

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

October 24, 1955

FIVE CENTS

**The SPD Opposition in Germany**

... page 6

**Student Strikes in Bolivia**

... page 3

**Fight in the Steel Union Heating Up**

... page 2

**Hounds and Hares in the Russian Press**

... page 7

## A Puzzle for Liberals: Demo Right Wing Is Coalescing Around Adlai Stevenson

By PHILIP COBEN

President Eisenhower's heart attack triggered off the 1956 presidential race a little before its time, just as it triggered off latent tensions on the stock market. For the most part, as the Washington correspondents are saying in their cynical way, the picture is "politics as usual."

Republican and Democratic hopefuls are jockeying: Nixon is cleaning himself up for inspection, with the aid of sympathetic journalistic detergents; Harriman is slaving for the nomination; Stevenson is playing elder statesman uneasily. Above all, what is most "as usual" about this outbreak of politics is its American-type unpoliticalness; that is, its lack of political content as compared with political maneuver; that is, its programlessness.

But in spite of and behind the relative programlessness of current U. S. politics—which is one of the luxuries that a war-economy prosperity allows American capitalism to enjoy along with TV sets and refrigerators—political lines are being blocked out.

The most interesting development which is shaping up at this time concerns the tendency of the Democratic Party conservative wing to adopt "liberal" Adlai Stevenson as its man.

This too is in the sparring stage at the moment, and events may still take a different turn; but at this point it looks as if the Democratic liberals face demoralizing problems.

The demoralization they face is built into their decayed version of liberalism. Already in 1952 it was perfectly clear that Stevenson was substantially to the right even of Truman's demagogic Fair-Dealism-on-the-half-shell. (Incidentally, LABOR ACTION's documentation of this during the 1952 campaign is a job that stands up to re-reading.)

Yet the liberals insisted stridently on convincing themselves that their witty intellectual leader was a standard-bearer of liberalism. As they hung on to his coattails, with the very slightest of encouraging words from him on the issues, he in turn sought to bring them over to reconciliation with and capitulation to the Southern conservatives and racists.

This has been the Stevenson pattern for the past three years. This is the pattern now, and Stevenson may be coming into his reward.

### SOUTHERN OK

As the field shapes up now, Stevenson's chances are challenged by New York Governor Harriman and Senator McFauver. As against these two contenders, the strength that is being unveiled by Stevenson is the fact that he is the only one acceptable to the Southern white-supremacists.

As Tammany boss De Sapio thrashed through California for some Harriman pick-ups, Kentucky's Governor Wetherby fired a shot on behalf of the favorite, with the statement "that Adlai Stevenson is the Democrats' strongest presiden-

tial candidate and that the South will vote solidly for him if he's nominated." (N. Y. Post, Oct. 17.) The point was reinforced since "Wetherby made his observation after talks with 16 governors at the Point Clear, Alabama, site of the Southern Governors Conference..."

Democratic National Chairman Butler, a Stevenson man, made the same argument, following a trip through the four Southern states which deviated to Eisenhower in 1952; he pointedly professed his conviction that there was going to be a Solid South again in 1956.

The N. Y. Times the next day reported in some detail the work being done by Democratic Senate leader Lyndon Johnson of Texas to consolidate a "centrist coalition" (i.e., right-wing bloc) within the party which would be able to control

the nominating convention and dictate its platform. "Indeed, Senator Johnson had told friends that Mr. Stevenson would be a more acceptable candidate in the South than would Governor Harriman."

The Southerners would prefer their own Senator Russell, of course, but they do not really think they could put this Georgian over on the party or the country. The Times report amounts to conveying that the Southerners and right-wingers are organizing in order to make sure that along with Stevenson they also get platform concessions—not only on the party "loyalty oath" issue and states rights but also endorsement of the Democratic Congress's record in fighting for next to nothing against the Eisenhower

(Turn to last page)

### SOUTHERN COMFORT



ADLAI STEVENSON

## IUE's Westinghouse Strike Is First Big Challenge to Speedup

By BEN HALL

On October 17, 46,000 members of the International Union of Electrical Workers (IUE-CIO) stopped work at 29 Westinghouse plants in 10 states. It was the first major strike called by their union against either of the nation's largest manufacturers of electrical equipment. Westinghouse is second only to General Electric.

By the strike call alone, the IUE asserts its right to a place among the leading industrial unions.

Through a key demand, the union takes up a fight that has been gingerly dodged even by far more powerful unions like the UAW. The issue of speed-up and time-study is being fought out on a national basis with top management at a time when the national agreement has expired and is up for renegotiation.

Last month the IUE shut down all its Westinghouse plants briefly over the same issue. The strike, pinpointed around a single grievance, continued for a time even after IUE President Carey had signed an agreement with the company to end it.

Time-study men had pulled their clocks on hourly workers at the company's East Pittsburgh plant. Local 601, which holds the local contract, protested and sparked a walkout that was quickly supported by the IUE's Westinghouse Conference Board. A temporary compromise sent workers back to their jobs, but the basic issue must be settled.

The union demands what other unions

in mass-production industries have already surrendered. It bluntly resists the right of the employer to set production standards for workers paid by the hour (not by the piece).

The significance of this demand is highlighted by one fact alone: in virtually every big auto factory, plant authorities assert and practice this right without basic challenge from the powerful UAW. The auto union does not resist the employers' basic right; it merely reserves its own right to protest an unfair application of the company right.

The issue is so critical to all mass-production workers that it is incredible that it can be handled in so routine a fashion by the labor movement. One reads nothing about it in the union press.

### SENSITIVE SPOT

The IUE-CIO News reports the events on an inner page as though it were a routine matter. Leaders of the biggest unions in the country have been afraid to handle this question because it touches the employers' most sensitive profit nerve.

Here are some excerpts from the IUE report:

"The union's proposed 'ground rules' for handling company studies of day workers, while providing for surveys and general measurements necessary for the company's production improvements and general budget determinations, would prevent studies of day-worker operations for the purpose of establishing individual production standards where no incentive payments are permitted."

"In view of explicit statements by Westinghouse that its wage proposal is tied into its 'efficiency' program, we are forced to the conclusion that Westinghouse wants to be free to take back with one hand what it gives with the other. What clearer proof do we need than that the company has refused to make any offer in regard to studies of day workers even though less than two weeks ago it agreed to negotiate on that subject."

The IUE spotlights the cause of dissatisfaction of literally hundreds of thousands of union members who resent poor "working conditions" and who are forced again and again into quick strikes. What the companies give with one hand they take back with the other. Wages rise; more fringe benefits are won. But these are paid for by human speed-up: faster production lines; increased work quotas.

So far, the labor movement has no over-all answer. At Westinghouse, the IUE-CIO lays down a basic challenge to management's right to speed up.

[See page 2 for story on Westinghouse strike from Pittsburgh.—ED.]

**WITCHHUNT**

NEXT WEEK!

SEE BACK PAGE FOR  
HEART-RENDING STORY!

## STEEL WORKERS

## Fight in Steel Union Heating Up

By EMIL MODIC

The wraps are off in the fight for the vice-presidency of the CIO United Steelworkers, which is seeing a revolt against the grip of President Dave McDonald.

A special election is scheduled on October 25. Three vacancies are to be filled, created by deaths: a vice-presidency to succeed the late James Thimmes, and two district directorships.

The acting vice-president now is Howard R. Hague. Hague got the job upon McDonald's recommendation to a meeting of the union's Executive Board on March 2. But this appointment touched off an organized campaign to overturn it. Hague's opponent is Joseph P. Moloney, director of the union's District 4 (New York).

Moloney was a steel worker during the Little Steel Strike and a local union officer at the time. Through the years, he has been a union organizer and leader. Hague is a McDonald office boy pure and simple. The attempt to elevate him into national leadership has cracked the McDonald administration.

One of the leaflets issued by the Moloney group tells why.

"We can find no record of Howard Hague working in the steel mills as a man. He may have worked during vacation when he was a boy. He never belonged to a union until he was employed by our national office. He has never attended a meeting of the local union in which he carried his card. He never walked a picket line; never was a local union officer; never was on strike; or led a strike; never organized a local union." After a dozen other "nevers," it remarks that he "has been in charge of other office employees as office manager. Has training as a boss, but not as workers representative."

The Moloney campaign, coinciding with special elections for regional directors, takes the form of a small organized slate. In District 15, Homestead, Pa., his campaign is conducted jointly with regional candidate Paul Hilbert. And in District 28, Cleveland, he is joined by candidate Nicholas Radlick. There is no contest in the third district.

Until recently, the campaign has been very gentlemanly. Moloney professed his friendship for McDonald and declared that he was opposing Hague only because Hague, a boyhood chum of McDonald's, had never worked in the mills.

In recent weeks, however, violence has broken out against the Moloney forces. Windows with Moloney posters in them have been broken. In Chicago, Moloney supporters distributing literature have been beaten up.

Moloney men charge their opponents with attempted murder, no less. On September 14, an arsonist set fire to a house trailer in which three Moloney supporters were asleep. Fortunately, the blaze was brought under control before it spread.

The trailer had been purchased by union members and locals as a contribution to the Moloney campaign. It was touring the country distributing his literature. At the time of the arson attempt, the trailer, manned by three Moloney men, was concentrating its educational efforts at the Pittsburgh plant of the Bethlehem Steel Corporation, a Hague stronghold.

McDonald has deplored this violence, but suggested that it may be the acts of "agents-provocateur." This may possibly be true with regards to the trailer fire, but it is certainly no mystery who beat up the Moloney men in Chicago.

As the election draws near, Moloney has dropped his friendly pose toward McDonald. Speaking to a rally of his supporters in Cleveland on October 16, he declared that there was a need "to bring some humility to the leaders of this union."

He was wildly cheered when he went on to assert: "Our president [David J. McDonald] is showing signs of thinking that he is the union; and, by God, he is not the union."

Moloney further declared that his candidacy was a test of democracy within the union. "If anyone is fired [from the staff] for taking part in this campaign," he declared, "we will go on strike in the New York District and we will picket 1500 Commonwealth Building." The latter address is the headquarters of the International in Pittsburgh.

## SEAMFN

## Curran's Third Purge

By BEN HALL

In the National Maritime Union, President Joe Curran has not quite succeeded in creating the type of monolithic, submissive leadership that he learned to admire in the days when he was a Stalinist stooge. But he keeps trying.

Two top NMU officers now in line for official execution are: M. Hedley Stone, treasurer; and Adrian Duffy, a vice-president. The 10th biennial union convention, upon Curran's recommendation, voted to merge the office of treasurer, now held by Stone, with that of secretary. Union elections take place soon. If Stone runs for the merged post he will be opposed by Curran and defeated. Duffy too will be rejected by the official machine, and is doomed.

The convention composed their epitaph, voting to condemn them both as "unworthy of the trust the membership bestowed upon them" and for "setting themselves above the will of the membership."

Their crimes—in fact just about the only high crime on NMU statute books—is opposing Curran on a key question. In August 1954, Curran decided to dodge conflict with the Taft-Hartley Law by opening union books to non-members and permitting non-union seamen to use union hiring-halls. Duffy and Stone vigorously opposed this policy at the union's National Council meetings, and that was the beginning of their end.

This will be the third purge of the union's upper leadership since the break between Curran and the Communist Party.

In 1949 he proposed to bar Communists from membership in the NMU. A

group headed by then Vice-President Jack Lawrenson opposed him on this question and at first succeeded in defeating his proposition in a membership referendum. But Curran would not accept a mere democratic vote. He relied on other methods.

## TWO MORE GO

He organized a faction squadron of strong-arm men from all over the country and brought them to New York to beat up oppositionists, tear up their membership books, and terrorize meetings. Even so, he could not have succeeded in the early critical days of the fight without the open support of the city's Police Department. Finally he drove his critics off the ships and expelled them from the union.

But by 1953 two top officers who had rallied loyally to his side in the fight against Lawrenson were appalled by the trends they detected in the Curran machine. Neal Hanley, then secretary, and H. Warner, a vice-president and prominent Negro unionist, charged that the Curran regime was tolerating the growth of Jim Crow tendencies in the union, and condemned it for not taking steps against a ring of racketeers selling union books illegally. Curran, with all the machinery of power in his hands, cut them down, and out of the leadership they went. Ironically, Warner and Hanley made Duffy and Stone the main objects of their attack.

Now Duffy and Stone must go. Not because of charges leveled against them by former leaders; only because they criticized Curran.

## LABOR SCOPE

## BEHIND LABOR PEACE: THE O-K PLANT CASE

By G. W. RUSSELL

In October the U. S. Department of Labor released figures which were loudly proclaimed by savants of labor-management tranquillity as proof that class strife had long seen its day in America. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the past fiscal year saw the least number of strikes and lost man-hours due to strikes since the end of the Second World War.

Yet behind this façade of outward labor peace there are different signs, typified by the bitter Kohler strike in Wisconsin and now by the violence in New Castle, Indiana.

The same situation can be found all over the country in smaller communities which have only recently experienced the organization of workers in their plants and factories. Because it is going on outside the bigger cities, little attention has been focused upon the pattern of constant fighting by the newly unionized workers for the elementary right of representation, a pattern which resembles in some ways the experience of the mass organizing of the '30s. Long apart from the mainstream of American industry these small plants were often placed in the rural communities that they are in because their owners intended to get away from "urban" worker organization and its high wages (or rather living wages).

Typical is the community of Ada, Ohio. A university town located in Northwestern Ohio not far from the oil refineries of Lima and Findlay, its population of 3000 represents the typical Midwestern community which has attracted a small industry whose owners hold to the "benevolent employer" ideology.

Back in the late 1930s, after the disastrous Cincinnati flood wiped out their original Covington (Kentucky) plant, the Ohio-Kentucky Manufacturing Company decided to locate upstate in Ada. The town fathers gave their blessing and the company operated for a number of years on a seasonal basis with the majority of its employees being local farmers who worked in the factory during the winter months. Then with the coming of the war years, the small company realized its share of profiteering with over a million dollars worth of various government contracts for the "O-K" line of leather athletic goods. Assembly-line workers who turned out the company basketballs, volleyballs, baseball gloves and such still were paid below the state and national minimum wage law, however.

With plenty of money and time the company could afford to threaten a complete shutdown if production workers, many now on a yearly basis, grumbled about wages and lack of piece rates. With continued expansion, the large Wilson Athletic Goods Manufacturing Company of Chicago began to show interest in the Ada plant, and in January of this year purchased it. By the end of June over 140 were employed on a full-time basis and in another month, by a vote of 74 to 32, the employees voted to organize a union of the Textile Workers of America (CIO).

## INTRANSIGENT BOSSES

The union was voted in after a barrage of anti-union propaganda through full-page advertisements in the local paper and letters from the Chamber of Commerce mailed to company employees before the TWA local was voted in July 19. In blaring headlines the company stated that its employees would obtain no more benefits or wages from them through union membership, and that the "management preferred to deal directly with its employees rather than 'an outside agency.'"

With little attempt to hide its attitude, the company said that if "the union is voted into the Ada plant, we fear . . . we will have strikes and continual turmoil and the plant may suffer the same fate as did [the] Schenectady plant," referring to the upstate New York plant which Wilson closed a number of years ago rather than tolerate a union.

On September 1 the union went out on strike, demanding a wage which was at least above the proposed national minimum wage, arbitration of grievances, and a union shop. Since the beginning of the strike the company representatives have childishly evaded all attempts at arbitration, letting outside spokesmen within the Chamber of Commerce say that it will not negotiate until the strikers return to work.

Some 120 production strikers are still on strike; the only development came when the company attempted to import scabs the second day of the walkout, at which time they were successfully prevented from entering the plant by the pickets.

The company maintains that if the workers have a grievance they can "talk" about it, but with no provision for settlement, after they return to work. Long notorious for maintaining a wage

(Continued bottom of next page)

## THE IUE STRIKE

## Westinghouse Gets Tough

By GERRY McDERMOTT

Pittsburgh, Oct. 17

For the second time in five weeks, the IUE-CIO has shut down the Westinghouse Corporation's plants throughout the country. Until this year, the IUE had never struck a nation-wide chain.

Westinghouse has been on a union-busting rampage ever since the split between the IUE and UE. They were stopped in their tracks early in September by a nation-wide strike, but they have not yet given up.

Unlike General Motors, Ford, Chrysler, U. S. Steel, Goodyear, Goodrich and other industrial giants, Westinghouse apparently believed that a flood of company propaganda would persuade the people not to strike. For the last several months, Westinghouse workers have been bombarded with full-page newspaper ads, distorted newspaper stories, stacked television newscasting, letters through the mail, and everything else. It didn't work.

The current strike is over wages and time-study grievances. The union has a

two-year contract with one year to run, but the contract had a reopener on wages this fall. The union asked 15 cents an hour (the same raise granted earlier this year by the steel industry and by General Electric) and assurances that the company would negotiate the time-study question instead of taking unilateral action.

The company instead demanded that the present contract be torn up, although it has a year to run, and that the union sign a new five-year contract. The company bases its demands for a five-year contract on the fact that the union signed a five-year contract with General Electric.

But the five-year contract which Westinghouse offered was inferior in every respect to the General Electric settlement. Most important, Westinghouse, alone among major corporations in the country, refuses to arbitrate grievances after they have gone through the grievance procedure. This means either that the union must strike over every grievance or else lose virtually every grievance.

There is some evidence that Westinghouse will try to break this strike. The company has announced that it intends to keep the plants open.

Furthermore, in Local 601 in East Pittsburgh, the key local in the chain, a last-minute attempt was made to rescind the strike vote. While no one has suggested that the people who made this attempt were acting in collusion with Westinghouse, if the vote had carried it would have torpedoed the union position throughout the country. However, when the disastrous motion came to a vote, it received only about 20 votes in a meeting of several thousand.

The entire labor movement must be on the alert against any attempt by Westinghouse to try Perfect Circle or Kohler tactics in a major corporation. This is a strike which must be won even if it means shutting down the steel mills and auto plants in sympathy. However, the growing militancy and solidarity of the Westinghouse workers indicates that this will be unnecessary.

FRIDAY at 9 p.m.

OCTOBER 28

MAX SHACHTMAN

ON

The Fight  
for Civil Rights  
and Civil Liberties  
in America

at the

FRATERNAL CLUBHOUSE  
110 West 48 Street, N. Y. C.

Auspices of  
ZUKUNFT BRANCH  
WORKMEN'S CIRCLE

ADMISSION FREE, ALL INVITED

**BOLIVIA**

# Student Strikes Reflect Crisis in Paz Government

By JUAN REY

The Bolivian regime of Paz Estenssoro is now facing a serious political crisis which it provoked by an attack on the autonomy of the universities.

University autonomy is a strong tradition in Bolivia; the students elect their professors and together with the faculty vote on all fundamental questions affecting the school. The Nationalist regime's course of gradually suppressing all opposition led it to exert pressure also on the universities.

In spite of the increasing destruction of political opposition, the universities and higher-education schools remained a focus for independent political currents in general and, in particular, for Stalinism, for the POR-Trotskyists, and on the right for Falangism (in imitation of Franco fascism).

Most of the universities are rife with teachers of Stalinist inclination; ever since the 1946 revolution against Villaroel, the Stalinist party (PIR) has made this field its stronghold. The students, educated by their teachers, preserved a spirit of ideological independence and opposition as regards the Nationalist government.

Since the government did not wish to attack the student youth officially in its own name, the job was undertaken by the Nationalist trade-union leaders, headed by Juan Lechin, who control the trade-union center COB (Central Obrera Boliviana). The COB adopted a resolution condemning the oppositional position of the "remnants of the Rosca" in the schools, and likewise the autonomy of the universities; it demanded the introduction of what it called "workers' control" and parity for workers' delegates in university councils.

Occupation of the university in Oruro, which is controlled by Stalinist professors, provoked local school strikes by

teachers and students. Under the leadership of ex-minister Lechin, the COB tried to counter by proclaiming a "general strike" in support of its attack on university autonomy. But the teachers and students replied with an effective general strike in the schools and universities. A street meeting by the striking students attacked and destroyed the plant of the government's official organ.

(In an action of their own which is independent of all this, in addition, the radio and telegraph workers—who are very important in this country—also went on strike and have been out for more than two weeks now. Their union is led by men of independent socialist leanings.)

To foreign readers, a student strike may seem irrelevant or unimportant, but in Bolivia this is a serious political problem. A government which undertakes to fight the students is asking for a political crisis. The killing of a few students by police could trigger off a political revolution and the fall of the government. That is how the revolution against Villaroel began in 1946—with a teachers' strike that was backed by a student strike and then by a general strike of the workers.

### UPRISING POSSIBLE

The Nationalist regime is well aware of the danger but it insists on suppressing university autonomy because it finds it dangerous. Paz Estenssoro's regime is developing toward a dictatorship which is incapable of tolerating any center of opposition.

The Stalinist elements in the universities are independent Stalinists, that is, they are not organized in the CP; and they represent a strong ideological force capable of resisting the government. The Nationalists fear the reconstruction of the 1946 alliance between the Stalinist elements and the democratic-rightists, an alliance that might be able to defeat them.

The job of bringing the universities to heel was given to Juan Lechin because, as general secretary of the COB, he could organize a workers' "penal expedition" against the "university Rosca." But the job was not so simple as the government thought.

And so, under the superficial appearance of a student strike there is a very serious political action taking place against the government. The problem goes deeper than the autonomy question. The Paz regime is wallowing in economic crisis and political difficulties. The country shows its discontent in the only way it can, after the destruction of opposition parties. Because the workers are domesticated by the COB and controlled by the Nationalists, this discontent shows up in the universities and in the student strike.

The regime is now at loggerheads with the youth and with the country. As indicated, some incidents could touch off an armed uprising. In the course of such a fight it is possible that the workers would divide and that opposition workers might support the rebellion. In that case the fate of the regime might well be sealed. But this is mere speculation now, good only to indicate the latent dynamite in the present crisis.

**TUNISIA**

# Under Partial Autonomy, Now Tunisians Face Economic Tasks

By DAVID ALEXANDER

Last month the Moslem quarter of Tunis was alive with the nationalist Star and Crescent. The bey had just signed the Franco-Tunisian Convention at Carthage. This was the final act in the accord which had been agreed on April 22.

The signature by the bey was the end of the chapter which had started in October 1951 when the talks between Chenik and Youssef on the one hand and Pleven and Schuman on the other reached deadlock. Early the following year there were riots and demonstrations in the main towns of Tunisia, and many nationalist leaders including Chenik, Mzai, Materi and Ben Salem, together with tens of thousands of their followers, were consigned to concentration camps in Southern Tunisia. The new governor general, M. de Hautecloque, arrived at Tunis in a warship.

Soon, however, the attention of the United Nations was drawn to the situation, and Voizard, a more liberal governor general, was sent to initiate discussions with the nationalists, but they achieved little. The accession of Mendès-France to the premiership of France was heralded by an insurrection of fellaghas, as a result of which the French premier made his famous flying visit to Tunisia. He enrolled the support of the nationalists in aborting the fellagha revolt in exchange for a promise of some degree of self-government. Talks on this subject were started, and since that date July 31, 1954, there have been no organized riots in Tunisia. Negotiations were finally concluded after settlement of two controversial questions: compulsory teaching of Arabic but French control of the Tunisian army and diplomatic activities.

By the terms of the agreement the Tunisians are given internal autonomy with the exception of police, justice and frontier control, which will undergo a twenty-year evolution to "Tunisification." The Resident General is to be replaced by a High Commissioner who will have control of foreign affairs and be responsible for the 220,000 Frenchmen and other Europeans of French nationality. French investments are safeguarded, and Tunisia is to remain within the "franc" area. Such was the deal.

### NEXT MOVE

Now that they have gained at least partial autonomy the next move is up to the Tunisians. We found that the Neo-Destour (claiming 450,000 members) and the UGTT (trade-union federation with 110,000 members) had vague plans. They talk of a "two-stage struggle"—the first stage being the struggle for full political power and the second being the building up of the country economically.

Achmed ben Salah, the secretary of the UGTT, listed some of the economic measures which they propose to take. First they want to put substantial taxes on the wool, alfa, oil and cork productions which are at present controlled by foreign interests. This would raise capital for development of Tunisian enterprises.

At the same time they intend to approach international organizations for

grants and loans to develop their industries; this source is obviously preferable to private capital. With this money they want to set up factories to process paper, oil, iron and phosphates which are at present exported as raw materials.

As over half of the male population is "without work" (they distinguish between the unemployed, and those who have never had work) they intend to irrigate and develop the central area of the country. They plan to start up collective agricultural settlements on the example of Israel. They also intend to continue the work camps providing employment for about 20,000 people at a time, which the French have already started.

The French settlers have, on the whole, taken the signature of the conventions with less hostility than elsewhere in North Africa. Even the most reactionary see in it at least an end to the uncertainty which has bedeviled business there. Furthermore, their main fear, expropriation of their investments, has been allayed by French control of "security" police, the ports and aerodromes.

The economic-entrenchment clauses which have been attacked severely by the Left, are the price the Tunisians have to pay for any degree of self-government. Leaders of both the trade unions and Neo-Destour admit, albeit ruefully, that their need of foreign capital and technicians compels them to treat foreign investments generously; but they also state privately but unequivocally that when they achieve full political power they will feel at liberty to deal with foreign capital on their own terms.

### FRENCH FEARS AND HOPES

The French in Tunisia have a certain uneasiness about their economic future. The progressive "Tunisification" of the government and the economy will eventually ease them out of their jobs.

However, the French minister at the Residence seemed more assured. He pointed out that there were now more British people in India than when it was a colony, and he thought the same would happen in Tunisia. Another important factor was that many of the leaders of Neo-Destour were French-educated; they wore French clothes, drank a little, etc.; their whole inspiration was French, and their policy would be guided by this rather than a Moslem one; the Arab espousal of their cause at the United Nations might make them want to hide this fact, but their behavior clearly proved it. Such are French hopes now.

It would be idle to pretend that Tunisian access to political power will by itself solve the major problems of unemployment, starvation, poverty, ill health and illiteracy. In a way the Franco-Tunisian agreement has involved the Tunisians in promises not to hinder the foreign exploitation of their own main sources of wealth, so that their proposed economic expansion, which is their only course, is already greatly impeded.

They must build a country out of what the French have left them. They have little capital and few technicians. Nevertheless, the Tunisian leaders like Tahar ben Ammar, Mongi Slim, and Habib Bourguiba are men of considerable ability.

## LABORSCOPE

(Continued from page 2)

barely above most state minimum wage laws, they now "offer" 95 cents an hour for most workers, and for the others, nothing. Wilson's outstanding accomplishment since coming to Ada was its unmerciful slashing of piece rates.

And in making no pretense of its dislike of unions, the Ada plant finds itself in the same company as Kohler or the Perfect Circle Co. The issue is not a new one; it had its parallel in every large industrialized city in the country two decades ago. Today it has counterparts all over rural America, a constant and dramatic proof of the reality behind "labor peace."

**There's No Angel Around to finance LABOR ACTION. It has appeared every week since 1940 because it's been backed by the dimes and dollars of independent socialists — AND YOUR SUBSCRIPTIONS.**

**A sub is only \$2 a year—Subscribe now!**

**A New Collection!**

### MARX AND ENGELS ON BRITAIN

Contains the whole of Engels' *Condition of the Working Class in England* in addition to dozens of their articles and letters. 538 pages—fully indexed—hard-cover—fine binding—but only \$2.50! All orders must be accompanied by payment.

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

# Algerian Terror Hits Civil Liberties in France Too

The Algerian war is beginning to seriously endanger civil liberties in France. As the scholar Louis Massignon has said: "It has not been possible to transform Algeria into three French departments, but now France is being transformed into 89 Algerian departments."

For several weeks hundreds of Algerians have been arrested in Paris, in Lyon and in the North, and are sent to concentration camps in Algeria, often without any evidence of any "crime," such as membership in the now illegal MTLD.

On July 29, the anarchist construction worker Pierre Morain, a member of the Fédération Communiste Libertaire (FCL), was sentenced in Lille to five months prison, along with 21 Algerian workers, for "reconstitution of a dissolved league," i.e., reorganizing the MTLD. The government has now appealed the verdict in an attempt to get the sentence increased.

There have been continuous police interrogatories and temporary arrests of members of the Trotskyist PCI, of the FCL and of the Stalinist youth organization.

Finally, an increasing number of left-wing papers have been seized in France. The following is a partial list: *La Vérité*, weekly of the PCI, holds an honorable record with three seizures this year (March 8, Aug. 3 and Aug. 19) for articles on Algeria and on the strike in Nantes. On August 19 the police also destroyed the type-face. *Le Libertaire*, organ of the FCL, was seized on July 7 and on August 4. It had already been seized once last year on November 11, after the Algerian revolt of November 1, 1954. *L'Humanité*, the CP daily, was seized on August 24 because of an article protesting against the terror in Algeria. *France-Observateur* was seized on September 8 because of an editorial by Claude Bourdet protesting against troops being sent to North Africa. The issue later appeared in France with a

blank-page instead of the editorial.

In Algeria, all issues of *La Vérité* have been automatically seized since November 1, 1954; so have most issues of *Le Libertaire*. *France-Observateur* has been seized four times, *Le Monde* once (on August 24) and *La République Algérienne* (weekly of the UDMA) once on September 14. On October 1, the current issue of the left-Catholic review *Esprit* was also seized. In Morocco, *France-Observateur* has twice been seized and *L'Express*, a liberal weekly, once.

On September 13, the small Algerian CP was completely suppressed, and several of its leading members were imprisoned, deported or put into concentration camps. Its press, *Alger Républicain* and *Liberté*, has been prohibited since September 15. Needless to mention, the press of the MTLD has been prohibited since the suppression of the party in November 1954. Its weekly, *L'Algérie Libre*, had been seized 52 times (one week out of two) between 1952 and 1954.

# J. ARTHUR RANK

## A PORTRAIT OF BRITAIN'S MOVIE MONOPOLIST

By BOB MILLAR

J. Arthur Rank had good news for his shareholders last week. To the busy box offices of Odeon and Gaumont cinemas have come a record stream of customers. Result? More for the shareholders' pockets.

Odeon Theatres' profits hit an all-time high of £8,727,000. Dividends go up from 15 to 25 per cent. A one-for-one bonus issue is to be distributed.

This all-star bill will no doubt boost Mr. Rank's reputation among the shareholders, but will it bring better films, cheaper tickets and higher wages? I doubt it.

For Mr. Rank, Emperor of Filmland, is a businessman pure and simple. Although his talents are extraordinary, his beliefs are not. He is a strict believer in "untrammelled enterprise," and its profits.

**How did this man, who was a relatively unknown flour miller eighteen years ago, become the controller of a great entertainment industry? The story is in the tradition of his best success-story productions.**

Less than twelve years ago, for an original outlay of £1,700,000, he gained control of an insignificant company called Manorfield Investments Ltd. Springing from it was an empire which is now said to be worth £62 million.

This investment company owned Odeon Theatres and the General Film Finance Corporation. In turn, the Corporation controlled the Metropolitan and Bradford Trust and General Film Distributors.

But that is not the completion of the financial jigsaw. The Metropolitan and Bradford Trust owns (take a deep breath)—the Gaumont Picture Corporation. Simple, isn't it?

**That is the financial structure of J. Arthur Rank's empire. What does it mean in terms of monopoly power?**

In addition to the Odeon and Gaumont cinema circuits, there is also the A.B.C. These three groups, between them, control more than a third of all the cinema seats in Britain.

But more important, they own over 70 per cent of all the first-run cinemas which seat over 1,500 people. The Rank Organization owns 58 per cent of them.

### 'THE WORST THING . . .'

So the Emperor of Filmland has a major interest in the films we watch through his cinema ownership—and, of course, by virtue of his share in film production. But his real monopoly power extends far beyond these figures.

Any producer making films must get a booking from the big circuits if he wants to recoup his production costs. That mostly means making a deal with the Rank-owned General Film Distributors, which seems to have fixed ideas about what the public ought to see—and thus helps to influence what films are made.

There have been occasions in the past when bookings have been refused to independent producers. Mr. Rank's own first interest in the cinema was as a producer of religious films. One, *Turn of the Tide*, won international awards but could not get a showing in the major circuits. The romantic story is that this setback made him determined to have his own cinemas!

Owning the bulk of Britain's first-line

cinemas and a heavy hand in the distribution side is not the limit of his influence over the silver-screen.

He also controls Universal and Gaumont newsreels and has a big stake in Movietone—and there are only five newsreels shown in the country.

These, alas, are only his more glamorous interests. His other, more humdrum job is chairman of Joseph Rank, flour millers. This business, built up by his Bible-thumping father, is no small fry. Along with Spillers it has a monopoly grip on the whole industry.

This flour milling company makes over £4 million profits each year and has now branched into the bakery trade. As it is mainly a family business, the bulk goes into the Rank coffers.

With a majority holding in Manorfield Investment, most of the profits made by its subsidiaries also enrich the same small group of people.

Our daily bread—as well as our weekly films—thus help to keep Mr. Rank in power. For make no mistake about it. He is there to stay.

Shareholders were also told last week that Odeon Theaters will have a new name—Rank Organization Ltd. This means that the decision, two months ago, to hand over the Rank shares to a trust did not mean a change of control.

**The British film industry is still dominated by the Yorkshireman whom James Mason called . . . "the worst thing that has happened to the British film industry."**

—Tribune (London), Sept. 9.

## BOOKS AND IDEAS: Hoffer versus Passion

# The Quietist State of Mind

THE PASSIONATE STATE OF MIND, by Eric Hoffer.—Harper & Brothers, 1955.

By A. STEIN

Several years ago the propagandists of the New Conservatism and the old New Deal had the fortune to discover Eric Hoffer. He excited their admiration with a small book of aphorisms called *The True Believer*. In it Hoffer claimed to lay bare the psychology of modern totalitarian movements. And need we add that to Hoffer working-class revolutionary movements are as totalitarian as those of the fascist type.

What delighted his literary patrons was not only his vigorous attack on the unhealthy, neurotic, authoritarian personality attracted to totalitarian (revolutionary) movements, but the fact that by occupation Hoffer was a longshoreman. Here seemed to be a club with which to beat Stalinists, their fellow travelers, and Marxists as well. Here was a "proletarian" writer rejecting the class struggle, revolution and socialism. Here was a "healthy" worker exposing the intellectual misfits who presumably constitute the core of modern revolutionary movements.

In his new book of aphorisms, entitled *The Passionate State of Mind*, Hoffer pursues still further his meditations on the state of mind of the "true believer." His method is simple. He argues by analogy from microcosm to macrocosm,

from individual to social psychology. For his purposes Hoffer has appropriated all the clichés coined by some contemporary neo-Freudian schools of psychoanalysis. And because he does have a genuine gift for the knife-edged phrase and applies it with a flourish, some of what he says sounds refreshing for the first moment.

To begin with a familiar antithesis, Hoffer tells us that a healthy, autonomous, creative individual is guided by self-esteem and never gives way to extremes of passion; he is reconciled to himself and fulfills his needs and desires in a positive and productive manner. The person who rejects himself seeks salvation in pride and the road to pride is a violent one. People who are savage toward themselves are savage toward others; and unable to bear the burden of their neurotic pain, easily and readily surrender themselves to the power of God, a political leader or a dictator.

**The reader will immediately see that revolutions and counter-revolutions are brought about by a loss of self-esteem and the pursuit of pride.**

And that is what Hoffer tells us in aphorism No. 29. He writes, "When, for whatever reason, self-esteem is unattainable, the autonomous individual becomes a highly explosive entity. He turns away from an unpromising self and plunges into the pursuit of pride—the explosive substitute for self-esteem. All social disturbances and upheavals have their roots in crises of individual self-esteem, and the great endeavor in which the masses most readily unite is basically a search for pride." Presumably the Russian masses in 1917 and the German workers in 1918 were really raising the slogan of "We demand self-esteem" and not calling for such ordinary things as bread, peace and freedom.

"Great evils befall the world when the powerful begin to copy the weak," writes Hoffer. And he opposes totalitarian society because it is the supreme image objectified of the weak, the misfits and the self-haters. He naturally prefers America because it is the land of the real, the peaceful "permanent revolution," where everyone enjoys a degree of material well-being and still cries for "more."

And yet he is uneasy about the American, and writes, "The superficiality of the American is the result of his hustling. . . . People in a hurry cannot think, cannot grow, nor can they decay. They are preserved in a state of perpetual puerility."

### PASSIONLESS UTOPIA

The secret of Hoffer's epigrammatic effectiveness is that he is free to attack all with impunity and wit—since he favors neither a society of the bourgeoisie or the worker, of the master or the slave, of the theologian or the push-button technologist. But Hoffer is human and has his utopia too. He dreams of a society that is neither too hot nor too cold; where there is a modicum of economic well-being for everyone and no room for mass fervor; where there exists a moral discipline which enforces a common standard of behavior for the mass but allows for the appearance of the unique, creative individual—namely, Hoffer.

But Hoffer knows this utopia cannot be, since men, alas, are in their majority weak and moved by the original sin of malice. And if the way to a better society is through the victory of the passionate mind and the true believer, why then he is against it—just look at what happened in Russia and Germany.

He therefore adopts the stoic's creed and renounces everything but his own wisdom. The only freedom is the freedom of the mind.

The secret of life, according to Hoffer, is not to want too much: not to be too passionate in either thought or action. He has learned that "The search for happiness is one of the chief sources of unhappiness," and his final truth is that "Wise living consists perhaps less in acquiring good habits than in acquiring as few habits as possible."

This is the kind of existence Epicurus attributed to his gods who presided serenely over a society in decay. For us poor mortals it is not quite possible; but insofar as people adopt Hoffer's social quietism, the modern gods who preside over this decaying society will no doubt be more serene.

## To the SWP, a Helping Hand

The following letter, proposing a debate with the Socialist Workers Party, was sent by the Pittsburgh branch of the Independent Socialist League on September 22. The opening reference is to excerpts from an SWP internal bulletin published in our September 12 issue.—Ed.

Socialist Workers Party Branch  
Pittsburgh, Pa.

DEAR COMRADES:

We have read with interest statements by your leaders, James P. Cannon, Murry Weiss, and Farrell Dobbs, that the Socialist Workers Party is interested in clarifying the differences between it and the Independent Socialist League. We note further that you are especially desirable of clarifying these differences before radical and socialist students—or, as Weiss puts it, "I am worried that our student work will not get to first base until we've taken off our coats and done a job on the Shachtmanites."

We note also statements by your leaders that the SWP membership is "politically apathetic," and that it is indifferent to the ideological past of the SWP. This observation on the part of the SWP leadership corresponds exactly to our own experiences with members of the SWP.

Therefore, we propose a debate between a representative of your branch

and a representative of our branch. We promise that, besides the members of our own branch, we will provide an attentive audience of radical and socialist youth, so that you will not feel you are simply wasting time talking to hardened political opponents.

We propose that the topic to be debated should be "What is the nature of Stalinism?" We think you will agree that this is the fundamental difference between us, and would be the most fruitful topic. However, we would be happy to consider any serious alternative proposal.

If this is agreeable to you, we believe that a militant of the Socialist Party will consent to act as an impartial chairman.

We set only one condition: that you agree that the membership of the Pittsburgh SWP attend the debate. From your point of view, this will serve to help overcome their "politically apathetic" attitude, which you complain about, and to interest or re-interest them in "past ideological struggles," which your leadership desires. You understand, of course, that from our point of view, we too would like to see your membership take an interest in this matter.

We await your reply, and look forward to a fruitful debate.

Fraternally,

For the Pittsburgh ISL  
GERRY McDERMOTT

## Philadelphia Meetings Discuss Third Camp

Philadelphia, Oct. 8  
The Philadelphia Third Camp Contact Committee held its first meeting of the 1955-56 season on Thursday at 2006 Walnut Street. Bayard Rustin, co-secretary of the War Resisters League, gave an excellent report on the International Third Way Conference held in London in September.

The details of Rustin's report were substantially the same as were given in LABOR ACTION of September 26 by Shirley Newcome writing from London. As a delegate to the conference, Rustin was able to bring to the group his own personal impressions.

In common with the LABOR ACTION report Rustin felt keenly that the conference suffered greatly from lack of official representation from the large Asian socialist parties. The conference hopes to remedy this next year by having another international conference preferably at Cairo just after the Asian-African sequel to Bandung.

The WRL reporter told of the formation at the conference of the Interim Council and Executive Committee with A. J. Muste as chairman. Plans are under way for the publication of an inter-

national Third Way magazine. It is hoped that means can be found to finance a world tour by Muste and some socialist leader such as Fenner Brockway to draw closer the world's socialist and pacifist groups particularly in Asia and Central Europe and the colonial movements. Rustin also reported that steps are being taken to interest individuals in the publication of a Third Way magazine here in the U. S.

The speaker emphasized that the Third Way movement is still in its formative stages. He expressed the opinion that the pacifist movements cannot grow on H-bomb-scare agitation or moral persuasion. Because war is now total, pacifism must be given a political content.

Announcement was made of the next discussion meeting of the group, to be held at the same address, on Wednesday, November 2, on the topic of "Decentralization." The speaker will be Dave Delinger.

All socialists, pacifists, and others in the Philadelphia area who are interested in building an alternative program to American imperialism and Russian enslavement are invited to attend the local group.



# LABOR ACTION

October 24, 1955 Vol. 19, No. 43

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

Read the  
**NEW INTERNATIONAL**  
America's leading Marxist review

Young  
Socialist

# CHALLENGE

OCTOBER 24, 1955

Edited and Published by the YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE

FIVE CENTS

A DISCUSSION ARTICLE

## What's Wrong with American Liberalism?

By TIM WOHLFORTH

The student liberal on the campus today faces a peculiar dilemma, one far different from those faced by his counterparts ten or twenty years ago. The battles seem to be over except for a few minor skirmishes here or there that are noticeable only for the lack of anything of interest going on. Liberalism seems to have won. Even Eisenhower endorses the major aspects of the New Deal program, and the liberal wing of the Democratic Party finds itself in general agreement with Ike on every major issue.

A few die-hards and intellectual dilettantes challenge the liberal victors in the name of "New Conservatism," but this seems to be largely a controversy over terminology and rhetoric, not over basic issues. For instance Rossiter, one of the leaders of this New Conservatism, is not sure whether he is "a conservative liberal or a liberal conservative." A debate held at Harvard last year between Arthur Schlesinger Jr., intellectual spokesman of ADA, and Russel Kirk, the leading New Conservative, "turned out to be a rather tame affair. Kirk told us how much he admired Schlesinger and Schlesinger allows that he was glad to have Kirk around." (James Reichley, "Young Conservatives at Old Harvard," *The Reporter*, June 16, 1955.)

And yet, as the more alert student liberal cannot fail to realize, if liberalism has won, this is a hollow victory. For the progressive content of this liberalism seems to be lacking. C. Wright Mills puts it this way: "... liberalism as a common denominator of American political rhetoric is without coherent content. . . . The crisis of liberalism is due to liberalism's success in becoming the official language for all public statements." (C. Wright Mills, "Liberal Values in the Modern World," *Anvil*, Winter 1952.)

About the only meaning one can find

### Independent Weekly At UCLA Goes Under

By J. CHARLES WALKER

In a letter dated September 11 the editorial board of UCLA's *Observer* notified its subscribers that the *Observer* was officially being discontinued.

The reasons cited were brief and typical for a non-official voice of liberalism today:

"We regret that, due to limitations on our time and lack of new personnel, it is necessary to discontinue the *Observer*."

"We found the task of editing an independent student weekly both rewarding and exhausting. We would like to be able to continue, but have agreed that it is not possible."

It was signed by Martin McReynolds, Fredy Perlman, Barry A. Tunick and Steve Wayne, for the *Observer* Editorial Board.

Thus after one semester of defiance the UCLA administration has succeeded in stifling any independent press at UCLA. Both the *Daily Bruin* and even the co-op *Chatterbox* have come under administration censorship in the past year, although not without an outcry and a rearguard fight.

Unfortunately, the liberal movement is too weak and politically disoriented to sustain any such press today, despite the fine showing made by a few capable and determined individuals this past semester. The California Student Civil Liberties movement—now crucially important, but the lowest common denominator of a "new liberalism"—is thus faced with the task of putting out such a dissenting newspaper on a statewide level to replace the *Observer*.

Socialists hope that such a venture will successfully replace the pall of editorial conformity in the Los Angeles student press.

in American liberalism today is its general acceptance of the status quo. Its main attitude is one of defense—defense of past liberal achievement from conservative attacks; defense of American capitalism in its struggle with Stalinism. It is indicative of the role of liberals in America today that the theme song of the Democratic Party in 1952 was "Don't let them take it away."

Thus, contrary to contemporary liberal mythology, the American liberal movement is no longer a reformist movement in the sense that it was in the Thirties. It does not compete with socialism by claiming that it can build an equitable society within the framework of capitalism. It is not concerned with building an equitable society. This is because it ludicrously believes that it has already built such a society and that "this best of all possible worlds" is it. It is therefore concerned basically only with the defense of the present society at home and the expanding American power abroad in the struggle with the Kremlin.

#### STRANDED

To understand why liberalism is performing this essentially conservative function in America, we must look beyond the superficial conflict between ideologies to the position of America in the world today. America is today engaged in an imperialist struggle with Russia for world domination. This basic fact must be understood before the domestic situation in America since World War II can make any sense. Because of its struggle with the Soviet Union, the government is given an excuse to spend tens of billions every year for armaments and thus bolster the economy to a level of relative prosperity. In this prosperity lies the basis for the relative lull in class conflict and struggle which we have witnessed over the last few years.

Within this context the stratum of the middle class which makes up the membership of the liberal organizations in America is left stranded with no function. In the Thirties these assorted labor bureaucrats, lawyers, government officials, and academicians played an important role in attempting to bring about class harmony through social reforms. Today, without the pressure of the masses upon them, many of them become more and more the "benevolent" bureaucratic manipulators of people.

In conjunction with their manipulative role as "social engineers" many of them develop an elitist ideology which (except for the New Conservatives) is never completely openly expressed because of its essentially anti-democratic nature.

#### LIBERAL ELITISM

The nature of this elitism comes out in Schlesinger's recent attack in *The Reporter* on the New Conservatives. Here we find absolutely eulogistic statements about "the grand traditions of British conservatism . . ." and a complete acceptance of the Burke myth that Burke was an enlightened man, devoted to the welfare of all the people.

He states this despite the fact that Burke, with his repressions against civil liberties at the time of the French revolution and his faithful service to British landed interest, represented not the people but one section of the ruling class. To Schlesinger the Burkes of today are, not the heartless businessmen whom the New Conservatives eulogize, but "the Stevensons and Harrimans," "the country squires" who lead "the commoners."

To Schlesinger, democracy does not mean the participation of the masses in government. It is rather, as he points out in a further reply to Kirk, Pareto's "circulation of elites, without which any society is doomed to rigidity and stagnation." He does not wish the people to assume power, but rather, as he further points out, "the bureaucrat, scientist, teacher, journalist, or professional politician." (Schlesinger, letter to *The Reporter*, Aug. 11, 1955.)

Schlesinger is here expressing what many of his fellow ADAers feel but are afraid to express, for these ideas are essentially anti-democratic ones. And yet these ideas illustrate the real role of the liberal movement in America today, the role of an organization of bureaucrats and functionaries who seek to share in the administration of power in this country. In other words they desire to regain the power they held in the Thirties when they were allowed to administer the state for the dominant capitalist class because of their position as placators of the masses.

#### ANTI-DEMOCRATIC

Not only do the liberals have an anti-democratic function in modern American society, but they also have an anti-democratic program. This is most apparent in the field of foreign relations where the liberals support wholeheartedly American foreign policy.

They support the essentially anti-democratic role the U. S. is playing in the world, bolstering up reactionary governments and the last remnants of colonialism in order to spread American military hegemony. Even many of those elements among the liberals who call for a more "democratic" foreign policy do so from the point of view of extending American power more effectively—that is, to give the aura of "democracy" to American imperialism in the same way that Russian imperialism is cloaked in the aura of "socialism."

Even on the domestic scene the liberal record in the field of civil liberties is none too good. Not only did Harry Truman start a good deal of the witchhunt with his attorney general's list and purges in the government, but present-day liberals like Hubert Humphrey and Wayne Morse lead the onslaught on civil liberties by introducing into Congress and fighting for a bill outlawing the CP. Furthermore, our millionaire "friend of the people" Governor Harriman has recently scolded the Republican legislature in New York State for being soft on the Communists and not investigating the Communist menace in summer camps in the state. This situation was quickly remedied by the legislature. (Thank God!)

#### ON THE LEFT

And yet despite the anti-democratic role and program of American liberalism today it would be foolhardy to ignore that there exist essentially decent and sincere elements in the liberal movement. These elements are attracted to liberalism today because they think liberalism is or can be what it says it is, that is a truly democratic force. They fail to see that liberalism by its defense of American capitalism and its concomitant support of our anti-democratic foreign policy can no longer be such a force. So that they may come to realize this essential contradiction between liberal ideology and reality, we challenge these elements in the liberal movement to struggle for a democratic program within their own organizations. In the course of such a struggle we feel they will be forced to the realization that a consistent democratic position is possible today only in a struggle for democratic socialism.

There is still another force at work within the liberal movement that keeps it from becoming completely stagnant and which makes its use of liberal rhetoric and democratic slogans necessary,

no matter how impossible it is for the liberal to carry out a democratic program in reality. This force is the labor movement. It was the working class with its unrest that forced the liberals into a reformist role in the Thirties. It will be this labor movement which at the beginning of the next progressive development in America will force the liberals to modify their defense of the status quo and again fruitlessly search for class harmony through reform.

#### WHICH WAY?

All this leaves the student liberals, and the only student liberal organization in America, the SDA, in rather a peculiar position. Many elements in the SDA are not really disturbed by this. To them SDA is only a stepping stone to enter the labor bureaucracy or its lawyer fringe. They seek to become the future ADAers, the future manipulators of the people.

And yet there are still those within SDA and without who are alienated by the status quo. These students have made what Ignazio Silone calls "the choice of comrades." They put themselves on the side of the people and their struggle for a decent way of life throughout the world and not on the side of brute power and the status quo. To them "to use the oppressed as a stepping-stone to power and then to betray them is undoubtedly the most wicked of all sacrileges, because of all human beings they are the most defenseless." (Ignazio Silone, "The Choice of Comrades," *Dissent*, Winter 1955.)

There is no place for such people in the liberal movement of today. It is the movement of the bureaucrats and the functionaries, of the apologists for the State Department, and those who retreat from the battle for civil liberties. It goes without saying that there is no place for them in the Stalinist movement, for this is an even more cynical and anti-democratic movement which seeks to bring about the type of totalitarianism and class oppression we find in the Soviet Union.

There is only one place for such elements and that is in the independent socialist movement which is struggling against both forms of oppression, capitalism and Stalinism, and which looks to the world's peoples and their struggles and not to one of the imperialist powers for peace and a better world. It is within the ranks of the YSL that all consistent democrats on campus belong.

But until such time as these student liberals realize this, we urge them, as we have urged their adult liberal allies to struggle within SDA for a consistent democratic program. It is within this context that we welcome the formation of a left wing in SDA dedicated to a militant struggle for a principled stand on civil liberties. We hope that this struggle can be expanded to include other areas such as foreign policy, but we realize that within the context of contemporary American liberalism this will be very difficult.

EVERY WEEK—

#### Young Socialist CHALLENGE

appears as a section in all  
regular issues of Labor Action.

Published, and independently  
edited, by the Young Socialist  
League,

it is the only socialist youth  
weekly in the country.

Don't miss it!

## "ATMOSPHERE OF BEWILDERMENT"

# THE SPD OPPOSITION AND ADENAUER

By A. STEIN

No one has ever claimed that the present leadership of the German Social-Democracy (SPD) is distinguished by a militant class outlook or excessive political sagacity. But even the most skeptical of on-lookers may wonder why it is showing such ineptness in failing to exploit an extremely favorable political situation. Never has the confidence of the Adenauer regime been so badly shaken; never has its foreign policy been so discredited as at the present time.

When Chancellor Adenauer traveled to Moscow last month to establish diplomatic ties, the testing time of his foreign policy had finally arrived. Once humorously known as the policy of "negotiating from strength," its proponents claimed the Russians would accede to German reunification if and when they were confronted by a superior force. And, it was argued, West Germany could only achieve this superior bargaining position if it were granted the right to rearm and be integrated into the American military alliance.

**Adenauer went to Moscow and promptly saw his policy shipwrecked on the rock of Russian resistance. In the political exchange which took place, it was the Russians who gained and not Adenauer.**

They dug their heels deeper into German soil, and in the process raised their puppet regime in East Germany to the status of a "sovereign and independent" state. The existence of two Germanies was officially established by Moscow's actions and the line between them drawn wider and deeper.

The domestic repercussions of Adenauer's failure were immediately evident on his return to Bonn. The once-confident chancellor, who in the days preceding the Geneva conference had spoken of Russian weakness, now apologized for his failures with reference to Russian strength. He pleaded with his followers in parliament to approve the establishment of diplomatic ties, that is, to endorse his failure to win German unity and accept the division of the country.

N. Y. Times correspondent M. S. Handler described the uneasy atmosphere in the Adenauer camp in the following way in a Bonn despatch dated September 23: "The Bundestag unanimously approved today the establishment of diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union. The decision was taken in an atmosphere of bewilderment over the meaning and consequences of the Moscow agreement setting up diplomatic relations."

### What It Has Not Done

**Given the disarray in the coalition camp, and the vulnerability of the Adenauer regime, it would seem elementary for the SPD to begin a ruthless and all-out attack on the ruling coalition of bourgeois parties. As the party of the working class, it could now in all legitimacy step forward as the true representative of the national interest and win the support of a disaffected and dismayed middle class. But this is just what the SPD leadership has not done.**

It has not called, as it has every right to do, for Adenauer's resignation and the holding of new parliamentary elections. It has not attempted to rally the masses for the struggle to establish a new government which will be competent to defend the interests of the German people in the era of coexistence. For what Geneva made plain was that coexistence is possible only on the basis of the status quo in Europe and that means the continued division of Germany.

To be sure, Erich Ollenhauer, chairman of the SPD, and his collaborators have raked the chancellor and his policy over the coals in parliamentary debate. But as the press service of the SPD says, this has been done in a conciliatory tone. And instead of demanding Adenauer's resignation, the SPD spokesmen in parliament have been discussing the possibility of collaboration between the regime and the opposition in working out a foreign policy!

Obviously, if the SPD grants the possibility that Adenauer can break with Washington and can set the national interest above the interests of his class, there is perhaps no need to call for the resignation of his regime and the holding of new elections to the Bundestag. The political problem becomes merely one of exerting sufficient pressure on the regime to force it to adopt a different policy.

So vulnerable is the ruling coalition that in Bremen, in spite of the SPD's restraint, the Social-Democrats were the beneficiaries of a big swing in their favor and against the bourgeois parties, raising their vote from

39 to over 47 per cent and their seats in the state parliament from 43 to 52, more than all the parties in the Bonn coalition combined. Yet in spite of this popular victory, and in spite of the fact that the other parties had tried to unseat the SPD from the Bremen coalition of which it has been a part, Bremen SPD leader Wilhelm Kaisen has announced that he wants to continue the coalition with these parties.

### With a Whimper

**Just as the SPD has taken a conciliatory attitude toward the Bonn regime in the hour of its great crisis, so it has invented a new tactic with regard to the United States. The parliamentary legalists of the SPD have discovered a weak point in the treaty which regulates the relations between West Germany and the three Allied powers.**

According to Article 10 of this convention, any one of the signatory nations (and this includes West Germany) may ask for the renegotiations of all treaties should there be reunification or should any event occur which all the signatory nations recognize as changing the situation in a fundamental way. For the SPD, the Austrian Peace Treaty, the Khrushchev-Bulgarian trip to Belgrade, the Geneva conference and the Adenauer mission to Moscow are such events. If the Russians demand a West Germany cut loose from the Atlantic alliance as a precondition of negotiating unity, why shouldn't Washington accept the fact?

And what is conclusive for the peculiar mentality of the SPD leadership is that such a step is legally provided for under Article 10 of the Bonn Convention.

To be sure, the Atlantic powers already have an answer to such a demand. The American-British alliance, pulling the reluctant French after it, is quite ready to permit a unified Germany to vote on the question of the NATO alliance and to accept the decision. This seems completely democratic at first glance until one remembers that the Atlantic powers are ready to take this step only because they know that Moscow will never gamble on the possibility that Washington might win.

**From the Russian point of view, the reluctance to take a chance is quite reasonable. So long as they occupy Eastern Germany, they can exert pressure on the Bonn regime, no matter what party is in power. But were they to accede to genuine democratic elections one of two evils would occur.**

Either the Adenauer regime would emerge triumphant, maintaining the link with NATO and thereby threatening the Russian empire with superior manpower and a nuclear-equipped airfleet based on Germany; or the Social-Democrats would come to power and show the masses in the satellite countries and Russia itself that social change can be brought about democratically and against the will of the ruling classes.

Since the United States is not going to be convinced by the legal niceties discovered by the SPD or the Geneva spirit of conciliation, what does the SPD propose as an alternative?

The answer given by Ollenhauer begins and ends with a whimper: "... unless the Western Allies face up to the new situation created by the Moscow Agreement and make a resolute attempt to reunify Germany, they run the risk of seeing a rise of nationalism or a national-Bolshevist movement in West Germany." That is, the SPD will energetically wring its hands in despair while the Adenauer regime and Washington continue to pursue a policy they have announced in words and followed in deeds to the bitter end.

### Not Only Adenauer . . .

The refusal of the SPD leadership to stir up the German working class and its middle-class allies with a slashing attack on the Adenauer regime cannot be explained only by a mere passion for parliamentary tactics or a lack of revolutionary perspective.

Even reformist parties have been known to lead the masses in a struggle for some given demand. And the fact is that the SPD did not hesitate to take the leadership of the tens of thousands of workers, young people and middle class sympathizers who came out to protest the passage of rearmament legislation in the early part of the year.

**The reticence of the SPD to engage its political opponents in a head-on struggle is explained by the fact that more than one political program was ground to dust when Adenauer went to Moscow. It was not only Adenauer's policy of "negotiation through strength" which failed, but the SPD program of winning German unity through a program of "neutralization" as well.**

In the course of the negotiations with Adenauer, the Russians doubly underscored their long-term program for the unification of Germany. They pulverized the claims made by the SPD: that if Germany remained outside any military alliances and did not rearm, Moscow would grant the reunification.

By their behavior, the Russians made clear that the rearming of Western Germany was not the central issue, and that the renunciation of alliances with the Atlantic alliance was not enough. What the Russians want is something more, and this they showed by raising their satellite regime to equality with Bonn.

**Reunification of Germany from above can only take place if the Russians retain some form of control over the destinies of a united Germany with its mighty economic and military potential. This is the claim which Moscow has made central to any negotiation on German unity and it is for this reason that it has pushed the Ulbricht-Grotewohl regime to the front as the instrument through which this control is to be effected. That is, no government can rule over a united Germany so far as Moscow is concerned unless its appointed representatives share in the power.**

And this is the view which Moscow is propagating not only through its official acts and statements but through every medium in the September 8 issue of *Die Andere Zeitung*, a West German socialist-neutralist weekly newspaper.

Bearing the title, "Moscow Seen With My Own Eyes," it describes the author's favorable impressions during a trip to Russia. Toward the end of the article, the writer describes his lengthy discussion with the head of the European Department of *Pravda*, Comrade Frantzov. Discussing Adenauer's trip to Moscow with him, the author gives Frantzov's views on German unity. "But independent of Adenauer's trip, in his opinion, some day negotiations will have to take place between Bonn and Pankow. In no other way can reunification take place."

### The Ghosts Walk

**The confusions which are the mark of the current strategy of the SPD leadership represent a danger for the future of the German working class, German democracy and German national unification. Moscow is perfectly well aware that a respectable section of the German bourgeoisie is growing impatient with the policies of the Adenauer regime. And it is at these circles that Moscow is aiming its diplomatic and propaganda blows.**

It is not only political ghosts out of Germany's past like the former chancellors of the Weimar epoch, Luther, Bruening, and Von Papen, who are espousing the neutralist doctrine to recoup their political fortunes. The case of Colonel Von Bonin, the former member of the military planning office of the Bonn administration is a warning of what is to come.

Last spring Von Bonin was fired for advocating the formation of a small professional army for Western Germany. The politics of Von Bonin's plan was that an army could be formed which could be detached easily from NATO. And Von Bonin made no secret of his motivations. In an interview with the British MP, Denis Healey, he declared that unless Germany were soon united, the younger generation in the Russian occupied zone would be lost—that is, lost to bourgeois influence. Further, the continued division of Germany would play into the hands of the SPD and the trade unions.

To the name of Von Bonin should be added the voices of the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* and *Der Spiegel*. The first is the leading West German newspaper and the second a popular weekly magazine along the lines of American magazines such as *Time* and *Newsweek*.

On the basis of a visit to American military establishments in mid-summer of this year, the military editor of the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* came to the conclusion that the United States could never give up its air bases in Western Europe and Western Germany and that this meant Washington's strategy implied the permanent division of Germany. Supporting Von Bonin, the military editor of the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, Adelbert Weinstein, came out in sharp protest against the military strategy of the United States as a peril to West Germany.

But behind this preoccupation with affairs military is the political problem. The longer Germany is divided, the more danger that the leadership of the struggle for German unity will pass to the hands of the German working-class organizations. It is this danger which is bringing them into sharp conflict with the Adenauer regime.

### Elementary Demand

**The SPD leadership is quite conscious of the threat a right-wing nationalist movement holds for the working class and German democracy. But so long as it keeps to its neutralist program of reliance on the good will of the Moscow clique it is caught in a hopeless trap.**

If it is argued that it is utopian to expect the departure of Anglo-American troops from West Germany would force the Russians to leave the Eastern Zone, we can do nothing better than to quote an English writer on military and political affairs of considerable reputation.

Writing in the September 8 issue of *The Reporter* on the problem of Disarmament and German Unity, Sir John Slessor has the following to say: "It is surely only realistic to admit that the Red Army will not withdraw from East Germany and hence German unification will be impossible—as long as British or American forces remain on the soil of West Germany. It is not practicable to withdraw our troops to France or the Low Countries. Can we safely remove them from continental soil altogether before the Russians are back behind their own frontiers? Nothing is safe in this dangerous world; it is a balance of risks, and in my view the risk is well worth taking."

**If a bourgeois British expert on military affairs can so candidly admit that the only way to force a withdrawal of Russian troops is by the withdrawal of American and British troops, why cannot the German Social-Democratic**

(Continued bottom of next page)

# RUSSIA Behind Some Reports from Moscow: Hounds and Hares in the Russian Press

By A. STEIN

Under a Moscow dateline of October 6, the N. Y. *Herald Tribune's* chief reporter in Russia, Marguerite Higgins, comments on an article appearing in the current issue of the Russian magazine *Economic Questions*, which predicts a major crisis seen in the United States. Like so many previous Russian articles and books in the post-war period, this particular essay, according to Higgins, explains that the delay in the coming of the American economic crisis and depression has been due to the effects of large-scale military spending and the exploitation of other countries by the United States. These stimuli, however, have lost their force. While militarism has increased productive power it has impoverished the masses, and the economic recovery of America's allies and enemies has turned them into competitors on the world market.

Such an article would hardly deserve special notice except for the fact that four days later, on October 10, the N. Y. *Times* specialist on Russian affairs, Harry Schwartz, now in Russia, reports on the contents of the leading article in *Kommunist*, the party organ, which seems to say the exact opposite.

Schwartz begins his story with the statement, "A Soviet economist has been denounced for painting too dark a picture of the capitalist economic situation." And in a later paragraph he says, "The editorial in *Kommunist* demands that capitalist economic life be presented honestly and objectively."

Has that day—long awaited by neutralists, Sweezyites, and other devout believers in the peaceful transformation of the Russian bureaucracy into a democratic ruling class—finally arrived? Are differences of opinion now being democratically and openly discussed in the higher levels of the bureaucracy?

Or to be more realistic, is a power struggle going on openly between two different factions in which a different estimation of what is going to happen in the United States enters as a determining factor of their conflicting points of view?

We think that neither of these hypotheses is in order since actually there is no genuine conflict between the views in these two articles. In each case the Kremlin is setting its hounds to hunt different hares.

## ATTACK ON KATZ

The article predicting a major economic crisis in the United States as well as in the world capitalist economy need not detain us. It is obvious enough that such an argument can be used to buttress a policy of "coexistence," in the following way: while the capitalist powers fall out among themselves as depression grips the homeland and drives them to fight more avidly for foreign markets, the countries in the Russian-dominated bloc will continue to prosper and attract the sympathies of the peace-loving peoples throughout the world.

However, economic crises will not inevitably lead to total political and social collapse in the capitalist countries. And what is wrong with the study denounced by the *Kommunist* article is that it says just that. Harry Schwartz quotes the following criticism of the study, entitled "Capitalism's Degeneration," by A. Katz.

It pictures capitalism as actually de-

creasing the amount of capital, machinery and equipment for production. And such a view, says *Kommunist*, tries to set up a law of the "self-strangulation" of capitalism, akin to the long-condemned theory of the automatic collapse of capitalism.

Behind this theory stands the erroneous belief that "capitalism's tendency to decay excludes the quick growth of capitalism." Furthermore, the magazine continues, "The over-simplified stereotype of capitalism's decay that has been presented in our propaganda has led to the denial or ignoring of the capitalist countries' attainments in production, science and technology."

Schwartz concentrates on two implications of this editorial attack. The first is domestic in character and visible to the naked eye. The editorial is continuing to press the line that Russian technology and science are lagging behind the capitalist countries and the old attitude of ignoring their achievements (inculcated and enforced by Stalin) must be reversed. Schwartz writes in this connection, "In major speeches earlier this year, Nikita S. Khrushchev, party chief, and Premier Nikolai A. Bulganin denounced Soviet inattention to capitalist scientific feats in corn raising and industrial technology."

Schwartz then calls attention to the editorial's insistence on an increased struggle against reformist trends in the world labor movement. For if capitalism will not automatically collapse as a re-

sult of economic crisis then these who politically mislead the workers must be either won over or "eliminated." And in this editorial the emphasis is on "exercising ideological influence on those representatives of the workers' movement who, though subjectively faithful to the cause of socialism, express confused ideas and try to reconcile reformism and Marxism." Schwartz comments that this might mean a change in attitude toward the British and Scandinavian labor parties or some major leaders of the United States union movement with socialist backgrounds.

## KATZ'S REAL POSITION

Schwartz's interpretation of the *Kommunist* attack on the economist, A. Katz, is not entirely correct, and it is liable to mislead the unwary reader unless he is familiar with the content of Katz's article and what it attempted to prove. Schwartz implies that because Moscow is apparently turning toward coexistence it is softening its criticism of capitalism. In reality, however, the issues involved in the attack on Katz, and the seemingly favorable reference to capitalism, are related to the domestic struggle over emphasis on heavy or consumer industry.

When the big turn back toward emphasis on heavy industry occurred at the time of Malenkov's ouster from the premiership, A. Katz was one of the economists who came under scathing fire for defending the thesis that it was now possible to place the main emphasis on consumers' industries. Katz's argument rested on a very careful and sophisticated study of the real trend of actual capital formation in the United States over the past four decades. (This, by the way, makes the attack of the *Kommunist* editorial on Katz, for being one of those who are not objective in their study of capitalism, a typical piece of Stalinist absurdity.)

## BRAZIL KUBITSCHKEK VICTORY POINTS TO TROUBLE AHEAD

# 'Getulismo' Winning Out in Brazilian Vote

By JUAN REY

Santiago, Oct. 12

As the ballot count goes on to determine the winner in Brazil's presidential election of October 3, it looks as if Juscelino Kubitschek is the victorious candidate.

Last week it looked for a while as if an electoral surprise was in the making, when Adhemar de Barros came out on top of the poll in the state of Sao Paulo, the most industrialized section of the country.

Brazil, it may be said, is a country of electoral surprises, probably because of its heterogeneous political structure and political backwardness. The dictator Getulio Vargas—after he had once been deposed, and after some years of the Dutra government—succeeded in his time in getting a majority of the votes against the wishes of the incumbent government. More recently Janio Quadros won the state election in Sao Paulo and took over the governorship against a strong coalition of parliamentary parties and against the formidable and big-moneyed electoral machine of Adhemar de Barros.

But the election of Kubitschek would be no such surprise, as our previous dispatches have indicated. Kubitschek, governor of the state of Minas Gerais, is the candidate of the "Getulist" camp, i.e., the candidate of Vargas' old demagogic-populist party, which is headed by his vice-presidential running mate Jango Goulart. The main opposition is the liberal camp, which is backed by the army and represented by the candidacy of Juarez Tavora.

The third candidate, Adhemar de Barros, represents a part of the Getulist camp, viz., the sheer adventurers and rascals, and he was given small probability of success.

So when, last week, the preliminary count showed that De Barros was ahead of both the other candidates in the industrialized state of Sao Paulo, it was something of a sensation. Because of this, also, De Barros temporarily led the count for all of Brazil.

It is difficult to explain this showing by De Barros only in terms of the large amounts of money which were at his disposal for electoral propaganda, making possible a great electoral machine. The

demoralization of the masses by the Vargas dictatorship is one reason.

Perhaps an even more important reason for this demoralization is disappointment with Janio Quadros, from whom the masses were led to expect a new political road; but then Quadros vacillated, withdrew from the presidential fight, and backed General Tavora in alliance with the army and the rightist UDN (National Democratic Union). This probably explains the defeat in Sao Paulo of the Tavora-Quadros forces. Of course the struggle between Kubitschek and Tavora also no doubt helped De Barros, who also presents himself as a populist leader and as inheritor of Vargas' mantle.

In any case, Adhemar de Barros' unexpectedly strong showing is proof of the considerable demoralization of the mass of voters as a result of 25 years of Getulist dictatorship. Only in Brazil perhaps could so much support go to a leader who publicly and unashamedly proclaimed the slogan of "Steal, but do something!" and who was openly charged with embezzlement of public funds before a tribunal.

## WHO WON?

But De Barros' gains in the state of Sao Paulo were more than balanced, as the count continued, by Kubitschek's two-thirds vote in his own state of Minas Gerais, which is also an industrialized section, and in other states.

Kubitschek's running mate Jango Goulart, who is the particular bête-noire of the generals, is also rolling up what seems to be a decisive majority and his victory also seems sure. In Rio, Kubitschek is now in second place, after Adhemar de Barros, but he is running first in the country as a whole.

The election of Kubitschek (or for that matter also De Barros) would signify the defeat of the democratic-liberal camp and the popular repudiation of the "August coup" of the generals which overthrew Getulio Vargas. It would be a posthumous victory for the old dictator.

Subjectively—that is, in the backward consciousness of the workers and peasants who voted for Kubitschek—his victory means victory over the rightist camp and the generals, and a blow in behalf of progress, democracy and a policy favorable to the interest of the masses.

In his study, Katz argued that the outlay of fixed funds per unit of production was falling. From it he derived a "law of the inevitable lag of production of means of production behind the production of consumer goods," which had been in operation since the 1920s. The growth of the total value of fixed capital had been less than the growth in the volume of production.

Furthermore, said Katz, this trend toward a decline in the outlay of fixed funds per unit of production applies to socialist society as well, and provided the objective conditions under which the consumer-goods industries could be expanded as rapidly as the producer-goods industries.

It should be noted that Katz based his argument on a line of development in the American economy which is not at all true for Russian industry. In the latter, given the bureaucratic methods of organization, the waste of material and manpower, the use of improved machinery and technology does not necessarily bring with it a reduction in the cost of fixed capital. Katz was right about American developments but wrong about Russia. The ideological needs of the faction which stressed heavy industry (Khrushchev-Bulganin) dictated that Katz be wrong about America as well.

And that is why the official economists who speak for the present party leadership, and the official party magazine *Kommunist* in this instance must, as Schwartz reports, condemn the economist Katz for "picturing capitalism as actually decreasing the amount of capital, machinery and equipment for production."

If capitalism were not to have occasional spurts of quick growth of this nature, why would the Russian economy have to be turned so sharply toward catching up with it? Why should the Russians have to learn from American technology? To admit the truth of Katz' argument would mean one of two things: either capitalist methods of economic organization and production are superior or the current emphasis on heavy industry is not justified.

The objective social meaning of Kubitschek's success would mean victory for the industrial bourgeoisie and petty-bourgeoisie, supporters of state-interventionist and state-capitalist policy, of industrialization, of extensive credit and inflation for the purpose of building industry, of social demagoguery.

Just as elsewhere in South America the masses of workers and peasants have backed industrial-bourgeois and petty-bourgeois elements in their fight for power, accepting their economic nationalism as a kind of "ersatz" for socialism, so the Brazilian masses has supported Kubitschek as representative of the program of industrialization and economic liberation of Brazil. They voted against the old liberals, against the old-style capitalists and *fazendeiros* (big landowners), against the generals.

In this sense the victory of Kubitschek is a popular victory over the traditional rightist forces of Brazil, but it must be added that it is also a defeat for the socialist and democratic elements among the masses.

The Communist Party, whose support for Kubitschek perhaps was decisive in giving him the day, was therefore shrewd in estimating that Kubitschek's bandwagon would bring them closer to the masses; shrewder than was the Socialist Party, which endeavored to achieve the same by supporting Tavora and Quadros, whose evident bankruptcy has plainly repelled the working class.

This repudiation by the voters of the liberal camp and the "August coup" against Vargas will now accelerate the onset of the political crisis, because it will be difficult for the latter to tolerate the restoration of Getulismo to power.

## LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, New York City

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

Send for our free book list.

# The SPD — —

(Continued from page 6)

Party call for this move in its own right? Why can it not lead a struggle of the German workers and the German middle class against the Adenauer regime and its American sponsors?

Certainly, in the days ahead, as the crisis in Germany grows more intense, this question will come to the forefront in the ranks of the German SPD and the trade unions. A left wing of militant socialists exists who showed their power in the strikes of 1954 and the political demonstrations of the Spring of 1955. We do not believe they will indefinitely permit the present leadership of the SPD to continue its fumbling tactics.

We believe that a great struggle lies ahead for the German working class and that it will not permit the reactionary wing of the bourgeoisie to usurp leadership of the struggle for Germany's national unity. Too much is at stake for both Germany and Europe.

# Puzzle for Liberals

(Continued from page 1)

administration and backstopping its foreign policy.

## "MORE PALATABLE"

In an article in the current *Colliers*, the liberal journalist Theodore White writes in a survey of how the Democratic candidates are shaping up:

"The South offers by far the most interesting change on the party scene. The alchemy of time has transformed several Dixie states from bitter Stevenson enemies to a potent bloc of support. . . . In the new view, Stevenson seems much more palatable than Harriman, whom they think of as a Tammany-controlled radical, or Kefauver, whom they regard as a renegade."

He goes on to say that "party revolt may yet flicker in the South," especially against any Truman influence (for to the Southerners that wild-eyed left-winger Truman is not the acceptable person that Stevenson has become) and he adds:

"Senator Richard Russell of Georgia, who led the Southern forces at Chicago in 1952, has promised to support Stevenson, whose strategists also count as solid Mississippi, Louisiana, Georgia, North Carolina and most of Alabama. . . ."

## WOING DIXIE

Since 1953 Stevenson has been working hard to achieve precisely this position as the man who can unite both Southern racists and ADAers. He swung into this job with a will, publicly, at the end of 1953 with a trip through the South chumming with the Dixiecrat crowd.

In a well-publicized love-fest, he spoke on the Atlanta capitol steps along with Governor Hummin' Talmadge of Georgia, even as Talmadge was threatening to abolish public education rather than yield to any Supreme Court decision on desegregation (not yet made, incidentally, but already feared). In his own speech Stevenson manfully restrained himself from saying anything that would offend these defenders of lily-white civilization. More: in a reference to Republican policy in Reconstruction days after the Civil War, which was not lost on his hearers, he impliedly tied up the current waving of the "Red shirt" by the Brownells with the waving of the "bloody shirt" by the Northerners who tried to press the defeated slaveholders to the wall. It did not matter to this scholar from Illinois that the tie-up was unhistorical and absurd; it said what he wanted to say.

The liberals viewed his open wooing of the Southerners with some disquiet but calmed their nerves with the thought that, after all, "party unity" was necessary to win an election, and wasn't it good for such a great liberal as Stevenson also to act like a practical politician? Stevenson went on being practical about the Southerners well into March, when he put on a similar performance at a Southern Democratic conference.

But this represented no real principled departure for him, as a matter of fact. During the 1952 campaign itself, Steven-

son had taken every opportunity he dared to indicate to the Southerners that he was no enemy of theirs.

## HE WORKED FOR IT

It was Stevenson who had, of course, named Alabama's Sparkman as his running mate; who backed up Sparkman in making the party platform on civil rights an exercise in doubletalk; who opposed an anti-filibuster law that might make possible an FEPC or anti-lynching enactment; whose record showed that he was cool to the idea of a federal FEPC.

While acceptance of the Jim Crow status quo is crucial for this kind of practicality, it was not only on civil rights that Stevenson went rightward even as compared with his milk-and-water 1952 campaign. Even hardened liberals found it embarrassing when Stevenson was quoted from Formosa as praising Chiang Kai-shek and his regime there. (On returning to these shores Stevenson was less fulsome.)

In the current *Saturday Evening Post*, a sympathetic article ("Adlai Girds for Battle") by John Bartlow Martin wishes to testify to its subject's expertise in foreign affairs. This is how:

"Stevenson's [law] firm had done a good deal of negotiating for American corporations with foreign investments. Stevenson went to Africa on behalf of several companies to discuss financial relations with South African interests, and to negotiate the purchase of scarce materials. He went to Puerto Rico and other Caribbean areas to discuss taxes, public relations, and other problems on behalf of American corporations. Such work reflects his own expert knowledge and deep interest in foreign affairs."

Very respectable, safe and blameless, to be sure.

All in all, if Lyndon Johnson, Talmadge and Byrnes are ready to "take" him again, it cannot be said that the man has failed to work for the honor.

Now the outstanding tribute to Stevenson's skill, however, has not been the mere fact that he has ingratiated himself with the Southerners. That is not difficult in itself depending upon the color of one's politics. Stevenson's coup was, however, that he has been able to do this while at the same time pulling the liberals along with him. That might have been a little more difficult, depending on the color of their politics. His success is a testimonial to the yellow liberalism of today.

## "GREAT DECISION"

At the moment the best demonstration of this is being put on by the liberal *N. Y. Post*, in a campaign so phony and fantastic that it can be understood only in the context of the demoralization of liberalism.

In a full-column editorial October 10, the *Post* issued an excited call to all New York Liberal Party members to dump their own party and register Democrat, in order that they might have a voice in the momentous decision which was to be made in the Democratic Party.

" . . . we believe that this year there are special and compelling reasons why liberal voters should not only register but simultaneously enroll in the Democratic Party.

" . . . in this year of all years enrollment in the Liberal Party is peculiarly irrelevant to the great decision confronting liberal voters.

" . . . This is not fight to watch from the sidelines; the outcome can make political history. . . ."

This kind of come-rally-round language obviously befits a great choice that is to be made between Progress and Reaction.

The "great decision" that is to be made, one finds out, is between Stevenson and Harriman for Democratic candidate!

And why is the Menace of Averell Harriman so acute that Liberal Party members must dump their own party in order to Make History?

## HANKY-PANKY

The strangest thing about this piece of fakery is that, in three editorials running, the *Post* has not even pretended to give a reason, let alone a liberal reason. That is, if we except the argument that Stevenson is the man that New York "rank-and-file Democrats" really want; which may or may not be true but certainly provides little reason for members of a different party to rush in in order to prove it.

Is Stevenson perhaps more liberal than Harriman? The *Post* does not make any such ridiculous claim; in fact, more to the point, it doesn't even raise the question!

There is something of an implication that Harriman must be stopped because he is merely a stooge for Boss De Sapio, but anyone who charges the *Post* with making this argument will not find it down in black and white. For one thing, it would be slightly embarrassing to make it, since it has previously been intimated that Tammany is not what it used to be, De Sapio is a new-type boss, and the old stigma is gone. For another thing, few people might believe it, even though it is quite evident that there is a Harriman-De Sapio alliance. But then: is it not a fact that Stevenson was inducted into politics in precisely this manner, as the protégé of Boss Arvey of Chicago, at a time when the city machine needed the services of a respectable front?

The phonyness of the "great decision" to be made between Stevenson and Harriman is redoubled when one adds that it is not at all likely that the registered Democrats of New York will ever be called upon to choose between two organized party convention slates as a referendum between the two aspirants.

What then is behind this hanky-panky?

For one thing, it is a way these liberals have of knifing the Liberal Party, whose dissolution into the Democratic Party was called for some time ago by the *Post's* publisher Mrs. Schiff. Since the party insists on annoying Mrs. Schiff by its existence, the *Post* calls on the Liberal Party rank and file for what the Stalinists used to call a "united front from below" against the leadership. To be sure, it is hard to see how this rank and file can be impressed by the *Post's* strained caricature of a "lesser evil" argument. Save the Democratic Party from Harriman, indeed!

## DISCREET PEOPLE

But this is the spoor of the *Post's* local politics. From the national angle, what gives its editors (and publisher) the idea of trying to pull this rancid stunt at all is, no doubt, a sincere feeling about the indispensability of Stevenson. But why this feeling?

As mentioned, editorially the *Post* managed to say absolutely nothing about any merits which it sees in Stevenson as against the New York governor whom it supported for election with the greatest eulogies. In the publisher's weekly column of October 16, however, where she laments the fact that "Harry" and "Averell" jumped off the Stevenson bandwagon, Mrs. Schiff permits herself just a slight hint by writing a couple of rambling paragraphs about the issue of "race relations and civil rights."

In this passage not one single sentence follows connectedly after the other, and so it is difficult to quote, but we venture to suggest that Mrs. Schiff is saying: *Stevenson can be elected*, because only he can appeal to the "Southern politicians."

In only one other place in the *Post* is a political reason given, in the letter column, by a veteran letter-writer who customarily seconds all its editorial stands: the reason here, again, is that the "Southerners . . . would vote for Harriman."

## LIBERAL RATIONALE

It would seem that the "great decision" that liberals have to make is to see to it, by jingo, that the Democratic Party gets a candidate who will NOT fight for civil rights, who will NOT disturb the white-supremacists!

Fantastic as that sounds, when put brutally, this is what the furor for Stevenson adds up to.

It may seem less fantastic when it is realized that this—nothing less than this—was virtually put into words by another liberal organ which faced up to the issue during Stevenson's 1952 campaign, when it had to swallow the presence on the Democratic ticket of the lily-white Southern senator from Alabama. The *New Republic* in August of that year ruminated in print about the possibility that to capitulate to the Southerners was clever liberal strategy.

It argued: Democratic liberals must want to bring the South along with Northern liberalism; a head-on collision would be fatal (to the Democratic Party, that is); this candidate represents the type of liberal who can do this; if he broke too sharply with the Southerners, the latter would not look on him as "one of us"; hence we must work with "the best forces in the South" and "seek a bridge between Northern and Southern liberalism."

This was the justification for Spark-

## 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 \_\_\_\_\_

man; so now for Stevenson that he looms as the Southerners' man.

It remains only to add that, in spite of the fact that Stevenson had gotten himself adopted by the conservative wing, it must not be imagined that it is Governor Harriman who is the liberal bargain of the two. There is no reason to believe this; though, as the campaign develops, Harriman may find it advisable to put on a 1948-Truman-style dress of radical talk. In point of fact, as of now, Harriman is letting it be known that he is ready at the drop of a vote to publicly repudiate the ADA, just to make sure that he is not tainted; and it seems, also as of now, that the main issue Harriman is relying on is crude anti-Communism.

So many lesser evils have the liberals victoriously supported that their lesser evils themselves have progressively become greater and greater evils as their hollow victories mount. Politics shifts to the right down along the line, and the liberals shift too, accommodating themselves to the right wing, as the inevitable punishment visited on them for failing to strike out on the road of a new party based on labor.

Do you dream of testifying before a congressional committee in your Maidenform bra?

Do they laugh when you sit down on your broomstick?

Do you have a Little Giant Witchhunter do-it-yourself kit?

Then come to our

ISL-YSL

# HALLOWEEN WITCHHUNT

No effort will be spared to make this as disgraceful a witchhunt as is inhumanly possible. We warn you: flesh and blood can't stand it; bring along all available ectoplasm.

SAT. EVE., OCTOBER 29

LABOR ACTION CAULDRON

114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.