the critical question of what is expected each side will be willing to give and will expect to get in exchange for doing the Germans the favor of letting them live in a united country.

ADENAUER OPPOSED

Adenauer and the core of the coalition which he holds together have been opposed to four-power negotiations. They have realized that if such negotiations are to have any real consequences (other than the very real propaganda advantages to be derived from them by the Russians) they must necessarily involve some kind of German neutralization. Instead, they have sought the re-building of Germany economically and politically as the leading element in a united Western Europe, even if this means that the country will remain divided until such a Europe, together with her American ally, are able to wrest Eastern Germany from the Russians by force of arms, or the overwhelming threat of it.

It cannot be expected that Adenauer's basic objective will now change, any more than this is true of the basic objectives of the State Department. But he will now have to sell his policy without the relatively attractive wrappings of the EDC. The Social Democrats, who were slandered viciously by his party in the last elections as Russian agents, must be brought around, if possible, to support the new policy. Otherwise it is quite possible that their strength will grow on the basis of Adenauer's defeat on EDC.

The new policy would be direct inclusion of West Germany in NATO, or some substitute for it which would get around the strong possibility of a French veto. If the Americans and British are willing to go along with this, without too much opposition from the smaller NATO countries, this would be a very adequate substitute for EDC.

But how get the SPD to go along? The trap can be baited with the claim that in the NATO set-up West Germany would attain complete equality with the other partners. But how about German unification via four-power agreement? It is inevitable that Adenauer will have to play along with that if he is to get SPD support. His problem is chiefly to work out some super-clever idea whereby the Americans can get through another four-power conference on Germany without giving anything while at the same time appearing to be reasonable. It is not an easy task, given the cards the Stalinists hold in their hands.

TRAP FOR SPD

If the German social democrats are trapped by Adenauer's strategy, they will suffer another major political blow, and the working class will be set back on its heels. If they refuse to enter the trap, but at the same time simply keep repeating their empty pleas to the occupying powers to unify their country, they will not be much better off.

The basic demand for socialists in Germany today should be the removal of all foreign troops from German soil at once. Their demand for unification, for an end to the occupation of Germany, for full sovereignty should be directed as much to the Western powers as to the Stalinists. They should act on their demand by demonstrating in every way available to them that Germany must be free of foreign domination, and that she is not in a position to even discuss freely her future course until her freedom has been established in fact.

Such a demand could place the initiative in the hands of the working class. As against either German occupation or German neutralization controlled by foreign powers the demand should be for German unity in freedom, to be followed by the unity of the German working class with the workers of the rest of Europe in an Independent Western Union.

FRANCE and EDC — —

(Continued from page 1)

puted issue of German rearmament has not been resolved. For one thing Mendes-France has declared he believes West Germany will be and must be rearmament in one form or another, and that she must also be given limited "sovereignty." He has also declared himself in favor of creating a loose West European military coalition backed and supported by the United States and Great Britain.

But important segments of the "neutralist" coalition responsible for the defeat of the EDC treaty do not share Mendes-France's views. And they dispose of a decisive means of political persuasion: their votes. The Stalinists and the Mock-Mayer SP faction are hostile to any and every form of German armament and "sovereignty." In this, they are joined by an important

grouping of the Gaullist faction. Together, these groups can bring about the downfall of Mendes-France should he seriously pursue a policy of the "middle-ground" on these issues.

As for the pro-EDC treaty elements, who till now supported Mendes-France on his domestic program, they may feel he is too closely bound up with the "neutralists" and Stalinists, and refuse to back him in the future.

Whether Mendes-France can clear these hurdles and remain in office for long now seems doubtful. But one thing is sure: he has not healed the bitter breach in French politics brought about by the problem of German rearmament. He presents the paradox of a pro-Western French political whose main political support is to be found among "neutralist" and Stalinist forces.

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 \$2.00 New
- 6 months at \$1.00 Renewal
- Payment enclosed Bill me.

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

READ ABOUT SOCIALISM

The Fight for Socialism cloth \$2 paper \$1

by Max Shachtman

Socialism: the Hope of Humanity .10

by Max Shachtman

Marxism in the U. S. .35

by Leon Trotsky

Plenty for All: The Meaning of Socialism .25

by Ernest Erber

The Principles and Program of Independent Socialism .10

(LA Special Issue)

Independent Socialist Press

114 West 14 Street, New York City