

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

NOVEMBER 14, 1955

FIVE CENTS

CLASS FORCES BEHIND PERON'S FALL

... page 6

THE ATTACK ON THE STUDENT CO-OPS

... page 5

FIEDLER: 'SOUR DREGS' OF LIBERALISM

... page 7

'LOOK' SQUINTS AT AFRICA

... page 3

DIRTY JOURNALISM AND THE SAAR—II

... page 8

Power-Politics Behind the Israel-Arab Crisis

Both Sides Offer Themselves as Pawns of the Rival Cold-War Blocs

RUSSIAN IMPERIALISM CHALLENGES WEST'S GRASP ON MID-EAST REGION

By AL FINDLEY

The current fighting on the Israeli-Egyptian border is of a different order from all previous forays and skirmishes.

Up to now, most of the actions were by individuals and small bands, some of them unofficial and some of them unofficial in the official sense only. Beginning with the Gaza retaliation by Israeli forces, the units involved have been getting larger and larger. On the Egyptian side there are the Fedayim (volunteer commando groups) and regular army units. On its side Israel may have committed as many as 3000 men in "incidents."

For the size of the states involved, these recent actions amount to more than "border incidents," almost verging on a "local war."

The spotlight, however, is held by another development in the region, the shipment of arms by the Stalinists to Egypt. There can be no doubt that Egypt under its ruler General Nasser is acting primarily to further its own aims and in response to the extreme nationalist currents now pulsating in the Arab world. However, the material supplied by Russia is one of the factors that is responsible for the large-scale fighting.

For a long time now, the West, primarily through England and France, has dominated the politics of the Middle East. After the end of World War II France was unceremoniously pushed out and the leadership in that area passed to the U. S. America's main object in recent years has been to organize a Middle East security alliance along the lines of NATO. For this reason it supplied arms both to Israel and the Arabs and advanced large sums for other purposes, primarily to Israel.

These services were offered both to the Israelis and the Arabs in the hope that both would submit to the broad line of American policy and subordinate their own and local interests to what the State Department considered the main issue. Of necessity therefore the State Department had to balance its favors to Israel with favors to the Arabs, to maintain some kind of balance of power in the area.

STALINIST LINE

With one contract the Russians have blown American policy sky-high. The mere announcement of the arms deal sent Washington into a tailspin. A special envoy was hurriedly dispatched by the powerful U. S. to weak Egypt. He pleaded and coaxed, but with no results.

In a succession of conflicting statements and reports emanating from the State Department, first Dulles offered to supply arms to Egypt instead of having Russia do so; then this cynical offer was hushed up in face of a storm of shocked criticism, then it was reported that the U. S. would arm Israel, that it would not, that it would... that it would help arm both... that it would consider an arms shipping list for Israel but only for defensive arms... and as this is set in type on Tuesday the headline is that Washington is ready to sell a "significant" quantity of arms to Israel.

The line of the dyed-in-the-wool Stalinists and their fellow travelers took its

typical course, as whenever there is a sharp change in line. The Stalinists and Stalinoids are the last ones to find out about it.

When the first press reports of the Russian-Egypt deal were printed, the Israeli Communist Party and the two pro-Russian Israeli parties, Mapam and Achdut Avodah, denounced the idea as ridiculous. Their indignation knew no bounds. It was a lie, an attempt to besmirch the honor of the peace-loving Soviet Union. Russia would never, never, no never, sell arms to

(Continued on page 4)

EGYPT THREATENS AGGRESSION, WHILE ISRAEL RELIES ON A PROVOCATIVE MILITARY APPROACH

By HAL DRAPER

The Middle East crisis over Israeli-Arab hostility illustrates on two separate levels the disastrous consequences of relying on military power-politics instead of a progressive political solution.

One is the regional level, where an aggressive array of Arab states under reactionary rulers faces a provocative Israeli regime operating on a Zionist-chauvinist policy. As Al Findley explains in his accompanying article, the Israelis, following David Ben-Gurion's lead, deliberately set out to raise the ante in the scale of border-fighting, with a policy of "massive retaliation" (scaled to the size of the states involved), implemented by the notorious Gaza raid.

In following this provocative and suicidal policy, the Israelis were attempting to solve by reactionary military means a problem which could be solved in a progressive way ONLY by a complete and

thorough transformation in their Arab policy.

To be sure, in following this policy, the Israelis were by no means seeking to provoke full-scale war; on the contrary they hoped to intimidate the Arabs into a peace settlement—that is, into a peace settlement on their own terms, unaccompanied by otherwise indicated concessions on the vexed problem of the Arab refugees and similar sore points.

Israel wants peace—of that there can be no doubt: but peace strictly on its own terms, which are far from being identical with the demands of justice and democratic politics.

On the other hand, when we turn our attention to the plague on the other house, it is an undebatable fact that the Arab rulers *officially* want war, that is, a second round of the Palestine war of 1948 in which they were defeated. (We underline *officially* because one has a right to believe it highly dubious that even Nasser is really very eager for a contest which will put his own power in extreme jeopardy, even if he thinks he is in a position to win eventually.)

In Egypt, Major Shawki, personal assistant to Nasser, declared recently: "Our aim is to fight to exterminate Zionism in the second round of the Palestine war." In Saudi Arabia the king, reigning by divine right of America's oil millions, has called for "surgical action" to eradicate Israel as a state. "We Arabs total about 50 million," he said. "Why don't we sacrifice ten million of our number and live in pride and self-respect?"

In Iraq, one of the hitching-posts of the Western-sponsored "Northern tier" alliance in the Middle East, Premier Nuri Pasha has explained to his people that it is all for the purpose of strengthening her militarily as against Zionism, "our main enemy." (Above quotes from London Tribune of Oct. 14.)

Here is the pattern of the crisis on the regional level, in the counterposition of these two chauvinist nationalisms. On neither side can socialists or genuine democrats support the politics which are pushing both sets of rulers into heightened conflict.

TOWARD AN OVERHAUL

However, we have always approached this question with the concept that a special responsibility in working toward a democratic solution falls on the Israeli working class, precisely because it considers itself politically and socially more advanced than the forces in the backward Arab societies. If an initiative has to be taken to break out of the vicious circle of antagonistic chauvinisms jacking themselves up mutually toward a blood-bath, then we have a right to make our demands on the Israelis first.

(Turn to last page)

Molotov Torpedoes Geneva And German Unity Hopes

By GORDON HASKELL

The Geneva Conference of foreign ministers was torpedoed by Molotov on his return from Moscow. Although there was practically no possibility, from the beginning, that the Stalinist and capitalist powers would be able to agree on the unification of Germany, the apparent hardening of Stalinist policy raises the question as to how mild and how durable the thaw in the cold war will be.

When Molotov left for Moscow, there was some hope in Western circles that he would come back with concessions on Germany which would make continued negotiations possible. He returned with a flat-footed, rock-bottomed rejection of free elections as the road to German unity, and a big propaganda blast which sought to counterpose the alleged existence of workers' rule in East Germany to the proposal for free elections in the whole country.

The "hard" stand taken by Molotov at this stage does not necessarily indicate strength and assurance on the part of the Stalinists. Quite the contrary; it can show that they have decided to make the most of a weak position by brazening it out. The bluster and noise on the Stalinist side can be expected to increase. This time, however, instead of the cheers of victorious battle, the noise is an attempt to cover defeat with bold front.

Although nothing concrete will be achieved at this conference, it can serve to drive home at least one important lesson: that when either side takes its stand on the basis of democratic rights it can crowd the other into a corner and achieve a notable political victory over it. In this instance, it has been the capitalist side which has taken its stand on the democratic right of the German people to be

united in freedom, and the Stalinists who, because they cannot and will not concede that right, have lost a political battle.

The strategies of the two sides have been clear for several months. The Stalinists have sought to exploit the longing of the peoples of the world for peace by proposing an international ban on nuclear weapons and withdrawal of all troops to their national boundaries. They have linked their disarmament proposals to this plan. Since it would involve a withdrawal of American power from Europe, as well as the dismantling of American air bases all over the world, the Stalinists have felt that they could push it safely with no danger that the Americans would take them up on their proposal.

At the same time, they have felt that they could continue to hold up the rearmament of Germany, and to push at the weak spots of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization by leaving in a state of suspended animation any discussion of German unity. If forced to discuss it, they have stood on their old position of demanding that "steps toward unification" must first be taken by the governments of the two Germanies which would give their East German puppets a veto power over every decision, and hence the puppet-masters an infinite

(Continued on page 6)

UAW Guaranteed Wage Hits Obstacle in Ohio Law

By JACK WILSON

Detroit, Nov. 5

All eyes in the United Auto Workers are turned this week to Ohio, where the fate of the Ford and General Motors contracts on the modified Guaranteed Annual Wage are at stake in the balloting in Tuesday's election, and where the political prestige of organized labor stands to make either a major gain or loss affecting its role in the 1956 national elections.

No matter what the outcome—and it should be announced before this article appears—one fact is burned indelibly in the memory of active UAW members: The most effective opposition to organized labor's campaign in Ohio comes from the leader of the Democratic Party there, Governor Frank Lausche.

What the Ohio voters are deciding on "Ballot Four" is whether to raise the unemployment compensation and extend the benefits, and whether to approve the payment of the GAW supplements by the auto companies (which is against Ohio law at present).

Under the UAW contracts, the GAW payments become legal when the integration of unemployment compensation and the company supplements are approved in states which combined had two-thirds of the Ford and GM auto workers. Since Michigan has okayed this payment, Ohio becomes the key state, for it has the second highest auto employment in the country.

Failure to win on Tuesday for the UAW would make almost impossible the realization of its GAW contracts at Ford and GM. In the case of Chrysler, the UAW has no problem, for two-thirds of Chrysler workers are employed in Michigan.

LAUSCHE IS AGIN'

The UAW, with the aid of the rest of the CIO and of the Ohio AFL, undertook to bypass a hostile state legislature, using the initiative-petition law to place its proposal on the ballot. It took more than 300,000 signatures to get this measure on the ballot.

The voters will be asked to approve the following:

(1) Increase the minimum unemployment compensation payment from \$10 to \$15 a week.

(2) Increase the maximum from \$33 to \$50 a week.

(3) Increase the maximum dependency benefit from a maximum of two children to three. With dependence allowance, the maximum would be raised from \$39 to \$59 a week (\$3 a child).

(4) Change the appeal method by placing the burden of proof on the party asking for a reconsideration of the claim instead of on the worker.

(5) Increase payment period from 26 to 39 weeks.

(6) Provide supplemental payments to workers whose claims are delayed by the "unreasonable action of employers."

Democratic Governor Lausche has denounced this measure as "fantastic," and he has the support of the Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers.

ENLIGHTENED?

Incidentally, one of the UAW's pet theories has already fallen by the wayside during this heated campaign in Ohio. Part of the strategy of the UAW in its GAW fight was to get the "enlightened employers in self-interest" to help them change state laws to get approval of the GAW payments. In Ohio, both Ford and GM are silent on the issue, and some leading national newspapers say that the corporations are aiding the anti-CIO campaign behind the scenes.

One thing is certain: the two auto companies are not living up to the "social responsibility" of which Walter Reuther speaks by coming out with ads jointly with the UAW to urge approval of Ballot Four.

Crucial to the UAW in this ballot is a clause proposed in the new legislation which provides that "payment to a claimant under the guaranteed wage plan shall not affect the weekly benefit amount of claimants under the employment compensation law of the state of Ohio."

As we go to press, it looks as if "Ballot Four" (discussed in this article) has been defeated in Ohio.

This would amend the current law forbidding the GAW payments which says: "All remuneration which an individual receives in personal services must be deducted from unemployment compensation benefits." The Ohio law also says that all retirements or pension benefits also must be deducted from benefit payments.

Governor Lausche's campaign against the new proposals is based on the traditional arguments of all reactionaries against social legislation: "Ohio, if the proposal passes, definitely will be sidetracked by new industries seeking reasonable opportunities. With 46 other states providing less compensation, imposing a lesser burden on industrial operations, it is obvious that new industries will not settle in Ohio."

At this writing, there is no evidence that any other presidential aspirant (say Harriman, Stevenson or Kefauver) has come into the state to place themselves alongside the CIO and AFL in giving the workingman justice by campaigning for Ballot Four. Would that be asking too much of them?

STAKES HIGH

Naturally, a CIO-AFL victory in Ohio would change the timidity of these politicians. For success by organized labor there would have a national impact. It would be a spectacular victory for Walter Reuther. Defeat, on the other hand, would make life in the Democratic Party somewhat more embarrassing for the labor leaders, for they would be increasingly ignored in the important councils.

Two other important points must be made on this issue: When the idea of unemployment compensation was first placed into law in the 1930s, the basic reasoning behind it was that the amount to be paid must equal at least 50 per cent of take-home pay if an unemployed worker was to have an absolute minimum of funds to eat and pay rent. In the ensuing years, this ratio has gradually declined because state laws have not been improved sufficiently to meet the inflationary trend and the subsequent decline in the purchasing power of the dollar. In reality, all that the CIO and AFL are asking is that the unemployment-compensation payments come up to the standards set nearly 25 years ago! This becomes a matter not of progress but of catching up.

A national survey, not conducted by organized labor, will soon make this point public in a report that is bound to shock the public. Its authority is such that the Eisenhower administration is expected to accept the findings.

The second point is that the UAW will find itself in an internal dilemma if the GAW payments do not become permissible at Ford and GM. It is entirely likely that the corporation would then be forced to make a payment of 5 cents per hour per employee to the workers, which would raise their hourly rate above those at Chrysler. It would also whet the appetite of the skilled workers for more money in that direction.

For all these reasons, the stakes in the outcome of Ballot Four are very high for the UAW and its future development.

Mass Rally on Till Case in Phila.

By JOE ARNOLD

Phila., Nov. 1

Five thousand angry Philadelphians attended a mass protest meeting on the Emmett Till case. They heard various speakers denounce the vicious murder of Till by the two Negro-hating Dixiecrats who were soon acquitted by an all-white jury in deep Mississippi.

Dr. Harry J. Greene, president of the Philadelphia NAACP, lashed out at what he called the real subversives in America today: "The various officials of the South who openly call on their constituents to defy the Constitution of the United States and the verdict of the Supreme Court. They should be tried for treason and rebellion against the laws of the U. S." cried Greene, and the huge crowd cheered him.

Another speaker pointed out that the Department of Justice, which moves with

LABOR SCOPE

ILGWU LAGS BEHIND ON GUARANTEED WAGE

By BEN HALL

The International Ladies Garment Workers Union has rejected the demand for a Guaranteed Annual Wage. Its position is put forward in a resolution adopted by its General Executive Board last month.

The board "applauds those unions which have successfully made the establishment of a guaranteed annual wage the major objective of their recent contract negotiations." But it adds significantly that such victories show the justification of GAW "in those sectors of our economy."

But, without saying so openly and directly, ILGWU leaders imply that the guaranteed wage is not feasible in the highly competitive ladies' garment industry. "It is our considered conclusion that in our industry, until now, the most effective means for stabilizing employment and earnings still remains the shortening of the work-week."

Either the guaranteed wage or the shorter week: the ILGWU counterposes one to the other, reminding us of the first discussions in the UAW. But its position is already obsolete and it is hard to see how it can be maintained for any extended period.

In 1951, Ford Local 600 pressed for the adoption of a demand for a 30-hour week instead of GAW. With equal persistence, the Reuther administration restricted its outlook to GAW and ridiculed the short work-week. They agreed only on this: either one or the other.

The dispute in the UAW is over. Both sides demand both GAW and a shorter work-week. The last UAW convention put the reduction of hours as the union's next great practical objective.

On October 17, Reuther for the CIO appeared before the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report and said, "the reduction of the work-week to 35 or 30 hours in the coming decade can be an important shock absorber during the transition to the widespread use of automation. It can reduce the impact of sharp rises in output and increase the manpower requirements in industry and commerce."

In the October 22 issue of *Ford Facts* the top officers of UAW Local 600 report to their membership: "in presenting his 8-point program to Congress, Brother Reuther completely eliminated any programmatic areas of disagreements on this issue. . . ." They report too that "The 1955 contracts nailed down the GAW principle, thereby clearing the decks for an all-out fight for a 30-hour week with 40-hours pay in our next set of demands."

The ILG will change its mind or be left far behind.

SUSPICIOUS

The Communications Workers of America (CIO) has decided to study the question of public ownership of telephone facilities.

Most of the union's membership work for the Bell system which dominates the country's telephones. The union's Executive Board voted to set up a committee of union members and private experts to look into the question.

Joseph Beirne, union president, said "I personally have always favored private ownership of telephone facilities. However, I recently returned from a world-wide meeting of the Postal, Telephone and

Telegraph International, a confederation of unions of workers serving communications operations throughout the free world. In most countries, the communications system is government-owned and operated."

Government ownership isn't socialism but when a union in the United States looks into the question it seems a bit suspicious of the virtues of private enterprise.

NAMING NAMES

Louis Manning, a pioneer organizer of the Transport Workers Union and a member of its International Executive Board, has cautioned President Mike Quill against toying with independence from the new united labor federation. In a letter to Quill last month, Manning commended Quill for his criticism of the merger terms but warned that their opposition "should not go to the point where it would mean our exclusion from the merged organization. I feel that if we were alone, we could readily be carved to pieces and destroyed."

But that is not the most significant aspect of the letter; for it is highly doubtful that Quill considers going independent even for a moment.

What is notable is Manning's criticism of certain AFL unions by name for racist practices.

"It is a known fact," he writes, "that President Meany, as head of the Plumbers Union, has not been able to integrate Negroes into his own union. The AFL Electrical Workers Union excludes Negroes from its craft locals. The AFL Boilermakers, railroad workers, bricklayers, carpenters and letter-carriers admit Negroes only as members of segregated 'auxiliary locals.' Leaders of all these unions sit in the highest councils of the AFL. It is therefore hardly possible that the integration of the Negro will be brought about with the merger."

He is right that integration will not come with the merger. But unity will establish a new platform for the fight.

Lofty generalities on Negro rights fall like rain. But to criticize unions and their leaders by name, as Manning does: that is a rare thing. From now on, he and others like him can carry their fight into the united councils of labor instead of confining it to the membership of the CIO.

CURRAN GETS HIS

The tenth convention of the National Maritime Union adjourned last month doing its part to restore the obsequious idolatry that Joe Curran enjoyed when he served as the union's ruling puppet for the Stalinists. The convention adopted a series of proposals which now go to a membership referendum. Among them:

(1) The initiation fee is raised to \$100.

(2) Officer salaries are increased. Curran is raised to \$19,000, one of the largest pay schedules for CIO officers in one of its smallest unions.

(3) A Joseph Curran scholarship fund is set up to award scholarships on a competitive basis to members of NMU families. But Joe Curran's son gets a free anticipatory scholarship "when he completes his high school education." No examination necessary. Not yet dead and so highly honored!

(4) The New York Port Committee and others are abolished.

(5) M. Hedley Stone, NMU national secretary, stands condemned and his post is abolished. This will warn all future critics of Curran.

The Officers Report Committee which delivered the condemnation was inspired only by the spirit of democracy, as it itself reported: "Too, we believe in and respect the right of any officer or minority of officers to disagree with the majority, even when our great and capable president is among the majority." Any of you wise guys disagree?

DEMOCRACY

In an article entitled "Democracy: GOP style" the *Michigan CIO News* explains how the Republicans keep control in that state. Every state Senatorial District gets equal representation. But the average Democratic district has 281,131 people. The Republican district averages only 142,579. Consequently in 1954: 1,066,737 Democratic voters elected only 11 senators; but 1,013,063 Republicans elected 23 state senators. It should be added that this same type of representation determines the control of Congress:

Subscribe to LABOR ACTION —
\$2 a year does it!

Read and subscribe to
THE NEW INTERNATIONAL
The Marxist review for serious
students of social issues
50 cents \$2 a year

LONDON LETTER

BLP Presses United Attack On Soak-the-Poor Budget

By OWEN ROBERTS

London, Nov. 3

In spite of the strong counterattraction offered by the emotional tangles of a certain member of the royal family, the recently introduced Tory budget continues to provide the main talking-point for millions of British workers.

While church and court circles debate the constitutional and theological niceties concerning the princess and the pilot, working-class families are still reckoning up the cost of the Tory budget in terms of pounds, shillings and pence on the weekly household bills. And they are not very pleased with the answer.

This displeasure of the working class is finding reflection in the attitude of the Labor Party, which always acts as a thermometer when the temperature of the class struggle rises a few degrees.

The top brass of the Parliamentary Labor Party have reacted very quickly to the changed situation, with the result that many of the right-wing leaders have moved, temporarily, a few paces to the left. This is nowhere better indicated than by the position now adopted by Hugh Gaitskell, who needs no introduction to those who follow the fortunes of the Labor Party in LA.

Following his devastating attack upon the Tories in general—and the Chancellor of the Exchequer in particular—in the House of Commons last week, Gaitskell seems to show every sign of pursuing his sharper course of action. In an article in the cooperative Sunday newspaper *Reynolds News* he alleged that the budget heralds the beginning of a new tough line by the Tories, one which will inevitably lead to the creation of unemployment in order to keep down wage demands arising out of Tory economic policies. He said: "The election has strengthened the right wing in the government."

In Labor's Daily Herald, on the following day, he once again repeated that the budget was only the first stage in Tory plans to wreck the "Welfare State." "This plan," he said, "would be completely torpedoed if higher wages were allowed to offset the cuts. The only way the Tories can stop that is by creating unemployment. This is the real menace behind the credit squeeze."

In Parliament on the same day Chancellor Butler said in a speech that Gaitskell was being extremely irresponsible in talking of wage demands inevitably following the budget. This brought Gaitskell bounding to his feet to interrupt Butler by asking: "Is it wrong that the trade unions should demand higher wages when the government is putting up the cost of living by increasing the purchase tax and by increasing rents?" A few months ago it would have defied even the strongest imagination to envisage Gaitskell taking such action and making such a statement.

This change of tactic and tone on the part of Gaitskell has caused much grief among the Tories, their friends in the financial world, and their supporters of the daily press. They are upset that Gaitskell should seemingly have been transformed overnight from a "responsible" spokesman of the Parliamentary Opposition into a dangerous rabble-rouser of the proletariat. On all sides the capitalist press organs are denouncing Gaitskell for "declaring the budget to be a battlefield of the class war." One political correspondent described Gaitskell as "vituperative, angry and relentless . . . he was determined not merely to wound but also to kill."

In playing this new role Gaitskell is anxious to improve on his success at the recent Margate Conference and further increase his lead in the race with Herbert Morrison for party leadership. But he has also displayed hitherto undisclosed talent for interpreting the mood of the rank and file which, as one writer aptly remarked, is sick of donnish niceties and wants a roughhouse.

No one on the left is convinced that Gaitskell's apparent conversion is a permanent affair, and they are not over-much worried by this knowledge. What they want is for the party to stand up and fight the Tories and if Gaitskell wants to join in so much the better.

Contrasted with Gaitskell the other aspirant for party leadership, Morrison, has done very badly during the past week. Chosen by the Parliamentary Party to lead the attack in the motion of

censure, which was debated in the House of Commons a few days ago, Morrison completely missed his cue.

His speech was hesitant and to some extent conciliatory. His obvious weakness permitted the Tories to launch a counter-attack and turn what would have been a moral victory for Labor into a third-rate debate in which the Tories gained the honors.

Morrison's attitude was clearly indicated in the statement which he made to the *Daily Herald* early this week. In contrast to Gaitskell's sharp attack on the Tories, Morrison spoke merely of the need to expose the Tories. Where Gaitskell spoke of the necessity for fighting the Tories inside and outside of Parliament, Morrison emphasized the need to educate the electorate and the fact that Labor must not ignore the grave economic problems which face the nation. "It is the duty of us all," he said, "in a responsible spirit, to make our contributions to their solutions."

"MORE DRASTIC . . ."

Aneurin Bevan has played little part in the parliamentary debates on the budget, but his position was made clear in the *Daily Herald*—which incidentally did him the honor of providing a spot on the front page, another indication of the few paces left which the party has marched. Bevan also takes the line that the Tories are now preparing an all-out attack on workers' living standards. These plans, he said, must be fought by every means at Labor's disposal.

Labor, said Bevan, must ask itself what is the answer to these recurrent crises since the war. For his part no talk of mere financial controls was sufficient: "We need to apply much more drastic socialist remedies than that."

Bevan was expressing a logical attitude. A militant fight against the Tories is good on whatever basis it is conducted, but to be really effective it must be a fight based firmly upon socialist alternatives. The task of the left, and of Bevan in particular, is to provide a positive content to the current anger of the workers.

READING FROM LEFT TO RIGHT

Japan's Two SPs Unite on Compromise Program

By GODFREY DENIS

The *New Leader*, always useful for its coverage of social-democratic politics abroad, carried an informative article on the unification of the Right-Wing and Left-Wing Socialist Parties of Japan, in its issue of October 31. The bias of the author—himself one of the minor leaders of the right-wing of the Right-Wing Socialist Party—does not obscure the real issues involved.

The Left and Right Socialists had split in October 1951 over the security treaty with the U. S., although the issue itself merely dramatized the already deep cleavage between the groups involved. The Left Wing not only kept the bulk of the party's trade-union base and student movement but also emerged much stronger in the elections.

The Left-Wing party in general was neutralist, semi-pacifist in foreign policy, opposed to American and Russian imperialism and committed to the principles of class struggle. The Right Wing in general subscribed to the principles of the Socialist International. (It is important to note that with the exception of the Right-Wing Party of Japan the socialist parties of Asia generally do not belong to the Socialist International but rather have a loose coordinating body of their own; the two major issues separating them from the world social-democracy are the questions of colonialism and alliance with the American camp.)

In the course of the unity discussions the two parties clashed on four major

'Look' Squints at Africa

By PRISCILLA CADY

Look magazine has evidently decided that it is *de rigueur* nowadays to discover Africa, and the latest issue of this learn-by-seeing organ regales its readers with fifteen pages of pictures and articles about the "awakening giant."

"Four Challenging Views" are presented by such a formidable list of experts as Adlai Stevenson, John Gunther, Edward M. Korry and Robert Ruark, with Ernest Hemingway baring his masculine soul in a preface. That anyone could consider this group as qualified to discuss the problems of Africa can only be considered as a magnificent example of nerve, but the editors probably expect their readers to concentrate on the pretty pictures of Africans dressed and undressed, and pass on. Anyway, Adlai Stevenson did go to Africa, and how many of his detractors can say the same?

John Gunther has, of course, more or less legitimately legged his way into the ranks of those whose knowledge of the continent is respected (we hope that after the appearance of his outsize *Inside* the flow of I-have-been-there books will abate) and he obligingly tells us again that there is North Africa, South Africa, East and West Africa, that these sections have their own peculiar problems, that British colonialism is different from French and the Belgian, and Portuguese different again, and although there are both good and bad colonial governments and lots of Africans still need lots of "tutelage," "People, no matter what the color of their skins, have an unassailable right to be free."

That he should place an impeccably democratic dictum in such a context of condescending chauvinism is typical of the whole *Look* approach, which is not in the least concerned with the African people as such (except as they make excellent subjects for color photography) but as a "problem" area in the "free world"—as "the world's richest prize" which must be held on to at all costs, even the cost of some political concessions.

The rapid and sterile quality of this magazine's extravaganza is typified by the contribution of Adlai Stevenson, whose qualification to the title "egghead"—considering the term as one of approbation—is made even more obscure than before.

He has some very profound things to say—that love of talk is an African affliction and a block on the road to independence (!), and that political morality does not come easily to people (he means the Africans!) who have always equated authority with wealth. Instead of seeing, as a good advocate of the two-party system might, the emergence of the Ashanti challenge to the Convention People's Party in the Gold Coast as

a function of democracy, he takes it as a sad sign of possible "fragmentation," proving, no doubt, that if Nkrumah is unable to establish a dictatorship he is incapable of governing.

Stevenson completely exposes his ignorance (but ignorance is not, of course, a block on the road to the presidency in America) in the ludicrous statement: "I like to think it [the modern world] came less through the slave trade—the Christian West's first link to Black Africa—than through Livingstone and Stanley [just what does he think Stanley was doing in Africa anyway?] and the early Christian missionaries who brought medicine, science, education and Christ's teachings. . . ."

Adlai Stevenson likes to think! Let's play a new historical game; *I like to think that*. . . . It obviously has endless possibilities.

Stevenson does face reality bravely, however, when he says: "Whether it would have been kinder to leave the African in a state of nature . . . is now an academic question. For the die has been cast; the modern world is here to stay." Leaving aside (with difficulty) the question of his formulations "kinder" and "state of nature," he does say truth there. What's past is past, the moving finger has writ, and you can't go home again.

Hemingway's earnest little contribution, being totally without social or political content, is of little interest for this review, but we cannot resist complaining that he is becoming unbearably precious, and that if he thinks that loving the country of Africa is like making love to the one unique woman he can go away and ponder the beauty of his metaphor.

Robert Ruark's piece is predictably titled "Africa: Land of Violence." We've said our say about Ruark in these columns before—he runs true to form here as he broods on the somber beauty of the fact that in Africa life feeds on death (this presumably does not occur elsewhere in nature) and the hyena (*fisi*, as he knowledgeably calls it), being a scavenger, wins in the end. The last part of his article brings in the Mau Mau; his comment is that in all this bloodletting nobody won, nobody but *fisi*.

Edward M. Korry reviews North African events, says that it is a land of terror, and hopes that France will go forward with a newly awakened conscience and policy of sanity and mold a Dominion out of the area. Look at England and India, for example.

All of this is so glib, so easy, so totally without any serious analysis or attempt to present the situation other than as one in a power struggle, that one feels that *Look* has eminently fulfilled its function and we can all go back to Jackie Gleason.

points:

(1) "The character of the Socialist Party. The Left favored a 'class party' based on the working class; the Right insisted on a 'national party' embodying various elements of the population. In the end, the platform coined a new expression, 'class party of the people.' The verbal nature of the compromise is evident.

(2) "Paths to Socialism. The old Left Socialist platform envisaged a political or economic crisis—brought along by war or depression—as the starting point which the Socialist Party, with the help of a mass movement, would utilize to assume power. Basically, the Left called for a socialist revolution to be brought about through class struggle. . . . In the new platform the Left retreated from its old position though it did not abandon it completely. The Leftists agreed with the Rightists on a peaceful revolution through democracy but managed to combine this with 'national independence' as well as socialist revolution. The new platform contains this sentence, . . . 'The broad mass of working people, with the working class as the central core, carries inevitably the struggle for national independence, namely, socialist revolution.'"—This last section apparently upset the *New Leader* correspondent sufficiently to lead him to hear an echo in this of "Khrushchev as well as Lenin."

(3) Japan's status. The compromise platform plank reads: "Japan is formal-

ly independent, but in fact she is controlled by the U. S.-Japanese Security Pact and a network of American military and other bases."

(4) Attitude toward Stalinism. While both parties drew a line between themselves and the Stalinists, attacking Stalinism along with imperialism and opposing the activities of the Cominform, Stalinism itself was not labeled as totalitarianism.

Apparently a considerable opposition to the merger developed in the Left Socialist Party and the left wing of that party forced through a resolution on the "four principles of peace," i.e., an overall peace treaty (including Russia and Stalinist China), neutralism in foreign policy, and opposition to rearmament and U. S. military bases. The Right supports the platform as a whole and it appears that the merged party has reduced the neutralist wings to a minority.

The Right-Wing leaders seem to hope that the responsibility of power will do much to make the Japanese Socialists more "reasonable" in the future, that is to say, turn the currently militant party into a watered-down version of European social-democracy.

It must be remembered that the unified Socialist Party is now the largest opposition party; in the lower house they have 155 seats to the 185 and 117 seats of the two bourgeois parties; in the upper house the proportion is 70 Socialists to 90 Liberals and 25 Democrats.

EAST EUROPE'S EXILES

Constantin Gherea is an Eastern European socialist abroad. The cogent views he presents in this communication are a valuable contribution to a discussion of this question, which was broached by the opinion expressed by Comrade Rudzienski in our Oct. 10 issue.—ED.

By CONSTANTIN GHEREA

Rudzienski's article on the Polish emigration (LABOR ACTION, Oct. 10) is interesting and informative, but misleading in its general conclusions, especially when he writes the following:

"While the political leadership of the emigration is nationalist and conservative, its enemy, the Warsaw government, because of its totalitarian and counter-revolutionary character, is still more reactionary . . . and therefore . . . the Polish emigration is playing an important role in the fight of the Polish masses against national slavery and for social and national freedom."

Although he does not say so outright, Rudzienski implies that the Polish "government in exile" should be supported against the Stalinist government in Poland. In my opinion such support, under any form, would be disastrous from the socialist point of view.

As Rudzienski points out, the Polish emigration has its special traditions and special problems. Its main problem, however, and the reason for its existence at the present time, is one which it shares with all Eastern European emigrations: the Stalinist occupation of their countries. The political role of the Polish emigration is also similar to the role of the other emigrations of Eastern Europe, and can only be understood in terms of the conflict between the U. S. and Russia. These emigrations are not playing an independent role, and are being used by the State Department as pawns in the cold war, just as the Stalinist puppet régimes are being used by Russia.

The reason for this situation is rooted in the historical, social and political origin of the Eastern European emigration, which is more complex than Rudzienski suggests.

First of all, a clear distinction must be made between the old emigration (those who left their countries before 1939) and those who have become assimilated in the country of adoption. There are sizable groups of Americans of Polish, Rumanian, Yugoslav, etc., origin, many of whom remained attached to their cultural traditions. There is also a fairly large Polish colony in the coal-mining regions of Northern France and Belgium. This category is predominantly composed of workers and peasants who left Eastern Europe to escape from poverty. Even though they often support the present political emigration morally and financially, they are in fact citizens of their country of adoption. Their perspective is completely different: they do not expect to return to their country of origin, and they are integrated in a different society with different problems.

POLITICAL MAKE-UP

The only category which is relevant in this discussion is the emigration of 1944 and after. These are the people who left their country of origin to escape from Stalinist occupation. Unlike the former group which was selected by economic need, and unlike the Spanish republican emigration which is based on a solid popular nucleus (about one million people crossed the Pyrenees in 1939), the emigration of 1944 is socially heterogeneous. It is composed of all those who, for one reason or another, happened to be in the West when the Russian armies overran Eastern Europe, and who refused to go back, plus those who could escape later.

This includes first of all the cadres of the ancien régime, i.e., those who were materially in a position to leave the country or who were abroad to begin with on diplomatic or other missions. Then there are the displaced persons, the bulk of which are workers or peasants who were deported by the German government in the last stages of the war to work in the war industries. When the Nazi empire collapsed in 1944, these people were in Germany and chose to stay there.

The political make-up of the emigration is shaped by these circumstances. In part it reflects, of course, the political make-up of the country of origin. For example, there are more Latvian socialists in exile than there are Rumanian socialists, because the socialist movement was stronger in Latvia than in Rumania, etc. There is an important difference, however: the working class and the peasants cannot emigrate as easily as the

bourgeoisie, and most socialist parties in exile are weak, especially since the bulk of the DPs are not political. This is less true for the bourgeois groups, whether they be liberal (Peasant Parties), reactionary or fascist. They were able to save a considerable part of their cadres, while the cadres of the labor movement stayed behind and were put in prison. The social and political character of the Eastern European emigration is therefore predominantly bourgeois and reactionary.

RESTORATIONISTS

Being neither rooted in the political life of the country of origin, nor in solid political traditions, these emigrations rapidly decomposed, became clique-ridden and corrupted. In general, two main groups have crystallized in each emigration. One is the "government in exile," or "national committee," which represents continuity with bourgeois democracy; if it is lucky, each emigration has only one of it. Then, there are the fascist and bonapartist groups and their splinters, and finally the cliques based on personalities or bank accounts. I know of no emigration in which either the "government in exile" or a fascist group, or another group, can claim to represent the majority of the population in exile, let alone a majority of the population under Stalinist rule. Their only political and financial support is the State Department.

The program of all major groups in exile is the program of the right wing in the Republican Party: restoration of capitalism in Eastern Europe and Russia under the aegis of the American bourgeoisie. The only possibility these groups have to return to their countries is in the train of the American army, after turning Eastern Europe into another Korea.

This, of course, is the very reason why such "governments in exile" remain politically ineffective. Their propaganda falls flat, just as the propaganda of Radio Free Europe and of similar organizations falls flat: they have no program except "liberation," that is, destroying the illness by killing the patient.

It is true that the Stalinist régimes in Eastern Europe are now waging a campaign against the emigration, partly by terrorism (the recent assassination of the Slovak leader Cernak in Munich), by abduction (Trushnovitch and others), or by the "conversion" of planted agents (Hanke, Lausman). This is not in itself a proof of the political effectiveness of the exiled politicians. The GPU also assassinated White Russian leaders in the 1930s who could not possibly be considered a political threat. That the pressure of the MVD is greater in Russia than in Eastern Europe, is probably due to the fact that it has ruled in Russia 20 years longer.

SOCIALIST PROPOSAL

The bourgeois groups in exile cannot elaborate a democratic program for the same reasons that prevent the capitalist bourgeoisie in the West from doing so. This is not true for the socialist groups in exile, who have a different and more effective political framework to work in: the international socialist movement.

Unfortunately, they have so far preferred to engage in bourgeois politics. Faithful to the social-democratic tradition of class-collaboration and union sacrée, they have entered the "governments in exile" and are supporting them as the "lesser evil." This is a position that should not be encouraged or tolerated, but fought, since a socialist or even a democratic policy can only be based on opposition to both imperialist blocs.

By advocating such a policy, the socialist parties in exile would effectively voice the aspirations of the peoples behind the Iron Curtain, who want to maintain the nationalized status of industry, but under their own control, not under the control of a bureaucratic ruling class; who want to maintain the agrarian reform but would replace forced collectivization by cooperative systems, etc.

Such a policy cannot be carried out in collaboration with the "government in exile." Therefore, the first step of the Eastern European socialists should be to break off all relationships with the bourgeois groups of their own countries. The second step should be to unite in a Socialist Federation in Exile, which would elaborate a program that all socialist groups in exile could endorse. These are the only bases on which Eastern European socialists could wage a political war on the Stalinist régime that would not be reactionary in character.

Russian Imperialism — —

(Continued from page 11)

aggressive Egypt and its military dictator Nasser.

Then came the official confirmation of the deal. The tide of indignation, however, rose still higher. The CP became indignant that anyone could possibly find fault with such a deal, despite the fact that only a few days previously they had done this very thing.

Achdut, Avodah and Mapam maintained their hostile attitude toward the deal. As Zionists they were opposed to the Stalinists' supplying arms to Egypt, and for the first few days they indignantly denounced not Russia, not Czechoslovakia, but the Israeli Communist Party for justifying the deal.

Mapam continued its double policy of denouncing the deal and finding excuses for Russia. Only a little while ago, despite the fact that their own lives were at stake, they persisted in saying that Russia was entitled to use all its efforts to block the creation of an anti-Soviet alliance; unfortunately it was sacrificing Israel along this road—a mistake. . . .

MOSCOW'S AIMS

For a while it did seem as though the Stalinist aim in the Middle East was merely a negative one, i.e., frustrating American plans for the area. However, as the story unfolds there appears to be much more to the Russians' moves.

The Egyptians who had led the opposition to U. S. military plans in the Middle East had not shopped around for the arms. The Russians came to them with a fully worked-out deal. While the armaments came from Czech factories it was the Russians who acted as the "merchants of death" in this instance. The price of the materiel is reported to be ridiculously low, according to some reports as low as one-tenth of the marked price. In addition it is all on credit, and the credit is payable not in cash but by barter of cotton and other goods that the Eastern bloc does not normally import in large quantities. The size, amount and quality of the arms involved is of relatively high order, including jets and submarines.

One of the most ominous signs was the speed with which the deal was consummated. Less than a few weeks after the signing of the agreement, Russian ships were already unloading their tools of death in the ports of Egypt. No such haste and no such terms were needed to keep Nasser and others out of the Middle East alliance. Russia has more than negative interests in this cauldron.

Historically Russia has always looked to the Middle East for expansion. While the Bolshevik regime renounced the imperialist plans of old Russia, the Stalinists reinstated the old tsarist ambitions in this area with a vengeance. Before the war, Stalin demanded that the British give him a warm-water port in Iran. After the war, Russia marched into Iran and seized some territory. Pushed out of Iran by its Western imperialist rivals, it tried to make a deal giving it control of much of Iranian oil. Here too it was frustrated.

At the wartime and post-war conferences, Russia demanded that the then Italian colony of Libya, which is now a nominally independent state on Egypt's western border, be placed under Russian control. Russia has never made a secret of its desires to control the Dardanelles. It has been hot and cold in its demand for acquisition of two Turkish provinces near Istanbul.

There can be little doubt that the Russians are playing for more than the immediate diplomatic stakes. They are now involved in a long-term rivalry with

opponents for imperialist influence in the Middle East.

As is usually the case with the Russians, the new line is put into effect in a totalitarian, or total, manner. During the early days of the late "Geneva spirit," the satellite countries freed some Zionists from prison. Now Zionists or suspected Zionists are once again being imprisoned in Russia.

If and when a new Israeli-Arab war does break out, another great power will have smeared its hands in blood again. The situation was difficult enough when the Arabs and Israelis were left to themselves. The actions of both power blocs have and will continue to act as a disturbing influence on the Middle East.

For Israel, a Jewish island in an Arab sea, the situation is deteriorating and shows little promise of change for the better as things are going now. As a result of both the power politics of the big states and of its own policies, Israel is being forced willy-nilly to depend on outside powers for its very survival.

BEN-GURION'S ROLE

No matter who is to blame for the new Israeli-Arab bloodshed, no matter who will supply the guns, it is Ben-Gurion who has supplied the Arab leaders with their slogans and atrocity material.

"Remember Kibya!" is playing and will continue to play a big propagandistic role for the Egyptians. Ben-Gurion, too, is responsible for deliberately substituting large-scale fighting in place of the small brush fighting that was the rule for the last eight years.

At the beginning of 1955, Ben-Gurion proposed a large-scale retaliatory attack on the Egyptians in Gaza. He carried his point in the councils of the Israeli government but had to assume personal responsibility by emerging from retirement and becoming defense minister. His rationale was that a show of force, a defeat for Nasser, would stop the border fighting by frightening the Arabs, and it might even bring a peace settlement.

We in LABOR ACTION pointed out at that time that this policy would not bring peace nor stop the border fighting, but that it would lead to mutual retaliation on a heightened plane. The events of the past year have proved that Ben-Gurion's policy of swashbuckling chauvinism is the worst poison for Israel. One of the reasons why Nasser quickly accepted the Russian offer was the defeat suffered by Egyptian forces in Ben-Gurion's Gaza raid early this year, and the consequent demonstration of Israel's military superiority over Egypt. No military dictator can long endure such a situation if he hopes to maintain his position.

The hope of the Israeli moderates like Sharett, who went along with Ben-Gurion in the belief that by headlining the border troubles they could get the benevolent intervention of the great powers, has also proved to be an illusion. The road to peace in the Middle East does not lie via Washington or Moscow or London, but in the Middle East itself.

Whatever the immediate outcome of the present border fighting will be, it seems to have put a damper on the Johnson plan for sharing the waters of the Jordan among Israel, Jordan and Lebanon. Should this prove to be the permanent quietus on the plan, it would indeed be unfortunate. Despite its suspect authorship in the U. S., it has been the only regional plan proposed up till now that would make some contribution to the development of the area and to the prospects for peace.



LABOR ACTION

November 14, 1955 Vol. 19, No. 46

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

Editor: HAL DRAPER

Associate Editors:

GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL

Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

YOU'RE INVITED

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

THE COLLECTED STORIES OF ISAAC BABEL

New edition of a Russian master, including all passages censored in earlier versions (chiefly references to Trotsky).

\$5.00

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

A Little-Publicized Front in the Battle for Civil Liberties—

THE ATTACK ON THE STUDENT CO-OPS

By TIM WOHLFORTH

On campus after campus throughout the country, efforts have been made to quell all those whom the administration cannot control, all those who dissent. While the brunt of this attack has been upon political organizations, the new student co-op movement has also been under attack. Most of these co-ops have been organized since the war and are in a vulnerable position on nearly every campus.

In California, a state where the witchhunt has been carried to its extreme under the direction of the infamous Tenney committee, a direct attack upon the independence of campus co-ops has been made.

In the spring of 1954 the 800-member housing co-op at Berkeley was required along with other tax-exempt organizations to sign a loyalty oath. It became evident that if the co-op did not sign the oath a sizable proportion of its membership might leave for fear that continued membership in the co-op would endanger future job possibilities. Because of the seriousness of the question a referendum of the membership was held in the following fall. The co-op decided to sign the oath by a vote of 560 to 237.

But this was only the beginning of the Berkeley co-op's troubles. No sooner had the co-op disposed of one oath than another oath was proposed in the legislature which was far more severe. This new law made it necessary for an organization requesting tax exemption to swear that no member of the organization was a "subversive."

The co-op hopes that when the legality of the law gets worked out it will be found not applicable to it as it would put the co-op in the position of violating a

basic co-op principle, namely, that membership be open to all regardless of political affiliation.

But Berkeley's troubles were not yet over. It faced only two oaths. This last spring the co-op held its semi-annual retreat at a nearby park. But before it could hold this retreat it was forced to sign a *third* oath; this stated that nothing "done or said . . . will be subversive to the Constitution of the United States; and we further pledge our allegiance to the United States."

The co-ops at UCLA have also had their troubles. There the administration feared the independent status of the co-ops and is now engaged in an attempt to put the co-ops under its control. There is a possibility that the administration will insist on approving all speakers who speak at the co-ops. Furthermore at present the administration is censoring the mimeographed newsletter of the co-ops, *Chatterbox*.

CO-OPS' CHALLENGE

This same general pattern is found throughout the country, but with one added ingredient. The administration is not only seeking to control the "political" aspect of the co-ops but wherever possible their entire administrative setup.

Thus we find, for instance, that at the

University of Idaho the administration attempted to take over the campus co-ops completely and was only stopped from doing so by the intervention of a state senator and by a militant campaign on the part of the co-ops involved. At the University of Chicago campus co-ops have been declared out of bounds for U. of C. students. At Oberlin College one of the co-ops is being operated under a form of "martial law" where one false move will cause it to be closed by the college.

The reason for this attack on the co-ops is easy to understand. In the first place campus co-ops represent genuinely democratic organizations which are controlled directly by the students. They are therefore a challenge to the college administration, which on the typical American campus rules monolithically and resents any resistance to its rule.

Secondly, co-ops are by their very nature a challenge to the status quo. That they exist is testimony to the fact that college students are capable of democratically controlling the most important aspects of their daily lives. Furthermore, that these organizations are cooperative and non-profit institutions is a challenge to the whole private profit system.

For these reasons, co-ops have always tended to attract left elements on the campus. Furthermore co-ops have at times lead progressive struggles on the campuses. This is especially true of the field of racial discrimination. Co-ops are universally opposed to discrimination and on many campuses are the only boarding and eating places where Negroes and whites, Jews and gentiles, can live and eat together. At the University of Wisconsin it was the co-ops which initiated and led the campaign which made discrimination illegal in university-approved housing.

Because of this unique feature co-ops tend to become the centers for foreign students on the campus and acquire a very cosmopolitan character.

PLAYING 'SAFE'

Despite all this there is an ever-increasing tendency among these co-ops to attempt to become "respectable" and "safe." Their response to attack is to give in, to submit, to be "realistic." Such a response, which predominates in the co-op movement today, threatens to deny the very reasons for the existence of co-ops.

Most co-ops accept the ideology of the big commercial co-ops, that co-ops are "free enterprise" and are opposed to socialism. While co-ops are free enterprise in a sense—in fact much freer than any private-profit enterprise—they are at the same time non-profit enterprises organized for the specific reason that profit enterprise cannot fulfill the

needs of the people. It is no coincidence that socialists and the co-ops have the same slogan, "production for use, not for profit."

With an ideology which attempts to minimize the differences between cooperative organization and profit organization, many co-ops on campus attempt to impose conformist self-discipline on the co-op. They oppose the expression of dissent, and try to suppress the non-conforming person on the ground that if they do not do so the administration will take over the co-op.

They fail to realize that by doing so they are in effect putting the co-op under administration control without even fighting, because they are turning themselves into the administration's police. "Independence" which does not allow one to be different is not independence.

Many attempt to rationalize this failure to resist on the grounds that co-ops are "non-political." On these grounds it would be wrong, for instance, for a co-op to oppose the witchhunt on the campus.

PLACE OF POLITICS

This position is based on a complete misunderstanding of the meaning of the basic Rochdale principle that co-ops should not be political. In the first place this principle was formulated by partisan men. The original founders of the Rochdale co-op were a crew of socialists, anarchists and Chartrists. What they opposed was the turning of the co-op into a partisan political machine which would not allow members of other political parties to join it and would put its partisan interests before the interests of the co-op.

But this does not mean that a co-op should not democratically decide to take stands on issues somewhat larger than what should be served for breakfast. For instance, any threat to democracy in a society is a threat to the whole co-op movement. In all totalitarian countries the co-op movement, like the union movement, is nothing but an arm of the government.

As we can see by what is happening in California, civil liberties are no abstract principle for the co-ops—it is a life-and-death matter. Democracy is essential for the very existence of co-ops. If campus co-ops do not cooperate with other democratic forces on the campus and carry out a concerted drive for the preservation and re-establishment of civil liberties they will be choking off the air by which they breathe.

BLP Dissolves Its Youth League

By MAX MARTIN

According to a front-page story in the October 21 issue of *Tribune*, British Bevanite organ, the recent annual conference of the British Labor Party at Margate voted to dissolve its youth organization, the Labor League of Youth. The *Tribune* article, written by Tom White, who had been until the Margate decision national chairman of the LOY, presents few details of the Labor Party decision and is sketchy in discussing its background and the motivations of the Labor Party leadership in proposing this move. The information which *Challenge* has received of this development to date is therefore limited.

Apparently the facts are as follows: The LOY national organization, as well as whatever regional organizations may exist, has been dissolved. The LOY branches throughout the country will be converted into Labor Party youth branches attached to their respective local LP organizations.

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

and presumably under control of the latter.

It appears that in arguing for this proposition, which the conference agreed to, the right-wing Labor Party leadership asserted its purpose to be one of drawing the youth closer to the party and helping to infuse new youth elements into the party. This, it was claimed, is in line with the concern of the Labor Party over the "aging" character of its membership and its desire to see fresh blood enter its ranks.

White, in *Tribune*, expresses sarcastic skepticism of these motives. He points out that the LOY leadership and membership have been heartily in favor of closer youth-party relations and that the Labor Party leadership has shown no interest in it during the past. He states that party leaders have not been attending meetings of the leading committees of the LOY, as they should, and in general attributes the recent decline of the organization to LP neglect of its youth, financially and otherwise. He points out that the professed aims of the party leadership could have been achieved without destroying the LOY national organization.

For the real motives of this move he suggests instead that the right-wing leadership of the Labor Party has regarded its youth affiliate as a thorn in its side on the basis of the ever-current propensity of the youth to be allied with the party's left wing. With its national organization non-existent, and its local branches under the control of the party's local branches, its ability to express its left-wing tendencies effectively will obviously be greatly reduced.

Whether or not the National Association of Labor Student Organizations, the British student socialist group, is similarly affected is not known, nor how this will effect LOY's membership in the International Union of Socialist Youth. *Challenge* is endeavoring to obtain a first-hand account of these developments from England.

BERKELEY YSL CLASS

Marxist Philosophy

SUNDAYS at 6 p.m.

- (1) Nov. 27:
FOUNDATIONS OF MARXIST PHILOSOPHY
- (2) Dec. 4:
THE RUSSIAN DISPUTE: LENIN VS. MACH
- (3) Dec. 11:
AMERICAN DISPUTES: DEWEY, BURNHAM, TROTSKY

2161 SHATTUCK (Room 31)
BERKELEY

JOIN THE YSL!

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

Send me more information about the Young Socialist League.

I want to join the YSL.

.....
(NAME—PLEASE PRINT)

.....
(ADDRESS)

.....
(CITY)

.....
(STATE)

.....
(SCHOOL IF ANY)

ARGENTINA

Class Forces Behind Peron's Fall

By TORCUATO DI TELLA

The political unrest in Argentina, culminating in recent months in a bitter fight between Church and State and in the downfall of Peron, is typical of a semi-colonial country that has attempted to industrialize quickly and become a rather independent capitalist power.

Argentina has been traditionally a great exporter of agricultural products; wheat, beef and wool were the products which she sold in the world market at very low prices, and in exchange for which she got her industrial capital goods and many consumer goods. The only industries which had been developed were food-processing ones: flour mills, sugar, wine, meat packing, owned partly by local and by foreign capital. The railways were the main British investment.

The government was in the hands of a coalition of those interests: landowners and exporting industries with foreign imperialism, mainly British. The economic policy was to export as much as possible at low prices and to allow imports without trade barriers.

The Second World War brought a very important development. Due to the scarcity of foreign products, two new industries sprang up, to attend local consumption: the textile and the metallurgical one. They soon became an important power to be reckoned with. The only shadow in their future was the prospect of the end of the war and the influx of cheap consumer goods which would ruin the new industries.

In this context came the military coup of 1943, which brought to power a clique of colonels, among them Peron. It would have been one more uneventful Latin American army camp had it not been for the situation described above.

The ruling class was divided into two antagonistic groups: the exporting interests wanted to return to the pre-war position, while the new industries wanted protection of their local market, even if this meant antagonizing foreign imperialism and endangering agricultural exports.

The most class-conscious representatives of the new textile and metallurgical capitalists gave support to the new regime and tried to make it their tool. They were not very numerous, maybe not even the majority in their industries, but they were a very strategic group. They helped Peron become the supreme ruler, and two important industrialists became his ministers of Finance and Commerce.

But in order to maintain power, these new industrialists needed the support of another social group, because they were much weaker than the old capitalists and landowners. They turned to the working class, and they obtained the support of a sizable majority of it through the demagogic appeal of Peron.

THE ECONOMIC BASE

It was possible for this demagogic appeal to be successful because the new economic program was able to develop the country economically. Industries continued expanding after the war; Buenos Aires increased its population by almost a million in ten years; a Keynesian program was followed. Several social-security laws were enacted or extended, and wages were increased (in spite of inflation they maintained an advantage over prices till 1950).

This development was done at the expense of the old power groups:

(a) Against the landowners and exporting commercial interests, a new state monopoly (IAPI) was established, which bought agricultural produce at one-half or one-third of world market prices. The profits went into industrialization of the country. Even the enormous sums that went into graft were also invested in the new booming industries.

(b) Against foreign imperialism: British-owned railways were nationalized, as well as a couple of American-owned public utilities. This was possible because British imperialism, the dominating one in Argentina till then, was in decline.

We must point out that there was no attempt at land reform or at nationalization of local industry.

On the trade-union front, the old socialist-controlled unions, which had always been persecuted by the conservative governments, were now smashed with the help of the police. But a few opportunist trade-union leaders gave support to Peron, and the new workers who were coming from the countryside and had no

Torcuato di Tella is an Argentine socialist now studying in Britain.

political education overwhelmingly followed Peron's demagogic appeal. New unions were formed, with a lot of funds and run from the top, and only these got official recognition.

The fact that we must realize, though, is that Peron in this period obtained the outspoken support of the majority of the working class. This was obtained through a dictatorial monopolization of the means of information and propaganda; with the help of police repression; and with the demagogic condemnation of the old capitalists and landowners (not the new ones) in fiery speeches. But all this could work because under Peron the country underwent a considerable economic development and because Peron had the support of one important sector of the ruling class. Otherwise it would have been impossible for him to remain in power.

During his government there have been regularly (every two years) rightist coups led by sections of the army. On these occasions, Peron summoned the workers to come to "defend the revolution," and they thronged into the city in great numbers. Of course the government on such occasions provided all the facilities, but still the workers came mainly voluntarily. The army feared to make a massacre in the city, and the coup failed.

We must now examine the attitude of the church in Argentina.

The Catholic Church has always been allied mainly with the landowning class. But at the same time it is the most self-conscious defender of the capitalist system as a whole. As such, it gave full

support to Peron from the beginning, because under Peron capitalism has been more secure than ever in Argentina.

If the majority of workers are in favor of a capitalist government—which only damages the interests of some sectors of the capitalists—then who will be against the system? Under Peronism, the same as under Roosevelt or under bonapartists, capitalism makes a last effort at stability by giving a lot of concessions to the masses. The old-fashioned capitalists, who don't want to give away even those small concessions, oppose the government, but the new, modern capitalists give support to it.

And besides, in Argentina the church gave its support, and got in exchange religious education in the schools and other privileges.

There had always been unofficial strikes, some very important and bloody: the sugar mills (1949), the railways (1951) and the metallurgical workers (1954), because the old socialist or anarchist trade-unionists were still active in spite of police repression. But only now was there an increasing number of discontented Peronists, who were beginning to condemn the whole system and not only this or that "traitor" official or minister.

END OF IDYLL

But the internal instability of capitalism did not allow this idyll to last very long. Prices started overtaking wages, and by 1954 real wages were almost down to pre-Peron levels. Unofficial strikes were becoming worse.

The church—and other capitalist circles—possibly felt that if in the next few years the world economic situation continued to deteriorate, it would become impossible for Peron to go on

"throwing crumbs" and deceiving the workers. If Peron lost his mass support he would not be able to maintain power, and a situation of chaos might develop, because his capitalist supporters were too weak against their old rivals, the landowning and exporting interests.

The only alternative would be for all sections of the ruling class to get together, under the blessing of foreign imperialism and of the church, which would give them the support of broad masses of the middle class. Only in this way could they dispense with the support of these workers, and start all the necessary restrictive measures.

As a matter of fact, Peron himself saw this need, and since 1953 he was moving in this direction. He tried to unite under his leadership all the sectors of the ruling class, cutting down his demagogic speeches; and in 1955 he made an epoch-making give-away oil concession to an American company.

But it seems that Peron was not moving fast enough in that direction, maybe because it was not easy for him to make an overnight change in the bases of his support, and because there were too many resentments against him among the landowners. The church decided it was better to oppose him, and to try in the long run to set up a full right-wing regime.

The end of a dictatorship is always welcome by all democratic and socialist elements, who hope new perspectives will be opened up for the country. But in this case we must have in mind that it is the traditional right-wing interests that are solidly behind the new government. They will try to strongly integrate the economy of Argentina with that of the United States, which has by now replaced Great Britain as the main foreign influence.

On the other hand, there will be a sharpening of the class struggle, which has been blurred in recent years by the illusions of Peronism. This may create the opportunity for socialism to lead the working class once again, as it did in the thirties; if socialism succeeds in this task, a new era would certainly be opening for Argentina.

Molotov Torpedoes Geneva — —

(Continued from page 1)

area of maneuver, delay, diversion and obfuscation.

The capitalist camp at Geneva has sensed that the question of German unity is the Stalinists' greatest weakness, and have decided to exploit it for all they are worth. They have sought to hinge all discussion of disarmament or a "security system" on the question of German unity, and have held fast to their demand that the country be united on the basis of free elections to be held in both zones. With a great show of concern for the future sovereignty of a united Germany, they have further insisted that once unification has taken place, the country should have the right to determine its own foreign policy, including its right to join NATO if it wishes.

STALINISTS AGAINST UNITY

No matter how the Stalinists twist and squirm, they have not been able to give any kind of answer to these proposals which has even the appearance of democratic reasonableness. All their discussion of the necessity of government-to-government negotiations, their reservations on the kind of democratic elections to be held, their demand that a unified Germany must be forced into a policy of neutrality as a condition for such unification—all that underlines the point that the Stalinists are not willing to permit the democratic unification of the country.

The Stalinists' real aim is to hang on to their East German satellite. The economic advantage to Russia and its whole empire of a satellite East Germany are obvious and important. But perhaps much more important is the political effect on the whole Stalinist empire if East Germany were to be permitted to freely choose its form of government and were to overwhelmingly and stunningly choose against Stalinism.

The Stalinists have been able so far to restrict the damage to their position implicit in their determination to keep a captive East Germany in their empire because of the widespread anti-German feeling which still exists in Europe and the United States. This feeling tends to be indifferent to, when it does not resist the idea of a free and united Germany.

It regards a united Germany as a menace, and even though many who hold it may not be happy at the Stalinization of Eastern Germany, their chauvinist attitude toward the German people is such that they either prefer the present

situation to a united Germany, or at the very least they take an indifferent attitude toward the whole question. Without trying to describe all groups who share this feeling in one or another degree, one may point to a section of the Bevanites in England, the liberal New York Post in the United States, and much of neutralist-shading-into-Stalinoid sentiment all over the world.

MAKING CAPITAL

By pushing for German unity, the American bloc has been able to make political capital at this conference without really risking much in the process. The more adamantly the Russians have held out against German unity, the more boldly the capitalist allies have pressed for it.

They insist, with righteous mien, that free elections are an inalienable part of the democratic process, and national unity integral to the rights of man. Since the Russians would like to get as far away from this point as possible, they have not even pointed out that the allies' passion for democracy and unification seems to stop abruptly at the borders of the Saar territory. Even the French government which hangs onto the Saar, and which in the past has always been the coolest of the allies on German unity, seems to feel safe at this conference to press the Russians on this issue.

The American position at Geneva, since it is based on a democratic proposal, gives the capitalist bloc the political initiative. Since their advantage is gained in the context of a stalemate, and depends on the continuation of this stalemate for its effect, it simply points up the fact that whatever the "Geneva spirit" and the let-up in the cold war may mean, it does not portend the negotiated unification of Germany.

The German Social-Democratic Party, which has an enormous stake in this whole question, has "intervened" at Geneva in what appears to be a typically pedestrian and almost hopelessly unimaginative way. Erich Ollenhauer, their most prominent leader, had a talk with Secretary of State Dulles in which, according to the papers, he urged that Dulles press Molotov to agree to the setting up of a legal framework within which West and East Germans could discuss and negotiate technical problems which affect the daily lives of the German people such as rail and highway communications, trade, a payments sys-

tem, postal and telegraph communications, etc.

Of course, there is nothing wrong in such a proposal in and of itself. In fact, in the context of a militant, popular struggle for German unification it could play a real role in exposing and discrediting the Stalinist bureaucracy in East Germany.

But put forward, as it appears to have been, together with the "demand" that the imperialist partitioners of Germany rather than the German people themselves negotiate and determine the future military status of Germany, the proposal is bound to be a harmless dud.

It is high time that the German Social-Democrats stop telling their people only half the truth. That half is that West German rearmament and entry into NATO will not bring about the unification of Germany, but will rather be an obstacle to such unification. The rest of the truth is that unless the German people exercise some real pressure on their occupiers the chances that the capitalist and Stalinist imperialists will reach an agreement for their unification is negligible.

The SPD has stood for free elections in the whole of Germany for a long time. But, instead of seeking to mobilize the German people for the struggle for their freedom and unity, they have placed all their hopes on a negotiated deal by their masters.

The Geneva conference demonstrates that no such deal is possible. If the German people are to be united and free, they must strike a blow on their own behalf. They must raise their voices in a powerful campaign which demands the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Germany; the unconditional freedom and sovereignty of their country, the unconditional right of the German people, both East and West, to decide for themselves the economic and political forms best suited to them; and the untrammelled right of the German people to decide what alliances they will form, or whether they will form any with the existing power blocs.

If the capitalist allies have been able to make things uncomfortable for the Stalinist rulers by pressing for a democratic solution to the German problem in their own demagogic way, it is clear that a massive effort by the German people themselves to demand and struggle for their own freedom would have a much stronger effect.

BOOKS AND IDEAS

Fiedler: An End to Innocence

The 'Sour Dregs' of Renegade Liberalism

By J. F.

The American politico-literary liberal avant-garde, if not extinct, seems about to go the way of the dodo—an earlier marginal type which likewise found difficulty in surviving the rigors of modern life.

Though it is scientifically identified as the *Didus ineptus*, there is at least this to be said about the dodo: when it went, it went quietly, with damn little verbalizing about the whole business. Not so the avant-garde. They're not much for silent suffering or internal bleeding. They don't mount the soapbox, of course (the very expression smacks of the naiveté of the thirties), rather do they hie themselves to the public confessional.

One of the latest members of the avant-garde to arrive in a lather of repentance and bleeding from a thousand wounds—most of them self-inflicted—is Leslie Fiedler, currently teaching at the University of Montana. His confession, titled *An End to Innocence* and sub-titled *Essays on Culture and Politics*, is published by the Beacon Press, has 214 pages, costs \$1.25 in the paper edition, \$3.50 in the clothbound one, and is a waste of money in either case.

The articles chronicling Fiedler's descent into oblivion have all appeared previously in trade magazines such as *Partisan Review*, *Encounter*, *Keryon Review*, and *Commentary*. Not one to indulge in the vanity of false modesty in these his last solemn moments, Fiedler says of these pieces, "I have, as a matter of fact, been pleased to discover how often I have managed to tell what still seems to me the truth about my world and myself as a liberal, intellectual, writer, American, and Jew."

And it is all so easy for Fiedler! "I have no expert knowledge in political matters," says Fiedler, preening an academic feather or two, "and am an indifferent researcher; but I have lived (deeply, though somewhat grudgingly, involved) through a crisis in liberalism which seems to me a major event in the development of the human spirit. This crisis I feel peculiarly qualified to describe, precisely because I am a literary man, immune to certain journalistic platitudes and accustomed to regard men and wards with a sensibility trained by the newer critical methods."

Well, it was only a question of time until the current Do-It-Yourself craze (No Special Tools Needed) hit the academic world. Nor should it be any more surprising that after all the dedicated hammering and sawing with the tools of the "new criticism" Fiedler's intellectual handiwork, like the products of so many home craftsmen, should be inferior to that available on the ordinary commercial, non-avant-garde market.

LAMENT FOR HISS

"It is not necessary that we liberals be self-flagellants," says Fiedler, flicking off a speck of penitential ash from his fashionable sackcloth. "We have desired good, and we have done some; but we have also done great evil." And what, precisely, is this Great Evil that has been done?

It seems that for the past twenty years or so American liberals have been playing the game of Stalinism. This is hardly news. The analysis of the Stalinoid and the Popular Front mentality (and that is what Fiedler is fumbling around with) is pre-eminently the work of Trotsky and the political tendencies which derived from him—the ISL in particular. The initial analysis was made at least twenty years ago.

Fiedler's contribution is his hysterically considered opinion that all liberals have been guilty of whitewashing Stalinism. Speaking of Alger Hiss in his essay "Hiss, Chambers, and the Age of Innocence" Fiedler says, "In the end he failed all liberals, all who had, in some sense and at some time, shared his illusions (and who that calls himself a liberal is exempt?), all who demanded of him a common recognition of complicity."

In any meaningful sense this is untrue, and we do not propose to waste one second of this Indian Summer of international amity demonstrating it. But let us concede that there is a limited truth in his contention, and that many American liberals were at least very naive about Russian phenomena. What ensues if, following Fiedler, we are "to move forward from a liberalism of innocence to a liberalism of responsibility"? The abandonment of the possibility of liberalism in the United States. Abdication of the intellect. Despair. Prostration.

Fiedler does not view the current reactionary trend, of which McCarthyism is a logical consequence, as a necessary domestic reflection of the inability of the government to prevent the spread of world Stalinism in the post-war epoch by the employment of either military or political means. For him, such a thing as the conditioning of the public mind to the requisite official point of view through the mass-media of communication does not exist. In a postscript to his article on McCarthy he defines McCarthyism as a "psychological disorder compounded of the sour dregs of populism, the fear of excellence, difference, and culture."

This is the aristocratic view of life, existence seen as the opposition of the gifted few to the (how shall we put it in these days of creeping democracy?) underprivileged many. Since "a whole section of our people" is involved, and since those rare spirits who burn with a hard, gem-like flame are indeed so few, there is obviously not much which can be done. "In light of this," says Fiedler, "the constant hope of the already enlightened that McCarthy's following can be split away if only some forceful exposé could be got into the right hands, or if only someone would stand up to him boldly enough at the hearings, is revealed as fantasy. Equally chimeric is the dream that 'given enough rope he will hang himself. . . .'"

ON THE OTHER HAND—

Nevertheless, says Fiedler, with the "on-the-other-hand" approach which characterizes his entire article, "I am not trying to suggest that McCarthy cannot be dislodged from his place of power." Perhaps it could be done if the Republican National Committee were to cut him off unequivocally, which Fiedler thinks is unlikely, or if the General Staff were to gang up on him. But no matter—McCarthyism itself, whatever new name it bear, will outlive the death of its present form."

But in any case, is McCarthyism really so bad? Haven't things been exaggerated a little? "What defies analysis is the aura of fear which surrounds him." After all, in the public school system it was only a matter of "an occasional firing" and in universities and colleges it was only "some" regents who dropped instructors. In point of fact, Fiedler doubts that there has ever been gathered together a broader or more articulate united front than the one which opposes McCarthy. "One can almost feel pity for the man. . . ."

And fundamentally, gasps out Fiedler, his own fingers at his throat, what's really wrong with McCarthy's methods? "In certain ways, it would seem more desirable to make the proceedings of congressional investigation less formal, less like trial procedure, leaving to the courts the business of establishing technical innocence or guilt, and reserving for the legislative branch, as our national conscience, the task of seeking the truth of morality and feeling."

Translated from the *Lingua franca* of the American Committee for Cultural Freedom, whose blessing he obviously enjoys, what Fiedler is advocating is the perpetuation and extension of conditions which would permit a McCarthy to become the *arbiter elegantiarum* of the higher "truth of morality and feeling" as contrasted with simple "technical innocence or guilt."

A SORT OF APOLOGIA

After all, says Fiedler, what is McCarthy but a typical product of the American political system: "He is a hopelessly ordinary politician in all things. . . ." "In McCarthy," bumbles Fiedler, his eyes swimming in tears evoked by the large slice of Bermuda onion stashed away in his handkerchief, "what is for other senators incidental vice becomes published as public virtue; and this, in a country still in a residual sense puritan, is unpardonable. McCarthy will not pay vice's customary tribute of hypocrisy to virtue; and in the end it is for his sullen honesty in dishonesty that he has been condemned." All of which would seem to mandate an attack on the whole system, but which for Fiedler serves only to palliate the role of McCarthy.

Like so many authoritarian types, the Fiedler who bows, scrapes, wrings his hands, and equivocates before the power-figure McCarthy, reveals the correlative part of his self in his discussions on Stalinism in the essays, "Hiss, Chambers, and the Age of Innocence" and

"Afterthoughts on the Rosenbergs." Glowing, one feels, after a workout with the barbell, the voice stentorian, the manner savage and self-righteous, Fiedler bounces into a discussion of the Stalinist mentality. You can find almost anything in these two essays, even a little calculated cold charity for the Rosenbergs (induced, needless to say, out of an even greater care for the appearance, presented by United States capitalism abroad), but you will not find the same indulgence extended Stalinism that he extends McCarthyism: "to admit that good and evil are divided, though not evenly, between ourselves and our enemies; that there is not an entirely innocent 'we' opposed to an absolutely guilty they?'"

NO EXPLANATION

It follows that Fiedler cannot advance any serious explanation as to why people like Whittaker Chambers, or Alger Hiss, or the Rosenbergs, become Stalinists in the first instance and spies in the second. The best he can do is state that Chambers "discovered in the revolution an answer to the insecurity and doubt which had brought his brother to suicide, himself to months of despair and near paralysis." However adequate this may be for single individuals it is obviously defective in explaining the relatively uniform behavior of hundreds of millions of people all over the world in countries which before their Stalinization represented almost all stages of economic, political, and social development.

Fiedler, who so pugnaciously asks why Hiss and the Rosenbergs, when they were standing in the shadow of prison and the electric chair, did not admit CP membership, might have performed a minor service for the sociology of politics and simple honesty by asking himself what induced him to play the Stalinist game in the thirties, a fact nowhere noted in this book otherwise so noisy with the crash of temples to outworn truths being pulled down.

It would have been no trick at all for him to have explained that he and countless others all over the world were attracted to Stalinism, whether as actual members or not, because of the simple brute facts of unemployment, poverty, exploitation, fascism, war, and the deformation of personality suffered under capitalism. But since he has now transcended this naive period when he both understood and was sympathetic to the human condition, he is left with no program for combatting Stalinism other than mass therapy or mass repression—

both of them impossible. He yields the field to the Stalinists by default.

Fiedler emerges as the uncritical—and in the end irresponsible—champion of American capitalism. If he differs in any basic essentials from McCarthy it would be of interest to collectors of political curiosia for Fiedler to show us on concrete issues just where the differences lie. His "liberalism of responsibility" either has no content at all or it is McCarthyism divested of its crudities.

Poor Fiedler! Like so many of the avant-garde convinced of their exquisite uniqueness, he feels that he writes under at least some modest aspect of eternity. How unfortunate for him that in the few months since the appearance of his book the international détente has made his ideas seem simple tropisms governed by nothing more stable than the fluctuations of the cold war!

BLEAK VIEW

In any case, and above all, he's a patriot, specifically, "a patriot at bay," as he denominates himself. For it is all up to the United States. "There is no political act . . . that is not marred these days by the obsessive envy and anguish of the Europeans in our regard." America is "leaning to face up for the first time to endemic frustration and to loneliness, as the whole world threatens to desert us out of hostility or cowardice or indecision."

But, we venture timidly, all this leaves the perspective in the United States a little bleak, doesn't it? Hasn't it been Fiedler himself who has revealed to us that "in a certain sense McCarthyism not only flourishes in but is this hostility between the community and its intelligence"? And those who embodied this intelligence, the liberals, those innocents who "substituted sentimentality for intelligence"—have we not been told that they have failed their task? ("And they were wrong, drastically wrong, about the most important political fact of our time. The unpalatable truth we have been discovering is that the buffoons and the bullies, those who knew really nothing about the Soviet Union at all, were right—stupidly right if you will, accidentally right, right for the wrong reasons, but damnably right.") Can we therefore be sure that intelligence or the striving for it are worthwhile?

All we mere mortals can do, it seems, is to wait hopefully while Fiedler, barricaded behind the doors of the English Department of the University of Montana, takes counsel with those Old In-corrup-tibles, Melville, Faulkner, and James, and tries to resolve the dilemma as the dark forces of Stalinism from one side and the sour dregs of populism on the other converge on the last of the avant-garde intellectuals.

Their's Not to Reason . . .

General Hershey, who is in charge of the draft for the brass, recently lamented that American youth are not as enthusiastic over the prospects of a military attachment as they should be. Speaking at the National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in Boston early this month, the Director of Selective Service under three presidents voiced his opinion that the military may have to go back to Congress for "stiffer" draft laws.

Not that the recent extension of the draft is not liked by the brass; for in giving them direct and indirect control over all youth drafted under the new Reserve program for eight years, it also means that within five to ten years every qualified American will be in military training or already trained. Also, noted the general gleefully like a Texas cattleman whose stock has grown to the butchering stage, we are nearing the stage of selecting those born in the 1940s when the birthrate soared.

As for the new controls which would be placed upon professional and scientific people in the new Selective Service Act, he told the assembled grouping of vets that the military can now "keep better tabs on them," making certain that their skills are used in fields necessary to "national defense." "Otherwise," said the general, "they would be free to work for whomever they pleased and we no longer would have any control over them."

"I am concerned," he concluded, "that today you are expected to take an American soldier aside like a kindergartner and tell him what he is fighting for. . . ."

Too many Americans are trying to dodge military service, was the frank statement which the encamped veterans

of foreign wars for democracy heard. Also, too many are belittling those who are wearing uniforms. "There is a growing tendency to try to find a way . . . to serve your country without fighting for it" (1). The general found it difficult to understand, he told his listeners, why young people are unwilling to leave "the comforts of home, and their innerspring mattresses" to enter the training camps dotting the country.

With the first response to the new "volunteer" Reserve program for 18-year-old youths turning out to be a miserable bloop (with scarcely over 1000 men signing up for the program for which the Pentagon wants 100,000 yearly), the general came to Boston with a solution for the apathy of militarism upon the coming generation. Undoubtedly after many sleepless nights lying upon his innerspring mattress, he proposed that—

"We . . . have got to inculcate dedication in our youth . . . [we] have got to set a premium on the fellow who tries to perpetuate humanity even though when he looks at it . . . he doesn't see why he should. . . ."

"Something is wrong," he concluded, with the profound perspicacity which distinguishes the Pentagon, "when . . . we have to tell them [the conscript soldier] it is worthwhile for them to fight . . . before teaching them to fight."

Get All Your Books from
LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, New York City

Egypt Threatens — —

(Continued from page 1)

Advance toward a political solution of the crisis cannot get very far without a bottom-up overhauling of Israel's whole Arab policy. This is where to start.

This can be done by the type of program advocated in Israel by such groups as Ichud (the group founded by the late Judah Magnes), the Jewish Bund, and the Democratic Club. The Ichud, for example, proposes:

"(1) Israel must change radically the ideological position underlying her present foreign policy, namely, that physical, political and military force can bring peace between herself and her neighbors.

(2) Israel must acknowledge the principle of repatriation, and admit a considerable number of Arab refugees to their old homes. It is possible that many will not want to return. But Israel must make a magnanimous offer. Those refugees who will not want to come back should receive just compensation for their land and property. (3) The Arab minority living in Israel now should also be given complete equality with Israelis."

(Quoted from *Jewish Newsletter*, Nov. 7.)

IT CAN'T GO ON

All these proposals and the reasons for their importance have been spelled out in our own columns on many occasions. Their importance does not consist in the fact that, if applied by Israel, the Arab rulers will love Israel instead of hating it. Their importance lies in that a program consistently pushed along these lines will work to eliminate the legitimate grievances and powerful issues used by these rulers to whip up their people to a chauvinist frenzy, and indeed which understandably infuriate the Arab people even without demagoguery from the leaders.

Steps on the immediate sore points should only be a beginning; the only long-term solution for the region is a much more extensive integration of Israeli-Arab interests looking toward regional federation. But this, politically practical though it is, is a pipedream as long as Israel is obsessed with the Zionist politics of making this small state the racial homeland for the "Ingathering of the Exiles" of all world Jewry.

What should penetrate even Zionist skulls in Israel today is the fact that the country simply cannot go on living this way, no matter how the present acute crisis is temporarily settled, if it is settled. Its leaders must come to realize that they must come to an accommodation with their Arab neighbors, instead of following their present arrogant and insolent policy toward the Arabs, in reaction to the latter's aggressive threats and skirmishes.

WAY OF SUICIDE

The Israeli government's response to the danger which is now upon its head is a typical extension of the same policy which has led into its cul-de-sac. It demands as the answer: counteract the Russian-Czech shipment of arms to Egypt with a Western shipment of arms to Israel; and counteract the new Russian-Egypt relations with a U. S.-Israel pact.

This is the way of suicide for Israel. No one in his right mind can believe that the Middle East explosion can be damped by jacking up armaments on both sides. Least of all can this be a far-seeing way out for the little state of Israel. It is fantastic that, for any length of time, one state with 1,800,000 people can demand from world opinion the "right" to military parity with a whole region of the world with over 40 million people.

Likewise no one with an elementary understanding of world politics can believe that the Middle East crisis can be solved by splitting it down the middle along the lines of the international cold war, by institutionalizing and freezing the line-up of different sections of this area with different camps of the worldwide imperialist struggle for the world.

In their demand for a "security pact" with the U. S., the Israelis think to purchase a precarious safety by tucking themselves under the wing of the big world overlord, the U. S., and, from this "secure" perch, thumbing their nose at the local hoodlums—"Just dare to touch me, and I'll call my Big Brother on you..."

Thus the Israelis only turn themselves into another pawn in the big game going on, without even the slightest insurance that at some propitious moment they will not be traded off with complete cynicism for some castle or king.

While the Israelis openly offer to sell

themselves to one camp as its base in the Middle East, the Egyptian people are being given to understand that, by making the deal with the Russians, Cairo is showing its independence of the blocs. It is doubtful whether Americans understand this aspect of the Egyptian arms deal, from the point of view of its impact on the Egyptian people, because the U. S. press, with its voluntary kind of monolithism, cries to the heavens that Russia is taking Egypt over and in its panicky way even implies that the arms deal makes Egypt a kind of Russian "satellite."

Now, to be sure, this "independence" of the Egyptians does evidence independence from the Western bloc, and this is a good thing, but it is rife with illusions about independence from Russian influence, once the latter's foot is in the door. The aims of Russian imperialism, as it fishes for a maximum of prizes in these troubled waters, are well analyzed by Al Findley's accompanying article. It is a sorry but characteristic commentary on such efforts at independence in the world of blocs that it can be achieved by these states mainly by playing off one bloc against the other. It is no recommendation of the Egyptian move that it counters the pull of the Western camp by leaning back into the arms of the Stalinist camp.

PARTY-LINE CYNICISM

But quite another thing is the kind of abuse against the Egyptians that has been raging in the U. S. press. It is not without reason that the Egyptians angrily and correctly reply that they have as much right to buy arms from one nation as from another.

The U. S. party-line reaction is all the more sickeningly hypocritical, in its moral and political pretensions, in view of some absolutely public facts. Soon after the disclosure of the Egyptian arms deal with Russia, Dulles openly proposed that Egypt buy its arms from the U. S. instead: everything would be all right, presumably, if the arms to kill Israelis came from good democratic sources rather than bad totalitarian factories. After this little inconsistency was fixed up, some people remembered that Israel not too many years ago had bought shipments of arms from the very same Czechoslovakia which was now sup-

plying Egypt. In this connection, too, it is worth noting that, formally, Russia has covered itself by claiming willingness to sell arms to Israel—whether on the same easy terms may be another matter—but Israel now spurns the tainted weapons: at least while it still hopes for the security pact with the U. S.

But there is something more to this question of Egypt's "right" to buy arms where it will—an undoubted right as long as U. S. propaganda puts the question on this superficial level. This "something more" is also more sinister.

CIA THREAT

This is the implied threats from the U. S. that a government which buys arms from Stalinist states against the wishes of the Washington overlord is a government which must be treated like—Guatemala.

This note was struck in the press right after the disclosure of the arms deal, when inspired stories from Washington commented that the deal put in doubt the "stability" of Nasser's regime.

But this was only a subtle hint compared with the crude menace contained in a pronouncement by Allen W. Dulles, the head of the same Central Intelligence Agency which reportedly took care of the "stability" of the Arbenz regime in Guatemala, when that government made the "mistake" of buying arms from the wrong side.

This was contained in a speech appropriately made by this Dulles to the International Association of Chiefs of Police, as published in that organ of the cops, the *New Leader*.

Dulles swings into a discussion of "a somewhat recent development in their [the Communists'] program of sowing international discord"—their use of stocks of obsolete war equipment to tempt countries that want to build up their military establishments. He leaves little to the imagination:

"... we now hear of advanced negotiations with several countries of the Middle East. I would not be at all surprised if we soon heard that countries in this hemisphere were being approached.

"A premature start with this program was made over a year ago. You will remember that it was a shipload of obsolete arms sent by Czechoslovakia to Guatemala which aroused the Guatemalan peo-

ple to realization of the Communist plans for a take-over of that country. Once again, Czechoslovakia looms up as the front for the delivery of Communist arms—this time in the Middle East."

He could not more clearly have put the case of Guatemala and of Egypt in the same bag. Of course, the affair may be more difficult in practice for the CIA's spies and provocateurs to operate, and it is not a question here of predicting that Washington is realistically looking for a Castillo Armas in the Middle East. What is involved in this disgraceful pronouncement by the U. S.'s cloak-and-dagger head is obvious enough without that.

CONFESSION

Lastly, on this level of the international cold war, we come back around to the same point with which we began on the regional level: the fatal substitution of military lineups for political program.

We have seen how this characterized Israeli policy. The same is true, writ larger, of U. S. policy in the Middle East. In fact, this failure is now semi-officially confessed.

In a *Times* dispatch from Washington on Nov. 7, James Reston communicates the officially unofficial views of the State Department on how U. S. policy must now be changed in the area. In the course of this account of State Department thinking, it is admitted that the U. S. policy-makers have been relying on the "Northern Tier" military pact of Turkey, Iraq, Iran, Pakistan, and Britain, and that this is a weak reed, for—

"Finally, the defense alliance of the 'northern tier' of Middle Eastern states has not contained the Communists. The pact has apparently provoked the Russians to action, and led them to the decision to vault right over the 'northern tier' into Egypt."

Reston points out that some in the State Department counterposed "economic solutions" to the provocative military solution of the pact, and it is such "economic solutions" that he apparently counterposes to the military. One supposes that the economic solutions referred to boil down to more handouts of foreign aid, which is no solution in itself, but which could be integrated into a consistent political program for a democratic foreign policy. The American powers-that-be, however, have no conception of such a political front in the war against Stalinism, which they know how to wage only in their own imperialist way.

Dirty Journalism and the Saar:—Left at the Post

By BERNARD CRAMER

As we noted in a short item in last week's *LA*, the *N. Y. Post* was not behind the general ruck-and-muck of American newspapers in its chauvinistic treatment of the Saar vote. In the case of the *Post*, indeed, ordinary American chauvinism (liberal variety) is complicated by the additive of a virulently poisonous anti-German chauvinism of the type which tends to cast the responsibility on the whole German people of the Nazi crimes against the Jews.

The *Post* editorial on the Saar vote not only painted the whole situation in terms of "a Nazi offensive," but also gratuitously added a smear against the Saar socialists. This writer picked up the latter point for a "Dear Editor" missive to the *Post* which gave rise to the following exchange. Unfortunately the *Post's* letter column is of the tabloid variety, usually printing only telegraphic-style short squibs, so that one cannot say much. My letter as published was a long one for this paper:

"Your Oct. 25 editorial on the Saar vote said, 'The Socialists in the Saar were dreary echoes of Dr. Schneider,' whom you describe as an 'unreconstructed Nazi rabble-rouser' whose campaign had 'all the ugly overtones of a Nazi offensive.'

"If this smear against the Saar Socialists is made in good faith, then surely it requires some evidence. Otherwise, it sounds like a particularly despicable McCarthy-type slander.

"It is possible you 'merely' meant to say that the Socialists also favored reunion with the Saarlanders' own country, which happens to be Germany—a view you label 'reactionary German nationalism.' It is a pity you don't discuss your undoubtedly very liberal reasons for believing that the Saarlanders should be deprived of the right to self-determination. Is it perhaps for the same reason that Max Lerner argued the Moroccans are such backward people that they have no right to freedom? It is a pity you do not mention the right to self-determination at all, in the

course of whipping yourself liberally to a chauvinist frenzy."

In an appended editorial reply, editor James Wechsler dodged the little matter of self-determination and tried to shift the ball while running:

"We'd welcome any evidence from Mr. Cramer," wrote Wechsler, "that the Saar Socialists repudiated and condemned Dr. Schneider's performance. Dispatches from the Saar reported that Socialists there shared campaign platforms with the Schneider forces."

That was all from him. This invitation encouraged me to send in the following reply which, though necessarily still telegraphically concise in the *Post* letter style, probably covers the main points:

"Re your editorial defense of your smear against the Saar Socialists:

"(1) I see you decline to defend your charge that 'The Socialists in the Saar were dreary echoes of Dr. Schneider,' whom you described as a Nazi. Instead you replied with a new and different charge (see point 2). I take it, then, you admit your original statement was an invented falsehood.

"(2) The new charge you shift to is that Saar Socialists 'shared campaign platforms with the Schneider forces.' This charge is based exclusively on a *Times* photo caption depicting a joint campaign rally of ALL Saar parties advocating a no vote. Your words convey the misleading impression that the Socialists carried on their campaign jointly with Schneider.

"True, I would have been for an entirely independent Socialist campaign—but for reasons you'd consider 'doctrinaire.' I have opinions on this score not shared by American liberals who cohabit in the same party with Southern lynchers, while they write editorials smearing Socialists.

"(3) You ask me for evidence that the Socialists 'repudiated and condemned Dr. Schneider's performance.' With this demagogic request you try to shift the obvious burden of proof; still I comply. It is well known that the German Socialists are the only consistent enemies of the neo-Nazi rehabilitation carried on by

Adenauer, Washington's pet German. In the Saar campaign, the Socialists (as well as other parties) specifically disavowed mob tactics against Hoffman meetings such as flared for a few days (*Times* 8-21). It was the Socialist paper which fingered the use of stench bombs against Hoffman meetings (*Times* 8-19). After Aug. 21 there was NO violence or disorder reported in the Saar campaign (*Times* 10-20, 10-25). It is plain from copious *Times* dispatches that Schneider at no time permitted himself to express any Nazi ideas but posed as reformed. Other than what I have covered, what is the "performance" that requires repudiation?

"(4) Above all, you carefully avoided replying on the one and only main issue: democratic self-determination of the Saar. Harold Callender's dispatches in the *Times* blew to pieces the hypocritical farce about 'Europeanization,' which was an empty mask for French control of Saar coal. The French had grabbed the Saar in exactly the same way that Bismarck and Hitler grabbed Lorraine; or that the Russian despots grabbed East Europe. The Saarlanders voted their wish to reunite with their own country. If Nazis can take advantage of this legitimate aspiration toward national integrity, if they are handed that issue free then the crime belongs to French imperialism, which is supported by liberal chauvinists among others."

As this goes to press, over a week and a half later, Editor Wechsler still has the above letter on his desk (according to his office) without publishing it or rejecting it, in spite of his invitation. Perhaps he is finally trying to find out what happened in the Saar election.

Read the
NEW INTERNATIONAL
America's leading Marxist review