

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

SEPTEMBER 24, 1956

FIVE CENTS

Panama Is Getting Restless Too

Watch Panama! A storm is brewing over Washington's own "Suez."

Both internal economic and nationalist issues are seething. Canal zone workers are demanding application of the American minimum wage, which would mean wiping out the coolie-labor system under which they work for government contractors. Anger has risen high over Washington's abolition of special commissary privileges for these workers, in cahoots with Panamanian businessmen. A four-day bus strike, which nearly became a national general strike, recently precipitated a national crisis and was denounced by the incoming president as "a revolution."

The Suez crisis has been finding an echo in Panamanian feelings about the long U. S. rule over part of their country. On Sunday a N. Y. Times dispatch from the city of Panama made the frank statement:

"There appears to be hardly a Panamanian who, deep in his heart, would not be happy to see the United States sent packing from the Canal Zone and have the entire canal operation placed in the hands of Panama. But calmer heads urge a realistic view." (Sept. 16.)

On Monday, the government of Panama formally voted to back Egypt's proposal for a Cario conference on the Suez problem!

The country that was "invented" by the United States in order to separate the canal zone from Colombia is now tugging at Washington's leading-strings.

Harmony and Hypocrisy: Is It Practical Politics?

By BEN HALL

On September 15, 2000 delegates to a special United Auto Workers conference in Detroit voted to endorse the Democratic ticket. They were prodded and persuaded by their president, Walter Reuther.

It became official: the Democratic Party can have Eastland, the Southern slave-dealer, together with Reuther, the labor New Dealer.

No one was astonished; it was simply a formal endorsement of what had become official labor policy the instant after the nominations were over. Two weeks before, the AFL-CIO Executive Council had already endorsed the ticket.

Yet it was perhaps the most pitiful act of political capitulation in the career of our modern labor leaders, committed blatantly and publicly as if it were the most natural thing in the world.

They act as if they have already forgotten their bold denunciations; their insistent demands; their loud threats—everything that turned out to be mere wind—and they turn toward drumming up votes for the Democratic ticket.

But they cannot forget; for the hostility between the labor and reactionary wing of the party remains and the domination of the party in Congress by the right wing is guaranteed.

Up to the last minute, labor officials lashed out against Southern reaction and insisted that they would not continue to ride along with it. Most dramatic of all, Walter Reuther proclaimed that the Democratic Party could not have the support of both Eastland and the UAW, threatening to withdraw support if the liberals compromised with the Dixiecrats.

EMPTY THREATS

George Meany, on April 27, told the Industrial Union Department that "We couldn't buy the Democratic Party with its Dixiecrats and its record on civil rights and we couldn't buy the Republican Party with its subservience to big business."

A month later Emil Mazey told report-

ers that he wanted a civil-rights plank in the Democratic platform so "tough" that the Dixiecrats would be forced out of the party. He warned that the UAW might sit out the elections: "For instance, if the Democratic Party candidate is strong and the civil-rights platform is weak, we would sit it out. We would do the same thing if the candidate is weak and the platform is strong."

All empty threats.

It continued right along up to the end. Here are some headlines from the labor press:

August 11: LABOR ASKS BOTH PARTIES
(Continued on page 3)

From Emmett Till to James Gordon

By PRISCILLA CADY

One year ago this week, on September 23, a jury in Sumner, Mississippi, found J. W. Milan and Roy Bryant not guilty of the lynch murder of 14-year-old Emmett Till. The country, indeed the world, was shocked. The crime itself was a heinous one, but the far greater crime was committed by their acquittal. That there are murderers in our society is not a new and startling fact; that the state condones and supports these murderers is an unforgivable crime. On November 11 of last year, another jury refused even to indict the two men for their self-confessed kidnapping of the boy.

To recapitulate the case:

Emmett Till, a Negro schoolboy from Chicago, went down to Money, Miss. for a vacation with his relatives, among them his great-uncle, Moses Wright. On August 24 he went to the general store to buy some candy. Exactly what happened there is not clear; the general accusation was that he was "fresh" to Carolyn Bryant, wife of the owner.

We can assume, perhaps, that Emmett, a boy born and brought up in the North, did not react to the Jim Crow by putting on a subservient mask; he remained a normal 14-year-old boy. He may have been "fresh" in the process. Given the context, one can only say that, perhaps all unknown to him, this took courage and self-respect. In a sense, Emmett Till was not a martyr in a large issue, but a small important one—the right to be fresh and live.

On August 28 the two murderers broke into the home of Moses Wright and kidnapped the boy. He was next seen dead.

The world-wide excitement that the case of this child caused

WHAT'S STOPPING THE GOP FROM PLAYING FOR THE NEGRO VOTE?

... page 3

Union Braintrusters Get a Brainstorm

... page 2

Guy Mollet and 'The True Face of France'

... page 4

Democracy Loses at the SDA Convention

... page 5

CP Discussion: A Basic Question Is Raised

... page 8

Dulles Plan Sets a Dilemma That Can Provoke Suez War:

'START SHOOTING OR BACK DOWN'

By HAL DRAPER

The Dulles second-string plan for a "Users Association" to take Suez away from Egypt is sailing through rough waters, as this is written. It may turn out to be a dud, like the London Conference plan which Nasser definitely rejected on September 9 and which was forthwith dropped (with a crash) by the Big Three imperialist powers. Or it may indeed turn out to be a provocative step to prepare the way for an armed assault on Egypt's sovereignty.

Which it will be will partly be determined no doubt by the amount of support Dulles-Eden-Mollet can drum up at the second London conference which will get under way before this is off the press.

The plan itself is, juridically, the most fantastic lawyers' brainstorm that has come out of the diplomatic mills since the canal nationalization on July 26. The claim that Egypt will be "in violation of the 1888 convention" if it rejects the scheme is simply shyster talk which no body, absolutely nobody, is really expected to believe.

Briefly, the U. S., Britain and France (plus any other nations that want to join, but alone if need be, says Dulles bravely) will set up on their own say-so a canal "Users' Association" which will

proceed to insist on using its own pilots through the canal, on controlling the pattern of traffic through the canal, and above all on paying the canal fees not to Egypt but to their own Association, which will in turn hand out a cut to Egypt ("if all goes well," adds the inefable French Premier Mollet in a modulated shriek of rage, to qualify the last point).

This is proposed by three countries, one of which was not even a signer of the 1888 Convention. What if Liberia, Panama and Monaco want to set up their own Users' Association—is Egypt supposed to hand over the canal to them too?

In an amusing typographical error, the N. Y. Times reported that diplomatic sources were calling this Dulles plan a "smart lawyers' ploy." In one column

(Continued on page 7)

did not die down quickly, but it eventually did die down. This fall, however, on the anniversary of Emmett Till's death, interest is again centered on the Negro children of the South. Not one child, but many children, and their courage.

The Supreme Court decision, standing by itself without implementation from the federal government, has passed the necessity for courageous action from the state, where it belongs, to the children. And the children, where it has been possible for them, have taken up the challenge.

It is difficult to imagine what it must be like for Negro youngsters like James Gordon to pass through hostile lines, suffer insults and missiles, and feel the impact of a mob's madness. They could have said they were afraid, let's try another time, and not have been blamed, but they had the self-respect, the courage and the will to win their own fight, and they went on.

In Texas they lost, and now too in Sturgis and Clinton. But these efforts will accomplish much in terms of their future development and the development of their fellows. The successful integration in Louisville affected far more in numbers, but it was harder in Clinton, for they were so few in number and so much in the spotlight.

There is more here than the symbolic relationship between Emmett Till's murder and these children's courage. Children have not suffered the harsh and manifold defeats of their parents; they have the freshness and youthful courage that gives them the will to achieve a life of full equality. If the future belongs to youth who have known how to hold their heads high when they were alone and right, then it will be in good hands.

Union Braintrusters Need A Spell on the Assembly Line

By JACK WILSON

A few years ago it went without saying in the labor movement that the major objective of the unions was a shorter work-week, along with higher wages and better working conditions. For these three goals were and remain the very foundation and reason for existence of the union movement.

It was not surprising, then, that at the conference last week of 100 research directors of the AFL-CIO, the usual platitudes along these lines were repeated by George Meany and Walter Reuther as spokesmen.

What was surprising, however, was the resistance and the dragging-off-foot by some union "brain-trusters" against committing themselves to these traditional sentiments. In fact, one major union, the former CIO rubber workers' union, has been trying (unsuccessfully, we are glad to note) to change the basic 6-hour day of the rubber industry into an 8-hour day and 40-hour week.

In the discussion on this issue, what was painfully clear, but politely left unsaid, is that some of the arguments against a shorter work-week are repetitions of the 19th century arguments against an 8-hour day. Only, this time, it is not hard-boiled anti-union employers uttering them, but well-paid union functionaries, who have no intention of course of trying the theory out on themselves in an industrial plant.

Peter Henle, assistant director of research of the AFL-CIO, said, for example: "As one analyst has cruelly stated it, does the American woman want her husband around the house three consecu-

tive days?" If the husband can't make a decent living in four days, of course the wife wants him out hustling to make money. But suppose the union movement was successful in getting a decent living wage on a 30-hour week: would that be a major problem?

CONFUSION

The second favorite argument—and it has gained widespread assent among union leaders—was expressed by George Brooks, research director of the Pulp, Sulphite and Paper Mill Workers: "The issue is not that someone has been made to work, but that he has been deprived of a chance to make overtime pay. . . . Workers are eager to increase their income, not to work fewer hours."

Here, in two sentences, is all the confusion possible on the question. Just why are an increase in income and fewer hours conterminous? Suppose the union movement adopted and fought for a 30-hour week with 40-hour pay: wouldn't that change the alleged contradiction?

Sure, all workers like overtime work and overtime pay, when they don't make

enough money on a 40-hour week to meet the rising cost of living. A 48-hour week is a poor substitute for the failure of the union movement to achieve real higher wages. In this sense, overtime work and overtime pay are a commentary on how the union movement has retrogressed in this basic field.

The prize argument was presented by Woodrow Ginsburg and Ralph Bergmann, research men of the rubber workers' union:

"The basic pressure for higher standards of living persist, and in some ways are accentuated under a shorter work-day." Isn't that an awful thing! The workers are never satisfied. They plague union officials no matter what you do for them! And, outside of the fact that it disturbs the complacency of a self-satisfied bureaucracy or flunkie in the union movement, just what is wrong with pressing for a higher standard of living?

"Whereas, under an eight-hour day, workers holding a second job are rare, under a six-hour schedule second jobs are widespread."

VOICES OF CONSERVATISM

Now it is true that in Akron many rubber workers hold down two jobs. The basic reason is that all the economic gains of the URWA are peanuts compared to the vast profits the rubber companies have been making in the past 20 years. To meet the problems of paying bills, workers are forced, since their

wages aren't high enough, to get outside work. The criticism should be directed at the conservative policies of the union leadership, rather than the workers.

As a matter of fact, the rubber workers' first major strike, the Goodyear walk-out in 1936, had as a major objective the preservation of the 6-hour day which Goodyear was trying to change into an 8-hour day. Furthermore, the URWA officials failed to inform the conference that among the workers there is widespread opposition to the top leadership's plans to go back to an 8-hour day.

Finally, with the increasing impact of automation, anything less than a shorter work-week with at least the same if not more pay, is simply suicide for the union movement.

Fundamentally, the trouble with the research staff men is that they speak and alibi for the prejudices, conservatism, and ill-formed opinions of their bosses, the men of power of the union movement. And the opinions they often express just reflect the backwardness of the leaders, rather than any objective study. The Washington conference served to emphasize this point again.

In all the arguments against the idea of a 30-hour week with 40-hour pay—which include such employer excuses as "The industry can't afford it," or "The workers wouldn't know what to do with their time," etc.—no one yet has dared to claim that in any vote of the workers concerned the men involved would turn down a contract calling for a 30-hour week and 40-hour pay.

A major step in the education of these research men would be to spend six months on, say, a fast auto assembly line, a steel mill, a foundry, a mill room in a rubber plant, or some other physical labor. This would convince them quickly that 30 hours a week is enough to be a tiny cog in the huge dehumanized industrial system.

Mine Workers Union Doesn't Sidestep

The opening of the election campaign coincides with the beginning of the school year. A few Negro youngsters have to serve as symbols of the fight for democracy in the South. The presidential candidates squirm uneasily while racism and civil rights are pitted against each other on the streets in Tennessee, Kentucky and Texas.

So far, the labor movement has sidestepped the struggle and confines itself to routine declarations for civil rights, in general as though racist mobs were not actually assembled in front of schools.

Only the United Mine Workers is known to have taken a strong public stand.

When it was reported that white union miners had joined gangs in Sturgis, Ky. and elsewhere to prevent Negro union miners from sending their children to unsegregated schools, Thomas Kennedy, UMW vice-president, sent a letter to all districts:

"Any participation by members of the UMW in such racial incidents is completely in opposition to the policy of this union. The UMW has prohibited racial, religious and national discrimination in its constitution since 1890. Any coal miners taking part in such incidents do so as individuals and have absolutely no authority to refer to themselves as officials or otherwise representatives of this union."

The full text of the message is not now available to us; from this excerpt reported by the New York Times it appears that the UMW has taken a first necessary step to curb racist action by its members.

Just a few weeks before, when no one had yet heard of Sturgis and Clay, the UMW apparently thought it had finally solved the civil-rights question for itself. The August 15 issue of the *United Mine Workers Journal* editorialized, "While civil rights are no problem to the UMW which has prohibited racial, religious or national discrimination in its constitution since its founding in 1890, it is of great national and international importance."

Unfortunately, the problem remains; but at least, in the heat of the struggle, the UMW acts to give moral support to the fight against segregation.

LABOR SCOPE

AFL-CIO Anti-Racketeer Committee is Skirting the Fringes of the Problem

By BEN HALL

In politics, the powerful newly united labor movement began by hurling thunderbolts, only to shrink back submissively to its old attachment to the Democrats. Meanwhile, on racketeering it took the first gingerly steps to carry out the provisions of the new constitution.

The AFL-CIO has the power to investigate charges of racketeering in its affiliates, to suspend offenders and to recommend their expulsion by a convention. Up to now, the campaign against dishonest and gangster elements has been confined to speeches and resolutions.

But last month, the Executive Council took action against three unions. It demanded that the Distillery Workers Union, membership 25,000, show cause why it should not be suspended from the federation; it ordered an investigation into corruption charges against the Laundry Workers International, membership 72,000; and into the Allied Industrial Workers Union, 73,000 strong.

These unions are small, weak, and of little consequence in the inner power relations of the federations. The Executive Council, so far, shows no inclination to move against the truly powerful sections of the federation that have been charged with corruption within and without the labor movement. It moved only obliquely against the Teamsters Union when it outlawed its pact with the International Longshoremen's Association, expelled from the AFL for racketeering.

RUNAROUND

It intends to test out the ground by skirting the fringes of the problem; that was brought home in the last weeks by events involving the International Union of Operating Engineers.

This union has a considerable membership; its record is one of the most sordid; it has spawned some of the most infamous characters in the annals of union corruption; a most notorious graduate from its school was Joseph Fay, just out of prison where he served a long term for extortion.

A committee of members expelled from Local 138 of the Engineers appealed for

help to the AFL-CIO Ethical Practices Committee, but in vain. Their local, in Long Island, is run by William DeKoenig Jr., who serves as president and business manager. He took over from his father, who went to jail for graft and extortion.

A reform group in the local has been unable to get honest elections in their local; their leaders have been expelled and blacklisted; they have been frozen out of jobs; they have been unable to get relief from their own international president, William Maloney.

The reform group sent two representatives to Washington last month. They picketed the offices of their international and were promised that their grievances would be investigated. Nothing was done.

They turned a protest in to George Meany, who in turn referred it to Al Hayes, chairman of the Ethical Practices Committee. An assistant to Hayes told them that the Local 138 situation seemed "atrocious" but that was the last they heard. They waited one week; after failing to get entry to any AFL-CIO higher officials, they picketed federation offices in Washington. They learned only that Hayes, Meany and William Schnitzler were out of town and not available.

NO CALL TO RANKS

Later, they went to Forest Park, Pa. where the AFL-CIO Executive Council was meeting, and succeeded in interviewing Reuther, Meany and others. Reuther told them that he was "1000 per cent behind what you people are trying to do. . . . Whatever you do, don't stop fighting."

Meany referred them to Dubinsky and Potofsky, who are members of the Ethical Practices Committee. They were told that if they presented documentary evidence the committee would investigate.

The two men went home broke after getting a promise from their international president Maloney that their complaints would be investigated and that they could count on getting jobs through the local. They returned to their local hiring hall and were refused jobs four times. Each time they sent telegrams to the Washing-

ton office of their international.

Finally, one of them was assigned to a job 62 miles from his home; when he got to work he was driven off by two members of the De Koenig machine. Next day, four members of their group checked in to the hiring hall and were ordered off the premises by local officials.

In time, perhaps, they will get the attention of the Ethical Practices Committee. But the incident underscores the basic weakness of the AFL-CIO attack on racketeers. The Ethical Practices Committee relies upon slow, deliberate action by the officials on top intervening in due time, where and when they feel it advisable. But can they crack gangsterism where it is really powerful with such methods and how long will it take?

What is missing is an appeal to the rank and file to organize themselves inside the unions to oust racketeers.

Don't miss a single week of

LABOR ACTION

A sub is only \$2.00 a year!

NEW YORK

LABOR ACTION FORUM

THURSDAYS AT 9 P.M.

Sept. 27—Hal Draper

AMERICAN IMPERIALISM'S
COOLIE LABOR
IN GUAM AND SAMOA

Oct. 4—Michael Harrington

THE
ROOSEVELT MYTH

A Review of
"The Lion and the Fox"

Labor Action Hall

114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

What Stops the GOP from Bidding for Negro Votes on the Civil Rights Issue?

By GORDON HASKELL

In last week's LABOR ACTION, Jack Wilson reported the reaction of a group of Negroes in Arkansas to the attempt of an official of the United Auto Workers to explain to them why they should vote Democratic in the coming elections. This incident, as well as many other indications of disaffection among Negroes, raises an interesting question:

Why don't the Republicans really take hold of the segregation issue and seek to make it a major one in this campaign with the idea of regaining the support among Negroes which was traditionally theirs from the end of the Civil War to the beginning of the New Deal?

Everyone talks about the "Negro vote" in the North, and how vital a factor it may be in determining who will be the next president, as well as which party will control the next Congress. The strategists of both parties are racking their brains on how to swing as many Negro voters as possible into their column. It would appear that the Republicans, who do not have the anchor of the South around their necks on this question, would ring all the changes on it and thus clinch the presidency and Congress for themselves.

Instead, they are diffident and reluctant. They let their insignificant Southern delegations, most of which can do nothing concrete for them in this election no matter what position the party takes on desegregation of the schools and other civil-rights issues, induce them to adopt a plank in their platform which is barely distinguishable from the mealy-mouthed plank of the Democrats.

Why? There is one obvious over-all answer. It is to be expected that the Republican Party, as the more conservative of the two major parties on a national scale, would not be more liberal in this one respect. Or to put it differently: if they were more liberal, one would have to find a special reason to explain it.

As a matter of fact, it cannot be disputed that there are many in the Republican leadership who are not personally racists, who have no personal objection to FEPC laws and the like, and who are under little pressure from their influential associates or the mass of their voters to buck civil-rights legislation. When such legislation has come up in Congress, there has always been a significant group of Republicans who supported it along with the more liberal Democrats.

Nevertheless, it is clear that as a political party the GOP is simply incapable of a popular crusade against the Democrats on this issue on a national scale. And here are a few straws in the wind which illustrate why.

A HAND TO THE SOUTH

David Lawrence's weekly *U. S. News & World Report* represents a shade of Republican mentality just short of the crackpot right-wing fringe of the party. It features a combination of terse, dope-sheet-like analyses for the business executive with heavily charted and graphed general articles, and long interviews with prominent individuals on important topics. Although all this is written with an air of almost supra-terrestrial objectivity, with only one page in each issue of the magazine reserved for Lawrence's editorials, the magazine is actually an excellent propaganda sheet for its point of view. This is done by a careful selection of topics and how the facts on them are presented.

U. S. News & World Report has been beating the drums in its own inimitable manner against civil rights all along. The most concentrated recent example was the issue of September 14, which combined a lead article on "Troops to Compel Mixed Schools" with an interview with Johannes G. Strijdom, prime minister of South Africa, on "Here the White Man Must Remain Supreme."

For the executive who is too weighed down by business cares to be able to plow through this material, the "facts" are condensed on special sheets entitled

"Newsgram" for domestic issues and "Worldgram" on foreign issues. Here are typical sentences from both.

"At start of the third school year since the Supreme Court's order:

"Race relations are worsened, not improved. School building, to meet a growing need, is slowed in many areas. Federal aid for school building is blocked indefinitely. School children, in areas where race tensions are on the rise, are distracted from school work."

"One more experiment in trying to force social change upon people is faced with uncertain success; maybe with a large measure of failure."

BOOSTS RACISTS

And the "Worldgram" begins dramatically:

"Look away from the race troubles of the U. S. and the Federal Government's worries about enforcing Supreme Court decisions on civil rights....

"Look, for a contrast, at the Union of South Africa. There the government is taking direct action to meet an acute race conflict in quite a different way."

The article then lists a number of the things the Strijdom government is trying to do, and ends:

"For whites, say the Nationalists, the issue is clear. 'White supremacy' must be maintained by the 2,850,000 white South Africans or they will have to get out of the rich, booming country which they all call 'home.'

"For Negroes, mulattoes and East Indians, the government offers only more segregation, more controls, slow econom-

ic progress, a separate and unequal life."

In the interview with Strijdom, no effort whatever is made to put him on the spot or embarrass him, that is, to question him closely. Not at all. The questions are designed simply as leads to permit him to expound his views as fully as possible. The significance of such an article at this particular time in the United States is pretty obvious.

Why should the right-wing Republicans take such a position? Aside from what their actual views on such questions as "white supremacy," "mongrelization," and the other stock-in-trade ideas of racism may be, the fact is that, generally speaking, and on some of the key political issues, the Southern racists are their natural political and economic allies.

This has been made clearest by the existence in Congress of the informal so-called Dixie-GOP coalition which has succeeded in blocking all major advances in social legislation for the past ten years, regardless of which party was running the administration or had a formal legislative majority. It has been demonstrated by the inability of labor to get any amendments in the Taft-Hartley Act since it was adopted: by the passage of "right to work" laws in a number of Southern states; by the bitter and successful fight of the business-political coalition in the South in blocking the spread of unionism in that area despite its increased industrialization since World War II.

ANTI-LABOR ALLIES

Of course, there may be individual businessmen with a broad point of view, like old Charles Wilson of General Electric who came out for greater economic equality for Negroes partly on the basis that the development of a truly national market for consumer goods requires the raising of the standard of living of the Negro population. But the dozens and dozens of corporations who have been

relocating their industries into the South or developing their expansion programs in that area are bound in a tight alliance with the racist business and political leaders of the area.

It is they who have guaranteed the new industries low taxes, free land, and above all, a docile, low-wage labor force. And even if this or that industrialist may privately have no objection to giving jobs to Negroes on an equal basis in his plant, or may even consider it desirable, he is not going to break with his allies on the race question.

At the Republican convention, the Southern delegation made their plea for a vague plank on desegregation on the ground that a strong pro-civil-rights plank would put an end to any hope they may have of becoming a major political factor in the South. Since no one can possibly believe that the Republican Party can hope to grow in the South by out-Jim-Crowing the Democrats, this attitude simply underlined the well-known fact that the Southern Republicans are a petty job-racket with no independent perspective.

But the bulk of the Republican Party went along with them not because they have any real hope that they can crack the solid South on this or any other issue in this campaign but because the Republican Party is constitutionally incapable of leading a campaign for the political and economic emancipation of anyone who needs it.

If it actually turns out that Negroes in large numbers vote Republican this year, it will be more because of their bitter and justified hatred of the Southern Democrats than because of anything the Republican Party has done or promises to do for them. Actually, it would not be surprising if the Democrats suffer not so much because of an active shift of Negro votes to the Republican column in key Northern areas, but from a widespread refusal of Negroes to vote at all.

Harmony and Hypocrisy — —

(Continued from page 11)

TO 'MEAN WHAT THEY SAY' (AFL-CIO News). MEANY LAYS IT ON LINE TO DEMOS: MEANY INSISTS DEMOS USE STRONG CIVIL RIGHTS PLANK (*Labor's Daily*).

August 14: CIVIL RIGHTS PLANK OR ELSE: REUTHER (*Labor's Daily*).

August 15: UPW WARNS DEMOS: PUSH RIGHTS PLANK.

This story from *Labor's Daily* reported that a mass meeting of 10,000 Chicago stockyard workers called "under the very nose" of the Democratic convention by the United Packinghouse Workers warn the party against compromise on civil rights. And in the same story, it was related, Willoughby Abner, regional UAW political action director, cautioned that the Negro vote would turn toward the Republicans if the Democrats compromised on this crucial issue.

August 18: TWO-PARTY SYSTEM NOT SACRED—CROSS.

Here *Labor's Daily* reported a speech by James Cross, general president of the Bakery and Confectionery Workers International Union of the California State Federation of Labor. "We should start thinking that the two-party system of ours is not sacred." If labor cannot guide the old parties on key questions of policy affecting labor, "then it is going to be necessary for us to look for other avenues and other political affiliations."

It was consistent with this position that Herman Winter, representing the Bakery Workers on the AFL-CIO Council, voted against endorsing either presidential ticket. But when this position was rejected and the principle of endorsement voted by the council, he swung with the majority for Stevenson.

In the end, the Democratic convention capitulated to the Dixiecrats on civil rights and Stevenson had become the most popular candidate of the South.

Three courses were open to the labor movement: (1) To add their own capitulation to the capitulation of the liberals; (2) to "sit out" the elections in silence and passivity; (3) to denounce both parties actively and loudly, using the elections campaign to rouse the workers and the people generally for a new political policy and a new political road.

They chose simple capitulation, eating their words of yesterday—all out for the ticket.

They who had called upon the Democratic Party to abandon expediency and compromise for principle decided to continue in the same party with reactionary Eastland in the name of expediency. Mazy had wanted a split with Southern reaction; now labor accepts unity with it on behalf of Stevenson-Kefauver.

This is "practical" politics. One wonders: if it is correct and "practical" for labor to capitulate to the weak-kneed party liberals in the name of unity, is it correct for the timid liberals to capitulate to Southern reaction under the same banner of unity?

WHO'LL LISTEN?

But is it really practical? That remains to be seen. We refer not simply to the possibility of a Republican or a Democratic victory. One thing seems certain: for the first time in history, the mass industrial union movement faces a political split with a big section of its own membership, the Negroes. Support to the Democrats in 1956 drives a wedge between union politics and hundreds of thousands of its most loyal supporters.

"Where else is there to go" asks an editorial in *Labor's Daily*, with no answer. Perhaps, writes the editor, "the time may have come for the trade-union movement to consider a completely new approach to its political education and political action policies." One of its

columnists adds the question "Is this harmony worth the hypocrisy it entails?" When the Democratic convention sold out on the civil-rights plank, another *Labor's Daily* writer pointed out bluntly: this "puts it up to such labor leaders as Meany, Walter Reuther, Ralph Helstein (Packinghouse Workers) and others to back up their warnings."

We notice that union misgivings are still expressed even in resolutions endorsing the Democratic ticket. The Oil Workers convention felt compelled to note in passing: "That the 1956 Democratic platform, while failing to meet fully the requirements of our country..." And similarly, a resolution passed at a UAW Foundry and Wage Conference for the ticket expressed its mild reserve: "...we are disappointed that neither major party wrote civil-rights planks which more firmly expressed the necessity for implementation of the Supreme Court decisions on desegregation of public schools..."

But this is small-potatoes now. Yesterday demanded, they threatened, they excoriated—only to quiet down and go along, muttering a few private grumbles to themselves. Is it practical? Who can take their pronouncements and warnings seriously now?

Union leaders can remain loyally inside the Democratic Party for the moment; but by their very threats they are making their own position more untenable. No "practical" Democrat need fear their words and warnings; they themselves have made that abundantly clear in 1956.

That leaves this problem: in order to extract concessions they must exert political pressure; but their words can no longer have the same force. They will be taken seriously by the Democrats only when they are driven, willy-nilly, to take political action, genuine political action, on their own behalf.

The Mollet-Socialists and The 'True Face of France'

By PHILIP COBEN

Premier Guy Mollet of France, who also enjoys the title of head of that unfortunate country's Socialist Party, has suppressed another left-wing paper for exercising its right to criticize the government's Algerian policy. The latest victim is *Le Libertaire*, an anarchist weekly.

Earlier this year Mollet's government had slapped a \$300 fine on the same organ, also for being over-critical. And as *LA* has detailed before (see "Mollet Does the Dirty Work," May 7) governmental police measures have been taken against press criticism in the case of *France-Observateur* (whose editor Claude Bourdet was arrested), *La Vérité*, and *L'Humanité*, and also against individuals.

In view of these police measures against partisans of Algerian freedom, it is highly ironic to look back at the text of the resolution which the French Socialist Party adopted at its Lille congress, which ended July 1. The party adopted a statement which generally endorsed the Mollet policy, though with appropriate emphases on promised reforms, which Mollet says will follow his imperialist "pacification."

In the course of this resolution, we do indeed find threats "to suspend the rights of the press," but it is not the radical press of France that the words refer to. They refer to the press of the French colonies in Algeria. In action, however, the government's crackdown on freedom of the press was directed against the left, not the right.

The French SP resolution read, at three different points:

"Strict measures should be taken, going so far as to suspend the rights of the press which has always served the interests of the masters of Algeria, which incites to hatred and opposes the policy of Franco-Muslim rapprochement and, if necessary, to decide on the expulsion from Algeria of those who are leading and inciting this press...."

"Opposition of every kind, political or juridical, must be broken...."

"In the administrative sphere, it is not enough to move certain civil servants. In order to win the confidence of the indigenous population, one must first of all initiate an absolutely necessary purge and then, within the shortest possible time, create a new nucleus of officials, appointed irrespective of race or religion, who are prompted by the will to apply unreservedly an entirely new policy...."

How "tough" the language is—almost sounds like big bad Bolsheviks threatening Red Terror, Dictatorship of the Proletariat and what-not. They are going to "purge"... "break" opposition... suspend rights... *que voulez-vous?* If

Humane-Type Imperialist

In his speech on the Algerian question before the Lille congress of the French Socialist Party, Mollet's minister of labor, Albert Gazier, put forward an up-to-date version of the lesser-evil approach which is sure to impress Algerians—though not exactly in the way intended.

Gazier explained to the congress that the alternative to the Mollet policy of slaughtering Algerian resistance fighters in the dirty war now going on is one of which "no socialist would consider even the possibility." This alternative which he rejects with principled firmness is "the policy of extermination," which would be adopted "if the present government were to be replaced by another."

Opposition to exterminationism is not the only boon which these Mollet-socialists have conferred on the happy Algerian people. Gazier goes on to say:

"It needs all the diligence of Robert Lacoste and the government to keep in check the forces tending in that direction [exterminationism], to prevent, for example—as Robert Lacoste did—the use of napalm bombs and the launching of individual reprisals and terrorism."

Let it not be said that *LA* concealed from its readers this touching bid for the thanks of a grateful world.

HIDING THE NEWS

While the Mollet-socialists hail the young French soldiers who "convey to the Muslim population the true face of France" in the form of bullets and bombs (see accompanying story), an editorial in *Mendès-France's* organ in June revealed that the press has been busily suppressing the full facts about opposition to the Algerian policy on the part of the young conscripts:

"The government, which so often complains about the newspapers, has good reason—alas—to know on the contrary how grateful it should be to them, for hiding the saddest and most anguishing part of the news that reaches them."

"The right-wing press, because it has the greatest interest in lying by omission, and the left-wing press (with the exception of the Communists, and others) because it reacts with shame and deep patriotism—both of these minimize, hide as much as possible, and most often keep silent about, the demonstrations that take place on the departure of the youth who have been called up for service, and above all about the growing personal difficulties which this mobilization is running into."

"The government itself, which must be perfectly well informed on the nature and extent of the feeling of rebellion which is developing, and on the extremely grave consequences which follow in certain areas, in the very heart of the country, cannot fail to be impressed."

—*L'Express* (Paris), June 8

Marxists were to use half this language about counter-revolutionary bourgeois, they would be denounced as totalitarian Leninist-Stalinists by our tender social-democrats.

However, the Mollet-socialists of France can perhaps be excused, since they didn't mean a word of it in the first place. The bluster was directed against the French colonialists in Algeria, but the working side of the gendarme's billy has been swung by Mollet against workers who fight colonialism in Algeria.

A GENEROUS IMPULSE

In fact, there is an even more remarkable paragraph in this same resolution of the French SP congress. It should be preserved for posterity, like the deathless words of Gustav Noske, "Someone must be the bloodhound; I do not shirk the responsibility," when he assumed command of the officers' corps to shoot down the German revolutionary workers in 1918.

The congress devoted a special passage to "pay tribute" to the soldiers engaged in massing Algerian liberation fighters, and to praise them for generously showing "the true face of France" to the Algerians!

On second thought, since this verges on the incredible (for this day and age, if only because it flies in the face of all discretion) we had better give the full text of this passage:

"The Congress pays tribute to the young soldiers who are courageously discharging their tasks for the restoration of peace and whose deportment and generous impulses convey to the Muslim population the true face of France."

On third thought, we had better add that this text (and translation) is from the official *Socialist International Information* of July 14.

Most of the rest of the French resolution can be read in the current issue of the *Socialist Call*, though not any of the paragraphs we have quoted here; also in the *Call*, balancing the presentation of the Mollet line, is a short article, reprinted from the *Glasgow Forward*, by an Algerian socialist on French exploitation of the country.

Read the

NEW INTERNATIONAL
America's leading Marxist review

WORLD POLITICS

Chile's Political Line-Up . . . Indian Socialists Rake the Bevens . . . Left-Wingers Are Changing Argentine SP

A Chilean socialist traveling in this country has given us some notes on the political situation down there.

In April municipal elections indicated the relative positions of the parties. The Popular Socialist Party held its own, with over 62,000 votes and 150 councilmen elected.

The biggest gain was made by the Radical Party, which is strong among the middle classes and favors state intervention in economic affairs. The biggest loss was by the Agrarian Laborist Party, which has about the same social composition as the Radical Party but is more nationalist, more rightist and pro-Peronist; this party, which won far more councilmen than the PSP three years ago, got only 98 this time.

There is another socialist group, the Socialist Party of Chile, which is far smaller than the PSP; it obtained 18 councilmen. It used to be far more right-wing, but (according to our informant) it has in recent years moved quite close to the third-camp position of the PSP, and now mainly personal differences divide the two.

Two other large parties top the PSP—the United Conservative Party (big landowners' Catholic party) and the Liberal Party (based on industrial and bank capital).

The Communist Party is outlawed, in a "soft" way, but it probably has about 10 among the councilmen elected.

NEHRU AND THE BEVANS

The Praja Socialist of India; in its organ *Janata*, has bitterly complained about the pro-Nehru propaganda of the British Bevanites. It particularly raked an article by Jennie Lee (Mrs. Aneurin Bevan) in which she "spoke in superlatives about the 'Socialist experiment' in India, and showered praise on the prime minister, Mr. Nehru, and his party, which was given the appellation of 'Indian Socialists.'"

It is of course one of the main tasks of the real socialists of India to expose the "socialistic" demagoguery of Nehru and his bourgeois Congress Party, and it is no help to have these pretenses endorsed by British Laborites, "left-wingers" to boot.

The *Janata* writer goes on to say: "This was not the first time a Bevanite went out of his way to flatter Mr. Nehru. Mr. Bevan himself, who visited India three years ago... so consistently cold-shouldered our party men wherever he went and in the end issued such a good certificate to the rulers here 'that this was even cited by a Congress Party leader in a legislative debate against the socialists. 'Now his wife has followed suit.'"

Here, as in other cases, one sees good reason to squint at the amount of socialist internationalism that Bevan is capable of putting into practice. It is one reason among others to keep in mind that the British socialist left wing which often goes by the name of "Bevanism" should not automatically be identified with Bevan himself!

Bevan's fondness for Nehru is no doubt highly colored by his leaning toward Nehru-type neutralism. But it is hardly good socialist conduct to barter one's solidarity with comrades for a mess of foreign policy.

ARGENTINE SP MEETS

The recent congress of the Argentine Socialist Party in June was the first it has held since the overthrow of Peron. The important differences between its right wing and left wing came into open clash, though none too clearly.

The right-left demarcation in this party is not identical with but is heavily conditioned by an unusually distinct difference in generations. The basis of the old leadership is largely among people in their fifties and over, and very right-wing. The middle generation—say, people who were about 30 when the Peron regime started and who could not be in their forties—is virtually missing, for under the Peron regime the SP, illegal-

ized, ceased to have significant influence among the workers; many militants of this generation tended to drop out of political life altogether, if they did not become Peronist. The SP went into a sort of suspended animation in exile.

Whatever illegal resistance to the Peron regime there was took place at the hands of militant youth who today are in their twenties, and who want to color the party with their own militancy and left-wing sentiments as against the fossilized reformism of the old guard.

The immediate target of this young militant tendency was the policy, imposed on the party up to recently by the old Party Executive, of unconditional support to the provisional government. The policy that was voted in its stead included, to be sure, support of the present government, but added (1) a program to fight the "reactionary elements" in the government, and (2) a program of social and political demands on the government, such as: wage increases for the workers; continued nationalization of the former German industrial enterprises; heavier levies on capital; secular education and no concessions to clericalism.

There are indications also that among the militants are some who think in terms of a more consistent left-wing socialist program.

It was with left-wing votes that Dr. José Luis Romero was elected chairman at the beginning of the congress. Shortly after Peron's fall, the university students had insisted on Romero's appointment as rector, his activity in that office had been distinguished by his firm anti-clericalism; earlier this year he was forced to resign.

At the SP Congress Romero was one of those who voiced the general feeling that support of the government could not be unconditional and that it was necessary to turn attention to combating reactionary dangers within the government itself.

As the SP made a quarter-turn away from the Aramburu government and voted its distrust of tendencies within it, the U. S. government moved closer.

This past week the Export-Import Bank announced that it was giving Argentina \$100 million in credits. President Waugh of the bank announced that he was "impressed... by the efforts of the Argentine government in behalf of free enterprise in the Argentine." A *Times* dispatch from Washington interpreted: "The loan represents an official United States expression of encouragement for the Aramburu government in Argentina, which replaced the regime of Juan D. Peron."

YOU'RE INVITED

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



LABOR ACTION

September 24, 1956 Vol. 20, No. 39

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

Editor: HAL DRAPER

Associate Editors:
GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL
Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

Democracy Loses at the SDA Convention

By S. L.

On September 8 and 9, students for Democratic Action, the youth affiliate of Americans for Democratic Action, held its second convention of the year. It resulted in a complete and total victory for a right-wing leadership which had carefully organized the meeting so as to minimize the democratic representation of the membership of the organization, and which used its mechanical majority to push through a series of bureaucratic motions which further inhibit the internal life of SDA.

The background for this development was reported in the June 25 issue of *Challenge*, which described the SDA Convention at Sarah Lawrence.

The right wing had come to that convention and tried to organize it in bureaucratic fashion. By doing this, they alienated all kinds of support from their position and were defeated on the convention floor. The right wing next attempted to defend its stand against the membership of YSLers in SDA. After a long and drawn-out debate, marked by dilatory tactics on the part of the leadership, this move also failed. The delegates repudiated the National Board action excluding YSLers from SDA.

The matter appeared to be settled. But two days after the full convention discussion and decision on the YSL matter, the right wing brought the question up tangentially. They ran their slate for officers and National Board on a pledge to overturn the previous convention decision by committee action.

RIGGED UP

Here again, the right wing managed to alienate its own supporters. Several delegates crossed caucus lines and supported a candidate backed by the left wing for national chairman. Smarting under this defeat, the right wing bolted the convention and voted to split. After a fantastic series of events on the Sarah Lawrence parking lot and then on the Cross County parking lot in Yonkers, the matter was left up in the air.

At that time, *Challenge* analyzed the split at the convention in terms of the issue of democracy. The con-

THE AIM OF THE YSL

The Young Socialist League is a democratic socialist organization striving to aid in the basic transformation of this society into one where the means of production and distribution shall be collectively owned and democratically managed. The YSL attempts to make the young workers and students, who form its arena of activity, conscious of the need for organization directed against capitalism and Stalinism. The YSL rejects the concept that state ownership without democratic controls represents socialism; or that socialism can be achieved without political democracy, or through undemocratic means, or is short in any way other than the conscious active participation of the people themselves in the building of the new social order. The YSL orients toward the working class, as the class which is capable of leading society to the establishment of socialism.

—From the Constitution of the YSL

tent and tactics of the right wing approach, both as to organizing the convention and as to the nature of SDA, were bureaucratic. The majority was politically heterogeneous, including some right-wingers in the final fight, and was united around the issue of internal democracy.

The events of the summer leading up to the recent convention, and the convention itself, bore out this point of view.

During the summer, the right wing, with the support of ADA, demanded and received the resignation of the new national chairman. This cleared the way for the old leadership to summon into being a new convention to consider "programming," new elections and organization.

The right wing, still smarting over its ineptness and crushing defeat at the June convention, moved the new confab to what it referred to as "friendly territory," Temple University in Philadelphia, and instead of keeping the delegate roll of the June convention, passed a new resolution which drastically reduced rank-and-file chapter representation. As a result, the votes held by the old National Board members constituted almost one half the representation at the convention.

SEALED IN ADVANCE

This, however, was not enough for the right-wing leadership. They adopted a proxy system which gave them the convention wrapped and sealed before it even began.

Moreover, most chapters did not have a chance to meet and discuss the issues over the summer, or to hold genuine new elections; thus the delegate picture was somewhat confused.

Further, the right wing passed a rule which stated: "Where no delegate is chosen and no summer meeting is possible, the chapter chairman nominates and gets 35 per cent approval for these people from the chapter membership." In practice at the convention, this rule was a bit of a joke since it was difficult to find out if 35 per cent of the chapter had endorsed the proxies selected by their chairman.

Proxies were openly distributed by the leadership to their adherents, most of these proxies coming from outlying and/or newly organized chapters which had never participated in national discussions, and whose only contact with SDA was the national office. Since no internal discussion material went out to them it

is probable that few of these groups even knew what problems existed.

The left-wing caucus came to the convention at Temple with the certain knowledge of overwhelming defeat, but proceeded to offer its platform to the delegates. Every motion for more internal democracy that was made by the left wing was defeated by sizable majorities on the floor.

The highlight of this effort was the attempt to assure democratic elections to the National Board. The first confrontation by the left wing called for proportional representation with a 10 per cent base, as opposed to the right-wing suggestion of a 33-1/3 per cent base. The 10 per cent base would have meant that a 10 per cent minority would obtain one position on the board while the meaning of the right-wing proposal was that a one-third minority would secure one position on the board.

After postponing decision for a while, the right wing put forward and passed a motion eliminating PR altogether, calling for elections by majority vote—thus eliminating any possibility of getting minority members in any proportion on the policy-making committee of SDA.

EXCLUSION MOTION

The second major task of the right wing was to eliminate the few YSL members in SDA. Readers of *Challenge* are aware that the impetus for this expulsion was not the ideological difference between the organizations, but was initiated some time ago, first around the issue of academic freedom, where the YSL defense of the rights of Stalinist teachers put them in opposition to a section of the SDA leadership, and then on the issue of internal democracy. This was apparent at this September convention, where the YSL fight was but one issue in a broader struggle over internal democracy in SDA.

On the YSL question itself, the leadership sought its goal of exclusion by passing a statement of principles which they figured YSLers could not sign. During the discussion, however, a YSLer present indicated that he would not object to signing such a statement. Nothing daunted, the right wing went on to pass a motion which declared that YSLers could not accept the statement of principles because of their adherence to revolutionary socialism.

At the present time, the actual effect of these motions is unclear, as right-wing leaders made contradictory statements on whether they automatically expelled YSLers who presently belong to SDA, or whether they simply set up an enabling motion to accomplish that in the future.

In all of this, the right wing operated as a bound caucus with a mechanical majority whose basis has already been described.

The left-wing caucus came into possession of a document from one leading right-winger to his caucus. This was published, and it is, to be sure, a candid analysis. It said that the right was defeated at Sarah Lawrence because the original representation was figured on the basis of a Philadelphia convention (in "friendly territory"), but that this boomeranged when the site was switched to New York. No such accident marred the right-wing control this time.

STEVENSON ISSUE

One issue which was not a caucus question was of interest. A motion against endorsement of Stevenson for president picked up a handful of votes—a highly progressive development in SDA.

At that, the motion of endorsement

which was passed saw a sharp clash among its supporters, one grouping wanting to attach a statement critical of Stevenson on civil rights and attacking the liberals' failure at the Democratic convention. All in all, this discussion made it plain that the Stevenson tactics of the past four years and at the Democratic convention have impaired the enthusiasm of some of his most articulate supporters.

But the main issue was internal democracy. This was true at Sarah Lawrence in June; it remained true in Philadelphia this month.

The convention was organized in the most bureaucratic fashion possible. It gave the greatest weight to the National Board; it provided for an incredible proxy system; and it established a majority which was used to whittle democracy in SDA down even more.

BUREAUCRATIC "CURE"

The voting for officers and Board is a summary case in point. By this time, the left wing had been so bureaucratically beaten down that it saw no purpose in proposing a slate—and proportional representation had been eliminated any way.

The right-wing leadership went on a rampage. It elected a National Board which does not contain one single member of the minority. And because the left is strong in New York, one of the two organized and functioning regions in SDA, only one New Yorker, a right-wing supporter, was elected to the Board. This final incident of the convention is an index of how far the right wing's convention tactics went.

In this context, the final result of the convention was clearly a blow against liberal youth organization in this country.

The right wing stood on a curiously simple, one-cause analysis of the organizational difficulties in SDA. Their "cure" was to stack the convention to limit internal democracy, to smash through to the election of a monolithic National Board. In doing so, they once again alienated many who are sincere liberals—how badly, no one yet knows.

Such an approach cannot conceivably lead to a strong and healthy SDA—and there should be such an organization. Democracy, as a matter of internal organization and political content, is an absolute pre-condition of a strong liberal youth movement in this country. It received a staggering blow at the SDA convention.

JOIN THE YSL!

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

Send me more information about the Young Socialist League.

I want to join the YSL.

.....
(NAME—PLEASE PRINT)

.....
(ADDRESS)

.....
(CITY)

.....
(STATE)

.....
(SCHOOL IF ANY)

LONDON LETTER

Labor vs. Eden's Camel Corps

By OWEN ROBERTS

London, Sept. 13

When Sir Anthony Eden presented his aggressive plans for settling the Suez Canal dispute to a crowded House of Commons yesterday afternoon, he succeeded in uniting behind him the full complement of Conservative MPs. The bellicose "Suez Group" of some 50 or 60 Tory MPs—who have been threatening to rebel if Eden showed any signs of playing soft with Colonel Nasser—were overjoyed to find that their leader had succumbed to their pressure, and they joined with the other Tories in roaring approval of Eden's latest plan.

But in uniting his own party, Eden succeeded in splitting the nation. For it is now quite plain that if Eden drags Britain into a war over Suez he will not be able to carry more than half the population with him.

On all sides resistance to the government is building up as the man in the street realizes just what the latest moves may mean. Even the right-wing elements of the Labor Party, who a month ago displayed dangerous signs of being prepared to follow the Tory government in its rash adventures in the Middle East, are lining up to criticize the policies now advocated.

British press comment today, following the debate in the House of Commons yesterday, clearly reveals the feelings of the nation. The Tory section of the press is, of course, in support of the government. But intermingled with this support there are indications of dismay that the Labor opposition is now in fact doing its duty and opposing the government.

The ultra-right-wing *Daily Telegraph* opened an editorial, entitled "No Second Munich," by saying:

"In tone, yesterday's debate marred the unity that was so impressive when the House of Commons learned of Col Nasser's coup seven weeks ago. In the interval, the Socialists had taken a voyage to the clouds... Mr. Gaitskell has since August 2 taken a compulsory somersault, and it is a tragedy that the inversion of his former position should lead to sponsoring what amounts to a vote of censure today."

The tragedy, according to the *Daily Telegraph*, is that the cleavage between the Labor and Tory parties in the House of Commons does not reflect the feelings of the nation; "there is really no such national division as the vote of censure implies," said the leader writer.

"DISUNITED"

Another extreme right-wing Tory newspaper, the *London Evening News*, sees the matter in a different light—even though it backs the government 100 per cent:

"There is a real risk," it says, "that we shall come to some of the gravest decisions in our history as a disunited nation." And it went on to talk of the "deep division in national opinion and feeling at this time."

Yet another Tory newspaper, this time the *Daily Express* of Lord Beaverbrook, says in an editorial: "By his account of the evolution of policy the prime minister has justified his conduct to Parliament. He has confirmed the confidence which the people give him as the next round opens."

But this paper's confidence was not shared by the Tory mouthpiece on foreign affairs, the *Times*. In an editorial the maiden aunt of Printing House Square commented:

"As a piece of objective reporting it has to be said that in present circumstances this country would only be united on the use of force if the dispute had first been put to the Security Council and a majority view had been given on Nasser's act."

Two Liberal dailies, the *Manchester Guardian* and the *News Chronicle*, stand in opposition to Eden's latest move; and the first mentioned paper—which has played a vigorous part in attacking the government since the Suez crisis blew up—hits out with a violent editorial. "The prime minister's policy," it says, "can lead only to disaster. It will bring this country, as Mr. Gaitskell rightly said, either to carrying out the threat of using armed force or to the greatest climb-down in diplomatic history... War, or

utter diplomatic defeat. That is where Sir Anthony is leading us."

The *Manchester Guardian* concludes by saying that the alternatives are quite clear. On one hand there is the policy of "other means" which implies war. And such a war, it says, "would be the end of Britain and France as important nations."

The *News Chronicle*, in demanding that the government stick by the United Nations, says: "We have no more moral or legal right to take the law into our own hands over Suez than a householder has to wreak vengeance on a burglar because the police have not yet arrested him."

And, once again pinpointing the state of affairs in Britain, the *News Chronicle* comments: "The House, like the country, is even more divided than ever before."

LABOR LOOKS TO UN

The Labor newspaper, the *Daily Herald*, in an editorial which appears rather toned down, says that Eden remains determined to smash Nasser by force if it seems necessary, and this policy is discredited and repudiated by almost the entire world. "Why does he try to bypass the United Nations, as if world authority has nothing to do with us?" it asks of Eden.

The *Herald's* reference to the United Nations outlines, in a few words, the official Laborite view towards the situation. While the use of force in the present

circumstances is opposed, it appears that if the UN sanctioned the use of force the Laborite leaders would be prepared to back it. Their policy consists simply of demanding that the matter be referred to the United Nations, and if Eden were to give a pledge that force will be used only if sanctioned by the UN, most of the right-wing Laborite opposition to his policies would vanish.

This is well summed up in an editorial in the *Tory Daily Mail*, which merits quotation.

Referring to yesterday's debate in the House of Commons, it says:

"Mr. Gaitskell's speech, in tone and emphasis, is very different from that of August 2, when he supported the government. He says that if we use force the Arab nations will rally to Egypt, India may leave the Commonwealth, Russian volunteers will fight against us, and the Middle East will fall to Communism."

"Mr. Gaitskell recoils from these horrors—but not if they are sanctioned by UNO. He is not, however, willing to take such risks for Britain."

SHAKY LINE

The *Mail* thus exposes the shaky foundations of the official Labor attitude on the Suez crisis, and in fact demonstrates that in content it is really not so far removed from the Tory line as many people seem to think.

However, the ordinary man in the street in Britain has not yet found it necessary to probe so deep into the matter. He is only aware that the Tory government is prepared to rush headlong into a war while the Labor Party is endeavoring to hold it back.

Incidentally, at the Trades Union Congress in Brighton a week ago, the General Council presented to the delegates an emergency resolution on Suez which broadly underlined the attitude of the

Labor Party. It gave support to the proposals of the 18 countries at the London Conference and expressed the hopes these would lead to a speedy settlement. It concluded by saying:

"Should these talks [in Egypt] break down, force should not be used until the question has been referred to the United Nations, and with its consent." The resolution was given unanimous support—even by the delegates from Stalinist-controlled trade unions!

It is not likely that Eden has any intention of letting the matter go before the United Nations—because it would both waste time and would also run the risk of being vetoed by Russia. By taking such a stand Eden is therefore making the job of the Labor Party right wing much easier—and also helping the right-wing Labor Party leaders escape from what might well turn out to be a very sticky position.

NO PLUNGE TO WAR

The *Bevanite* weekly *Tribune* is also nursing illusions about the role of the United Nations—but these play only a very small part in its attitude. Which, in the main, concentrates upon attacking the Tory government. In its current issue, published today, it says that the people can have no faith in any word spoken, or any action taken, by the present British government in connection with the Suez issue. The only hope now, it says, is the vigor with which the British people, backed by friends in other countries, express opposition to the government's policy.

"Every resource of the Labor movement must be mobilized to prevent the plunge or drift into a wicked and catastrophic war. The campaign must lead to the destruction of this government"—such is the call of *Tribune*.

There is little doubt that the sentiments expressed by *Tribune* are widely held by the rank and file of the Labor Party and it is because of such feelings that the Labor right wing in Parliament have sought cover in the United Nations as a means of opposing the Tories. And it is the same feelings which will continue to push the right-wing leadership until they stand into unqualified opposition to the war plans of Anthony Eden and his imperialist camel corps.

Sidecurrents on the Suez Canal

While John Foster Dulles acts as gangster's mouthpiece for the imperialist powers in the Suez crisis, declaiming about the moral necessity for international control of that international waterway, it is interesting to note that—

Just about the only international waterway which is NOT under any kind of international control is the U. S.'s own Panama Canal.

John Kerr of the *London Tribune* writes:

"The river Rhine is under a commission whose membership embraces all nations bordering the river plus Britain, Belgium and America. It was put under international control 88 years ago.

"The Danube is controlled by an international commission which includes the states bordering it, plus Britain, France and Italy. In 1948 the Communist countries set up their own administration, but this has not been recognized by the Western Powers.

"The Danish Government, by means of treaties, allows ships of all nations to use the Kattegat without charge.

"The Dardanelles is governed by a convention which grants freedom of navigation to merchant shipping of all nations in war and peace.

"Fifty years ago a zone five miles wide on either side of the Panama Canal was granted to America. Since 1951 this territory has been run by the Panama Canal Company. There is no form of international authority."

As a matter of fact, in the case of America's big ditch, not even the country in which the canal is carved has anything to say about it. Panama has virtually no rights with regard to the canal, whereas Egypt had some in respect to Suez even when it was under the control of British imperialism.

And that isn't because the people of Panama don't object to the present condition. On the contrary, a dispatch to the *N. Y. Times* (Sept. 16) from that country casually mentions—categorically—

that the people are solidly opposed to the status quo.

REVERSAL

A letter to the *N. Y. Times* gave one of the many historical cases which show up the hypocrisy of the U. S. position on the Suez issue:

"In 1946 the USSR demanded a revision of the Montreux Convention under which Turkey was authorized by international agreement to administer and defend the Black Sea Straits, a waterway lying wholly within the confines of Turkey. The Soviet view was that Turkey, a hostile power, was not to be trusted to keep the Straits open to Soviet shipping even in the times of peace. (Under the convention, Turkey may close the Straits in time of war to enemy vessels.)

"We resisted the Soviet effort to bring a greater share of direct international control to the Straits by saying that any change in that direction would be an infringement of Turkish sovereignty. We even risked a show of naval strength in Istanbul to back up our resistance to any Soviet-Sponsored change in the status of the Straits.

"The Suez business is the exact reversal of the Straits case. Now it is the West—including the United States—which demands the internationalization of a waterway lying wholly within a sovereign state, Egypt..."

ON THE POSITIVE SIDE

For a change it is pleasant to report an encouraging fact that stands out amid the welter of chauvinist reactions to the Suez dispute.

The *Jewish Newsletter* (New York) mentions that "Five prominent Jewish members of Parliament in the Labor Party have come out in defense of President Nasser's position on the Suez Canal and in criticism of the British government's strong measures against Nasser's

nationalization of the canal. The MPs are Sidney Silverman, Maurice Orbach, I. N. Mikardo, Howard Samuel and Frank Allaun—all known Zionists. Sidney Silverman is also the president of the British section of the World Jewish Congress, a World Zionist body."

Of these, at least three (Silverman, Mikardo, Allaun) are well-known Bevanites; perhaps the others too. Their stand, then, is that of the Labor Party's left wing generally. But still it is noteworthy that their socialist consciences overbore their Zionist politics; would that the same could be said of the leaders of Israel!

The *London Sunday Express* commented on the five MPs as follows:

"All these men subscribe to the Jewish faith. All call themselves Zionists. Some of these left-wing Zionists have, in the past, pressed the British government to guarantee the future of Israel. Against whom was such a guarantee to be directed? Against Egypt. It does seem that Israel should be protected against Nasser, but Britain should not be."

It does not seem relevant to this right-wing editorialist that Egypt once invaded Israel (1948) but that today it is Egypt that is under threat of invasion, and not by a small country but by great powers.

A NEW PAMPHLET, JUST PUBLISHED IN ENGLAND

Russia from Stalin to Khrushchev by

TONY CLIFF

22 pages

15 cents

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

Dulles Plan Sets Dilemma — —

(Continued from page 1)

the typo *ploy* was corrected to *plot*. In another place, it became *play*. We suppose, regretfully, that the truth is that it was hailed as a smart lawyers' play, not a lawyers' plot, but why not the latter?

The critical question is: what will the plotters do when Egypt rejects the scheme? There are still mutters about armed force from London and Paris, but the open talk is of resort to an economic boycott of the canal. With this perspective, Dulles saved England and France from having to put up or shut up on its threat of armed invasion.

'DESPERATE HASTE'

"To give Britain and France an 'out' after all their loud brandishment of force, Mr. Dulles had to come up fast with an alternative program, a stop-gap arrangement that would make it appear as though initiative still lay with the Western powers," wrote Homer Bigart in the *Times*, Sept. 16.

The next day the *Times* said the Dulles plan "was credited with saving Sir Anthony Eden politically by giving the British prime minister a chance to back away last week from the policy of force."

"The plan was conceived in rather desperate haste," we are also told.

It does not appear that Dulles had to work hard to convince the loud-talking Eden and Mollet to snap up his desperate scheme instead of barging ahead with plans to land paratroopers on Port Said. On the contrary; the secretary of state's saber-rattling partners seemed only too glad to take a way out of the choice that loomed before them: of starting a war or backing down.

We assume this is what was reflected by the joyous reaction to the Dulles plan by the conservative press in London and Paris. "Now America is with us," headlined the *Daily Express*. In Paris, right-wing papers like *Le Figaro*, which had been grouching into their moneybags over Washington's reluctance to underwrite a holy war against Nasser, "made almost a hero out of Mr. Dulles," according to a Paris dispatch.

One motive for the elation seemed to be the idea that, if anything blew up now, the U. S. would be in there fighting with the other two Defenders of Western Civilization. Said the *London News Chronicle*: "The prospects of the Americans becoming involved up to their necks in trouble on the spot is regarded by the government side as transforming the situation." Another paper headlined, "Armed Convoys the Next Step."

Big Brother

By CHARLES WALKER

Berkeley, Aug. 28

One more of Big Brother's methods to invade the privacy of the individual's home was declared legal in California yesterday when the State District Court of Appeals okayed the use of an electronic listening device placed against the side of a house. Appropriately enough it is called a "supersnooper," and it "can pick up conversations inside a house by amplifying the vibrations of the outside walls," as a San Francisco bookmaker can testify after being convicted in this manner last year.

The court said that the "house-bugging machine" (as the *S. F. Chronicle* calls it) was no more than "an aggravated form of eavesdropping," and evidence so obtained is admissible in court. No illegal entry is required as in the case of planted microphones, for the supersnooper operates from the outside like a physician's stethoscope.

Since no one can deny Big Brother's right to feel the heart beat of the nation with his stethoscope, there can surely be no objection against using an X-ray machine or a telescopic TV camera to turn your house into a goldfish bowl. Maybe technical problems are holding this Brave New World up, but after all no honest person should object to being subject to police surveillance from brushing teeth in the morning to trimming toenails at night.

Whatsamatter—got something to hide?

How much substance is there to this prospect, which would drag the U. S. into the mess even deeper than it is now?

COOL RECEPTION

In the first place, Dulles and his friends are likely to be given serious pause in their schemes by the cool reception which the lawyers' plot has been getting from the other 15 countries which supported Lawyers' Plot No. 1 at the London conference, not to speak of the hostility of those countries which never went along at all.

"Skepticism over the Dulles plan has been apparent in Italy, West Germany, Sweden, Iran and Pakistan. Scant enthusiasm has been evinced by Spain, Norway, Denmark, Turkey and Ethiopia... Italy also is wary..." (N. Y. *Times*, Sept. 16.)

And two days later: "none of the fifteen is reported to have accorded a warm response to the new plan. Italy is doubtful, West Germany is expressly 'uncommitted' and the government of Australia is divided on the issue... The apparent impracticability of the plan, which would depend on the unlikely co-operation of Egypt, has led to political and diplomatic charges that its real aim is to clear the way for further action by war, a boycott, or referring the issue to the United Nations."

In fact, Dulles himself was reported peeved by the too openly warmongering way in which Eden explained the lawyers' plot to his Parliament.

In West Germany, although Adenauer insisted on at least attending the second London conference now convening, the two major opposition parties, the Social-Democrats and the Free Democrats, demanded that no German delegates go there at all. Major conservative newspapers like the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* attacked the British-French policy on Suez as too tough, too dangerous and too irresponsible—i.e., as imperiling expansion of West German trade relations with Asia and the Middle East.

WON'T STAND UP

Expressions of criticism and suspicion about the plan were quoted from the very Suez Canal pilots who were leaving Egypt and who are supposed to implement the scheme:

"One of them, Capt. Oscar Carew, who was chief instructor at Port Said harbor... said he did not think the users' association would be practical if it was proposed to place pilots aboard 'out of the blue.' They would not be conversant with the intricate details of running canal traffic, he explained." (*Times*, Sept. 17.)

"One British skipper said he wanted no part of the proposed canal users' association, and added that he thought his opinion was shared by '90 or 95 per cent' of the British and French pilots leaving their Suez posts." (*Times*, Sept. 16.)

Even the Suez Canal Company itself, via its head Jacques Georges-Picot, threw cold water on the plot. He thought it doubtful that the users' association could keep the canal operating over Egyptian objections. It is "not absolutely realistic," he opined.

"In the canal ports of Suez, Said and Ismailia, resigning European pilots seconded M. Georges-Picot. They said any pilot would have to receive weather information, shipping charts and other navigational data from the Egyptians." (*Times*, Sept. 15.)

So the lawyers' plot does not even seem to stand up technically, let alone politically or juridically. It must indeed have been spawned in "desperate haste." On September 17 a *Times* story even said that "the program was so hastily evolved that even Mr. Dulles is said to have serious doubts about it." That would seem to be making it unanimous!

All this indicates one difficulty in trying to imagine that the three plotters will dare to use Egypt's rejection of this fantastic plan as a pretext for armed action, even if the U. S. could be led to approve. It is too thin; it isolates them too much.

"In fact," said the *Times*, "Britain and France are the only warm supporters of the Dulles plan." But even this is not quite true, unless Britain is equated with the Tories.

The Labor Party, under the equivocating leadership of Hugh Gaitskell himself (such is the pressure from below), is not only pressing militantly against resort to arms but is making Eden himself retreat to weaker formulations. On September 11 the press also reported that "Public opinion polls indicate that popular support for the government's position is weakening."

On the eve of the second London conference, Dulles himself began to wobble, with a statement that his plan was not fixed, it was open to amendment, etc. On Monday the papers announced that Dulles was planning to offer the 15 countries a half-billion dollar bribe to support the users' association—that is, he would make up out of U. S. loans for any financial losses suffered by going along with the plot. The next day, he said this news was exaggerated.

Conceivably, Washington might be able to buy adherents to the plan, but it is not clear how far it is willing to go.

CONCILIATORY

Nasser's relatively soft policy has made it harder for such maneuvers to get anywhere. Although U. S. newspaper readers are not likely to realize it very clearly, since it is not headlined nor underlined by editorialists, the fact is that Egypt has made a number of significant concessions, which have had an effect on the smaller countries.

Egypt has indicated willingness to discuss some form of international supervision of the canal, as distinct from control or management. It has backed down on its early threats to take sanctions against the pilots who quit at the call of the canal company. It has most recently let it be known, through India, that it is willing to accept international agreement on what the canal fees shall be.

"Diplomatic sources conceded that President Nasser's new proposals to create an 'international negotiating body'—proposals made soon after the breakdown of the Cairo discussions—was a clever propaganda move. Egypt thus seized the initiative toward breaking the stalemate while the Western powers still were undecided as to the next step." (*Times*, Sept. 11.)

While Nasser at least went through the motions of engaging in an amicable chat with the Menzies Committee set up at London, to hear the Big Three proposal, the latter brushed off his counter-ideas with little more than a sneer. This may seem eminently fitting to most Americans, Britons or Frenchmen, but it does not go down so well with citizens of less aristocratic parts of the globe.

DANGEROUS RUMBLES

Still, in spite of international pressure, the plot which was gotten up in "desperate haste" may also lead to other desperate recourses, especially if it bursts like a bubble and leaves England and France starkly confronted with the choice of: start shooting or climb down.

There are even disturbing indications that Eisenhower and Dulles are getting "softer" in their opposition to eventual armed action by their allies—not for the participation of the U. S. in such armed action, just for giving Britain and France a go-ahead signal. No one can be sure of this, since Dulles' doubletalk on the subject has been one of his few masterly achievements; but with that warning it should do no harm to spotlight some suspicious features that have accompanied the new lawyers' plot.

Although Eisenhower has been quite unequivocal in promising that this country will not try to shoot its way through the canal, this in itself is no indicator, for it was never really in question. From the beginning, even in the very first days when Britain and France were breathing flames and openly threatening immediate invasion, they both made very clear that they did not want or expect the U. S. to get into the military part of it. All they wanted or needed was U. S. backing in the form of approval or toleration.

The question all along has been, therefore, only whether Washington will give its allies the green light to go ahead with an armed assault on Egypt.

At his press conference on September

13, Dulles refused to answer such questions, as-before, pretending that he could not understand what reporters meant by asking "would you support" armed force by Britain and France.

Just before assuming this obtuse air, however, he had put on his ecclesiastical robes and intoned:

"Let's look at the situation from a moral standpoint: I do not feel that adequate appreciation has been given to the fact that great powers with vital interest at stake, possessed relatively of overwhelming material and military power, have exercised, so far at least, a very great measure of self-restraint..."

In addition to this lesson in morality, he had been asked whether a Users' Association vessel would have the right to "defend itself" if stopped from going through the canal by Egypt. He answered: "Well, I would say if a vessel is innocent passage was attacked and if it had any means to defend itself, it would be entitled to use those means."

CHANGE OF TONE

For those who believe, as is widespread, that N. Y. *Times* editorials on important foreign policy matters are unofficially cleared with the State Department, or at any rate often reflect State Department thinking, it is disturbing to find that these editorials underwent a marked change of tone, precisely with regard to the use of armed force, on the day that the Users' Association plot was launched.

In editorials on September 13 and 14, the *Times* clearly changed its formulations to leave the door open much wider to resort to arms. In one entitled "The Climax Approaches," it noted in the past tense that Eisenhower and Dulles "have been on solid ground in arguing against the use of force" but now that the U. S. has joined its allies in the users' association, "Washington can no more afford to take the role of an appeaser than London or Paris..." "It could never have been President Eisenhower's idea that force had to be ruled out under any circumstances," it said, in a subtle change of emphasis.

If this country's leaders give their friends Mollet and Eden the green light for the crime of attacking Egypt, they will share in the deserved infamy that will overwhelm them, whether or not Nasser himself is overthrown.

Solution, At Last

A prominent psychiatrist has come up with the latest suggestion on how American soldiers should cope with "brainwashing" in the future. His suggestion has two cardinal virtues, as contrasted with the "code of conduct" which has been adopted by the armed forces for the same purpose, and those are simplicity and practicality.

What Dr. James Miller, chief of the Mental Health Research Institute of the University of Michigan, suggested to the convention of the Psychological Association was that each soldier be given a capsule of poison which he could swallow in emergency.

Simple, and in a technical way practical enough. All one would have to do is to impart a "suicide squad" mentality to the whole army. That, of course, brings one right back to the real issue: how to convince soldiers that the war aims of their government are worth dying for.

Actually, although the daily press wrote up Dr. Miller's proposal as if it were an alternative proposal to meet the general problem of "brainwashing" as it was encountered in Korea, it appears that this way of putting it does the professor an injustice. From the context of the article it seems that he was referring especially to intelligence agents or others who bear military secrets of a vital kind which they could disclose to an enemy.

He went on to describe the possible application of chemical and other means of torture which would be an application to this field of the latest discoveries in psychology. Science marche son.

The Rock-Bottom Basic Question Is Raised in the CP Discussion

By GEORGE POST

"By now, no one can or should deny our party is in a crisis." These words begin the lead article, signed by one "M. D.," in the September issue of the *Party Voice*, the N. Y. State bulletin of the Communist Party. The rest of the issue gives dramatic evidence of the truth of this statement.

M. D.'s article is a good case in point for it attempts, without thoroughly coming to grips with the issue at stake, to re-evaluate "party democracy" or the complete lack thereof.

The article states that not only has the party in the past been bureaucratic and undemocratic but that even at present "The national leadership is debating these questions [raised by the 20th Party Congress] on top; differences are being concealed and at most 'compromise' positions are being made public, and at worst there is silence."

Consequently, the author asserts, "Our party is in rebellion and correctly so against bureaucratic authority."

"M.D." reflects, it is apparent, the basic thinking of the "Young Turks" faction within the CP, led by John Gates, *Daily Worker* editor, and the majority of the New York State Committee of the party. That is, it attacks the pro-Stalin forces, led by W. Z. Foster, the orthodox pro-Khrushchevites, led by Dennis, as well as the small faction which calls for the dissolution of the CP.

The article, while concerning itself with an analysis of what would be necessary to sufficiently democratize the CP, proposes steps in this direction which would still not make the CP a model of internal democracy. It, as well as many of the Gates groups, reflects the position of a younger, secondary leadership of the CP who lived somehow through the "white-chauvinism" purges of the CP in 1949-1950, in which hosts of leading figures on the local level were driven from the party, as M. D. in effect charges, without being "guilty of proven harmful acts against the party or the interests of the working class," and without a "fair trial before the body in which the accused is a member."

QUESTION ON RUSSIA

But the articles in this issue of the *Party Voice* go beyond the slightly critical tone of the "M.D." statement. In an unsigned piece "On the National Committee Statement," a worker brings into question the very foundation upon which the Stalinist movement exists: the conviction that Russia is a "socialist society."

Faction Organ Appears in British CP

The ferment in the Communist Parties has not passed Britain by. One sign is the publication of an open opposition organ by a group of CP intellectuals. Called *The Reasoner*, it is edited by John Saville and E. P. Thompson, both university lecturers. First issue appeared in July.

One article blasts R. Palme Dutt, long-time CP prince of theoretical rationalizers, for his analysis of the anti-Stalin campaign in the *Labour Monthly*.

Party assistant secretary George Matthews is another target. With not untypical politeness, editor Thompson asks: "Can he [Matthews] cover over cracks in the walls of our theory with this piece of soiled wallpaper?"—referring to an article by Matthews.

The American CP is applauded, and counterposed to the bad British Stalinists, for its frankness on the question of anti-Semitism in Russia.

Party leader John Gollan is denounced for slavish adherence to the Russian line. His booklet *The British Road to Socialism* should really be called *The Russian Road to Socialism, Done Into English*, says editor Thompson.

Tribune reports that this group has "strong support" and is "seeking out like-

The author of this document writes: "Surely, the national committee must be aware that the character of Soviet society is questioned:

"(1) Can all the violations of socialist law . . . be attributed to one individual?"

"(2) Were the crimes committed a violation of socialist law—or a departure from socialism?"

"(3) If the present Soviet leaders were helpless to correct the situation—yet, why did they continue to build Stalin as demi-god?"

"(4) Why did the brother parties learn the content of the Khrushchev speech, made in executive session, through the medium of the U. S. State Department?"

"(5) Is the economic mode of production sufficient to characterize a society as socialist—if in the same society the people are deprived of their liberties for a long time?" (Italics added.)

Even though the author of this article then adds a few paragraphs piously repeating his belief that Russia is a socialist society, the very fact that the question is even raised, and that the CP has to publish a statement containing such a question, shakes the very foundations of the Stalinist party.

UNIONISTS OBJECT

In particular the active trade-unionists within the CP—trade-unionists who have for years labored within the trade-union movement as dutiful Stalinists, performing their tasks as assigned and seeing themselves increasingly isolated from the working-class because of the suicidal tactics of the CP—have become restive in the period of re-evaluation, are raising questions publicly which a little while ago they would not have raised even in private.

Thus a leading member of the CP caucus within District 65 (a union in which the CP was defeated in the past few years by a progressive anti-Stalinist caucus) attacks the "contemptuous attitude toward the thinking, experience and suggestions of the rank and file" on the part of the CP leadership.

He writes: "The tremendous gap in the levels of our party reflected itself . . .

mind Communist both in England and abroad. . . . Their policy is to stay inside the party and fight it out with the 'monolith.'"

Then in the Communist Party's Jewish organ, *Jewish Clarion*, an article by Professor H. Levy (well-known intellectual) went after the scalp of the editorial board for whitewashing the charges of anti-Semitism. Levy calls its editorial a mere bandage across a deep and festering wound.

"If 24 Jewish writers had been merely imprisoned in the U. S., we would have shouted to the high heavens about such a criminal action. When they are shot in the Soviet Union, and the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee liquidated, all you can tell us is that it is an abuse arising from the cult of the individual—and you pass on to discuss other matters."

Levy isn't satisfied with the abuse against Beria:

"If Soviet law has been re-established, are the Soviet people, and we also, to have the records of the Beria trial, and the dossier of evidence? Or was Beria tried and executed in the same summary way as he is said to have dealt with his victims?"

in the disagreements with the top 65 union leadership. The decision of whether, when and around which issue to break was made solely to be acted upon (without question or discussion) much as orders are issued to privates in the army. 'Theirs not to reason why—theirs but to do and die'—that old rhyme describing the fate of the rank and file in the military was the order of the day."

This article gives interesting clues to what life within the CP is like, clues which should lead all but the blind to ask basic questions about the nature of the CP.

"K.," the member of District 65, declares: "In my nine years in the Party I have never participated in, nor witnessed, a secret-ballot election of leaders, either to club positions or other posts of responsibility, although Article VI, Section I of the Party Constitution clearly states this as a right of membership. I have questioned many old-timers as well as new members regarding this. Invariably they express amazement that this section exists at all."

In the same issue of the *Party Voice*, Sam Coleman acknowledges the "errors" and undemocratic procedures in the activity in Local 65. He discusses an article in *Political Affairs* in June 1953 which attacked the leadership of 65 for having certain "Third Force" notions in foreign policy. Coleman argues that this was the same kind of "tragic error" made by "the German Communists when they used the slogan of Social-Fascists against Social-Democracy, and contributed toward maintaining rather than healing the split in the working-class and anti-fascist movement."

MASON DOCUMENT

Perhaps most interesting of all, this issue of the *Party Voice* contains Part I of an abridged version of a long document written by one Chic Mason (a pseudonym) in defense of Browder and Browderism. The story of this document, as revealed in the N. Y. *Post* some time ago and as virtually acknowledged by the editors of this issue of the *Party Voice*, is interesting for what it tells about what is going on within the CP.

The document was originally presented as a 20,000-word piece. The editors of the *Party Voice* had agreed to publish it, but later they began to hedge on the agreement, asking the author to cut and revise it, and the like. Mason went ahead and mimeographed the document himself, and sent it out to party leaders and others.

William Z. Foster then intervened and forbade the *Party Voice* to publish this defense of Browder. The *Party Voice* editors acknowledge this without admitting the role of Foster. They write: "There were some opinions that we should not run his article because it defended Browder's policies and ideas."

The editors of the *Party Voice* overruled Foster and decided to publish an abridged version of the document, declaring that "Our policy is that any article addressed to the problems of our party, written in good faith by a member, deserves publication. We feel strongly on this, and we are sure that the membership supports this policy, as the State Board does."

The article has been cut in a way that deletes many sections which defend Browder's full position. In a later issue of *LABOR ACTION*, we will say more about the contents of the Mason document, both in its abridged *Party Voice* version and its unabridged mimeographed version. For the moment the impor-

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, New York City

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

Send for our free book list.

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.

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

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

tant fact is that the editors of the *Party Voice* overruled Foster and allowed Mason to be heard.

The crisis deepens. "Errors" are piled up upon "errors." An occasional voice even dares to raise the question of whether all these "errors" are merely errors or whether they reflect the fundamental and basic nature of the Stalinist parties, and of their master, the ruling class of the Soviet Union. A question mark is even put over the "socialist" nature of the Russian state in the course of this discussion. The Pandora's box of Stalinism is open.

All this, which might be considered normal for a democratic worker's party, is the phenomena of disintegration in the case of the Stalinist party. That is not to say that the leadership, or sections of it, before or after its coming national convention, may not yet be able to save some of the pieces.