

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

G.D.H. COLE'S CAMPAIGN:
The Mind of a Fellow Traveler

... page 6

DISSECTING THE DEMOCRATS
Three Articles on the Party's Life

... page 2

SPOTLIGHT AROUND THE WORLD

... page 4

Youth Wins a Victory Over the Pentagon

... page 5

SEPTEMBER 3, 1956

FIVE CENTS

IT'S REPUBLOCRATS vs. DEMOPUBLICANS

THE DONKEY

What Kind of Appeal Can Stevenson Make?

By MAX MARTIN

Outside of the abject collapse of the liberals on civil rights—the distinctive feature of the Democratic Party convention—this gathering was about as undistinguished and lifeless an event as could be expected. There were, of course, the usual “spontaneous” demonstrations, staged by professional organizers of spontaneous convention demonstrations (at not exactly modest-fees), but these lacked the fire of by-gone years. Except for several moments—Truman's last-ditch attempt to stop Stevenson, and the vice-presidential horse-race won by Kefauver—the convention was a routine, even a dull, affair.

Governor Clement's keynote address abounded in “evangelical” flourishes. Behind it one could discern the rhetorical ghost of William Jennings Bryan, but one could see no political principles whatsoever, let alone a modern equivalent of Bryan's politics. The result was peculiarly repulsive.

In view of the civil-rights fiasco at the convention, there will be many liberal newspapers and organizations, many labor leaders and many Negro leaders who will do their best in the coming months to obscure the meaning of what happened.

They will claim perhaps that the selection of Kefauver as the vice-presidential candidate represented a triumph for the liberals and the labor movement, a victory which overshadows the defeat on civil rights. They will insist that the platform “as a whole” is a “liberal document.” They will seize upon every statement that Stevenson makes to convey that their man *really* does support integration, and they will ignore the role he played in the fight which took place at the convention.

DEMAGOGY

And needless to say, Stevenson will provide them with such statements, realizing, as he must, that the outcome of the elections may depend upon convincing millions of Negro and labor voters that he stands for civil rights. He had already stated that “I would have preferred a specific endorsement of the desegregation decision,” not bothering to explain, of course, why he didn't get

Costly Corpses

Death on the battlefield comes high. In World War II, according to retired industrialist Harold O. MacLean speaking before the Los Angeles Rotary Club, it cost \$260,000 to kill a soldier. The price of death in war has steadily risen throughout the ages, the retired industrialist stated, from 75 cents per soldier in Caesar's time to \$50 in the Thirty Year War, \$500 in the American Civil War and \$25,000 in World War I.

—Socialist Newsletter
(Los Angeles)

around to put some teeth into his “preference” at a time when it counted.

The Democrats and their candidates can be expected to plumb the depths of demagoguery in regard to this issue. Indeed, with the echoes of convention shouting still resounding, and before the campaign has really begun, they have already produced an instance of such tactics.

On August 25, the Democratic National Committee released a plank-by-plank “analysis” of the Republican platform—presumably one which has Stevenson's approval, since it was given to the press

(Continued on page 3)

THE ELEPHANT

It Wasn't Even a Good Circus—You Want Politics Too?

By SAM TAYLOR and BERNARD CRAMER

Despite the surface differences with their rival's convention, and there were many, the Republican convention in San Francisco was cut out of the same pattern as the Democrats'. Above all, it too was convened in order to avoid the discussion of any and all real political issues. It was perhaps the acme in that distinctively American phenomenon: politicking without politics.

The Republicans in conclave had nothing to talk about—rather, there was nothing they wanted to talk about; talk would only put a crimp in the beautiful unanimity around their sole plank, whose name is Eisenhower.

It is something of an historical spectacle when the leading capitalist party in the U. S. puts on a better show of comradely unanimity and mindless hand-raising than the American Communist Party is likely to be able to do at its coming convention. The comparison (which naturally should not be driven

any further) did not suffer from the reminiscent type of groveling capitulation staged by Harold Stassen.

The GOP's temporarily “monolithic” new look, of course, is simply a conjunctural convenience for the right wing, who know that only the magic name of The Leader stands between them and defeat in November. Knowland, Jenner and their ilk are aware that it would be political suicide to appear as an opposition to Him. Even Sen. McCarthy, who in a recent TV interview refused to say whether or not he would support Him for re-election, is silent at the moment.

The disadvantage of this unanimity was something which also is not unknown to the Stalinists: the convention was the biggest bore ever televised for four consecutive days, not even providing the two fleeting moments of drama put on by the Democrats, on civil rights and the vice-presidency.

The Republicans had their own versions of these two issues. They were resolved in the subterranean recesses of the party bureaucracy.

STALKING-HORSE

The Nixon issue was an echo of the old Taft-vs.-Eisenhower demarcation between the GOP wings, and in part a response to the health issue which the Democrats will push. In its former capacity, it is quasi-ideological. But it is a very confused echo of this underlying issue because of Nixon's thorough unprincipledness even as far as the GOP framework of principle is concerned.

The dump-Nixon forces (reportedly including such men as “assistant president” Sherman Adams and Gen. Lucius Clay) apparently gave Stassen the thankless task of being the stalking-horse behind whom the cautious masterminds would discover in advance whether or not there was a groundswell of anti-Nixonism that would have to be taken into account. There wasn't; or it was scotched. The stalking-horse galloped across no-Republican-land to the other camp and nuzzled the masters where it would do the most good.

When it came to the civil-rights issue, the Republicans decided to forgo the luxury of sallying forth as the demagogic champions of desegregation and the Supreme Court decision. Their platform is only a “shade” better than the mealy-mouthed doubletalk which the Democrats accepted; and that wasn't hard. The GOP plank also was designed to be

(Turn to last page)

They Say They're Not Ashamed . . .

By JACK WILSON

Detroit, Aug. 26

The most harmonious convention of the Democratic Party ever held in Michigan took place this weekend, with Governor G. Mennen Williams in the role of star performer. There was only one brief flurry over the important question of civil rights and the fate of the “Michigan declaration,” which was a real statement on this issue.

Yet it was only June 3 that Walter P. Reuther emphasized in a major policy interview with the *Detroit Free Press* that:

“I believe the Democratic Party is at the crossroads. It cannot ride two horses going in different directions at the same time.

“If the Democrats try to be all things to all men, then I think Eisenhower will win, as he should win, and he will win overwhelmingly.”

Reuther insisted then that “the party's platform and candidate should provide leadership on such matters as the racial question so no one will question where they stand.”

A spokesman for the UAW explained the difference between that stand and recent events as follows: The Democratic Party stand on civil rights is not an accommodation to the South but one which that section of the country was forced to take because it wanted to stay in the party.

“I'm sure Senator Eastland and others

like him don't like the plank and may not support the party. That would indicate we got most of what we wanted.”

This is supposed to explain what happened to Reuther's dictum that “You can have Eastland or us but you can't have both”—something that Stevenson has, however accomplished.

“The plank wouldn't have been as strong as it is if we hadn't fought for it. The important thing now is how the party's candidates interpret it. We feel certain Governor Stevenson and Senator Kefauver will interpret it the same way we do. Therefore our basic objective has been realized.”

Tom Nicholson of the *Detroit Free Press*, who obtained both the June 3 and the current interview, remarked: “Of course, the South can do its own interpreting. The UAW won't be listening.”

Only one individual at the Democratic Party state convention objected to this line. She was Mrs. Nadine Brown, PAC secretary of Chrysler Local 490. She sought to get the new Michigan platform to include positive wording on Supreme Court decision implementation. The reply by a UAW member of the Democratic platform committee was:

“We are not ashamed of the national platform. We feel it is every bit as good as the one adopted by the Republicans at their convention.”

Now all that remains to be heard is the Negro voters.

THE DEMOCRATS Truman vs. Stevenson

Thus Dies the New Deal's Ghost

By MAX MARTIN

There will inevitably be continuing speculation over the rôle of Harry Truman at the Democratic convention, way into the history books or their footnotes. What surprised observers, of course, was not so much the fact that Truman opposed Stevenson but the unusual viciousness with which he publicly denounced the man who was soon to be his party's champion.

We do not wish to discount the role of Truman's notoriously irascible personality, which supplied the edge to his words. Explanations of Truman's course in terms of personalities have ranged from the probable to the fanciful: Stevenson in 1952 referred to "the mess in Washington" just like the Republicans and Truman vowed he'd fix his wagon; or Truman was sore because he wasn't given enough guest tickets to the convention.

More considerations than Truman's irascibility or amour-propre are required to explain what happened, though no doubt the full story will not be known for years. We would here like to suggest a view which links up a power-fight between contending groups of Democratic politicians, for control of the party machinery, with a struggle over quasi-ideological positions.

It has been a commonplace to point out that a whole new set of leaders has arisen in the Democratic Party in recent years. Such Democratic politicians as Governor Meyner of New Jersey, Governor Leader of Pennsylvania, Governor Williams of Michigan, California's Democratic senatorial candidate Richard Richards, Governor Freeman of Minnesota, Congressman Short of the same state, Mayor Wagner of New York, Mayor Dilworth of Philadelphia — to mention the more liberal members of this new generation of Democratic leaders — are among this rising group of politicians.

They all supported Stevenson.

MATTER OF AGE?

On the whole, this group contains a younger generation, one with little direct connection with the staffs of Truman's Fair Deal and none at all with the New Deal of Roosevelt. It has risen to power and prominence during the latter years of the Truman regime, or even in some cases during the administration of Eisenhower.

Roots in the "heroic" or halcyon days of the New Deal it has none, as is also pretty much true of Stevenson himself. With two outstanding exceptions, Mrs. Roosevelt and Senator Lehman, all of Stevenson's prominent supporters were members of this rising generation.

The group around the Truman-Harriman camp consisted of the Democratic Party's Old Guard, in good part, of what's left of some of the old city machines—New York's Tammany being the prime example—of the few remaining ex-Roosevelt office holders, of the "palace guard" of Truman's Fair Deal administration.

Naturally, neither camp had a "pure" composition, but just as the above-named group of "young" politicians is most prominently identified with Stevenson, so too one could find Truman and his old cronies McKinney and Pauley masterminding the Harriman campaign—not to mention the candidate himself, a rather obvious member of the Old Guard. But it is not merely a matter of struggle between generations.

ALIEN TO NEW-DEALISM

To be sure, there is common ground: The "Stevenson generation," like its New and Fair Deal predecessors, relies upon the coalition of labor and the South to keep it in power. Liberal gestures and liberal rhetoric are its stock-in-trade too.

But at the same time they feel uneasy at the more extreme social demagoguery of the New-Dealers and professional Fair-Dealers. Words like "money-changer" or "special interests" sit uneasily on their lips, while Truman would have been tongue-tied if he could not have used such verbiage in his convention speech of August 17.

They feel together with their candi-

date that "moderation is the spirit of the times," that "the middle of the road" is the place in which America wants to be, that it is a fine thing that Stevenson is not too great a political contrast to Eisenhower. The New Deal appears almost alien to them, and they want no responsibility for what they regard as the liabilities of Truman's Fair Deal regime, with its connotations of corruption and Korea.

They wish to present a different image of the Democratic Party to the public, different both from what Roosevelt exhibited in 1936 and also from what Truman gave the nation in 1948.

STEVENSON'S CAMP

We come here to the quasi-ideological basis for the contention over the presidential nominee. (Remember the stress on "quasi.")

For whatever the differences between the two camps, substantial disagreements on national and international policy were not involved, hence both groups were satisfied with the liberal platform promises. It would be hard, certainly, to name any differences and just as certainly, no gulf existed between the "radicals" and the "moderates" on the one issue which is a real live one in the country today, Negro rights. As a matter of fact, one can at least point to the fact that all of the liberal politicians who participated in the token effort for the minority amendments on civil rights were Stevenson supporters, whereas Truman spoke for the majority capitulation.

The difference then is one of rhetoric, of language, of pose. It is over what kind of mythos to provide for the Democratic Party, what tone it shall adopt, what sort of murky atmosphere it shall envelop itself in.

Nor is this an academic question for the Democratic Party, since it resolves itself into the question of how to achieve power.

The Truman-Harriman camp clearly believed that only a campaign of radical demagoguery like Truman's in 1948 can

result in victory this year, since it feels that its road to office lies along arousing a spirit of a Fair Deal "crusade" among the workers and the middle class, evoking the ghost of the New Deal, a call to social reform among the masses.

The Stevenson camp, like the candidate himself, have an entirely different approach, one which gives its content to Stevenson's vague formula of "moderation." They believe that the people are in an irremediably conservative and quiet mood, that this explains Eisenhower's 1952 victory and continued popularity, that the status quo seems attractive today and that "experimentation" is feared; and they do not themselves find this distasteful. They feel that the Democrats can win in November by appearing as much like Eisenhower as it is possible to do and as it is consistent to do while still trying to step into his shoes.

That these different orientations should be roughly associated with different generations, and therefore acquire an "age" line of demarcation, should surprise no one. The Old Guard found power along the New Deal road; it is the only one it knows. It can understand no other method of winning support. The Stevenson "youngsters" on the other hand, came to their state or local office in the age of Eisenhower.

Political passion, reform New-Dealist demagoguery, class appeals, plebeian accent, these are alien to it.

END OF AN ERA

Nor were the respective characters of the two camps totally dark to its adherents on both sides; on the contrary, a fair degree of consciousness was present.

Truman's pleas in support of Harriman clearly stressed what he regarded as decisive:

Stevenson is not a fighter; for which read: He will not conduct the kind of campaign I did in 1948.

He is a conservative; that is, he will not engage in the kind of "radical" talk, like "driving the money-changers from government," that I feel is necessary.

He can't win; which is to say: he will not appeal to the workers by promising vast social reform, even though he knows that such promises need not be carried out.

Mrs. Roosevelt's address to the convention showed similar consciousness, but from the view of the other side, heightened by the very fact of her own background. Her presumably non-partisan speech, a thinly disguised plug for Stevenson, abounded in the following



themes: It is good that we respect our leaders, but we must choose new and younger blood; it is meet that we pay homage to our past but we must remember that 1956 is not 1932.

(This statement, repeated by many Stevenson supporters, just shows poor memory: they mean 1936, not 1932. Roosevelt's campaign in 1932 was conservative on the whole; it was only in 1936 that he waged a "radical" New Deal-type campaign.)

Stevenson himself, in his acceptance speech, made a number of references to the fact that his victory at the convention meant the end of an era. Towards the beginning of his talk, he reminded the delegates of Mrs. Roosevelt's "moving" admonition that "this is 1956 and not 1932... that our problems change, as well as their solutions...."

And subsequently:

"When I stood here before you that hot night four years ago, we were at the end of an era—a great era of restless forward movement, an era of unparalleled social reform, and of glorious triumph over depression and tyranny. It was a Democratic era.

"Tonight, after an interval of marking time and aimless drifting, we are on the threshold of another great decisive era."

DEATH OF A GHOST

Moreover, Stevenson's speech as a whole, like all of his perorations, abounded in a certain kind of passionless urbanity but possessed neither the concrete, plebeian reform touch of a Truman, nor the concrete patrician reform touch of a Roosevelt. Indeed, Truman's speech to the convention delivered that same evening was a study in contrast to Stevenson's moderate tones, with its appeal to save the country from "the money-changers" and "laborbaiters" and "labor-busters."

As we pointed out in LABOR ACTION last week, Stevenson's triumph in Chicago was inextricably interwoven with the victory of reaction on the question of civil rights. It was also inseparable from something else: the repudiation of the entire mythos of the Fair Deal, and from the promise of "radical" social reform. The New Deal died back in 1940; the ghost of the New Deal is dead now too.

It is dead for good. A new radicalization of the masses in the U. S. is not likely to restore it even to ectoplasmic existence, though its name may linger in incantations. That will be the beginning of a different era, the era of a labor party.

THE DEMOCRATS Stevenson and the 'Open Convention'

Kefauver—a Victory for the Liberals?

If the vice-presidential nominating session turned out to be the only exciting public event at the Democratic Party convention, this was only because the heralded floor fight over civil rights was such a tepid and anti-climactic event.

Now there can be no doubt that Stevenson's refusal to dictate the selection of his running-mate, leaving the choice up to the convention, worked out as a shrewd move in terms of its utility as a weapon against the Republicans.

In view of the antipathy toward Nixon by a large number of both "independent" and normally Democratic voters, who helped the GOP win in 1952, in view of the special importance which attaches to the Republican vice-presidential candidate since Eisenhower's illnesses, and because the leadership of the GOP had in advance guaranteed Nixon's renomination, Stevenson's action presented a lively contrast to the situation in the Republican Party, one which the Democrats will undoubtedly utilize to the fullest during the campaign.

But the objective utility of this move does not necessarily mean that this was the initial reason for its adoption.

Some commentators have speculated that the Democratic standard-bearer's move was another indication of his con-

genital indecisiveness; Stevenson simply ducked making a decision and let the convention do it for him.

Maybe though for one thing, Stevenson in 1956 is not the diffident Stevenson of 1952, as his entire campaign this past spring demonstrated.

Perhaps more substantial, but unsubstantiated, is the view of such a right-wing Republican organ as *U. S. News & World Report* and such a GOP leader as Thomas Dewey.

WHERE WAS ADLAI?

This thesis argues that Stevenson wanted Kefauver to win, as a natural consequence of the latter's dropping out of the race for the presidential nomination and throwing his support to Stevenson, whether or not a "formal" deal had been arranged; the "open" convention "trick" was a device to get the Tennes-

sean named.

The Republicans like this story because it debunks the "open convention" appeal; liberals may like it because it presents Stevenson as pro-Kefauver.

Maybe; but the indications say that Stevenson himself favored Kennedy. When the second-ballot boom for Kennedy began, it was the Illinois delegation that started it. Indeed, that delegation, whose majority were Stevensonites, ended up as follows: Kefauver 9½, Kennedy 54½.

The few pro-Kefauver votes appear to have come from a small group of Illinois delegates under the influence of former Senator Scott Lucas who favored Harriman. Moreover, one columnist reported that Stevenson's personal alternate in the delegation (such stand-ins usually vote as instructed) cast his ballot for Kennedy.

If those facts are as indicative as they appear to be, they underline the essentially conservative character of the 1956 Democratic standard-bearer. Since Kefauver had strong convention support, much stronger than Kennedy's before the balloting started, Stevenson may very well have hoped that a more conservative nominee than Kefauver would

(Continued on next page)

THE DEMOCRATS *What's in a Platform?* Planks, Promises and Pretenses

The Democratic Party platform as a whole received no attention from the convention delegates. Everybody understood that there was no necessary relationship between what the various planks call for and what the Democrats will do if elected to office. As has been pointed out by many editorial writers and commentators, the platform is the document on which the party runs, and not at all necessarily the document for which it stands.

The conservatives and reactionaries in the party could therefore allow the platform to contain many proposals on domestic policy which they would have otherwise opposed vehemently. They could greet the various New-Dealish and "welfare state" promises with an indifferent yawn; secure in the certain knowledge that, on the one hand their presence in the platform is required in order to appeal to workers in November, and that on the other hand their enactment was an entirely different matter.

After all, this same platform, lavish with promises of so many things desired by labor and the people, found it possible to state that: "Our Democratic 84th Congress made one of the greatest legislative records in the history of our country. It enacted an active program of progressive, humane legislation, which has repudiated the efforts of reactionary Republicanism to stall America's progress."

This about a Congress which defeated or ignored so many of the proposals which the Democrats now "pledge" themselves to enact; whose claim to distinction was one based on reaction and do-nothingism.

Why should the conservatives worry? They know, with the certainty of those in power, that a Democratic 85th Congress would equally produce "one of the greatest legislative records" of the same kind.

In regard to some questions the platform bubbled over with even more than the labor movement and the liberals had been asking for. The AFL-CIO program, submitted to the platform committee by George Meany, called only for "complete overhauling" of the Taft-Hartley Law, urging the outright repeal of only one section, 14-B, which is the basis of state "right-to-work" laws.

WORDS, WORDS

"We," stated the Democratic platform, "unequivocally advocate repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act." We will produce, said the Democrats, new legislation based on "the Wagner National Labor Relations Act and the Norris-La Guardia Anti-Injunction law."

Sounds good. And if none of the Southern delegations which represent state governments that have initiated and sponsored the anti-union "right-to-work" legislation made a fuss over the question, it is because they could recall that the 84th Democratic-controlled Congress, as well as all previous Democratic congresses

since the enactment of Taft-Hartley, did nothing even to meaningfully amend the law, let alone to "completely overhaul" it as the AFL-CIO demands, let alone to "repeal" it as the Democratic platform promises. And they see no reason to doubt that a Democratic 85th Congress would behave any differently.

The same goes for giving legal recognition to unions of government employees—raising government workers salaries—unemployment benefits—and everything else that will sound good before election day.

Raise the minimum wage to \$1.25? Why not? Especially since the last Congress, controlled by the Democratic Party, turned down labor's request for that same minimum wage and only raised it to a dollar an hour.

For federal aid to education? Certainly. Why, even the Republican platform will undoubtedly be for that. What harm is there in it? In calling for it, that is? Didn't a fast bipartisan shuffle defeat federal aid to education just a few months ago?

"Immediate Statehood for Alaska and Hawaii"? By all means. Hasn't such legislation been kicking around Congress for years now, both when the Democrats were in power and when the Republicans were?

And while doing all of these things, lower taxes for the poor, "lighten the tax burden" generally and balance the budget? Naturally, everybody's for that.

FOR THE COLD WAR

The foreign-policy sections of the platform condemn the "drift" and "stagnation" of Dulles' course in international affairs and hold the administration responsible for the victories scored by Stalinism in recent years. In so doing, they have a good many grains of truth, just as the Republicans did in 1952 when they said the same thing about the Democrats—although not as either party conceives it.

Naturally, they do not indicate how the Dulles policy differs from that of Acheson, since it does not other than in detail, and in the higher frequency of stupid blunders. Nor do they outline an alternate course, since they have none.

Instead: "peace is a primary objective"; Eisenhower has failed to exercise leadership; support the United Nations, and support Chiang Kai-shek; call for effective disarmament, and call for stronger military forces; demand peace and justice in the Middle East; and demand a reactionary course on the Suez

Kefauver and the Liberals — —

(Continued from page 2)

be chosen even if the convention were "open."

Or there may, after all, have been an understanding with the Kefauver camp, or a promise to them in exchange for support to Stevenson against Harriman, that Kefauver would at least be given an opportunity to match his delegate strength against his rivals. According to this thesis, though Stevenson had an obligation to pay off, he did not want to pay it off by himself naming Kefauver because of the vicious antagonism by influential machine leaders against the former muckraker.

Whatever the combination of factors at work, the meaning of Kefauver's nomination was not exhausted by the fact that most laborites at the convention supported him, while most Southerners opposed him and backed Kennedy even in spite of the Catholic issue.

It would take a great deal of wishful thinking, however, to maintain that the coalition behind Kefauver was "the pro-civil-rights majority" and that Kefauver's victory was therefore the victory

for the pro-civil rights majority. Or, if this is the claim, then it is a pretty thin victory for a majority which couldn't even get a rollover vote on civil rights.

To be sure, the labor-liberal-NAACP bloc did plainly favor Kefauver, including Liberal Party ambassadors Dubinsky and Rose. Behind him also, however, were Democratic organizations in the farm states which recognize that their success requires Kefauver on the ticket.

Behind him also were some of the leading Democratic politicians who understood, if only in the course of the voting, that, after the capitulation to the South on civil rights, to let the South get its candidate for the running mate as well (Kennedy) might eliminate whatever chances the Democrats would have in November—especially when it wasn't necessary in order to keep the South from bolting.

Even so Kefauver almost lost but his presence on the ticket was needed to help persuade workers, Negroes and liberals that the Democratic Party was still a reasonable facsimile of a "people's party."

crisis; oppose "colonialism" but propose not a word about Algeria; object to Dulles-type brinks of war, and object to China's admission to the UN. . . .

In view of the fact that the extreme of the witchhunt, McCarthyism, can easily be associated with the Republican Party, one might have expected the Democrats to ignore their own initiation and endorsement of the assault on civil liberties in order to make some demagogue hay against the GOP. But so ingrained in American life has the witchhunt become that the following, from the section on Government Operations, is the sole reference to civil liberties:

"We propose . . . (6) A fair and non-political loyalty program, by law, which will protect the nation against subversion and the employee against unjust and un-American treatment."

And of what will this "fair" program consist? Silence. The same old witchhunt, in other words, perhaps minus its McCarthyite extremes.

It may be interesting to watch liberal and "egghead" circles drool over Stevenson's love of civil liberty and intellectual freedom in the coming period, in view of the candidate's complete silence over this shameful and cowardly treatment of the witchhunt.

Also of interest is the fact that, after decades of being the "freer trade" party in opposition to Republican protectionism, the Democrats now attack the GOP



for its failure to utilize various provisions in the Reciprocal Trade Act to "protect" American business, and promise that they will do so when in power. Naturally, the name of Cordell Hull is still regarded as "sacred," while the Democrats yield to the pressure of New England and Southern industry to limit foreign competition.

As was expected in view of Democratic hopes that the current low prices of agricultural commodities and falling farm income will produce another 1948 "miracle" in agricultural states, the farm-policy plank pledges 90 per cent of parity for farmers and speaks about working for ultimate 100 per cent parity. The Democrats will undoubtedly make some hay among farmers with this plank despite the standard-bearer's well-known coolness to such "simplistic" solutions to the farm crisis.

It is with good reason that scarcely ever has there been such open, unanimous and uninhibited jeering, from all political quarters, at the spectacle of the major parties adopting their political programs for the inspection of the electorate.

What Kind of Appeal — —

(Continued from page 1)

accompanied by the candidate's own statement on the same subject.

The following appears under the heading of *Civil Rights*:

"The 1956 GOP platform contains no mention of (1) fair employment practices legislation; (2) anti-poll tax legislation; (3) anti-lynch legislation—all of which were specifically promised in the 1952 GOP platform.

"1. This represents a major retreat from the 1952 GOP platform.

"2. In contrast . . . the Democratic platform . . . pledges . . . to 'continue its efforts to eliminate . . .'"

If one didn't know better, one might think that the Democratic platform does mention such "legislation," although the Democratic National Committee's statement does not say this in so many words. All it does is attack the Republicans.

It is possible but difficult to think of a more blatant lie.

Indeed, one of the two defeated minority amendments aimed at inserting a mention of legislation to achieve such ends as FEPC, etc.—the other dealing with implementation of the Supreme Court's decision on school integration.

As a matter of fact, if David C. Williams' article in the August 27 *New Leader*, is correct, the labor-liberal-NAACP group offered, during the back-room sessions which preceded the vote on the platform, to withdraw the "integration" amendment if the majority would agree to the amendment on "legislation" on FEPC, lynching, etc.

But the Southerners said no even to

this and the majority said yes to the Southerners. And now the Democrats have the gall to attack the GOP for its failure to mention such "legislation."

Moreover, many liberals and labor leaders will discover that the plank approved by the convention isn't so bad after all; that, in Stevenson's words, it "is a firm basis for moving ahead toward a constructive solution," forgetting their sharp indictment of it. (This applies, of course, to those liberals who didn't settle for the capitulation in the first place; the others have no problem.)

They will claim, as does publisher Dorothy Schiff in her N. Y. *Post* column on August 26, that at least the Southern segregationists were persuaded to "drop their policy of interposition and agree in writing that the Supreme Court public school decision is indeed the law of the land," ignoring completely what the plank actually says and why it says it. As we explained in last week's *LABOR ACTION*, the platform describes Supreme Court decisions as "part of the law of the land," and uses this language precisely because the Southerners insisted that state "interposition" and "nullification" legislation was also a "part" of the law of the land.

They will ignore statements, by such Eastlandites as Mississippi's Governor Coleman, which explain to the more demagogic Southern racists that because of "the gains we made in Chicago" it would be foolish to run third-party "States rights" tickets this year, unlike 1948. They will act as if the Negroes scored an outstanding victory in Chicago.

But the rest of this subject has already been fully covered in last week's *LA*. It is also necessary, however, to look at other aspects of the 1956 convention of the Democratic Party, both insofar as these have intrinsic interest, and also because these other aspects will be seized upon to obscure the civil-rights drubbing. This is what is done in the three accompanying articles, on pages 2 and 3.

NEW YORK
LABOR ACTION FORUM

THURSDAYS at 9 p.m.

Sept. 6—
ROUND-TABLE DISCUSSION ON THE TWO PARTY CONVENTIONS

Sept. 13—James M. Fenwick
SIMONE DE BEAUVOIR'S "THE MANDARINS"

114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 West 14 Street, New York City

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

Send for our free book list.

SPOTLIGHT AROUND THE WORLD

The Temperature Rises in Norway

A correspondent in Norway has sent us a report on recent labor struggles in that country which indicates a rise in the social temperature. Last year (in our June 27 issue) an article on "Class Conflict Shakes the 'Middle Way' in Scandinavia" by Daniel Faber reviewed events in Sweden, Denmark, Finland and Iceland, but on Norway it remarked only: "Even in Norway, where no large-scale social conflict has taken place as yet, the high investment rate and the excessive armament expenses (\$125 million a year, the largest single item in the budget), have brought about a mild inflation and a steep rise in prices. As a result, the trade unions demand that steps be taken to lower prices, and the Labor Party youth, in its annual conference in May, demanded that the government intervene more energetically in banking and credit."

But this summer nation-wide strikes hit Norway in the pulp-and-paper and building industries.

On July 7 workers in both industries walked out to support their demands for higher wages. The Norwegian Paper Workers Union and the Norwegian Building Workers Union (both industrial unions) were the main labor organizations involved and there were several other smaller ones.

The pulp and paper strike shut down the entire industry, about 80 mills. The building strike made over half the industry cease construction. Both industries belong to the private sector of Norway's "welfare state" economy.

The Norwegian Labor government has been in uninterrupted power since the end of the German occupation in 1945. Till 1949 price controls were administered rigidly and wage disputes were settled by compulsory arbitration. After 1949 the currency was devalued in line with the British pound and prices were permitted to rise 50 per cent: compulsory arbitration was terminated, except in case of "national emergencies."

This year the government yielded to farmer pressure and gave a price increase on milk and other agricultural products. The Federation of Labor, in turn, demanded wage increases as contracts terminated. In the spring, over 75,000 workers got raises of about 3 1/2-4 per cent.

In the paper and pulp industry, the workers have a long history of low wage rates. Prior to World War II, in the thirties the paper industry was unprofitable, but in the post-war boom, the paper industry has enjoyed extremely high profits. The paper workers have wanted a slice out of this prosperity. When they were offered the wage pattern set in the spring, it was rejected overwhelmingly in a nation-wide referendum.

The Paper Workers have voted to strike almost every year since 1945, but there has not been a strike in the industry since before the war. During the last 11 years, the wage disputes have been settled by compulsory arbitration, since 1949 under the "national emergency" section of the labor law. The settlements awarded each year by the Labor Board exceeded the amount the employers had offered.

This year the government did not invoke the "national emergency" provision and the strike was on. It terminated on July 27 when the Paper Workers Union and the other unions involved voted by the narrow margin of two votes to return to work. The votes of all the unions involved were tossed together. The Paper Workers Union actually had a majority of 170 to stay out on strike.

The settlement provided for a wage increase averaging about 4-5 per cent, plus a guarantee of at least 30 per cent additional pay in incentives. There is a complicated system of incentive pay in the paper industry.

The strike in the building industry continues. Some of the editorials in the Oslo newspapers have intimated that the Labor Party is not concerned about the length of this strike. It is held that, since Norway's rate of housing investment is one of the highest in the world higher than in the United States, the Labor government would like to divert some of the investment capital and labor in the building industry to other industries.

During the month of July, Norway had more workers on strike than at any other period since the 1930s. In Norwegian strikes, unlike American, you will not find any pickets. Norwegian employers have not tried to break a major strike for over twenty years.

Israeli Group Defends Egypt's Rights

A statement issued by the left-wing and anti-Zionist group in Israel which calls itself "The Third Force" (headed by Mordechai Stein) expresses "complete solidarity with the act of the Egyptian government in nationalizing the Suez Canal Company."

The Stein group stands out in Israel as one which takes a consistent stand in support of Arab minority rights in the country and for collaborative relations with the neighboring Arab states: though Jewish in its majority, it is also noteworthy in combining both Jewish and Arab members.

The statement goes on to support the "legality and propriety" of the nationalization and to approve the use of the canal revenue for the building of the Aswan Dam, as a project "which is of vital importance to Egypt's population." It strongly protests the military intimidation practised by Britain and France (unfortunately making no mention of Washington's role as accomplice) and their "imperialistic aims."

It expresses "sorrow at the fact that Asian nations which from their own bitter experience know the nature of the colonial lords are participating in the above [London] imperialistic conference."

Weak part of the statement is the third, which mentions but inadequately protests Egypt's ban on Israeli shipping through the canal, and which does not make clear that support of Egypt's rights against imperialism does not entail any political support to the Nasser regime.

Indian Socialists Blast Colonialism

The National Committee of the left-wing Socialist Party of India (Lohia) adopted a resolution on foreign policy which vigorously aligned the movement with the anti-colonial struggle in three hotspots in particular: Cyprus, Algeria and Kenya.

"In spite of all real or fancied distortions; the hard core of the situation in these areas consists of the battle between freedom and slavery," said the document.

"Kenya in the East and Algeria in the north of Africa have become symbols of the savage massacres carried out by well-equipped armies on ill-equipped native forces. Incidents of beastly conduct generally ascribed to concentration and torture camps are an open and common feature of the daily life in Algeria and Kenya, so that all the people in these countries live in a concentration camp."

While unreservedly supporting the Cypriot demand for self-determination and freedom from Britain, the resolution mentions its "wish" that the Cypriot people, both Greeks and Turks, "could have striven in combination for an independent Cyprus," rather than for enosis with Greece. But it calls this now an "irrelevant hope."

The Socialists pay their respects to Russian imperialism too, pointing to its "inactivity concerning Cyprus and comparative silence on Algeria since the visit [to Moscow] of French statesmen..."

Of Nehru's government, they also note its "comparative silence" on Cyprus and Kenya and "compromising intervention in the Algerian issue."

Nehru's "Socialism"

Still on the subject of India, there was a little episode in New York City which we learn about in the pages of *Young World*, the militant monthly of the Indian SP's youth. It is a note on the meaning of Nehru's "socialist" demagoguery, which excited much attention when his Congress Party adopted a program with the words "socialist pattern of society" tucked into it. It concerns the visit to the U. S. of one of India's leading capitalists.

"G. D. Birla, the biggest of them, for instance, was being feted by American millionaires at the time of the announcement of the [Nehru government's] new industrial policy in Parliament. The simple-minded Yankees gasped with surprise at Birla's unconcealed enthusiasm for the economic policies of a government which they had been taught to regard as only one step removed from the hateful kind of regime that exists in Moscow. Birla began his address to a group of American businessmen having dealings with Asia, with the categorical assertion that 'the Nehru government was on the right path.' The 'socialist pattern of society,' he said (according to the New York correspondent of the *Hindu*), 'was the only way to preserve capitalism.' Paying a tribute to himself, he told his American counterparts that Indian businessmen no longer thought in terms of profits alone. They had a mission to fulfill, namely, to establish a socialist pattern of society. Immediately, however, he assured his audience about his real meaning. The U. S. A., he told them, was 'a great Socialist State,' for it had provided a high standard of living for everyone! When someone asked him whether he did not fear nationalization of his industries, Birla replied: 'There is no serious threat of nationalization in India...'"

The Little Man Who Wasn't There

We have just received the June 15 issue of the Yugoslav Titoist propaganda magazine *Review of International Affairs*, issued for foreign consumption. In it is a weird article on the interesting subject of "New Stage in Development of Yugoslav-Soviet Relations," by Vladimir Bakaric, the Titoist boss of Croatia.

The article plows its way through the three distinct stages of this development, namely, before the break with Moscow in 1948; the period of "tense relations" of 1948-54; and the current phase of "normalization."

Most space is devoted to the first period, explaining why Yugoslavia is naturally pro-Soviet.

The second stage came "more or less unexpectedly," says Bakaric. (Not long ago the Titoists of course were claiming that antagonism to Moscow had been going on for a long time before the break, that they never really had been friendly with the Kremlin in the first place, etc., etc. This wouldn't be worth mentioning now except for the number of naive pro-Titoists in those days who echoed this line.)

In discussing this second stage, Bakaric is mainly concerned to argue that the Titoists never went over to capitalism, but kept the faith.

Then came the third phase; it "began in 1954-55," writes Bakaric.

What strikes us about this sketch of

recent history is that nowhere in this lengthy article is the existence of a man named S----- acknowledged. No mention.

There is no mention of his existence during the whole war period that the article discusses. While this was difficult, the article achieves a veritable *tour de force* when it recounts the Kremlin's reversal without mentioning that this took place only after this S----- had died in 1953 and been succeeded by new leaders.

Clearly this previously known historical figure has become an Unperson.

Now Please Buckle Your Seat Belts . . .

Speaking of things that aren't there, we are reminded that in this country the Socialist Workers Party (Cannon) has announced that it is dropping the name *Fourth International* for its magazine. That in itself would arouse something less than interest but for the mystery with which it surrounds this otherwise plausible move. A teasing few words are devoted to explaining why: "With the post-war stabilization of the Trotskyist movement, however, the name of the magazine began to lose its timeliness."

Timeliness? Then it goes on to say something about appealing to workers and student youth.

They omit to mention that their so-called Fourth International is now in the hands of a leadership (Pablo) which is busily galloping toward pro-Stalinism, and that they have politically broken. No wonder it isn't timely, so to speak. In fact, to make perfect sense of the above-quoted sentence, just substitute the word "split" for "stabilization," and you've got it.

"Split" equals "stabilization" in Newspeak.

Newspeaking of the Fourth International, the Pablo leadership isn't exactly stuck with the name Fourth International either. Its international committee in Paris has issued the slogan, "For the Communist International!"

This climaxed a resolution which also called "For unconditional fidelity to the USSR, workers' state, against imperialism and reaction . . ." (but not to the Kremlin, it adds). The formulation "unconditional fidelity" is a new wrinkle.

In France, since the split—pardon, stabilization—in the Trotskyist movement, there have been two Trotskyist groups, both called PCI (Pablo versus Lambert), the Lambert group being roughly aligned with the American SWP in its politics. Recently, the Pabloites printed an appeal for reunification, proposing political pourparlers for the purpose. According to them, the Lambert group replied that such programmatic discussions would be useless, and refused.

We note that in mentioning this, the Pabloites remark: "We understand the embarrassment the Lambert group must feel in a discussion on the question of the USSR and Stalinism. We understand that their embarrassment is so much the greater because, whereas they see in the 20th Congress a victory for the bureaucracy, the SWP of the United States, on which they have leaned for support against us, takes a position on these questions which is very close, not to say identical, to ours."

This sounds something like a bid for re-establishment of political relations with the SWP. The picture is complicated by the fact—don't let this confuse you, now—that the group which split away from the SWP because it agreed with Pablo's more extreme pro-Stalinist position (Cochranites) has since then drifted so far over to Stalinism that it ripped its umbilical cord with Pablo himself. So, as we understand how affairs stand, Pablo (alias "Fourth International") has no political friends in the U. S. any longer. All the more reason to woo the SWP, maybe.

YOU'RE INVITED

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



LABOR ACTION

September 3, 1956 Vol. 20, No. 36

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

Army's Reserve Plan Didn't Get the Youth

By EDWARD HILL

In a small news item tucked away in the press last week a surprising fact was announced: that the youth of America have won a major victory over the Pentagon. The authority for the statement was none other than the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, Carter Burgess.

In 1955 Congress voted a compromise bill instead of passing a full Universal Military Training (conscription) law. Under its provisions the youth were given the opportunity of signing up for six-months training in a regular branch of the service, when they reached seventeen and a half or eighteen. After the regular duty stint, they would be turned over to the Reserve for a period of service of six to eight years.

This program was part of a tendency growing out of a crisis in Selective Service. With the Korean War over and the needs of the military lessening, the draft was becoming less and less "selective." The reduced quotas meant that the draftees were older when they were called up; in some places, the age went as high as 23.

This, of course, meant a social disruption of much greater extent than in the case of eighteen-year-olds. In the early twenties, youth were more likely to be married, have a steady job, etc. And it also meant that favored categories for exemption—students, various classifications of technical people—stood a better chance of bypassing service altogether.

The new Reserve program was a gimmick to get around this problem, and also part of a new emphasis upon Reserve service itself. Under existing regulations, the army has control over youth from the age of eighteen well into the twenties. When coupled with the amazing actions of the military's discharge and security program, this meant a tremendous transfer of power to the army commanders. True enough, the Pentagon didn't get its UMT bill through in 1955, but half a loaf is better than none.

But it now turns out that American youth aren't having any of the loaf, and the military has capitulated. When the program was set up, the army announced that it had set a goal of 100,000 men. The number who answered the call were about

half of those anticipated.

And this was true even though the system was advertised as something of a "deal," i.e., get in, do a quick six-months hitch, and finish out your service obligation training one night a week in your home time, instead of taking two solid years of regular duty with the army.

NO ENTHUSIASM

Burgess, the Pentagon spokesman, now concedes that the program is moving along at "a minimum rate," but he's not yet willing to admit that it's been a bust. Not in those words, at least.

The "minimum rate" of current operation is a weekly intake of between 600 and 1000 reservists, when the T. O. calls for a spread between 1500 and 1750. In other words, the army is getting somewhere around a half or third of its needs.

When Burgess got off the question of a direct characterization of the program, he began to admit what these facts clearly imply: that the Reserve program has been a failure because American youth aren't showing the least bit of enthusiasm for it.

First of all, Burgess announced that the Pentagon will ask Congress for the right to draft men for the lagging program. "Personally," Burgess told a Scripps-Howard writer, "I see no other solution."

So the voluntary aspect of the program is being abandoned because there are no volunteers; the "deal" is off, and instead, there is going to be a resumption of a tried and true method, e.g. legal coercion of the volunteers.

On top of this, Burgess made an amazing statement: that the Pentagon has abandoned its advocacy of Universal Military Training! "I don't think we can have peacetime UMT and I don't think we need it. I believe we have about the right system now—provided we can draft men for the six-month reserve

program to the extent that we need to draft them. We are considering asking Congress for such a draft."

Thus the admission of defeat. After years and years of lobbying, propagandizing, advertising, the Defense Department concedes that UMT is not practical!

PLAIN SUSPICION

The credit for this victory has to go to American youth. It was their boycott of the Pentagon's deal which brought the military planners up short. And in a period of deafening eulogy for the services, it is another example of a fact that Washington is forced to take into account time and time again: that there is little or no enthusiasm among the youth for the current brand of militarism.

This fact has emerged from the studies of defection in Korea; it is apparent in

the Marines' arguments for a tough training policy. After all the speeches and articles, there is little or no enthusiasm for America's military policy.

There is not, to be sure, a mass anti-war movement. But there is this understandable apathy, confusion, and plain suspicion about the Pentagon's plans.

Finally, the fact that the Defense Department is now going to propose the draft for a Reserve program is an indication that the crisis remains in Selective Service. The uneasy conditions of the cold peace, and America's continuing military commitment, face the draft planners with a real problem.

Under the pressure of American youth, they have now abandoned the "voluntary" approach. After all, a draft does not require any enthusiasm on the part of the draftee. It's a simple matter of state force.

Now Teachers Talk of 'Collective Bargaining'

By RUTH KAREL

The recent convention of the American Federation of Teachers saw several developments which may have far-reaching effects among many professional and government workers. Delegates representing 50,000 classroom teachers throughout the country unanimously insisted on the right to bargain collectively with school administrators and local Boards of Education.

Up until now only eight federation locals actually have negotiated contracts; the traditional squeamishness of teachers about considering themselves "workers" may take some time to dissipate. Nevertheless the first steps have been taken.

The Aug. 26 N. Y. Times points out: "It was not too long ago that classroom teachers hesitated to mention the term 'collective bargaining' within earshot of their administrators or supervisors because it was believed to carry with it an insidious connotation of labor-management disputes and strikes."

Actually it must unfortunately be mentioned that the decision on bargaining carries with it no such equally important stipulation about the right to strike. On the contrary Carl J. Megel, president of the federation, told the delegates that "force" or even the threat of strike should not be used.

This admonition was underlined in a memorandum by the National Education Association's research division. The largest professional organization of both teachers and administrators, concerned primarily with curriculum and the like, the NEA could be relied on to strike a much more conservative note than the AFT.

JOB ACTION

Grudgingly noting that collective bargaining "is a process not necessarily to be outlawed" in the schools, the memorandum went on to outline several "safeguards" to the use of bargaining by public school teachers: "The closed or union shop should be excluded; the possibility of a strike must be avoided through a provision waiving the right. The provisions must not violate the civil-service laws and should include a statement to the effect that present and future civil-service regulations shall have suprem-

acy over provisions of the 'bargain.'"

Fortunately, the AFT is a union and not a teacher-administrator association; it has made clear that it intends to be the bargaining agent. In several cities, notably New York, the local affiliates of the federation have been attempting to become the recognized bargaining agents for teachers in their districts.

The New York Teachers Guild, for example, introduced a bill into the state legislature giving teachers the right to bargain collectively. The bill was defeated but the Guild has not given up.

It, together with other teacher organizations in New York City, has been engaged in a "strike"—or at least a "job action"—of sorts for the past year or more. Because the city has refused teachers the kind of salary increase they demanded, extracurricular activities such as supervision of clubs, etc., particularly on the high school level, have been sharply curtailed. Parents may get up in arms at the fact that their children are suffering as a result but the blame must be laid squarely at the feet of Mayor Wagner and the city government. Clearly a case where union recognition and collective bargaining could lead to victory for the teachers.

It is to be hoped that the decision of the AFT convention will be the beginning of a militant nation-wide movement for teachers' rights.

It must unfortunately be noted that the convention, which did so well on this question, made a poorer showing on civil rights. A motion to expel several segregated locals in the South, both Negro and white, failed to secure the necessary two-thirds vote, despite the fact that the last convention had warned that they must comply with the desegregation decision or face expulsion. Apparently no attempt has been made, moreover, to organize rival desegregated locals in these areas.

Previously limited to presenting its demands through public pressure, government hearings, etc., the AFT has now taken the position that it, like any other union, represents the workers and has the right to force the Boards of Education to sit down and bargain. A victory in this effort would mean a tremendous lift to the whole concept of white-collar unionism for government and professional workers.

LAST CHANCE FOR THE YSL CAMP

We start Monday, September 3 at suppertime, so maybe you can still make it. But in any case, you're invited out for the final weekend of the camp, September 8-9.

It's at Mountain Spring Camp, Washington, New Jersey. (Directions for getting out there available on request.) There will be our usual high-quality educational program; swimming, sports, games, socials, dancing, sunshine, and an excellent cuisine.

Rates for the whole camp week run as follows: Room in lodge \$40; cabin \$38; dorm \$35.

But if you can make it only for the weekend, it's \$14 for a room in the lodge, \$13 for a cabin, and \$12 for the dorm. For other periods or odd meals, the cost will be pro-rated.

But you must register immediately. If for the weekend only, send in a \$2 deposit with your name and address. Make checks or money orders out to Max Martin.

G.D.H. COLE'S CAMPAIGN:

The Mind of a Fellow Traveler

By HAL DRAPER

G. D. H. Cole, the prolific British socialist scholar, has a new booklet out, "World Socialism Restated," published by the *New Statesman and Nation*. More than ever, it marks his role as the leading advocate of Stalinist fellow-traveling who yet retains the respect and ear of the world socialist movement.

This is a pity, for Cole is making deplorable use of the capital he enjoys. For one thing he presents himself as a socialist thinker proposing a line of solution for the ills of the movement, and this is not the long suit of the man who has written an astonishing number of books containing well-researched information, lucid writing, and cogent criticisms of social-democratic failings.

However, today he clearly thinks that the best use he can make of his talents is to act as broker to bring about the reconciliation of socialists with the Stalinist movement. This is clearly also the main burden of his new pamphlet.

Toward the end of his pamphlet, Cole mentions a complaint which is no doubt justified:

"... Some of them [anti-Communists] smell Communists everywhere, even in the most unlikely places, and are all too ready to brand as a 'crypto'—or fellow traveler—anyone with whom they happen to disagree. I have been so branded myself because, though I have been consistently critical of Communism on the grounds I have stated here, I have always refused to take sides against either the Russian or Chinese Revolution or to accept as final a breach that divides the world working-class movement right down the middle. Doubtless, I may have been lying like a trooper all my life in the secret service of a doctrine I profess to detest; but at any rate some evidence is surely needed to back up such an imputation..."

This passage itself tells much about Cole. One of the things, among others, that it tells is Cole's inveterate inaptitude about even keeping clearly in mind the question he is discussing. Since he is an excellent writer, it is not a difficulty in language but in political thinking.

In this case Cole obscures the difference between a "crypto" ("crypto-Communist") and a fellow traveler. If language is to continue to mean anything, a crypto is a concealed CPer, by definition—a Stalinist who pretends he isn't. Cole is not a Stalinist; never was, never will be.

Properly understood, and aside from the lamentable way in which much abused terms have been perverted simply into name-calling tags, a fellow traveler is precisely a non-Stalinist who sincerely believes in going along with (collaborating with) the Stalinists.

The point about a fellow traveler is not his sincerity or honesty, which should be beyond question if he is to be at all effective, but his political ideas.

But it is precisely the task of consistently thinking his own political ideas out to their conclusions that is not Cole's forte. He has been able to make valuable contributions to scholarship without possessing this talent, but the lack of it becomes noteworthy when he sets himself up as an international leader of an ideological tendency within the socialist movement. It is in this role, at any rate, that he invites judgment.

LEFT WING?

Cole writes his pamphlet as exponent of what he calls "left-wing socialism." His claim to this label is twofold: consistent and vigorous opposition to capitalist imperialism and colonialism today, and explicit support of its present-day victims everywhere; and advocacy of more militant socialistic measures (like nationalization) by British Labor at home, in the Bevanite spirit.

In political theory, however (or what he calls "philosophy") Cole is a holdover

of old-fashioned reformism. In the fundamentals of his thinking, Cole is a reformist. Although this is too big a subject to discuss here, we want to mention in this connection that he is only one of a whole breed who handily combine reformism with a type of Stalinoidism. Cole's hero Pietro Nenni of Italy is an outstanding example; Bernard Shaw was another.

For instance, Cole quite frankly rejects Marxism. Here is the passage in "World Socialism Today" in which he explains why:

"... I accept the class struggle as fact—though a more complex fact than Marx considered it to be. But I take no pleasure in it, save as a means to the classless society that I want to see established. I am, in terms of Engels' famous distinction, an 'utopian' rather than a 'scientific' Socialist; and that makes me scrupulous about means as well as ends, for I do not like hurting people except for very cogent reasons, and I abominate cruelty, even when it is used to support causes I believe to be good."

EXPLANATION

That seems to be sufficient explanation, in his opinion. One gathers that a Marxist is among other things one (a) who takes "pleasure" in class struggle for reasons other than its role as a means to socialism; (b) who is unscrupulous about means; (c) who likes to hurt people.

To dissect this fatuous hodgepodge would take an essay on Cole as a thinker. Perhaps it is too ill-mannered to remind the reader that this professor once wrote a book which he entitled *What Marx Really Meant*. We must nevertheless point out that Cole does not even understand what he writes, let alone what Marx wrote. He does "not like hurting people except for very cogent reasons," he writes, as an explanation of his scrupulousity about "means as well as ends"—actually!

Then, as if saying the same thing, he adds: "I abominate cruelty, even when it is used to support causes I believe to be good." Very laudable; but a few pages later, we find that he proclaims very vigorously that he is "for Mau-Mau against the white settlers in Kenya"—"despite its barbaric abuses."

All this presumably explains why he rejects Marxism...

THE ETHICAL MAN

But we are here concerned with this aspect of Cole only because he purports to write as a theoretician of "left-wing socialism" and there should be no misunderstanding about what this left-wingism is. It springs from ethical revulsion against injustice, not from political ideas; that is not to derogate it but to distinguish it.

A strong feeling of justice can carry a man a considerable distance toward socialist decency. Unfortunately, it often bogs down when two injustices conflict, as when the injustice of Mau Mau "barbarism" conflicts with the injustice of British rule; or when the injustices of capitalism conflict with the injustices of Stalinism. The ethical man then either follows other guides, of whose existence he may not be entirely aware, or else his thinking tailspins into a deplorable muddle. There is never any adequate substitute for clear theory.

Take Cole's strong point, for example: his very strong defense of colonial struggles for freedom against British as well as French and other capitalist imperial-

isms. We take our hat off to him. The hat goes back, however, when we begin to notice that he is willing to turn something of a blind eye to Russian imperialism, and that his ethical revulsion to injustice and his abomination of cruelty seem to become listless and sluggish when facing east.

He comments that "apart from groups of exiled protestants from the Ukraine and the Baltic States, the national question has almost ceased to be heard of in Europe." He apparently has never heard of the national feelings of the satellite peoples outraged by Moscow's overrule-ship—in Poland, Czechoslovakia, and elsewhere in East Europe, and not only within the borders of the USSR at the two spots he does mention. Or if he has heard of the national oppression of the satellites, he does not believe that it exists...

DEFENSE COUNSEL

In this chapter on "Socialism and the National Question," it is only in the last paragraph that he recurs to the question as it exists under Stalinism. The very form in which this is cast is overtly that of a lawyerlike defense:

"It will, I know, be objected [but not by Cole?] that, if the Communist powers claim the right to intervene in these countries' affairs by stirring up trouble in them, the anti-Communist powers must intervene to defeat their aims. But the Chinese did not intervene in Korea until their own territory was directly threatened..."

Let us say solely for the sake of argument that this claim is true; what is appalling is that Cole does not even refer to the fact that the Korean war, after all, started by the initiative of the Stalinist North Koreans, whom he forgets to mention. To be sure, we Marxists do not support one side in an imperialist war simply because the other fellow fires first; but surely this fact is not without relevance to a man who is undertaking to whitewash the first-firer.

Among other things in this paragraph is a passing assertion that Formosa is part of China; the existence of an anti-Chinese national feeling on the part of the Formosan people (against Mao as well as Chiang) somehow just does not attract the attention of this writer who is otherwise so voluminously concerned with the rights of anti-colonial nationalism.

MIRROR IMAGES

But Cole is not uncritical of the Stalinists. He does not want to be. He even wants to end this chapter of his with a slap against them; the only slap in it. So this is how it comes out, for a two-sentence chapter conclusion:

"Even Communists claim to accept this principle of national self-determination, though they have been untrue to it in action—for example, in Czechoslovakia in 1947 [sic; he means 1948]. But Communist misdeeds are no excuse for other Socialists to misbehave on the opposite side, or to allow their anti-Communism to degenerate into support for American, or West European, capitalist policies."

The flavor is, *mutatis mutandis*, the same as that of the Committee for Cultural Freedom intellectual who, at the tailend of his harangue against Communism, is willing to mention hurriedly that "of course our democracy in the West is not perfect," lest he be accused quite unfairly of being a mere uncritical sycophant of his own camp; but who hastens to counterbalance this grudging admission with an exhortation not to let such imperfections carry one away to support Russian policies.

It may help some to view Cole as the bisymmetric counterpart of Arthur Koestler or Ignazio Silone, who also get sincerely indignant when politically analyzed as fellow travelers—of the State Department.

One thing that unites both types of

fellow travelers is their firm conviction that one must travel along basically with one imperialism or the other.

WHAT HE LEAVES OUT

In the chapter which is explicitly entitled "Attitude to Communism," Cole explains why he is not a Communist. (By the way, see *LA* for May 2 last year, for discussion of another article in which Cole does this in a different but just as revealing way.)

Here is his indictment: the Communists are "ruthless in suppressing opposition and in maintaining one-party dictatorial rule"; "callous about the infliction of suffering on anyone they have regarded as a political enemy or potential counter-revolutionary"; they lie about opponents "and have kept from their peoples the means of correcting their false statements by preventing them from acquiring true information"; they betray "non-Communist Socialists who have attempted to work with them in the cause of working-class unity" but don't accept their complete control.

This Cole subheads "The Case Against Communism and What It Leaves Out." He means what others leave out, as we shall see. One should also note what he leaves out.

There is nothing about its imperialism, as we have seen; the word totalitarianism is also eschewed. In the very preceding paragraph, listing what "many socialists" charge, the "slave labor camps" figure prominently, though in disclaiming quote-marks. When Cole proceeds to his own indictment, this detail has disappeared, even in quote-marks. The reader can add the rest himself.

TWO CLAIMS

But having given his own objections to Communism, Cole devotes the rest of this section to "the other side," namely, to a defense of Stalinism. This he rests on two things:

(1) The Russian Revolution was one of the greatest achievements of the modern world, overthrew capitalism, socialized the means of production, lifted Russia from primitive barbarism, and impelled emancipatory movements in Asia and Africa.

Please note that this scholar, who has read everything and understood nothing, does not even raise the question of whether it is permissible thus to identify the Russian Revolution of 1917 with the present-day Moscow regime which he is defending. He simply does. Did a counter-revolution take place inbetween? or at any rate, such important changes that one cannot glibly veil the abominations of a current regime with the glories of a past revolution? No word.

(2) The second line of defense is: "... despite all the abuses of dictatorship in the Communist countries, it is unquestionable that the life of workers and peasants in Soviet Russia is immensely preferable to what they endured under Tsarism and that their status and opportunities for culture and good living—politics apart—have been immensely advanced."

There is the claim. Anyone has a right to make and try to support it. No one has a right, before an intelligent socialist audience, to present this assertion with the statement that it is "unquestionable" when in fact it has been cogently "questioned" and rebutted by serious students and sincere socialists. It is "unquestionable" only for gullible readers of the *Dean of Canterbury* or dupes like the *Webbs*, those prototypes of Fabianism who are so closely related politically to Cole.

DELICATE TOUCH

It is not even certain just what Cole is claiming in this sweeping historic generalization. Is he saying, for example, that the (average) Russian worker and peasant enjoys a higher standard of living under Khrushchev today than under the tsar? He does not quite do that, if you look twice. Fuzziness of language and evasive phraseology came to the rescue of this usually lucid writer. On a later page he exhibits the same delicacy in wording his way around the point:

"... It would be quite wrong to accuse the Russians of ever forgetting that the purpose of the new society they have been struggling to build was to raise the quality of living for the great masses of Russian people who had been so bitterly repressed under Tsarism. The vast de-

Should Socialists Unite with the Stalinists—or Combat Them?

velopment of higher education and the immense stress laid on cultural development in the Soviet Union are a sufficient answer to any such accusation."

This is either ingenuous or ingenious, but not both. Is "the quality of living" akin to "standard of living" or is it something less susceptible to objective determination? If it is akin, then higher education and cultural stress are by no means a "sufficient answer." If it is not, but undefined, then one can scarcely determine the relevance of the "sufficient answer." Unfortunately, Cole is likely to be read as saying what in fact he does not quite say, and what in fact he makes no attempt to demonstrate.

Those two points he presents as the crux of his case. His evasions therefore are also crucial as testimony to the state of his thinking.

A SORT OF ANSWER

There are more crucial points of which he gives no sign of awareness. It is hard to imagine that anyone can be accepted as a competent socialist thinker today who has not at least given consideration to the basic question: *Is a socialist society sufficiently defined by the abolition of capitalism and the statification of the economy?*

Cole gives no nod to raising this question about Russia, in this "World Socialism Restated," any more than if he were restating it in 1913. It is all the more doleful that he has a very categorical answer to this question which he does not raise. It comes out in passing.

The Stalinist world, he remarks, "has gone over to a system of planned production under collective ownership—that is, to a sort of Socialism."

So Russia and its similars are a "sort of socialism." It is a sort of definition. Why? Is the ownership automatically "collective" because it is ownership by a state, even though the state itself is not "collectively" owned and controlled by the people, who have no political rights?

Do you have a "sort of socialism," or do you rather have a sort of new class society, when a state machine owns and controls the means of production but at the same time that state machine "belongs" only to a class of bureaucrats uncontrolled by any democratic institutions of the masses?

That Cole unquestioningly assumes the answer is indicated also when, elsewhere, he remarks that "Socialism, in its Communist form" is making great strides in the world today.

IS IT SOCIALISM?

Yet, believe it or not, there is a page on which Cole asks and even answers the very question we have raised. Only—and typically—he applies it solely to capitalist Britain, and does not think of applying it to his "socialism, in Communist form."

Here is what he writes under a sub-head "The Managerial Society":

"For evidently a society does not become Socialist merely by turning men and women into public employees, if they continue to be paid and graded much as they would be under a capitalist system..."

We interrupt to wonder whether our scholar ever heard of the Russian piece-work system of paying labor or the fact that wage differentials are demonstrably far wider in Russia than in most advanced capitalist countries. The chapter we are quoting from, by the way, is headed "Socialism and Equality," but Cole never tears his eyes away from the sins of capitalism, while discussing this.

To continue with the passage: "Such a society would not be Socialist, but only State Capitalist—a very different thing..."

We interrupt again to note, perhaps with some astonishment in view of our previous discussion, that Cole is very clearly saying that, even if all workers were "public employees," the resultant statified economy would still not be "socialist." (He calls it state-capitalist, we would call it bureaucratic-collectivist perhaps, but the terminology is not important here.)

Why? Because the all-employing state is the One Big "Capitalist"? Very well then, what do we have in Russia?

The twice-interrupted passage continues:

"This is the danger that lurks behind the notion of arriving at Socialism by

way of piecemeal nationalization, while adopting for the nationalized industries a social and economic hierarchy modeled on that of the capitalist enterprises that are left in being. How much difference is there, in social structure, between the personnel of the nationalized coal industry or transport service and that of Unilever or ICI? Not, I think, a great deal; for these great private businesses too have passed under the managerial control of men who are much less capitalist owners than highly salaried administrators—men whose social status is not much further removed from that of the main body of their employees than the status of an ordinary coal-miner or railway engine-driver is from that of the National Coal Board or the Transport Commission."

Before he is through, we see, this "state-capitalism" has virtually ceased to be capitalist too; and we already saw that it isn't socialist. As the stream of consciousness flows along, "managerialism" pops out of itself—something he read, no doubt—and in it goes, another crouton in the gruel, unrelated to anything before or after it.

In any case, the important thing that requires connecting up is the nature of the Stalinist social system. It is a question that strikes at the underpinnings of all Stalinoid tendencies. If Stalinism ceases to be a "sort of socialism," then Stalinists cease to be "sort of socialists." And this would be a catastrophe—to the perspective of "world socialist unity" and "healing the split between socialism and Communism" which is the fount and origin of Cole's tendency.

It must not happen; the question must not even be raised.

THE DEAD FIRE

This is it. This is the end which governs Cole's sporadic obfuscations. This is what makes Cole tick. The socialist and Stalinist movement must be hitched together; that is, the socialist movement must be hitched on to the Stalinist.

This is not because Cole is an agent or "stooge" of the Stalinists. There are few better laboratory cases than Cole for getting a glimpse of what has happened to such people.

The 1945 victory of British Labor lifted Cole's heart, like all good socialists. Socialists were coming into power—really, for the first time. Power! *Ideas are fine, but they must be hitched on to Power.* The sentiment is indisputable.

The record of the British Labor government disappointed Cole, as it did so many other good socialists; and again, for creditable reasons. Then, in 1951 Labor was defeated, defeated by the old and discredited Tories! Cole's vision of glory collapsed. Five days after this defeat, Cole delivered the Webb Memorial Lecture, and concluded on the following note, baring his heart as it were:

"The fire and fervor, I feel, are dying out fast from the socialism of the West, which has a good case against Communism only if it stands fast to the idealism that went into its making. In fact, the problem confronting Western socialism today is simply this—can it meet the challenge of Communism without accepting the philosophy of Americanism as a substitute for its lost ideas?"

"I do not know the answer; I only know that I feel lonely and near despair in a world in which socialist values as I understand them are being remorselessly crushed out between the two immense grinding-stones of Communist automatic centralism and hysterical American worship of wealth and hugeness for their own sake and not as means to that fellowship which lies at the very foundation of the socialist faith."

It is a moving confession; not everyone would have been strong enough to make it. It is also enlightening as to Cole's subsequent course.

WHICH POWER?

Ideas are fine but they must be hitched on to Power. The power collapsed. Loneliness and despair. Only a slight, almost imperceptible amendment is required: *Ideas are fine but they must be hitched on to a Power.*

On to which Power? Take your choice of what is available. Our subject is not the psychology of individuals. Different individuals work out different ways of collapsing. Some, hand on heart, catch hold of the left coattail of the Western

capitalisms; some join the Committee for Cultural Freedom; some begin to see for the first time the true glory of Our Country and Our Culture and the social significance of Coca-Cola; some even settle for the small consolation prize of Power which resides in the office of a trade-union bureaucrat.

But if you can't stomach that side, then there are a whole repertory of ways of hitching on to the Power which stands on the other side of the war camp. It is even easier in many ways to convince oneself that this is the Power of the Future.

IS IT AN ENEMY?

In any case, Cole oriented toward hitching the socialist movement on to a Power. He did not "sell out" to the Stalinists; he did not "go over" to the Stalinists; not a bit. All he proposes is that the whole socialist movement unitedly hitch itself to the Stalinists. There is nothing personal or careerist or venal about it; it is a line worked out for the good of the movement.

It is also a line that leads straight from despair to disaster.

regard Communism simply as an enemy regard Communist simply as an enemy to be fought." Very good! It is not simply an enemy to be fought.

But is it an enemy to be fought?

This is the vital question that Cole walks around, as we have seen him walk around others.

Is it an enemy to be fought, in our own socialist way, by our own socialist forces, with our own socialist objectives, at the same time that we fight the enemy capitalism and its imperialism?

What question could go more directly to the heart of his subject? He never raises the question but—again—he gives his answer.

EXHORTATIONS

On page 12 he is proclaiming that "I shall accordingly refuse to associate myself in any way with a world crusade against Communism *whoever are its sponsors.*" (Italics added.) One can only cheer refusal to line up with the so-called "world crusade" against Communism organized by NATO and its allies and fellow travelers. That is not what Cole is saying, though that is the impression that a hasty reader might go away with. He is saying that he is opposed also to a socialist struggle against Stalinism.

Further on in the same paragraph he announces that "I am for the Communists in Indochina." Why only in Indochina? or is that simply one place given as an example?

On page 14, he exhorts his fellow socialists not to "waste their energies in fighting against their fellow workers," meaning the Stalinists. He would not inveigh against wasting energy in fighting against "fellow workers" who happen to be mouthpieces of the Tories or company unions, or scabs. So it is not a question of fighting "fellow workers" but of fighting Stalinists.

On page 37 he deplores "discriminating nicely between those [movements in colonial countries] which reject and those which respond to Communist appeals"—a delicate piece of wording which also might be understood to decry "discriminating nicely" between movements under Stalinist control and those that aren't. And "discriminating" for what purpose? For the purpose of police-suppression, as in British Guiana, which is one thing, or for the purpose of ourselves giving support or resistance? Perhaps he himself does not discriminate nicely between these different questions.

He adds, more astonishingly: Socialists "have no right to expect the nationalists of the less developed countries to line up with the capitalist-dominated West in the cold war against Communism [which is fine, but note:] or even to understand their case against Communism as a perversion of libertarian Socialist principles. The most they have any right to hope for is the balanced neutralism of Nehru..."

So we cannot expect that the benighted nationalists of Asia, Africa or Latin America can be so very clever as we are in understanding our case against the Stalinists? There is an echo here of the contemptuous imperialist chauvinism from which Cole thinks he is free. The Burmese or Indian socialists cannot understand our case? The Chilean socialists cannot understand the real case? The Algerian socialists of Messali Hadj are

not as smart as G. D. H. Cole?...

On page 41, he remarks on the "moods of irrational hatred such as are found among many Russian refugees abroad and, I do not doubt, in Russia too." (Italics added.)

VOICE OF DESPAIR

"Collaboration" is his slogan. We must "come to terms with the Soviet Union and China on a policy of cooperative world development," he cries. (That is, we must make a deal.) And "in France the rift between the Socialist Party and the Communists must be somehow healed..." (One wonders: why only in France?)

In Italy we must welcome Nenni's alliance with the CP. (But he is not quite so candid as to advocate that all go and do likewise in their own countries, to "heal the rift.")

Yugoslavia: the Socialist International must have closer relations with the Titoists. Must good Yugoslav socialists also have closer relations with the Titoist regime? how, in or out of jail? (Incidentally, Cole's own formulation of his "Case Against the Communists" applies, word for word, to the Titoists—see summary above—but that particular crouton in the gruel floats on another page.)

Unless we hitch on to this Power, we are doomed! he cries. "Socialism cannot possibly be achieved, or any substantial advance toward it made, without their collaboration," he says of the CPs of Italy and France and perhaps others, meaning collaboration with the apparatus, not winning away the sincere Communists.

Doom, doom, he threatens. Unless the cold war is ended (by "coming to terms" with the Stalinists, of course), "unless this can be done, non-Communist Socialism will remain helpless and Communism will profit by its impotence in capturing the allegiance of the suffering peoples of the underdeveloped countries, to which non-Communist Socialism will be able to give no effective aid in their struggle for self-determination and economic freedom."

The note of despair rings out as clearly as in 1951.

WHY?

Why is socialism doomed to "remain helpless" while "Communism will profit" as long as the cold war is on? *Why* cannot socialists give "effective aid" to anti-imperialist struggles?

Because socialism is doomed to be dominated by the right-wing social-chauvinists and reformists? In that case Cole's exhortations are doomed too, and he is wasting his time in putting out pamphlets, unless his aim is merely to split off as large a pro-Stalinoid group as he can.

Why is it, in Cole's opinion, that only the agents of an exploitive despotism can dynamically appeal to the peoples' aspirations for greater freedom and greater happiness? Why can't this be done by a socialist movement that has shaken off pro-capitalism and reformism and that takes the field under a revolutionary socialist banner against both capitalism and Stalinism?

At any rate, would it not make more sense for a left-wing socialist to work within his movement for this, rather than proclaim the doom of socialism unless we ally ourselves with the totalitarian enemy of our enemy?

Cole is afraid that if socialism "sets out to fight Communism it finds itself allied with capitalism—above all, with American capitalism—against it." And this "makes it very difficult to fight for Socialism." Yet he has made speeches, which were no doubt greeted with applause, at Third Camp Conferences and such in England.

It would appear that he never has grasped an essential idea of the Third Camp approach: that one cannot fight capitalism effectively and for socialist ends unless one also combats Stalinism; just as one cannot fight Stalinism effectively as long as one is allied with the capitalists.

Don't miss a single week of

LABOR ACTION

A sub is only \$2.00 a year!

A Lesson About Labor and the Democrats

By GERRY McDERMOTT

Pittsburgh, Aug. 27

Westinghouse Local 601 (IUE) got a lesson this week on how not to use labor's political power.

Last year, Pennsylvania Governor George Leader was looking for votes for a tax bill which the local opposed. At the last minute, the local's officers wired the legislators from the East Pittsburgh area and asked them to vote for the measure. As a result, the measure carried.

Patty O'Connor, who was the president at the time, was influential in getting the local to change its stand. When he came up for re-election in the spring, he was defeated. Recently, however, he has been given a plush political job by the Leader administration.

This is wardheeling, dirty machine politics. It is the way patronage machines like Tammany Hall or the Lawrence-Kane machine work. It is all right for them, but it is no way for the union movement to conduct its politics.

The political influence of labor should not be up for sale in return for jobs or

favours; it should be used on the basis of principle. We don't have a thing against Patty O'Connor, but his acquisition of a political job with the state is not going to help the workers in 601, and that is what counts.

If the political support of a local union is for sale for jobs, the employers and their political friends will get it every time, for a very simple reason—they have the jobs to give out.

Labor does not have jobs to give out, but it has something much more potent—it has right on its side, and the interests of an overwhelming majority of the people. Once the labor movement begins to realize that it has that power, and to use it, it will become as strong in the political field as it is today in the economic field, and even stronger.

Westinghouse Local 601 (IUE) has apparently solved its problems of conducting elections democratically. At least, the two principal factions have agreed on a plan. It will be a big gain for the labor movement here if the fre-

quent charges of the past, that elections have been rigged, can be scotched.

The new plan will be used in the election of stewards for the coming year. Under the plan, members will vote in the plant during working hours; the votes will be counted and the results announced on the spot.

The plan was proposed by James Ferace, chief steward and the chairman of the elections committee, and has the support of Paul Carmichael, president of the local, and Al Thomas, who was defeated by Carmichael in the last elections. The pro-company Westinghouse Employees' Forum has said nothing so far about the new plan.

Local 601 has been plagued by charges of rigged elections ever since the days when, in the old UE, it was under Stalinist control. Such charges and counter-charges are always played up by the reactionary daily press, and serve to undermine the union.

The present plan seems to be a good one; if it can be adapted to elections for local union offices other than stewards, perhaps it should be made permanent.

The ISL Program in Brief

The Independent Socialist League stands for socialist democracy and against the two systems of exploitation which now divide the world: capitalism and Stalinism.

Capitalism cannot be reformed or liberalized, by any Fair Deal or other deal, so as to give the people freedom, abundance, security or peace. It must be abolished and replaced by a new social system, in which the people own and control the basic sectors of the economy, democratically controlling their own economic and political destinies.

Stalinism, in Russia and wherever it holds power, is a brutal totalitarianism—a new form of exploitation. Its agents in every country, the Communist Parties, are unrelenting enemies of socialism and have nothing in common with socialism—which cannot exist without effective democratic control by the people.

These two camps of capitalism and Stalinism are today at each other's throats in a worldwide imperialist rivalry for domination. This struggle can only lead to the most frightful war in history so long as the people leave the capitalist and Stalinist rulers in power. Independent Socialism stands for building and strengthening the Third Camp of the people against both war blocs.

The ISL, as a Marxist movement, looks to the working class and its ever-present struggle as the basic progressive force in society. The ISL is organized to spread the ideas of socialism in the labor movement and among all other sections of the people.

At the same time, Independent Socialists participate actively in every struggle to better the people's lot now—such as the fight for higher living standards, against Jim Crow and anti-Semitism, in defense of civil liberties and the trade-union movement. We seek to join together with all other militants in the labor movement as a left force working for the formation of an independent labor party and other progressive policies.

The fight for democracy and the fight for socialism are inseparable. There can be no lasting and genuine democracy without socialism, and there can be no socialism without democracy. To enroll under this banner, join the Independent Socialist League!

Get Acquainted!

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

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

I want to join the ISL.

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

kick in the teeth for his pains. Lewis did a great deal to "sell" FDR to the workers as their friend, and then found in 1940 that he couldn't "unsell" them.

It looks like Walter has to learn everything for himself. We predict here and now that Reuther and Carey will live to see the day when they will regret having built up Adlai.

Just one index to the irresponsibility and dishonesty of the Democrats—the existence of White Citizens Councils in the nation was not even mentioned. Incidentally, we'd like to see some enterprising journalist investigate how many delegates to the convention were members of the Councils.

Governor Goodwin Knight of California gave a champagne and lobster party for the delegates which cost \$120,000 for one evening. What's he trying to do—compete with Averell Harriman?

Sidelights on the Conventions

By GERRY McDERMOTT

There was only one thing missing in the series of carefully staged seconding speeches for Eisenhower at the Republican convention.

There was the Official Mother, who was also, to boot, bargain, from Texas.

There was the Official Catholic, who was also, to boot, from Texas.

Dame football coach, Frank Leahy, who liked to refer to "Ike the quarterback."

There was the Official Negro, who was allowed to speak despite protests from the delegates from her own state, North Carolina. (The rules were set aside so that seconding speeches could be made by people not delegates. We don't know if they had to have a card in the Actors' Union.) This delegate said of the Great Leader that it "makes you proud just to look at him."

There was the Official Jew, and just so everyone caught on for sure, in her talk she referred several times to "my rabbi."

There was also an Official Worker, and so on.

As we said, there was only one thing we missed. That was the official collective farmer from the Azerbaijanian Peoples Republic, to tell how grateful he was to the Great Leader for his Happy Life fulfilling quotas.

Which raises the question—why didn't a baseball player second Ike? How can anyone possibly vote intelligently till he knows how Mickey Mantle feels?

Present at the convention—and why not?—was Gerald L. K. Smith, who staged a rally in defense of Nixon. Guess no one told him that the Republican Party is in the Middle of the Road. Or else they didn't tell him what road it's in the middle of.

Gerald L. K. Smith must have been embarrassed the next day when Nixon announced in no uncertain terms that he was really a Liberal. Not only that, but in the vice-president's own words, he is not a "Johnny-come-lately Liberal."

As proof of this, he pointed to a speech he made way back in 1949, in which he said, "The Republican Party has gotten itself in the position of being classed as the tool of big business and vested interests. This charge is false and we should make a resounding declaration of independence from Wall Street, from Labor Bosses and any other vested interests."

Yesterday, Nixon was a McCarthyite; today he is a Liberal; during the cam-

paign, we understand, he is going to become a "Statesman (that is, he will not directly, in so many words, accuse Stevenson of personally turning over atomic secrets to the Russians).

If the United States were conquered by Baluchistan tomorrow, how long do you think it would be before Dick was wearing a turban?

A South American newspaper correspondent, after covering both conventions, sent the following despatch to his paper: "The difference between the two parties is that the Democrats claim there is a difference, and the Republicans claim there is none."

While the Democrats demagogically attacked the Republicans as the millionaires' party, an enterprising reporter went through the list of delegates and alternates to the Democratic convention and discovered no less than 275 millionaires among the Democrats. In addition, about forty more were present, giving parties, picking up checks, and lobbying.

A Democratic Party spokesman admitted that the count was accurate, but said that the Republican convention would have even more!

Among the prominent millionaires were Adlai himself, Senator John Kennedy of Massachusetts, Senator Robert Kerr of Oklahoma, Senator Lyndon Johnston of Texas, Senator Stuart Symington of Missouri, Governor Averell Harriman of New York, Governor Mennon Williams of Michigan, and Senator Herbert Lehman of New York. In short, just about every prominent leader of the party.

If anybody was even shown up as bankrupt politically, it was the lib-labs of the ADA and CIO such as Reuther and Hubert Humphrey.

For years they have been saying: "What we need in this country is a realignment of the parties. We need to get all the liberals in one responsible party and all the conservatives in another responsible party. That is what we are working for."

This convention made it plain that this was all pie-in-the-sky talk. The one candidate calculated to prevent that from happening, the one candidate acceptable to the North and to the Southern reactionaries, was the one they worked their heads off for.

Reuther is being played up in some quarters as a kingmaker. It was he, supposedly, who pressured Soapy Williams to throw the Michigan delegation to Stevenson, which was a decisive move in Stevenson's nomination. Supposedly, too, labor was instrumental in getting a place on the ticket for Kefauver.

John L. Lewis, in his time, did far more for F. D. Roosevelt than Reuther can possibly do for Stevenson, and got a

It Wasn't a Circus — —

(Continued from page 1)

read from both directions, North or South.

The Democratic plank was such an utter capitulation to the South that it opened the way for so weak a Republican effort, which could succeed in being that "shade" better without really saying anything important. The Republicans did, however, state they "accept" the court decision.

The South was given the preceding paragraph, among other things: the party "recognized that the supreme law of the land as embodied in the Constitution which guarantees to all people the blessings of liberty..." By designating the Constitution as the "supreme law" and pointedly ignoring the court at this point, the language is intended to give the Southerners the ground to argue for the permissibility of "interposition" and nullification, which is based precisely on counterposing the Constitution to the court ("states rights").

Why didn't the GOP take the opportunity to make a greater play for the Negro vote? The following considerations may have governed:

(1) Most immediately, the GOP has its eye on two senatorial seats from Kentucky.

(2) There is the longer-range aim of trying to build a real second party in the South, breaking the one-party system there.

(3) They may have felt that they were assured the victory without such an out-of-character truckling to a suspiciously "radical" appeal.

The Republican "liberals" like New York's Javits and Ives, kept their mouths as discreetly shut during this operation as did some of their Democratic similars. Javits lamely philosophized that "you can't get in any deliberative body all you want" (a clear steal from Mrs. Roosevelt), and Ives muttered that "I would have had a stronger one, left to my devices" (a clear steal from Adlai Stevenson).

But the prize for sheer gall must go to Rep. John McCormack, Democratic majority leader in Congress, chairman of the Democratic platform committee, and architect of the civil-rights atrocity in Chicago. He denounced the GOP plank as "innocuous" and went on to complain: "When we come to the meat of the Republican plank it is the weakest plank that could be devised. It is a disgrace."

It was demonstrated that neither of the two parties could produce even a demagogically progressive statement on this key issue. It demonstrated the strength of the Southern racists of both parties when they went out and fought for their white-supremacy program, unlike the liberals and laborites.