

LABOR ACTION

AUGUST 11, 1958

TEN CENTS

A New History of the American CP

... page 4

Stellato Runs Against Fair Deal Democrat

... page 2

German Social Democratic Congress

... page 6

Attempted Counter-Revolution in Venezuela

... page 7

Not in the Headlines

Is Anyone Listening?

We live in the age of the professional informer and the professional eavesdropper. The activities of the professional eavesdropper equipped with the most up-to-date electronic devices came to public attention in the recent trial of Teamster president James Hoffa and during the Goldfine hearings.

The threat to privacy of wiretapping is well-known. But more insidious is the practice of bugging involving the use of hidden microphones and highly sensitive electronic devices—and virtually undetectable. That such practices should evoke criminal penalties is obvious for these are the methods of thought control and the police state.

The following are excerpts from an interview in the N. Y. Post of July 18 between Mike Wallace and Bernard Spindel, a professional eavesdropper, recently acquitted along with James Hoffa on a charge of conspiracy to wire-tap:

Q. What's the difference between tapping and bugging?

A. Tapping is eavesdropping on a phone conversation. Bugging is listening to a conversation almost anywhere—in a room, a car, in the street, even in a rowboat in Central Park.

SENSITIVE EQUIPMENT

Q. Which is more dangerous, bugging or tapping?

A. Bugging, far and away. People who are afraid of being overheard won't speak about sensitive subjects on the phone. But in their own bedroom or dens or cars, they'll feel free to talk openly to their wives or friends. And yet we can pick up these conversations almost as easily as those on the phone.

Q. But first you have to get inside the room to plant your equipment.

A. Not necessarily. I developed a device that's been secret until now which lets me penetrate a room without having to install anything. It projects radio waves right through a solid wall into the room and they bounce back carrying electronic impulses on the conversation. The equipment translates the signal and I can hear everything that happens from 100 yards away.

Q. Might it be possible for you to bug the White House?

A. Given sufficient time and money, yes.

Q. Is the Goldfine bugging attempt an isolated example in Washington?

A. Oh, no. It's a very common practice there. Lots of officials and military people bug their own offices and record all their conversations for purposes of self-preservation.

Q. What do you mean?

A. We live in an age where a remark can be taken out of context and used against a person two or three or five years later. These people fear such a thing and use the bug in self-defense. And then there are those politicians in

(Continued on page 2)

U.S. Out on Limb in Lebanon: No Justification for Marines

By SAM BOTTONE

If ever a policy was devised to guarantee a disaster and a debacle, the Middle East intervention by the U. S. and Britain wins hands down. It has all the earmarks of a policy carefully calculated to insure the complete demise of Western influence. And in this respect, it is a success. In every other—from the point of view of avoiding the dangers of a world war, encouraging the democratic and national aspirations of the people of the Middle East and weakening, if not eliminating, Russian influence—it is a complete failure.

If its purpose was to deny Russian access or influence in the Middle East, the consequence is that Russia's prestige was never greater.

If it tried to weaken Nasser's influence among Arab nationalists, Nasser's prestige was never greater.

If it wanted to make secure Western Europe's oil supply, it placed it in greater jeopardy by increasing the danger of war.

If it aimed at strengthening the West's military position in the area, it has never been weaker.

If its purpose was to win greater

friendship and support among the peoples of the Middle East, the U. S. has never been more detested.

"It had to be done" was most prevalent justification to explain why U. S. troops went into Lebanon. But now that it is done, can it be justified? And as the weeks go by it begins to make less sense and appear more reckless and irresponsible. It was an action of panic and impotence, despite, or even because of, the show of military force. It was the reflex action of a declining social order challenged by the further disintegration of its domination of the colonial or ex-colonial world.

One by one the shreds of justification and the arguments of necessity have been stripped away as the full impact of these events becomes apparent. But the impor-

One of the most disturbing reactions to the Middle East crisis has been the total abdication of political responsibility of Congress. Not only have the elected representatives maintained an undignified silence in terms of discussing policy but they have allowed the president and the Secretary of State to commit the American people to far-flung, world-wide military commitments without Congressional approval—and no one protests.

In the House of Representatives, Speaker Sam Rayburn summarily cut off a speech Rep. Reuss of Wisconsin shortly after the Marines went ashore. Since then Rayburn has refused to recognize Congressmen who want to make "controversial" speeches, that is, to discuss U.S. policy in the Middle East.

This is incredible. But even more incredible is that there is no outraged protests from Congress. Evidently not one Congressman has been moved enough to denounce this autocratic action. In fact we wonder whether there is any need at all for Rayburn's action since the House shows such exemplary discipline.

The situation in the Senate is even worse for there is not even the pretext of anyone cutting off discussion. It is reported, however, by some of the leading Washington correspondents that discussion is going on in private in the Senate cloakrooms despite the admonitions by Democratic majority leader Lyndon Johnson to avoid partisan criticism.

But surely all liberals can not believe all is right or that everything will come out for the best if no one rocks the boat. We have only to look at some of the liberal journals to realize the deep-seated uneasiness. For example, see *The Reporter* of August 7 and *The New Republic* of August 4.

After all the U.S. has embarked upon a military adventure which has brought the Middle East, if not the world, to the brink of war. It has used troops in an attempt to shore up and support regimes whose justification for existence is not easy to explain to most of the people in those countries. And it isn't necessary to equate it with the brutal Russian oppression of Hungary to recognize the policy as imperialist, U.S. style.

But where are the voices of the elected representatives of supposedly the most democratic country in the world. Where is the voice of the statesman who said he wants "to speak sense to the American people"? Who speaks for democracy?

It is this near-unanimity which is the despair of people all over the world. They see no critical and searching discussion but a monolithic adherence to the American Party Line. And what can be more tragic than the statement, "now that it has been done, we have to support the military action."

Only the barest comparison to the action of the British Labor Party in criticizing the actions of its government is enough to point to the complicity of the powerful labor movement of this country which has abdicated its great social responsibility by its silence.

tance of the intervention is that the U. S. has finally resorted to the naked use of military force to stem the tide of Arab nationalism. And with this act it takes its place alongside the British, French and Turks as the object of Arab hatred and distrust. If it was difficult for any politicians or political group to be pro-Western before, it now becomes a demonstration of disregard for one's personal safety or adequate proof of being in the pay of the Western powers.

What, then, could justify the course of action having such far-reaching consequence. A desire to protect Middle East oil? But there never was any danger it would be denied to the West European countries. Nor was there any danger that the Suez Canal would not have been able to operate efficiently after the 1956 nationalization.

NO SINGLE FACTOR

Oil is a factor in that the U. S. and the Western European countries are demanding control (ownership) of the oil resources. It is a question of who is to get the fabulous profits. So the Western allies want to head off possible nationalization. Of course they would not deny the principle of the right of any country to nationalize any industry it wished, but they are also on record that they will not accept it lying down.

However, it is more than oil. There are also the military bases in the Middle East and the Baghdad Pact. The Middle East is a vital trade route. And then there is the possibility that the entire area may come under Russian domination.

No one of these can be considered decisive all by itself. But in total they spell out, in one form or another, the continuation or absence of imperial control over the area. For the Middle East to slip away from the West's sphere of influence would be an important defeat for Washington in the cold war. And this is enough to dictate a lively Russian interest in influencing the outcome.

The "justification" then is found in the logic of the imperialist struggle between the U. S. and Russian bloc. The dominant and most dynamic forces of Arab nationalism today want to count themselves out as a participant on one side or another of the cold war. It is one thing for the U. S. to accept or tolerate neutralism where it already exists, as in India; it has a far different attitude when an area in its control decides to check out of its military bloc.

Washington saw in the Lebanese rebellion and then in the downfall of the Faisal-Nuri es Saïd dictatorship in Iraq as the near complete collapse of its Middle East position. Therefore "it had to be done" to "stabilize" the area in the hope of gaining a breathing spell to find some other arrangement.

The decision to intervene had nothing to do with the absence or presence of "indirect aggression" (whatever that may be). Weeks before the Iraq revolu-

(Turn to last page)

AUTO WORKERS

Stellato Runs for Congress Against Fair Deal Democrat

By H. W. BENSON

Carl Stellato is a candidate for the Democratic nomination for Congress from the 16th Congressional District in Michigan; primaries take place on August 5. He is the well-known president of United Automobile Workers' Local 600 at the huge Ford plant in Dearborn, a small industrial community bordering on Detroit. His campaign is unusual in this: he is running against John Lesinski, incumbent, who has been supported by labor in the past and whose record is generally listed as pro-labor by the unions. Here, then, we have a union leader running in the Democratic primaries against a liberal "friend of labor." This is not an ordinary event in our day.

Local 600 calls itself "the world's largest local." At one time during the war its membership went as high as 70,000, but by now it has dropped to less than half that figure. But it is still a powerful force in UAW and in community affairs. Thousands of its members live in the contested 16th Congressional District. Of its total membership, 15,000 at last reports were unemployed. In the District as a whole, 64,000 workers in all industries were reported without jobs. It was on this background of spreading unemployment and ferment among Michigan unionists that Stellato announced his candidacy in March. "The primary factor which prompts my entry into the 16th U. S. Congressional election," announced Stellato, "is the depression."

URGED TO RUN

He had been urged to enter the race by a formal vote of the local's General Council and by its Political Action Committee. The move had been initiated by W. G. Grant, financial secretary. According to the local's paper, *Ford Facts*, Grant argued that "the connotation of 'Democrat' did not necessarily imply that they were always good people inasmuch as some Democrats in Washington were not worthy of the name. The union did not only want to send Democrats to the legislative halls of this country but good Democrats."

But, up to now, Lesinski whom Stellato would replace was always called a "good Democrat" by the unions. At any rate he got labor's endorsement for eight years. Since then, he has done nothing in particular except to vote on the right side as measured by the modest standards which the labor movement uses to test its friends. The *Detroit Free Press* plays heavily upon this theme in an editorial on June 2. "Both Mr. Stellato and Rep. Lesinski are strong friends of labor. Apart from such advantage as being an incumbent might bestow on Rep. Lesinski, the only discernible difference between the two men would be the union label on one and its absence from the other." And the *Free Press* wants no union label, you may be sure.

Even Stellato and his friends have been very gingerly in their treatment of his rival. But they obviously are wary of denouncing a man whom the UAW may support in the general elections if Stellato loses the primary fight. Stellato, then, underlines the labor character of his candidacy.

At the local's General Council, he said that the District with an overwhelming majority of workmen should have a worker representing them, not a banker, and that he would run as a worker and a Democrat.

RUN AS WORKER

On July 19, *Ford Facts* highlighted Stellato's campaign for the first time in more than two months. The lead article was headed "Labor and America Need Stellato in Washington." In an accompanying article, the *Tool and Die Unit* reporter Walter Dorosh writes: "Has the American worker reached that level of

political understanding to support the proposition that labor must have its own voice in the legislative halls of our nation in order that it may receive its proper recognition and rights?"

While the results of the primary can give a hint of the degree of sentiment for labor politics in the community, it will not be a test carried on under the most favorable conditions. In April, according to *Ford Facts*, Stellato received the public endorsement of UAW Regional Director Joe McGusker and Ken Bannon, director of the UAW's Ford Department. But there has been little enthusiasm expressed by the upper echelons of the UAW or Michigan CIO leadership; and the UAW and CIO press has ignored the campaign.

A DRAMATIC MOVE

The PAC makes no endorsement. It cannot endorse Lesinski, a rival to the leader of an important UAW local. And it will not endorse Stellato who opposes the man it supported many times. Doubtless, UAW leaders are vexed that Stellato presumed to make so big a move without their clearance. Stellato's advisers, on the other hand, probably judged, correctly, that he was stalled completely in his efforts to rise within the UAW hierarchy and that some new dramatic move would be invaluable in winning him new attention and added independent strength within the union and perhaps even in the public. In the context of depression and suffering in Michigan a plunge into politics seemed attractive.

But nothing in labor politics seems to take a clear and straight line. However, it has come about, the Democratic primary in the 16th Congressional District in Michigan presents voters with a choice between a representative of the labor movement on the one hand and an ordinary feeble liberal on the other.

Passport Hearings

Opposition is mounting to the administration's attempt to reverse recent Supreme Court decisions which have sought to restore the right to travel as one of the basic rights of American citizens.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has been holding hearings on the proposed administration bill. A long line of witnesses has been testifying—the overwhelming majority against the proposed bill which would restrict the issuance of passports roughly along the lines on which the State Department has sought to restrict them in the past.

Representatives of the Workers Defense League, the American Civil Liberties Union, Americans for Democratic Action testified against the bill arguing the first sessions of the Committee's hearings.

On July 28 testimony was given by Fifield Workum, spokesman for the New York City Bar Association's Committee on Passport Procedures, and by Sanford H. Bolz for the American Jewish Congress. Both opened the administration's bill. Boltz asserted that "the discretion to withhold passports should be exercised only to detain fugitives from justice, persons under indictment and free on bail, and those generally who seek to escape legal obligations."

CROSSCURRENTS

Exclusion Policy on 'United Socialist' Ticket

The United Independent-Socialist Campaign Committee has finally announced the full slate it plans to run in the electoral campaign in New York this fall. The UISCC is the group formed at a conference in New York City at the middle of June in which the Socialist Workers Party and the leading figures of the *National Guardian* and of the old American Labor Party were the dominant forces.

We say the full slate has "finally" been announced, because it has taken the group a month and a half to hammer it out. And anyone who knows anything about the groupings involved must perforce be struck by one glaring aspect of the slate: not a single person identified in any way with the Socialist Workers Party got on the ticket!

THE "UNITED" SLATE

Corliss Lamont will be candidate for U. S. Senator; John T. McManus, general manager of the *Guardian*, for governor; Annette T. Rubinstein, former ALP wheel, for lieutenant governor; Scott K. Gray Jr. for attorney-general; and captain Hugh Mulzac, first Negro master in the U. S. Merchant Marine, for comptroller. The SWP didn't make it at all. Why?

This fact is all the more glaring, of course, because to get this campaign committee pasted together the SWP had to accept programmatic silence on the dictatorial regime in Russia. Now they have accepted non-presence on the slate as well. Such self-effacement, both programmatically and candidatorially, so to speak, is so uncharacteristic of the SWP, which has never stopped claiming its historic ordination for leadership of the American working class, that one is compelled, once again, to wonder, and to ask: why hasn't the idea of non-exclusion extended to the composition of the ticket?

CP REACTION

One rumor has it that the SWP was squeezed into this unaccustomed role of political self-abnegation by a united front of their allies in the committee who argued somewhat as follows: The most important thing for our project is that it get a big vote. This will be the sole justification of our efforts, and the only way to make a big impression on those of our general co-thinkers who have accepted the Communist Party's line that to run candidates in this election on a full-fledged socialist platform is a mistake.

To get the biggest vote, we must alienate as few potential voters for our ticket as possible. No matter who is on the ticket, the SWP's supporters will vote for it, as long as the SWP continues to support it. But if we put a "Trotskyite" (you should pardon the expression) on the ticket, no matter how respectable and hard-working and sweet-speaking a person he (or she) might be, the Communist Party will not and cannot support him (or her). They would have to blast the ticket, and that could lose us much-needed votes. Thus, in the interest of the objectives of the campaign, the SWP has got to yield.

NO STATEMENT ON DEMOCRACY

Of course, roughly the same arguments were used in getting them to agree to omission of any criticism of the Russian government, which they themselves term parasitic, dictatorial, and the like.

Furthermore we recall at the time of the mid-June Conference, the draft platform was adopted without any discussion of the relationship of democracy and socialism. Then the SWP's spokesman gave the impression that although there could be no agreement at the time efforts would be made to reach agreement in the coming weeks. However, we must report no indication of any progress on such an elementary and fundamental point.

It seems that agreement can only be reached in attacking U. S. foreign policy and the capitalist world. At a New York meeting late in July, a resolution was

passed calling for the withdrawal of U. S. and British troops from Lebanon and Jordan. What would it have been like if a resolution was introduced calling for the withdrawal of all foreign troops—including Russian—from all countries? But such is the nature of this electoral alliance.

This information on the composition of the slate comes from a source whose hypotheses (informed guesses) about such matters are often a bit better than the next man's. Is it substantially correct, or otherwise? And if it is not incorrect, the question arises also: under what circumstances does or can the SWP envision this particular alliance yielding to a different kind of political logic?

A CORRECTION

In the July 14 issue of *LABOR ACTION*, an article on the "United Socialist Conference" contained a quote attributed to Corliss Lamont. It has been brought to our attention that the quotation was incorrect and a later edition of the *N. Y. Post* had the correct version. But we missed it.

Originally Corliss Lamont was quoted as saying "This is a middle class country, so the socialist movement does not need to be based on labor."

The correction ran: "The middle class is so strong and numerous in this country that the socialist movement need not be based primarily on labor."

While we are glad to make the correction, a real difference in the two versions escapes us since it was never assumed that Corliss Lamont looked toward a movement that was not based, to one extent or another, on the labor movement.

A PRACTICAL QUESTION

What was at issue at the conference was not a theoretical discussion of those classes and groups upon which the electoral alliance should be based but the practical one of whom their type of politics might appeal to.

The interest in this question arose because of the insistence by SWPers at the conference that running a full slate would isolate the ticket only from the labor bureaucrats and then hinting that the full ticket somehow corresponded to a rank and file development in the labor movement. We interpreted Corliss Lamont's remarks as an attempt to disassociate himself from wishful thinking, and as an expression of the belief that the politics of the groups could best gain support among church groups and non-labor middle class individuals. And, as such, it represented another important difference between the Guardianites and the SWP.

NOT IN THE HEADLINES

(Continued from page 1)

Washington who want to beat a person into the ground or get something on him. If they don't have some legitimate way of doing it, they often resort to a bug. But they're not the only ones who misuse the bug.

Q. Who else.

A. How often have you heard of information leaking to the press out of a closed Congressional Committee session? Often, it's not a human leak but an electronic "drop" transmitter put in the room beforehand. Then there are police in the country who use it for blackmail and political ammunition. Often, they bug cells and reception rooms where prisoners talk to their lawyers. This is supposed to be one of our most privileged areas of privacy.

Q. With the electronic tools that have been developed for bugging, then, is there theoretically any such thing as the right of privacy?

A. Only your thoughts are safe—that's all.

LONDON LETTER

First VFS Foreign Policy Statement: Need for Realistic Approach Clear

By OWEN ROBERTS

London, July 19

Since its reshaping five months ago as a broad base for the left-wing forces of the British Labor Party, the Victory For Socialism group—known in this age of abbreviations as VFS—has issued three statements outlining its policy attitude on various subjects. Covering foreign affairs, education and housing, these statements were issued by the leadership of VFS and are said to represent the opinions which the thirty-four members of its executive council hold in common and which they present to the labor movement "as a basis for informal discussion."

The first of these statements to be issued was entitled *Policy For Summit Talks* and, according to its cover sheet, it describes "how to end the cold war." It is probably the most important of the three statements because it clearly exposes the fundamental weakness of both VFS and the BLP in the field of foreign policy—the weakness which stems directly from the failure to envisage the ideas of democratic socialism as standing in positive opposition to both Stalinism and capitalism as a practical foundation of the foreign policy of a future labor government in Britain.

CONTRACT OUT

The underlying theme of *Policy For Summit Talks* is that Britain should contract out of the nuclear arms race by renouncing the use and manufacture of the H-bomb and prohibiting its use from bases on British soil. In demanding that Britain pursue such a policy regardless of the attitude of other powers in the international nuclear club, the VFS statement stands out on the left of official BLP policy and is on common ground with almost every member of the various schools of left-wing thought current within the British Labor movement. But, from the standpoint of an analysis of political attitudes, the important consideration is how the authors of the VFS pamphlet arrive at the main conclusion and the secondary demands which they link with it. And when the lines of argument running through the pamphlet are traced out their basic lack of realism becomes painfully apparent.

The initial question posed by the pamphlet in its opening section is: "Do the Russians want war?" The answer is a categorical "No." To reach this conclusion the pamphlet does not engage in any detailed examination of Russian foreign policy or the motive forces in Russian society. Instead it satisfies itself by quoting the views of men who "cannot be accused of left-wing sympathies, pacifism, political inexperience or ignorance." The bag is a very mixed one: George Keenan, Vice-President Nixon, Guy Mollet and General Twining. All men who have, so it seems, at one time or another let fall a phrase or two which expresses the opinion that Russia does not want war. These opinions, says the pamphlet, "seem to be pretty conclusive testimony against the view that the Soviet government wants, or has ever wanted, war." The idea that armed conflict is a consideration of Russian foreign policy is dismissed as "clap-trap."

On to co-existence. What do the Russian leaders mean when they advocate peaceful co-existence? The pamphlet has the answer because, it says, Khrushchev and the others "have explained their thought and intention by many speeches in Russia and many long letters in the British and other Western press." The Russian leaders, it seems, believe that by ending the arms race they can divert resources to the building up of Russian industrial capacity and thus raise the living standards of the Russian people. The consequent social and economic successes of Russia will lead workers in other countries to choose Communism "because they will increasingly contrast it with the waste, disorder and injustice of capitalism." Time and time again, the pamphlet patiently explains, Russian leaders have said they have "no interest in trying to

impose Communism on other countries by force."

HOW EXPLAIN?

This being so, how can the Soviet actions in the cold war be explained? Says the pamphlet, at points Soviet ideology overlaps "with Soviet power politics in defense of what the Soviet government holds to be vital national interests." In defending these interests Russia is "as ruthless and unscrupulous as any other great power." But, despite this, "Soviet leaders have never departed in essentials from the position of Lenin" that the issue of Communism is "primarily an internal and ideological question, the task of the workers in each country and not an international military question to be settled by the Red Army."

Called in as evidence is Stalin, whose foreign policy before and after the war "might be ruthless, shortsighted and sometimes downright treacherous, in the classic tradition of power politics and on the best capitalist models. But it was not interested in ideology or in spreading revolution. It was concerned solely with Soviet national interests." Stalin, the pamphlet reminds its readers, fought the second world war as a "national and patriotic war," he did not fight it as a "revolutionary war."

"The victorious Soviet Union," continues the pamphlet, "emerged from the war with all and more than the territories torn from the revolutionary Russia after 1918. Some of this was power politics, like the American acquisition of bases all around the Soviet Union. It was jockeying for position in the cold war that had already begun. It afforded no reason for believing that Stalin was preparing to impose Communism on other countries by force of arms." The clashes in the cold war since the end of the second world war "suggest that the Soviet government is as liable to make mistakes as anyone else and that its foreign policy is no better than it should be. But the responsibilities are mixed and on both sides." There are no grounds for believing that the Soviet government wants war "or is cherishing some grandiose crack-pot scheme of 'world Communism through world conquest.'"

SUBVERSION

Having thus reassured its readers that the men in the Kremlin have no intentions of imposing "Communism" on the world by force of Red Army bayonets the pamphlet then switches to British foreign policy and examines the claim that H-bombs act as a deterrent. Macmillan's Tory Government, it states, see themselves as holding the line against a rising flood of subversion, spread by Soviet agents and backed by Soviet arms and money. "They [the Tories] see the world like this because they think that social unrest and anti-colonial nationalism are the same as Communism, and that Communism is the same as Soviet aggression." The Tories think that they can hold back these "subversive" ideas with H-bombs.

After stating the case against nuclear weapons the pamphlet summarizes: "H-bombs and their like do not protect peace. They do not deter. On the contrary they increase the risks. They invite war. By piling up arms against an imaginary danger of deliberate Soviet attack, Britain not only ruins its economy but increases the real danger—the danger that mounting

fear and tension between the two sides will touch off war between them by accident."

What should be the attitude of the Labor Party in such circumstances? To answer this it is first necessary to state an attitude towards Communism, and the pamphlet states what it considers is the Labor Party's attitude.

"Unlike the Tories we have no quarrel with the Communist-ruled 35 per cent of the human race because they are building new societies based on public ownership, public control and public planning in industrial life. The Tories want to destroy them because they hate and fear the new order they are building. We don't."

DETESTS DICTATORSHIP

"Labor detests dictatorship and the police state wherever these evils occur. . . . Labor rejects the Tory belief that the spread of ideas can be stopped by force. We believe that the only way to beat an idea is with a better idea, and our idea of democratic socialism is better than either capitalism or Communism."

"Labor believes that the more the Communist regimes succeed in raising the standards of living and education of their population and industrializing their economies, the greater will be the demand of the new societies for more democracy and political freedom. We think that this demand will ultimately prevail, but that its victory can be hastened by peace and trade and friendly and human intercourse."

"The task of democratic socialism and especially of Labor—as the greatest force in the world for democratic socialism—is to prevent the two ideologically muscle-bound giants from colliding and blowing up the world by accident. They have to prevent this until such time as the idea of democratic socialism has permeated both the capitalist and Communist halves of the world to the point where it ends the mortal quarrel between them, and induces them to join with the uncommitted countries, through the United Nations, to harness the vast powers of nature to enrich and not to destroy life."

Where does all this lead in terms of a practical policy for the British Labor Party? To advance a program of social reform at home means that defense spending must be slashed, says the pamphlet. Defense cuts cannot be operated unless an "effective policy for peace" is operated. Therefore the H-bomb must be scrapped, alliances based on "balance of power" policies (such as SEATO, NATO and the Baghdad Pact) must be scrapped. In their stead must be placed East-West agreements based on the UN Charter. If, says the pamphlet, the BLP

took its stand on such a policy the road to summit talks would be opened up as soon as Labor took over the government of the country and Britain could mobilize world opinion against an extension of the nuclear powers and place itself in a position to bargain more effectively with both the Russians and the Americans.

This review of the VFS pamphlet has been more in the nature of a summary than a critical commentary. Readers of LABOR ACTION will be able to make their own assessment of the pamphlet. But as they do so there are several points to bear in mind.

NOT ALL VIEWS

First, the VFS pamphlet must not be taken to represent the views of VFS as a collective body. It was prepared at top level by a discussion group of VFS leaders and although it has been circulated to all VFS members they were not consulted about its content before publication. A large part of the responsibility for this must rest in the hands of the National Executive of the Labor Party, for at the time this first statement was prepared the NEC was frowning on any congregation of VFS members (indeed, the fate of VFS itself was still in the balance). Since the publication of the first statement the situation, as explained in the last London Letter, has eased and when the last VFS policy statement (on housing) was produced a meeting was arranged so that VFS members could discuss it. But, again, this was only after publication.

Second, although the statement is said to represent the views held in common by the thirty-four members of VFS executive council this must be taken with a pinch of salt. It probably represents an approximation to the views held in common by a majority of the VFS executive, but there is undoubtedly a strong minority which would not fully support the line of argument advanced in the pamphlet (although they may well agree with the broad conclusions reached at the end.)

Third, the H-bomb has undoubtedly fouled up a clear-cut advancement of foreign policy views. It appears that the authors of the VFS pamphlet are so determined to build up a case against the H-bomb (and rightly so) that they allow themselves to be trapped in a maze of false arguments to justify their attitude. This is where the big weakness, from a Third Camp socialist viewpoint, is apparent.

Fourth, the pamphlet undoubtedly bears the handwriting of one person—who shall be nameless—whose foreign policy attitude in the LP has led him into many weird situations. Out of the Labor Party, expelled because of his pro-Stalinist views; supporting the Yugoslavs against the Russians; back in the Labor Party; vacillating to and fro with the swings in Soviet foreign policy; and generally acting in a manner expected when "diplomacy" has become an ingrained habit. Hence the VFS should not be expected to carry the responsibility for this one man's acrobatics—although it cannot escape the responsibility of allowing him to act as the spokesman of its executive council.

Tea, Anyone?

As LABOR ACTION goes to press, a group of young socialists and unaffiliated people representing various political points of view, are preparing to engage in a Brooklyn Tea Party.

The demonstration is occasioned by the presence of a ship in New York harbor carrying radioactive tea. Brought from Japan, it was stopped at the Brooklyn docks when the union refused to unload the cargo until a check had been made of the dangers involved.

The Pure Food and Drug Administration is currently going over the tea with Geiger Counters, and the announcement that the radioactivity is "not harmful" (the standard soft soap on these matters) should be forthcoming any day. Of course, there is always a possibility that the cargo will turn out as badly as the Japanese tuna which were rendered unusable by previous nuclear tests.

The protesting group will be costumed as Indians and will, in general, emphasize the historical parallels between their protest and the one made by the revolutionists in Boston. One of the signs will read "No Radioactivity Without Representation," calling attention to the bureaucratic and undemocratic practices of the Atomic Energy Commission and the other boards which control these matters in the United States.

The protesting group is an *ad hoc* committee, and its political range is another indication of the growing sentiment among young Americans against bomb testing and related activities.

**The First Full-Length History of
"The American Communist Party"**

A Valuable History of Stalinism

By H. W. BENSON

This is the first full length history of the American Communist Party. Its devious record is now assembled and available complete in one volume. The contents: factual and informative; the style: interesting and readable. Authors Howe and Coser approach their subject—tacitly if not quite explicitly—from an anti-Stalinist socialist view. They do not pretend to make any startling new revelations; they rely upon no confidential or private sources. But they have performed a valuable labor of assembling and organizing for today's reader, always with an eye for what is significant and revealing, materials that are already known, available in libraries, and documented.

THE AMERICAN COMMUNIST PARTY by Irving Howe and Lewis Coser, with the assistance of Julius Jacobson, The Beacon Press, 593 pp. \$6.75.

Their political narrative follows the formation of the Communist Party out of the old Socialist Party; describes how the party was Stalinized; reviews its first efforts to enter the stream of American politics; continues into the ultra-leftism of the "Third Period"; through the twists and turns of Popular Front, anti-war, pro-war, cold war; down to the virtual collapse of the party by 1957. An invaluable running documentation is chosen from the Communist press of the time. This, then, is what the authors call a "public history" of the CP, as detailed as a single volume could be and with special emphasis on the period of the thirties.

LIVELY ACCOUNT

Except for a last chapter, the book stays away from theory, except for an occasional passing comment. Nor is it essentially an analytical work. Its value lies in what it is, a lively historical account brightened up and illuminated, unevenly, by the insight that comes from the authors' socialist views and background. Unevenly, because sometimes they seem to pass judgment on events as left socialists or Trotskyists of the day; sometimes they appear to look back from the vantage point of a few years and sometimes they take the long view, examining the record of the past with all the accumulated experience of our own time.

Old readers of **LABOR ACTION** for whom the basic facts and their interpretation are quite familiar will be fascinated by the wealth of detail and documentation, skillfully presented. Those who have been acquainted with the development of radicalism in the United States only in recent years, especially youth and students for whom most of the material is new, will find the book especially informative and stimulating as it unrolls the full record of the CP.

Even if this were merely a scholarly work by ordinary college professors, it would merit attentive reading. But the authors are writers who independently address an audience interested in socialist politics. Howe was once an editor of

LABOR ACTION. He and Coser now edit the magazine *Dissent*. The publication of this book, then, can be looked upon as a modest political incident in the restricted contemporary life of American socialism.

BOOK'S FUNCTION

A book like this, published 20 years ago might have filled a big gap in the political literature of the time. Merely by recording facts as they happened it might have saved a few misguided people from Stalinism. Alas, however, who knows how many would have believed it then? Five years ago, by the inexorable action of truth, it might have speeded up the process of dissolution of the CP. But now? It can describe, report and finally record that process and how it began, but comes too late to contribute much toward it; for the CP, by now, is discredited and dying as a real influence. Even most of those who have not yet freed themselves from the residue of Stalinist ideology are quite ready to write off the CP, past, present, and future.

Now, it remains to orient a new generation and some of the old back toward genuine socialist politics. Thousands, tens of thousands of the past are disillusioned and disorganized. Is there anything in the record to encourage them to strike out again today? or was it all in vain? The authors are sensitive to the genuine personal tragedy of so many who gave their lives to a movement which proved to be a fraud and they avoid that jeering or mocking tone into which they could so easily have stumbled.

HUMAN WASTE

But what did it all mean? "What impresses one most, however," writes one author, "is the enormous waste of human resources that followed from the sectarianism and obtuseness of the Communist leadership." And in pursuing this recurring theme, almost with obsession, he falls into a mood of detached irony as though he were a mere recorder of the follies, foibles, and tragedies of others. He repeats elsewhere again, for example, "In the long run . . . our story is a story of human waste."

There was waste, terrible waste indeed: people, talent, lives, ideals. The socialist, democratic wing of our labor movement with a long and honorable tradition was wasted and destroyed. But that was not all. The full record shows that there were others; some who came out of the Communist movement itself; others from the various socialist currents who were inspired by the same ideals of Marxian socialism that were perverted by the CP, but who devoted themselves to a one-sided political and ideological battle to defend socialism from Stalinism. We can look back to that with pride and

for assurance that the authentic ideals of socialism have never been crushed to death. If much was wasted, something was preserved. But this, the long fight to save socialism from Stalinism finds little representation in this history and that, in the mind of this reviewer, is its main shortcoming, an inexcusable one.

This judgment must be modified only in this respect: in the chapter "The Intellectuals Turn Left," the author records the rise of a socialist opposition from within the Communist intellectual community. Here, for the first and only time, one senses that he identifies himself with genuine sympathy with some of the actors in his story. He describes not merely with deftness but with obvious feeling, almost passion; how these intellectuals fought the CP, and with what ideas and ideals.

But individual American intellectuals in the thirties were not the only ones to fight Stalinism from a socialist viewpoint. In fact, as the author indicates, their revolt was pushed forward and stimulated by others. There were the anti-Stalinist left socialist groups, Trotskyists and others who carried on persistent organized ideological and political activities. (In its early days, we remind our readers, the Trotskyist movement was an intransigent opponent of the Stalinist regime and of all its apologists, unlike the self-styled "orthodox Trotskyists" of our day.) "One reason for this rapid turnover (among intellectuals sympathetic to the CP)," we read, "was the susceptibility of intellectuals to criticism from the anti-Stalinist left."

STRANGE OMISSION

Although the writer identifies in retrospect with the anti-Stalinist intellectuals of the thirties, he did his own share at the time as part of the "anti-Stalinist left" to preserve socialism from Stalinism. If he passes lightly over the contribution of people like himself it is a startling case of unusual modesty. Unhappily, he applies his own self-effacing, rigid standard of modesty to others. Among those that sought to counter the "waste" of Stalinism were our own Workers Party and then the Independent Socialist League. It is a simple truth that these groups, especially their chairman Max Shachtman, did more than any other in the United States to explain the nature of Stalinism as a political and social movement (that is the subject of this book) and of the society it had created in Russia, and consequently to give clarity to those who sought to fight it.

In fact, these contributions are drawn upon with success in the present volume. But they receive not even passing attention. It is not simply a matter of setting the record straight, although that alone is important. If not, why this book? Some few hundreds or thousands of people, in all these years, have persisted in the organized effort to maintain a socialist movement; that effort continues into the present just as its record goes back into the past. Nor is it a matter of giving recognition where it is merited but of preserving and defending the record and honor of the organized socialist movement in all its forms.

What was the Communist Party? More broadly, what is Stalinism? A last chapter, under the title "Toward a Theory of Stalinism" essays a tentative reply. The writer offers many illuminating observations about random aspects of the Stalin-

ist movement; its politics, its sociology, its psychology, its organization; but when it is over, he leaves us dissatisfied.

AN ABRUPT PS

He jolts us finally with an abrupt P.S. (literally so), noting that recent events in the Communist world have created new theoretical problems. "The character of the Communist movement," he writes in his P.S., "has changed in important respects since the death of Stalin. . . . Yet, as events in Hungary have proved, those who symbolically rejected part of Stalin's inheritance continued to react in an essentially Stalinist manner when confronted with crucial threats to their dominance. Certain Communist parties can in 1957 no longer be said to be fully Stalinist parties, yet they are certainly very far from being anti-Stalinist." But then, what is Stalinism? The reply is left not merely tentative but cloudy. We note, for example, that the connection between socialism and democracy, quintessential in this connection, is hardly touched upon.

But the underlying impetus to the rise of Stalinism emerges clearly. For one thing, "an essential condition for the growth of Stalinism was that it appear as a reaction to great defeats suffered by the European radical movements. Stalinism was the movement that came afterward—after the defeat and disillusion, after everything seemed lost yet the power of the Soviet Union remained." And finally, "Stalinism came into being as a caricature, a vast and terrible distortion of the profound yearning of modern man for a new role and a better life. The power of the caricature should be sufficient testimony to the need for the genuine."

This book is welcome as the record of how that genuine desire for a new society of justice and democracy was distorted and debased in the United States into an instrument of tyranny. That chapter in the history of American radicalism, we believe, is done with at last.

LABOR AND THE NEW DEAL edited by Milton Derber and Edwin Young, University of Wisconsin Press, 393 pp. \$6.00.

This volume is made up of ten separate essays by twelve authors, all members of the staffs of the University of Wisconsin or the University of Illinois. Selig Perlman contributes a concluding chapter on "Labor and the New Deal in Historical Perspective."

We call attention here to the chapter on "The Impact of the Political Left" by Bernard Karsh and Phillips L. Garman who recount in 40 pages the activities of socialists and Communists in the labor and unemployed movements of the thirties. Their snapshot survey is of interest and their own speculations cover a wide field. Chief defect is their lumping together of Socialists and Communists into a single "left." Thus they begin to assess the record:

"In conclusion it may be of some interest to speculate as to whether the left-wing unionism of the New Deal period left any relatively permanent legacies to the American labor movement." The point is, however, that this "left" was not fundamentally one current. The Communist Party which at one time captured ideological hegemony over a majority of radicals in the labor movement debased their socialism, turned them into manipulated dupes for Stalinist Russia, ruined labor's genuine left wing and thus helped to discredit socialism within the unions. Most of the Socialists, as the writers indicate, became part of the New Deal while a small minority maintained a small socialist movement, aiming at independence from capitalist and Communist politics. Each then had quite a different—and mutually antagonistic—effect upon the labor movement of the time.

We bear these qualifications in mind in order to read correctly one of the authors' conclusion. ". . . left-wingers in this period, as in a few of the earlier ones, contributed a somewhat lasting tone to organizations in which they were most active. This 'tone' is not easy to define or measure, but its presence may be indicated by the greater readiness of the subsequent non-radical leadership to experiment with ideas and programs not traditional to the mainstream of the older labor movement."

NEW BOOK OFFERS

The New Class

"An Analysis of the Communist System"
By Milovan Djilas

List \$3.95

our price \$3.50

The Roots of American Communism

By Theodore Draper

List \$6.75

our price \$5.75

Orders must be accompanied by check to
Labor Action Book Service
114 West 14th St., New York 11, N. Y.

LABOR ACTION • 19th YEAR

August 11, 1958

Vol. 22, No. 16

Published every other week by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone WATKINS 4-4222—Re-entered as second-class matter July 26, 1957 under the act of March 3, 1874.—Subscription: \$2 a year; \$1 for 6 months.—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: GORDON HASKELL
Assoc. Editor: HERMAN BENSON
Business Manager: Mel Stack

Editorial Board:

GORDON HASKELL
HERMAN BENSON

MAX MARTIN
SAM BOTTONE

CHICAGO YSL

Lebanon Peace March

Members of the Young Socialist League participated in an informal organized Chicago University student protest demonstration against U.S. troops in the Middle East over a week ago. Parading picket signs in the heart of the downtown section of Chicago, the students called for "Troops out of Lebanon," "Self Rule for the Middle East," and denounced both "Russians in Hungary and the U.S. in Lebanon."

Both the Chicago Sun-Times and the Chicago Tribune covered the demonstration with photos, showing the colorful array of posters. The picket lines in Chicago and earlier in New York protesting the American government's sending of Marines to Lebanon are indicative of the kind of reaction displayed by the YSL on a national scale to the recent manifestation of American imperialism in the Middle East.

While this latest of adventures was more blatant than previous policies by the U.S. and Britain, it is the result of a consistent refusal on the part of the government to support the democratic rights of the colonial peoples rather than the oil interests and their reactionary potentates.

WEST COAST

ANVIL CAMP

For Information

write

P.O. Box 521

Berkeley, Calif.

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 in 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

**Federal Aid-to-Education Bill:
Scholarships for the Cold War**

As we go to press, a Federal Aid to Education Bill may pass Congress, one which is being likened to the Morrill Land Grant College Act of 1862 in its sweeping coverage and long term perspective according to the August 3rd N. Y. Times. The comparison to the Land Grant Act which established the legal possibilities for public support of mass higher education to the present bills before the House and the Senate is particularly distorting. While the act in 1862 actually paved the way for the network of state colleges around the country today, the aid-to-education plans are not conceived of with the same motivation but are conclusively far less effective in solving the pressing problems of American education in the 20th century.

What are the problems? According to a world conference of educators in Rome this week, the top ranking trouble spots are lack of competent teachers, poor physical plants, and lack of text books and material needed for classroom work.

Each country's education association, in answer to a world-wide questionnaire, reported that facilities for teaching, meaning decent pay and, therefore, competent scholastic training, were increasingly inadequate to meet the tremendous growth of the student population. Fifty per cent more teachers are required to reduce classroom size for adequate instruction.

SPUTNIK SCHOLARSHIPS

The United States is no exception. As a matter of fact, in the land which boasts of the greatest wealth, its concentration on the arms race, among other factors, prevents meaningful progress towards a high quality mass education.

Instead, both the Congress and the president, still intent on saving face after Russia showed in prowess in the scientific school, are putting forth a federal aid program guaranteed to produce technicians and scientists without thinking twice about the serious deficiencies in education as a whole.

For national security, we will spend money, and if it should happen to sprinkle a bit of education about the countryside, all to the better—but we've got to have scientists, engineers and technicians for they are the backbone to the salvation of "our way of life." Perhaps, we should be thankful for the drippings off the cake and be glad the inadequacies of present educational facilities have come to the forefront, regardless of motivation.

Now, what is Congress planning to do to meet the problems outlined above? In January, Eisenhower presented his special aid to education message with a proposal for the expenditure of one billion dollars over a four year term to meet the "national emergency." Translated it

means: Russia had produced a Sputnik first and was ahead in the ICBM race. Yet, the president neglected to mention in his special aid message or school budget outlays any federal program for school building construction.

Well over two thirds of the 1959 special aid is going toward encouraging high school students to pursue scientific training. Such training means a stress on the technical aspects and application of acquired skills to already established theory. Research in the pure scientific sense and investigation which leads to new theoretical work is limited to only five per cent of the total governments appropriation of science expenditures.

Congress apparently concurs with the administration, and is most likely going to pass the four year plan with minor additions. The major factor in the bills coming out of both the House and the Senate is the matching fund plan through which the state governments must meet the federal appropriations. This is considered by all the way to beat the bogey of significant federal aid and intervention in education. By insisting on matching funds with the local governments, the president's recurring theme that the federal government must only take responsibility for education needs for purposes of national security, and even then reluctantly, is vindicated and strengthened.

SOUTHERN STATES

The fact that the poorer states which have the lowest level of facilities will still be getting the worst of the bargain does not seem to disturb the administration or Congress. The Southern states in particular, who refuse to integrate their school systems in spite of the Supreme Court decision, are hardly going to be intimidated by the threat of less money from the federal government. They, in this case, are not singled out for their segregation policy but for their financial status.

The special aid includes sixty million dollars for instruction in the sciences, mathematics and languages in high school, constituting one third of the high school curriculum. These fields are the only ones covered by the bill. A guidance program for discovering capable students will cost fifteen million dollars and a provision for ten thousand college scholarships per year, a thousand dollars per student, under federal financing and state control is included.

Although there is pressure for a national commission to supervise the scholarship program because of the tremendous variance possible in criteria from state to state, true to style, there is strong support for state control because of a fear of federal intervention.

HIGHER TUITION

The original figure of twenty-three thousand scholarships was cut by more than half on the basis that only financially needy students should receive these scholarships. It seems that while the federal government is all for helping needy students it can only spend ten million dollars rather than twenty-three million a year to do it. After all, over forty billion dollars for military spending leaves the government little room for federal scholarships. While no one can complain about obvious improvements and some move toward actual federal subsidy, it is interesting to note that unless a student attends a state college where tuition is free the thousand dollars barely covers tuition and book expenses.

Especially revealing is the guidance program which includes a scholarship

testing section operating as an inducement to communities to give more attention to local-boy-makes-good in education as well as football. Competition among schools, run by the states, would "arouse community interest."

Ex-secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Marion B. Folsom claims it would "create an essential esteem for the scholar and teaching staffs that would produce scholarship winners and might become as prized community assets as good athletic coaches." While this sentiment is laudable in a day when, undoubtedly athletic competition has become a big business to the detriment of scholarship; it is fundamentally lacking in understanding of what constitutes improved education.

ROUNDED PROGRAM

New York State Regent examinations have been the bone of contention among educators primarily because of the school competition. Teachers find themselves spending most of their time preparing students for taking the exams and not for an education because of the pressure by high school administrators to produce good results. It is an acknowledged fact that high marks in Regents exams are hardly a criterion by which to judge good scholarship.

A scholarship program by the federal government that involves many more awards which would be given to students according to their overall scholastic ability as well as financial needs would require many more millions of dollars. And even more important, a willingness on the part of the federal government to sponsor a substantial federal aid program, which did not depend on local interests or the arms race.

Completely lacking in the Congressional bills is any provision for additional expenditures in primary and elementary education. Beginning at the beginning is not a motto of the administration or the legislators.

That Congress and the administration are taking steps towards a concept of federal obligation in the field of education is without a doubt a welcome sign and we would not belittle any improvement. Yet, the painful, but realistic problems facing America in our perennial crisis of education are far from being tackled, and this has to do not with ornery meanness, but a concept about American society and its role in the world which contradicts sharply any head-on approach which educators and parents are clamoring for.

When the administration sees the lack of adequate educational facilities as a national emergency due to the race for sputniks and, incidentally, world destruction, it is not thinking of education in any total sense, but how best to be the firstest with the mostest in its struggle with Russia for political, economic and military domination.

The call for scientists and technicians is not even a subtle camouflage for what the American government thinks is missing in education. Concentration on one field of education to the point of ignoring all else is an approach that well may produce ICBMs, therefore adding to the destructive weapons arsenal of the U.S., but it will not build more classrooms, write and publish more textbooks and bring the standards of teaching to a point where the overwhelming majority of children and youth can benefit. By maintaining the core of the anti-federal aid attitude, neither the Republican President nor the Democratic Congress are capable of or willing to deal with the constant crisis in education.

Put this week on your reserve list—Sept. 1 to Sept. 7

FOR THE

ANVIL CAMP

"a vacation with an education"

at the HUDSON GUILD FARM, Andover, New Jersey

swimming volley ball baseball badminton.

and a lecture schedule that can't be beat

Herbert Hill Prof. Robert Alexander Bayard Rustin Samuel H. Friedman
G. August Gerber Darlington Hoopes Herman W. Benson Michael Harrington
Max Shachtman Maurice Spector B. J. Widick Paul Jacobs

for full information on rates, travel information, the lectures, etc. write to
ANVIL, 36 E. 10 St., N. Y. 3, N. Y.

A DISCUSSION ARTICLE

A Discussion of the SPD Congress — II

The German Social Democracy

By MICHAEL HARRINGTON

As I reported in the last issue of LABOR ACTION, the Stuttgart Congress of the German Social Democratic Party (SPD) adopted a continuing program of struggle against nuclear rearmament and for disengagement in central Europe. It also moved toward the conception of socialism as a mixed economy. Needless to say, the anti-war currents of the Congress are greeted by all independent socialists. It is to the other point, to the revisions proposed for the Draft Program, that we must turn now.

In economic conceptions, the SPD revisions look toward the continued existence of small and medium sized business, even under a socialist society. They involve dropping the idea of a fundamental socialization of the economy. Politically, this trend is integral with the proposals to consider the SPD as a "mass" rather than a workers' party, as a rallying point of "all laboring men" rather than as the instrument of a sharp class struggle. These ideas are not, of course, confined to the German socialists: they figure prominently in the Austrian Socialist Party's Draft Program, they are a German translation of policies which now have the upper hand in the British Labor Party. In this sense, we are dealing with important ideological shifts in European Social Democracy itself.

THE ERFURT PROGRAM

First of all, we must recognize that the SPD-revisionists have a certain and very real basis in fact. When they point to the fact that the class structure of capitalism did not evolve as Marx predicted it would, and in particular that the small and medium sized enterprises have not disappeared, they are talking of a serious problem for democratic socialism. One need only go back to Kautsky's famous "orthodox" commentary on the Erfurt Program to see how things did not work out according to the original theories of the German Social Democracy. In that book, the very first section proclaims the inevitable proletarianization of the petty-bourgeoisie due to the inexorable workings of capitalism itself. The essence of the Social Democratic policy directed toward the small and medium sized entrepreneurs was predicated upon this prediction. Choose, Kautsky challenged the petty-bourgeoisie, between being proletarianized by the capitalists or being socialized by the socialists.

Indeed, a relatively short time after the Erfurt Program was passed, the leader of the revisionists in the German Social Democracy, Bernstein, began to point out the inadequacy of this point. And this theoretical error did not simply involve a question of policy toward the petty-bourgeoisie, it also played a role in another crucial question: the possibility of achieving a socialist majority democratically. If, as the Erfurt Program proclaimed, the process of proletarianization was inevitable under capitalism, so was the creation of a proletarian majority. But if, as it actually turned out, the petty-bourgeoisie successfully resisted this fate, then the old perspective was in need of re-thinking. This was specifically an element in the deliberations of the recent congress: how can the SPD move to a majority position in German society?

BASIS OF THE DECLINE

So far, the SPD Congress is on solid ground, and all democratic socialists must concern themselves with the questions which they raise. But then, the explanation put forward of the relation between this factual situation and Social Democratic policy does not stand a moment's scrutiny. According to one of the main theoreticians of the majority, it was the Social Democracy's commitment to a dogmatic and inflexible line that sealed its doom in the period between 1919 and 1933. One could hardly find an explanation farther from the truth. As Karl Kuhne wrote in a recent issue of the *Gewerkschaftliche Monatshefte*, the German Social Democracy did not lose faith in the functioning of capitalism until one year after the international collapse of the late twenties.

Similarly today. The problem is not that the Social Democracy has been carrying on an aggressive Marxist policy, be that Marxism dogmatic or flexible. The speaker who said that the new Program sought to unify theory and practice was nearer the truth—for the practice has been in this direction for a long, long time. In short, the Erfurt Program has indeed been proved wrong on an

important prediction—but the plight of the Social Democracy is not a result of its slavish adherence to that document.

Secondly, in the SPD Congress there was a tendency to recapitulate a famous error. The last decade of the German economy has been one of increasing general prosperity. The petty-bourgeoisie has not been uninfluenced by this fact; and neither have the socialists. But can this conjuncture be taken as "normal"? In Kuhne's article, cited above, there is strong evidence of a growing tendency toward a recession in West Germany. According to the author, the unions have yet to recognize this new problem. And certainly, there was little consciousness of what it might mean at the Stuttgart Congress. How would this change affect the temper of the petty-bourgeoisie? Under periods of crisis, as has been shown time and time again, it is precisely these elements of society who can be attracted by a strong, decisive socialist program—and, lacking that, by a forceful fascist program. They are, and in this history has vindicated and not disproved Marx, ambivalent as a social class. Given this fact, the SPD will have to combine its justified criticisms with a real theoretical consideration of capitalist crisis. If that old fashioned social institution has disappeared, then a basic and fundamental restructuring of the socialist program is indeed in order. If not, then the SPD might find itself in the embarrassing position of having eternalized social conditions which might not even last out the years.

THEORIES OF REVOLUTION

But this is not to say that the continuation of capitalist crisis absolves us of the task of thinking about the problem of the class structure in advanced society. As some of the comrades of the Union of the Socialist Left (UGS) in France have pointed out—I am thinking, of course, of Yvan Craipeau's book—the old "explosion" theories of the socialist revolution may well stand the need of fundamental revision, if not of outright rejection in advanced countries. But however one decides on that question, another statement can be made without danger of real challenge: socialist politics cannot be based solely on some future crisis and, even if one expects that crisis to come, there is an obligation to elaborate solutions to the immediate problems of society. In short, the SPD cannot determine its attitude toward the small and medium sized businessmen on the prediction that when the economy gives they will be amenable to the slogan of socialism itself.

Here again, the comrades of the UGS have performed a very real service. In every advanced country, there are objective common interests between workers and other sections of the population. Small proprietors are threatened by huge capital, by banks and loan policy; peasants are often in a miserable position (particularly in France and Italy) and so on. The SPD has recognized this in part, but it has given up one of the main opportunities which it has to cement this potential alliance. To point out that the trusts and concentrations of power threaten the small businessman, as the SPD has done, is to recognize a bond between that stratum and the workers. But then, in the name of this analysis, to retreat from a socialist policy toward big business is a contradiction of your very analysis.

In 1950 in Germany, the artisans and small businessmen constituted 83.1 per cent of the total enterprises and accounted for 11.3 per cent of the business. In 1955, their social weight in the economy had declined so that they encompassed 75.5 per cent of the enterprises and gathered in 6.7 per cent of the business. During the same period, the huge corporations went from comprising .07 per cent of the enterprises and gaining 34.7 per cent of the business to 15 per cent and 44.6 per cent respectively. (These figures are taken from an article in the UGS's *Tribune du Peuple* by Guy Roustang.) In other words, the old German pattern is reasserting itself forcefully, and this is, of course, related to the Christian Democratic policy in economic affairs. In such a situation, and in view of a possible recession in the near future, a Social Democratic majority would seem more likely in the event that the SPD pursued a vigorous anti-capitalist line. This need not, of course, repeat the old Kautskyan formula which used to be addressed to the petty-bourgeoisie.

The crucial point here is that the very fact which the SPD has recognized—the changes in the class structure of advanced capitalist Germany—do not, in any way, lead one directly and inexorably to the revisionist emphasis. A policy of concern to reach the petty-bourgeoisie, of course; but such a policy can only be really effective, it can only win the petty-bourgeoisie, if it is decisive and directed toward the real enemy, toward the German bourgeoisie. This is not, of course, to try to sug-

gest tactics from afar; rather it is to indicate a strategic course of action.

In Diest's report (the main statement at the Congress on economic policy) there were all kinds of indications that the "hard-headed" and "empirical" theoreticians are following a utopia of their own. Nationalization of certain industries, as remarked before, was not ruled out. But there was an undeniable de-emphasis upon this plank, and a turn toward the conception of "control" over the heights of the economy. But such control schemes, as any American socialist can testify, do not fundamentally alter the problem; they refocus it. Once the bourgeoisie learns that such administrative mechanisms can be a powerful capitalist force, then the change may be directed to further the growth of the very power which it was supposed to check.

THE LESSON OF DEMOCRACY

In America, the bourgeoisie did not decisively learn this lesson until World War II and spent the New Deal period of the thirties in the conspicuous consumption of their own ideological fantasies. In Germany, one suspects, the bourgeoisie learned it almost a hundred years ago from Bismark. The evasion, for instance, of the "co-determination" plan (the companies shifted their decision-making to holding companies where the union representatives do not sit) is a case in point.

But if Diest's proposals are fanciful in part, another insight of his must be credited. The German socialists have learned the lesson of democracy as it relates to socialism, at least in certain areas. The constant reminder of East Germany has instilled in the SPD a healthy and wholesome fear of the bureaucratic and anti-democratic possibilities of a nationalized economy. And yet, Diest's callous rejection of a suggestion from the floor which was directed toward worker's control (through shops and unions) is a clear indication that the German Party still has a distance to go in deepening its analysis of democracy in modern society.

That nationalization has a bureaucratic tendency in the absence of rank-and-file control is obvious—but the conclusion to draw from this realization is not that of declaring the possibility of workers' control a fantasy (Diest's line). In the name of the virtues so prized at the Stuttgart Congress—hard-headedness, empiricism, etc.—this doubles the socialist obligation to become concerned with such social institutions.

MOVING TO THE RIGHT

The German Social Democrats are moving then, toward the right in matters of basic conception—or rather, toward giving a revisionist articulation to a revisionist practice. In part, this is a function of the incredible prosperity of post-war Germany, a factor which may be severely shaken before next year is out. In part, it is based on a recognition of real problems of the modern class structure, and particularly of the dogged survival of the petty-bourgeois stratum in advanced societies. But the perspective put forth—a retreat from the socialist attack on the centers of bourgeois power—is not one really calculated to win those to whom it is addressed. One suspects that the German petty-bourgeoisie might see through all this rhetoric and notice the theoretical indecision, the hesitations with regard to action, behind it. If so, this might well drive them more firmly into the camp of the Christian Democracy.

However, independent socialists cannot content themselves with a simple critique of the movement of the German Social Democracy. There is the responsibility of working out a program, an approach, which will meet the objections embodied within the real insights of the German comrades and which will at the same time avoid their retreat from the central task of socialism—the creation of a socialist society. This challenge has already been taken up by the socialists of the UGS in France and by those around *Universities and Left Review* in England. The attack leveled in the latter's pamphlet, *The Insiders*, is a devastating demonstration of the inadequacies of the new Labor Party program. It demonstrates that the bureaucratized power of capital continues to be the fundamental enemy, indeed, that recent years have made it more so. The stock-buying plans of the Labor Party, the mixed economy proposals of the Germans and the Austrians, these all overlook this enormous fact. And as we debate their new perspective in a fraternal manner, we cannot hide this basic disagreement.

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

Workers' General Strike, University Demonstrations Save New Democracy

Attempted Putsch in Venezuela

By JUAN PARAO

On July 22, 1958, exactly six months after the revolution which overthrew dictator Pérez Jiménez, the Venezuelan people inflicted another decisive defeat on their country's reactionary forces. A group of counter-revolutionary army officers, headed by the Minister of Defense, Major General J. M. Castro León, was prevented by a general strike from carrying out a putsch and establishing a new dictatorship.

During the past few months, Venezuela's democratic provisional government, headed by Rear Admiral Wolfgang Larrazábal, has undertaken a number of measures which offended various layers of the Venezuelan bourgeoisie and the more conservative among the army officers.

Foremost among these measures is the complete freedom of action which the government has granted to the left-wing organizations. The Unified Trade Union Committee has led its member unions in a general movement for wage increases. A number of strikes have occurred. Some of the young, struggling national industries have been hit hard by these strikes.

STRIKE OFFENSIVE

The backwash of the American economic recession has struck Venezuela and at least 60,000 urban workers are unemployed. Business is in the midst of a slump. Wage demands at this particular moment are being considered very "unreasonable" indeed.

It is a significant fact, however, that the sharpest criticism of the strikes has not come from the small employers but from the semi-feudal upper bourgeoisie. The middle and small bourgeoisie realizes that, in spite of strikes, a democratic nationalist regime in the long run constitutes its best ally against powerful foreign interests and against native feudal reaction. The upper bourgeoisie, however, has used the strikes as a pretext for an "anti-communist" campaign.

In the political field, the democratic-socialist Acción Democrática Party (A.D.) has achieved a number of successes. It has increased its membership, gained a considerable influence on the press, and is trying to place its men in strategic government positions. While the Communist Party remains weak in spite of a relative growth in strength, A.D. has become again what it was before 1948—the great revolutionary mass party of the Venezuelan working class, peasants, and lower middle class.

The fact that A.D. is likely to win an absolute majority in the next congressional election, frightens all those who fought Pérez Jiménez simply because they felt he was carrying a good thing too far. A.D.'s power particularly annoys the upper layers of the officer's corps, for the Left insists on the elimination of the military from politics. For a group of men who have been accustomed to be the ultimate "owners" of the public administration, and the arbiters of political disputes, the moderate anti-militarism of A.D. is like a slap in the face.

NO U.S. INTERVENTION

A few months ago, the governor of Caracas, Colonel Marchelli Padrón, was dismissed, and replaced by a democratic civilian upon the demand of the trade unions, who knew Marchelli to be reactionary-minded. The upper bourgeoisie and its military friends also objected to the government's reluctance to punish the Nixon rioters.

It is almost certain that there was no direct foreign (U. S.) complicity in the Castro León putsch. Castro León was, however, influenced by the international situation in striking on July 22. The West was in danger of losing the Near Eastern oil. The Venezuelan counter-revolutionaries felt that at this point the U. S. might be only too glad to endorse a "pro-western" coup in another important petroleum country.

At dawn on July 22, Castro León and his fellow conspirators (including ex-governor Marchelli Padrón) made their demands known to Admiral Larrazábal. They asked for the abolition of the right to strike, for the introduction of press censorship, for the prohibition of left-wing agitation, and for the postponement of the elections. Larrazábal and his colleagues were to resign and give way to a new provisional government composed of Castro León and a group of colonels and top businessmen.

Larrazábal and the other members of the junta withdrew to the port of La Guaira, twenty miles from Carac

cas, where they placed themselves under the protection of the navy. With the exception of one destroyer, all naval units were ordered to take to the high seas and to stand by for action. Larrazábal feared that Castro León might control the air force and use it against the navy. A regiment of marines occupied the La Guaira-Caracas turnpike. All army and airforce units throughout the country were confined to quarters by parallel orders from Larrazábal and Castro León.

SET UP BARRICADES

In the meantime, Castro León's men arrested the leaders of A.D. and of the "Patriotic Junta," the inter-party committee which had been the leader of the January Revolution. Only A.D.'s president, Rómulo Betancourt, was warned on time and went into hiding.

Throughout the forenoon of the 22nd, military top brass stayed in touch with Larrazábal's headquarters. The admiral found that he could count on the support of the navy and of the national guard (internal security troops). On the other hand the army and air force were hesitant, apparently ready to throw their support to the winner, whoever he might turn out to be.

To break the stalemate, the decisive action had to come from non-military groups.

By seven o'clock in the morning, the professors and students of the University of Caracas had learned that democracy was in danger. The students promptly formed again the fighting squads which had defeated Pérez Jiménez in January. They armed themselves with iron bars and stones, barricaded the entrances of the University City, and set up outposts outside the campus limits.

Contact was established by telephone with the Unified Trade Union Committee and with the democratic minister of education, Professor Rafael Pizani, who had stayed in Caracas, and who in his turn was in constant touch with La Guaira. In the University's Economic Research Institute, two mimeograph machines started turning out thousands of leaflets. In the chemistry laboratories, elderly professors, young instructors and students went to work manufacturing Molotov cocktails. The campus milk bars generously donated their empty Pepsi-Cola bottles for that purpose.

DISTRIBUTED LEAFLETS

At eleven a.m., the 7,000 students and 500 professors of the University gathered in the aula magna, under the presidency of the provisional rector, Professor Francisco De Venanzi, and of the faculty deans. Professors and students swore an oath to defend democracy with their lives, if necessary. A messenger from Admiral Larrazábal promised that firearms would be distributed at the university in case of open fighting.

While the professors stayed on the campus, to defend it against a military attack, the students spread over Caracas, distributing leaflets, drafted in coordination with the Trade Union Committee. The leaflets exhorted the people, and particularly the working class, to march to the presidential palace in the afternoon.

Later in the day, approximately 200,000 men and women of the working class, middle class and university-intelligentsia converged on the center of Caracas from all directions. Professor De Venanzi, the deans, the professors, the student leaders and the trade union leaders marched at the head of the masses. Many people were armed with crowbars or stones, but discipline was exemplary.

CALLED GENERAL STRIKE

In the same hour, Castro León gave in. He released his prisoners. Most army officers proclaimed their loyalty to the provisional government. Admiral Larrazábal and his colleagues returned to Caracas, and stood on the balcony of the presidential palace, ready to receive the cheers of the marching masses.

Later in the evening, Castro León resigned from the post of minister of defense. In a weepy farewell speech, he called himself a democrat and a "defender of the people", whom he accused of the blackest ingratitude. He was granted an all too honorable exile, being appointed . . . Venezuelan delegate to the Inter-American Defense Council!

Feeling that the danger was far from over, and that the sternest measures should be taken against the conspirators, the University, the Trade Union Committee, the political parties and the Federation of Chambers of Commerce jointly called on the people to go on a general strike on July 23, from eleven o'clock in the morning to six in the evening.

COMPLETE DISCIPLINE

From eleven to six, a ghostly silence pervaded Caracas. There was not a single strikebreaker. And even though there were no police in the streets, and the whole city was in the hands of ragged-looking workers armed with iron bars and machetes, not a single store was looted, and not a single bourgeois was molested. The people showed that it could rule, and that it could smash its enemies. But it refrained from any sort of violence.

On that day, the bond of brotherhood that unites the Venezuelan workers with the democratic intellectuals and with the lower middle class was tightened. "National democratic unity" was more than ever a fact.

But the danger of counter-revolution is not over. The Castro Leon putsch has shown that the upper layers of the bourgeoisie are passing into the counter-revolutionary camp, joining hands with the feudal squirearchy and the most ruthless representatives of foreign imperialism. The conspirators have failed once but they will try again.

To eliminate the counter-revolutionary danger, both tactical and strategic measures are necessary. The tactical measures would be the following:

1. An extremely severe repression. Thousands of conspirators should be arrested and judged under the sedition law, which provides for a minimum of ten years' imprisonment for those found guilty of plotting to overthrow the government by force. The overwhelming majority of the people has seized control of the state and of its organs of repression. It is time to show that democracy can be ruthless in its struggle against the feudal-autocratic *ancien-régime*. Unfortunately, the provisional government is failing in this respect. It is Girondist and not Jacobin. It identifies democracy with universal tolerance. So far, only a few dozen conspirators have been arrested.

NATIONAL-DEMOCRATIC AIMS

2. Elections in November, as announced. The political parties will agree on a single candidate, who might be Professor Rafael Pizani, former rector of the University of Caracas and present minister of education. Pizani, or anyone like him, would represent the most democratic sections of the middle bourgeoisie, which is intimately united with the working class, and under the latter's influence, in the struggle for the destruction of feudalism, the breaking of semi-colonial economic bonds, and the beginnings of economic and social development under democratic planning.

The long-range strategy of the Left must tend in the direction of pushing the democratic middle class on and on in the completion of the democratic, anti-feudal and anti-imperialist program which corresponds to the present stage of Venezuela's development. At the same time, the Left must constantly point out to the working class and landless peasantry that the national-democratic program and the alliance with the democratic bourgeoisie are merely the preparatory stage for the eventual struggle for socialism.

LABOR ACTION
INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST NEWSPAPER

114 West 14 Street
New York 11, New York

Please enter my subscription:

<input type="checkbox"/> 1 year at \$2.	<input type="checkbox"/> New
<input type="checkbox"/> 6 months at \$1.	<input type="checkbox"/> Renewal
<input type="checkbox"/> Payment enclosed.	<input type="checkbox"/> Bill me.

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

On the Limb in Lebanon — —

(Continued from page 7)

tion; Washington was actively considering intervention into Lebanon. And then when it did go in, it had nothing to do with the state of the Lebanese civil war since there were indications that a compromise was in the making.

In fact the events of the past week have just about completely undermined the legal and political fictions worked up to justify intervention in both Lebanon and Iraq. The charge of "indirect aggression" was put to rest by the second report of the UN Observation Group in Lebanon which reported that there was no evidence to support the charge of large-scale infiltration of men or weapons across the Lebanese border. It was again laid to rest, this time by the U. S. when it recognized the revolutionary regime in Iraq.

DECEPTIVE STATEMENTS

The fact that UN Ambassador Lodge and John Foster Dulles continued to raise the charge of "indirect aggression" had become a great source of embarrassment to the State Department in the preparations for the now-postponed summit conference. And this was one of the reasons for the reluctance by the U. S. to go into a summit meeting. And undisguised expression of relief when Khrushchev after meeting with Mao-Tse-tung decided on a meeting of the General Assembly rather than the summit Security Council.

At the time of Marine landings, Henry Cabot Lodge tried to discredit the first report of the UN Observation Group

made early in July and at the same time justify the landings. Admittedly the first report was tentative but it found nothing to substantiate the charge of infiltration of any importance. At the time Lodge stated that the Observation Group "undoubtedly possesses a great deal of information which it has not yet had time to report or evaluate." Now the report is available, and Lodge found little to make him or the State Department happy.

SYRIAN PARTITION

But more important than its specific point by point denial of statements made by the U. S. and Lebanon representatives and criticism of the Chamoun government's refusal to allow unhampered questioning of alleged infiltrators was the Observation Group's explanation of the border situation. And this in turn bears upon the way the state of Lebanon was carved out of Syria after the First World War.

The report stated: "As regards the question of illegal infiltration of personnel, the nature of the frontier, the existence of traditional tribal and other bonds on both sides of it, the free movement of produce in both directions, are among the factors which must be taken into account when making an evaluation."

Of course there is movement across the border, but to infer that this constitutes aggression goes beyond the truth. The reason for this widespread movements among all Arab countries in that area is related to the way the states were carved out by the British and French in a series of mandates in 1920.

Out of the area which was traditionally, commercially and culturally Syria four "nations" were created—Syria, Lebanon, Jordan and Palestine. Agricultural areas were cut off from their traditional markets, national boundaries were created through tribal areas where none existed before and trading areas were cut off from their normal supply channels. The result: a series of artificial states and the frustration of Arab nationalist aspirations.

REVERSED POLICY

When the French established control in Northern Syria, a separate state was formed of the Maronite Christian area. In creating the nation of Lebanon, instead of including only the Maronite areas along the coastal areas, the French sliced off from what became Syria areas populated primarily by Moslem Arabs and the Druze tribes. And it is in these areas that the rebellion has centered. Consequently there should be no surprise if there is widespread sentiment for Arab unification among the Moslem population which probably is in the majority of Lebanon today.

The recognition of the new regime in Iraq in less than 3 weeks by the U. S. and Britain was a sharp reversal of policy, especially since the revolution precipitated the crisis. The logic of the intervention was to overthrow the new government. And in the early days there was active consideration of this by the remaining members of the near-defunct Baghdad Pact and the U. S. Up until almost the eve of reversal, the Jordanian regime of King Hussein was clamoring to be unleashed to march east and reclaim the throne for the Hashemite dynasty. But the consequence of such an adventure might have precipitated a general war in the Middle East and possibly involve Russia.

ANOTHER NAGUIB

In the meantime Washington and London took a second look at the composition of the revolutionary regime especially since it indicated that it was going to honor its international obligations (the oil treaties). Instead of being a pack of Nasser-type radicals, it found Prime Minister Abdul Karim Kassem and a number of other ministers to be moderate nationalists who weren't going to jump into the United Arab Republic. Furthermore there was nothing to justify concluding that the revolution did not represent an indigenous revolt of intellectuals and army officers against a king and his dictatorial prime minister.

Once recognizing the difference between Prime Minister Kassem and the more revolutionary pan-Arab, Ba'ath socialists, the U. S. changed its line. But once more there was concern for Kassem looked suspiciously like Naguib with a more radical regime waiting in the wings and on the street.

A British diplomat is quoted as saying: "We couldn't expect any better government to come out of this revolution for any change is more likely to be for the worse."

The idea behind the recognition is to find a new base for Western influence in the Middle East. There is the hope to build the Kassem regime, or something like it, into a counter balance to Nasser and the UAR—or nationalist, republican, and moderately pro-West.

Implicit in this switch is the idea that the U. S. and Britain must come to terms with the new forms of Arab nationalism. With the overthrow of the Faisal regime went the last important link with the old nationalism which came to the front at the time of the first World War. Despite the betrayal in carving up greater Syria in league with France, the Hashemite kings in Iraq and Jordan and the Lebanese Christians remained oriented towards the West.

NEW NATIONALISM

But these West-oriented nationalist groupings are clearly on the decline and a new neutralist-oriented nationalist ideology (of whom Nasser is the leading spokesman) is on the ascendency. Faisal is gone in Iraq, Hussein remains on his throne in Jordan but only on the suffrance of British bayonets and the minute the British leave, so does Hussein, and Chamoun is on the way out in Lebanon.

From Washington's and London's point of view a vacuum of Western-oriented Arabs is in the making. The only difficulty is that by the armed intervention they have managed to isolate themselves and place the Western nations in position of hostility to Arab aspirations. Therefore the problem they face is not only how to extricate their troops but how to find or create regimes willing to play ball.

Their difficulties are complicated by the presence of Russian influence, the willingness of Russia to send both arms and economic aid to those willing to accept it, and the willingness of Nasser to play off one imperialist power against the other in the interest of strengthening the independent position of the Arab countries.

A NEW POLICY

While the Marine intervention had all the appearances of a panic reaction, and the charge of "indirect aggression" is clearly indefensible and even dangerous from the point of view of the U. S.'s worldwide activities with the Voice of America, it does not follow that the State Department is running wild without a policy. Much has been made of the peculiarities and moralizing of Dulles, and even attempts to portray him as some sort of a legalistic boob.

There is the outline of a policy in the making. The intervention represented a distinct change of policy in the Middle East. Previously, and the reaction to the Suez adventure was typical, the policy had been to try to placate Nasser. Despite running hot and cold on the Asswan Dam project, it is clear that Dulles wanted, insofar as it was possible, to avoid identification with the old imperialist policies of its British and French allies.

The U. S. wanted also to stand aloof from the internal conflict which arose as Arab nationalism clashed with British and French policies, and stand as a kind of "honest broker" to mediate the disputes. Hence the seemingly peculiar policy of sponsoring the formation of the Baghdad Pact and then refusing to formally join it. And now the reversal on this too.

The State Department's new attitude is that militant pan-Arab nationalism

can no longer be placated in a way to preserve the old client state relationship. The new nationalism seeks to end all Western domination of the Middle East. The new relationship can only be of free and independent states each seeking to cooperate with the West as equals, or as equal as underdeveloped areas can be with the great industrialized powers.

The new policy is really a return to the old pasha way of thinking: the natives have to be treated to a show of force to demonstrate where the real power lies. And in line with this, there must be some second-thoughts about the refusal to back up the Suez adventure.

Although Dulles would never admit it publicly, all the signs now point in the direction of Dulles adopting the policy outlined by former Secretary of State Dean Acheson after the Suez crisis. Acheson at the time was one of the most vocal public critics of Dulles' policy of non-support to the British and French.

FOREIGN AID PROGRAMS

The policy was outlined by Acheson in an article in *The Reporter* of May 2, 1957 and it is worth quoting at some length to see the development of the imperialist ideology that it embodies and the role of foreign aid programs.

"The first step in going at this problem [safeguarding U. S. interests] must clearly be to increase our bargaining power with the Middle Eastern countries, and the first step in doing this is bringing to them a realization of the mutual-ity of dependence [oil] to which we have referred. Means lie ready at hand for doing this.

"Temporarily the U. S. could provide Western Hemisphere oil and the dollars to pay for it. This could bring much illumination to oil producers in the Persian Gulf. The canal might have been left blocked by Nasser's ships. This could give canal users like India a refreshing sense of realism. We might still start on freeing Europe from so much dependence on the canal by pipelines through non-Arab countries and by vigorous construction of large tankers. We might much more energetically hasten the day when nuclear energy could replace a substantial portion of petroleum energy, if only on a standby basis.

"There are other courses of action that might induce a more understanding and reasonable attitude in Colonel Nasser—courses of action which recall Winston Churchill's admonition to the French, quoted from Thiers: 'Think of it always; speak of it never.'

"When by our own efforts our bargaining position had been improved, a broad and imaginative economic program for the area as a whole would both be and appear to be the generous act of one in a strong position, rather than an act of appeasement from weakness." (Italics added.)

IMPERIALIST IDEOLOGY

This approach has as its aim the creation of a series of client states who live in fear and dependence on the great powers of the West. They would be clubbed into submission by an economic stranglehold. And if this was not sufficient then the State Department and Foreign Office would employ those actions that you always think of, but never speak of. A "democratic" statesman could not permit any more frank an expression of the imperialist realpolitik lying behind and justifying those so-called generous foreign aid programs.

One of the litanies now making the rounds is "we have to come to terms with Arab nationalism." As a sentiment it sounds fine. As a policy it can mean almost anything. The U. S. can come to terms with Arab nationalism recognizing its aspirations toward the unification of the various artificially created "states," for economic development and non-involvement in the cold war. Or it can mean a series of client states dependent on the U. S. for economic aid, military equipment and providing military bases for U. S. troops and planes, forced to sell its oil on terms set by the West and voting right in the U. N.

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.

ALL BOOKS REVIEWED

LABOR ACTION

are obtainable from

Labor Action Book Service
114 West 14th St., New York