

French people are beginning to lose their stomach for the Algerian war. More and more I hear sentiments such as, "Let us get out of Algeria and leave the natives to stew in their own juice"; the general supposition being that the Algerians have neither the talent nor will to govern themselves without French overlordship.

Though there are many Algerians in Paris, they have virtually no contact with the French, including leftwingers. Until recently, the Algerian CP was under instructions to lend the "terrorists" no aid, but this policy is being belatedly brought up to date. Servan-Schreiber, whom Mollet foolishly sent with the army to Algeria as political punishment, has written a series of blistering articles for *L'Express* and is threatened with court-martial.

Frenchmen of all persuasions are openly suspicious of American intentions toward North Africa, and I have heard both radicals and conservatives speak darkly of secret American subsidies to the FLN, the Algerian resistance movement.

THE government is having conniptions seeking ways to keep the cost-of-living index to a prearranged figure. An extra one percent and the whole crazy-quilt structure of the French economy goes toppling as the workers demand wage increases.

The fact that there were no real protests against General Speidel is a rather forceful reminder of the current political numbness of not only the people but the leaders. But under the surface something is happening. I am too new here to clearly spell it out, but I do know that one of its characteristics is a growing tendency to violence, an almost taste of violence in the air, an increasing quickness of temper, a building up of pressure. Now, even when the students demonstrate on non-political matters, the police and *Garde Mobile* are brought out as for an armed invasion. The police are very nervous.

One final comment: From what I have seen of the French Left, the *American Socialist* can keep its head up with the best and is even ahead on some points.

OPINIONS

The Israeli-Arab Conflict

by A Jewish Socialist

THE writer of this communication is a Jewish socialist who participated in the Jewish labor movement before the war in Poland. I fled from Hitler and then from Stalin. Being now in the "land of the free and the home of the brave," I am reluctant to reveal my name.

I am very much interested in the problems of socialist revival in this country and hope these thoughts can be a small contribution on my part to this effect.

I attended a forum in New York on the subject of the Israeli-Arab conflict where I. F. Stone and Harvey O'Connor were the speakers. Mr. Stone represented, as he put it frankly, a "biased" view in favor of Israel. He stressed repeatedly that, being a Jew, he had to support Israel in its conflict with the Arab countries. He admitted magnanimously that there is a natural conflict between the two sides, each having its own rights, but felt that the Jewish people all over the world and in this country have to take the Israeli side, while Arab progressives might view it from the Arab side.

Having been a Jewish socialist all my adult life, I was shocked by the presentation of this case, which seems to me runs against all the principles of socialism. Doesn't it occur to Mr. Stone that there cannot be a Jewish socialist point of view as against the Arab socialist one, but that there is *one* international socialist point of view for Jewish and Arab socialists alike, and for other socialists as well?

To amplify my question, let's take a few instances pertaining to the Arab-Israeli conflict.

There is a problem of the very existence of the state of Israel. There are Arab rulers who proclaim their aim to destroy Israel by a new "holy war." It seems to me that there cannot be an "Arab socialist point of view" in support of such a war because as socialists they have to recognize the right of every nation to independence. If there are Arab socialists who nevertheless favor a war to abolish Israel, it shows only that as a matter of fact they are nationalists who betray the idea of socialism. Or, if some Arab socialists were to favor the slogan of their rulers to throw the Jews into the sea, it would show that they have nothing to do with socialism or any progressive movement which is against genocide and for freedom of all peoples.

By the same token, we are entitled to ask the adherence of Israeli or Jewish socialists in other countries to the basic principles of socialist ethics and policy.

LET'S examine the problem of Arab refugees who live in extreme destitution on the border of Israel. The Jews were victims of the Nazi idea of "living space," which held that one nation has the right to build its prosperity at the expense of others. We were opposed to this theory, not only because we were on the receiving end of the stick, but because we considered it barbarism. We appealed to all progressive forces, and to Germans among them, to resist it. Is it not a shame that the former victims of this "philosophy," having the opportunity, didn't hesitate to apply the same principle—of course not in the same barbaric manner—to their Arab neighbors? The Israeli government, which is very much concerned about the persecution of Jews in other countries, is callous in regard to the former inhabitants of the Israeli part of Palestine. The rectification of this through repatriation, resettlement, and indemnification of the Arab refugees is not an "Arab point of view" but in the first place the obligation of Jewish socialists.

Or take the situation of the Arab minority in Israel,

which lives under martial law with all discriminations, or the denial of the right to vote to the Arab workers in Israeli trade unions. Is it not the duty of the Israeli socialists to protest?

Now take the criminal adventure of the Israeli government (headed by "socialist" Mapai) in attacking Egypt in collusion with British and French imperialism. Is it possible to talk about "Israeli," or "Arab," or any other differing socialist policies? Or the right of Egypt to the Suez Canal against the policy of the former foreign exploiters. The Socialists who supported imperialist robbery against Egypt represented the interests of their own capitalists, but not the interests of the working class, or the colonial people, or socialism. The British Labor Party, after some vacillation, opposed the Tory government and thus served well the cause of British socialism. The French Socialist Party, by its involvement in this adventure, covered itself with shame and will repay for its policy bitterly in the future. Can we say that there was a British versus

a French socialist view, each right in its own country? I think the nationalist way of looking at things is not real socialist policy.

I am old enough to remember the first World War, when there were "socialists" on opposite sides supporting "their" rulers in slaughtering millions of people. There was then talk of a "German socialist position" as against the French one. This was the greatest catastrophe of socialism. Fortunately, there were groups which didn't surrender their internationalist socialist point of view to the conflicting nationalist policies of the leading socialist parties, and they saved the honor and future of socialism.

Hitlerism flooded the world with the dirty waves of nationalism, contaminating even its victims. Even now, we feel the receding foam of nationalism, but let's not overlook the swelling waves of the socialist future. And the socialist future means not only the abolition of the exploitation of one class by another, but also the exploitation of one nation by another.



Rebels All

AMERICAN RADICALS: SOME PROBLEMS AND PERSONALITIES, edited by Harvey Goldberg. *Monthly Review Press, New York, 1957, \$5.*

THIS book consists of fourteen essays, each by a different author, about American radicals of the past century, plus two additional chapters on repressions against radicalism, and on renegades from it. The fourteen men whose lives are sketched and achievements appraised are John Jay Chapman, Theodore Dreiser, Heywood Broun, Henry Demarest Lloyd, Robert M. LaFollette, John Brown, John Peter Altgeld, Vito Marcantonio, Eugene V. Debs, William Haywood, Daniel De Leon, Walter Weyl, Thorstein Veblen, and Charles A. Beard.

There are bound to be complaints against any such selection, and one can sympathize with the editor's problem of cramming into manageable size an anthology of persons representative enough to satisfy numerous critics. It can be claimed with justice that, as one of the broadest streams of American radicalism up to the twenties was the constantly renewed rebellion of the farmer, some of the farm radicals, for example that dynamo salesman of a socialist farm program Arthur C. Townley, should have been included. It is hard to see how, if Theodore Dreiser is included, writers of fiction like Jack London or Upton Sinclair, or for that matter Edward Bellamy, can be left out, unless one is to take as his

criterion artistic excellence rather than broad national impact. No one can quarrel with the choice of the three socialist leaders—Debs, Haywood, and De Leon—but it would be immensely profitable for some writers of the Left to grapple today with figures like Hillquit and Berger; they were less colorful, and their careers may be less sympathetic to us today, but the job of taking account of their line of thought in some detail and with sobriety is long overdue.

And finally, again with deference to the editor and his many problems, it is pretty hard to justify the absence of Wendell Phillips, one of the grandest figures in American history, and the man in whom Abolitionism and labor radicalism of the post-Civil War era found their living link. Even Richard Hofstadter's "The American Political Tradition and the Men Who Made It" includes Phillips as the sole rebel in its galaxy of eight presidents, two cabinet officers, and the Founding Fathers.

IT is startling, when one considers it, that although the labor movement is universally considered to be the indispensable foundation for modern radicalism, most of the figures considered in this book (outside of the three socialist leaders) had no connection with organized labor. The accent is on middle-class radicalism, both personally and doctrinally. In this case, there is no criticism of the editors intended. It is a reflection of the sharp cleavage between middle class radicalism and the labor unions which never organized their own political structure. Some middle class radicals attached themselves of course, to the Socialist and Communist movements, but these always remained minority currents in the nation.

It is noteworthy in this connection that some of the writers in this book put a somewhat different interpretation upon the policies of the radical movement of the thirties than we have been accustomed to. Thoughtful people on the Left are starting

to re-evaluate the policies which aided the complete subordination of the labor movement, and of the radical movement in great measure too, to the middle-class reform program of the New Deal, and hence rendered itself extremely vulnerable when that phase of our history ended abruptly. "In the '30s and early '40s," write Harvey Goldberg and William Appleman Williams in their introductory essay, "the pitfalls were deep and the failures great for American radicals. Abandoning the independence and vigor attached to the rich tradition of the men described below, many sincere men and women were tempted into the easy solution. Either they became Russophiles, or they cast in their lot with the liberals and sought to change America by using the power of the existing national government." It is this thought that contains some of the reasons why, at the very moment when an independent labor radicalism seemed ready to emerge at last in America, it was dissolved back into New Deal liberalism. The radicals in the best position to aid and lead at least a section of labor along a new great path doubled the unions back on their tracks in alliance with the older union leaders.

THE quality of the essays in the book is very uneven, and an overall judgment is pretty much out of the question. A number of essays catch the spirit of their subjects strikingly. Richard Sasuly's sketch of Vito Marcantonio, for example, despite an unsuccessful half-attempt to rationalize Marcantonio's changes of line at the time of the Hitler-Stalin pact, is a fine picturization. Also of professional skill is John Lydenberg's perceptive portrait of Theodore Dreiser. Some other essays, notably those on Lloyd, LaFollette, and Altgeld, effectively re-create a slice of our history.

Only a few of the essays are of the probing variety. Bert Cochran contributes an acute evaluation of Debs and his role, far more rewarding than the ceremonial rhetoric which Debs has inspired over the