

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

AUGUST 27, 1956

FIVE CENTS

TUNISIA: LABOR AND NATIONALIZATION

... page 6

BLP Left Wing Forces a U-Turn on Suez

... page 3

CP Hacks Are Still Selling the Old Wares

... page 2

Our Japanese-Americans: 14 Years After

... page 4

American Science Orients Toward War

... page 4

WHY THE LABOR-LIBERAL-NAACP BLOC COLLAPSED AT THE DEMO CONVENTION

SPOT-LIGHT

Lawyer Dulles

At this writing, two alternative plans have been offered at the London conference on Suez, and the jockeying is under way to see how much of a majority the Big Three can get for their Egypt-bludgeoning course. As we explained in advance last week, the contrast is between the proposal for "international" control and operation of the canal—which means taking it and its revenue away from Egypt—and the proposal, put forward by India, for international supervision of the canal.

It is not a narrow difference, essentially. If the big powers were really concerned merely with ensuring free shipping through the canal for all, there would not be a moment's difficulty in agreeing on some version of the "supervision" plan. India's formulations, as well as perhaps other "compromise" attempts to be proposed, are designed to prove to the hilt that the Big Three want imperialist control, not the guarantees about which they like to declaim.

It is the U. S. that appears before this conference as the lawyer for the imperialist side.

As the conference convened, inspired reports in the press spoke of Dulles' desire to be a go-between in order to arrive at a peaceful settlement. He could have done this only by breaking with his NATO partners; he did not. That line of publicity was intended only to let him come to the conference with an aura of differentiation from his other two friends, so that he could more effectively represent their case.

So closely has he stuck to the joint imperialist case that he did not even neglect to remind the conference all over again, in the low-key way suited to the occasion, that the threat of armed intervention still hangs over the affair. If Egypt refuses to accept the majority view of the conference, he said—

"... then, it seems to me, that will present a new situation to be considered by our governments at that time. There might or might not in that event be further concerted decisions as between all or some of the participants in this conference."

Thus it is the United States that takes up the role of mouthpiece to put across

(Continued on page 2)

Next week:
THE REPUBLICAN PARTY SHOW
IN SAN FRANCISCO

By MAX MARTIN

There was one live political issue at the Democratic convention, and one only: civil rights. By this must it be judged.

The vice-presidential contest was a dramatic horse-race, and we do not derogate it as entertainment, but, as in the rest of the convention, there was no political program involved. The civil-rights issue could not be similarly pushed out of sight because behind this issue are masses of people struggling for their rights. It is the Negro people who put civil rights on the agenda over the heads of the so-powerful steering committee of the Democratic leadership.

It came up under the heading of "Platform," in spite of the fact that, as everyone knows, major-party platforms are mainly literary exercises. Indeed, this very fact is being busily pointed out by commentators: why get excited about the civil-rights plank if platforms are meaningless anyway?

This cynical line of emphasizing a truth long known to socialists and other honest people is especially rife among liberals now; it is their way of derogating the

significance of their own collapse in Chicago.

Thus, Mrs. Roosevelt, in her newspaper column of August 20, written to congratulate the Democratic Party on its "unity" plank, defines a platform as "the background which a president can use if he really intends to live up to the principles enunciated by his party." (Emphasis added.) It seems platforms are not promises any more, not even dishonest promises.

The liberal N. Y. Post, naturally put out by the sorry spectacle in Chicago over civil rights, philosophizes: "Party platforms, it is often said, are adopted and forgotten. What eventually matters more is the quality of the campaign and

the men who lead it. Certainly there is validity in that view."

Time was when self-confessed liberals pointed to the demagoguery of platforms as an indictment of the old parties. These are new times and new kinds of liberals. These people console themselves with the refreshing thought that their standard-bearers don't mean what they write anyway...

Of course, it is true that even if the Democrats had seen fit to write a plank promising implementation of the Supreme Court decision, no one would have taken it too seriously. (For example, Truman's administration did not lift a little finger to implement the stronger plank of 1948, when the Dixiecrats walked out of the party.)

But in the context of 1956, at the very least a strong plank would have given new impetus and encouragement to the existing Negro struggle, encouraged them to continue their militant fight against the Southern racists.

The Southern white-supremacists made sure they won, and win they did. Let

(Continued on page 7)

They Still Have Reuther and Eastland

By JACK WILSON

Detroit, Aug. 19

The victory of the Stevenson-Kefauver slate at the Democratic Party convention represented a personal triumph for Walter P. Reuther, UAW president, in terms of the kind of influence he hoped to achieve within the Democratic Party.

It was no triumph at all for Reuther's politics, or for the line the UAW was supposed to be pushing before the convention.

And, to be sure, it was done at the expense of a principled fight on program—even the kind of fight that marked the role of labor and its associates in the 1952 convention—but that is another story.

Unlike other labor leaders, Reuther was lock-stock and barrel in Stevenson's camp, and the role of the UAW at the convention emphasized this point.

When Reuther met Stevenson before the 1952 campaign, he told associates that Stevenson had more ability and leadership qualifying him for the office of president of the United States than any man he had met in his life. Since this included Roosevelt, one can appreciate the personal impact that Stevenson had on Reuther.

At the 1956 convention Reuther helped cut the prestige of President Truman down to the size of a has-been, by being the first important labor leader to declare for Stevenson, when Truman blasted his hero.

A little-publicized secret meeting between Stevenson and Reuther took place

during this crucial time. In the power politics of the convention, Reuther used his influence to make the important Michigan delegation drop any idea of helping Governor Williams become a favorite-son candidate, which might perhaps force the balloting to go more than one round. Many people thought that Williams and the Michigan delegation would rally behind Truman-Harriman. Reuther, committed to Stevenson, changed all those ideas.

On the crucial civil-rights issue, it was Reuther's avowed support of Stevenson that helped prevent a REAL fight on that issue. For if labor's most militant and powerful voice was acquiescing to moderation, who was left to fight?

Correspondent Ed Lahey described the argument on that issue as one which would have thrown both sides out of the ring on a charge of foul.

THE TAIL AND THE DOG

What happened to Reuther's famed challenge to the Democrats that "You cannot have Mr. Eastland and have us at the same time"? That is something worth thinking about. The key to maintaining the unity of the Democratic Party was precisely to avoid that kind of sharp principled fight, and Reuther, going all-out for Stevenson, along with some other labor leaders and some liberals, helped Stevenson immensely by being "reasonable" on that issue, in spite of his pre-convention huffing and puffing.

As a matter of fact, on Tuesday, before Stevenson was even nominated, he

and Reuther discussed the vice presidency, according to a N. Y. Times dispatch. In plain words, Stevenson knew that a coalition of Southern moderates, plus the labor leaders influenced by Reuther, plus his own strength, was something no one could match.

On the matter of civil rights, it was relatively easy for the UAW to talk big beforehand without worrying that anyone else would lead the fight that they didn't want to make, when it was learned before the issue came to the convention floor that Truman was committed to speak for Stevenson's "moderation" approach.

There will be a million and one rationalizations by his admirers for the fact that Reuther played such a different role at this convention than his earlier pronouncements promised. Insofar as they effect vote-getting for Stevenson and Kefauver, they are important in the eyes of the UAW leadership. Insofar as they effect a genuine discussion on what happened to the previous course of the UAW and Reuther's avowals in favor of a political realignment, that will be called "hair-splitting," "sectarian," and "disruptive."

While Reuther may have gained in personal prestige in quarters important to him, the labor movement lost ground at this convention. More than before, it was the tail of the Democratic Party. No doubt it will be explained that the tail is wagging the dog, but surely it is harder than before to convince oneself of that, and it is easier than before to see that it is still the same old dog.

West'ghouse Labor-Busters Are Still Working Overtime

By GERRY McDERMOTT

Pittsburgh, Aug. 20

The Westinghouse strike has been over for several months, but the drive against the union in Westinghouse plans goes on. A company-union movement started during the strike is being kept alive and continues to embarrass and oppose the Electrical Workers' IUE.

In East Pittsburgh, the company-union movement is known as the Westinghouse Employees Forum. It appeared during the strike as a back-to-work movement. Although supposedly made up of workers who had been on strike for four months, it had plenty of money for newspaper advertisements and mailings to strikers. It had a mailing list of Westinghouse employees which it could have gotten only from the union or the company; it didn't get it from the union.

After the strike was settled, the Westinghouse Employees Forum entered a slate in the election of officers at East Pittsburgh Local 601. But the elections were won by a slate headed by Paul Carmichael.

Carmichael had been the most militant and hard-fighting leader during the strike. The election was therefore a referendum on whether the workers approved of the conduct of the long and bitter strike, or whether they sided with the back-to-work movement. It appeared that they sided with the union.

However, the Westinghouse Employees Forum slate brought suit in the courts to have the election put aside as fraudulent. So far the courts have upheld the local, but the case is still being

appealed.

Needless to say, the newspapers had a field day; the publicity did not help the labor movement in general or the local in particular.

Now the second big election of the year has taken place—that for the Westinghouse Conference Board, for the IUE convention, and for the District Six Council. Again, the "Unity" slate led by Carmichael won, and again the Westinghouse Forum people, who entered a slate, have charged fraud. The result has been a second round of bad newspaper publicity.

It is impossible for someone not on the election committee to weigh the charges of fraud, however, we would like to suggest that the next time the local holds an election, elaborate precautions be taken and publicized in advance to prevent any such situation again. The labor movement does not need to yield to any such people on the score of democracy.

Much more serious than the activity of the Westinghouse Employees Forum in East Pittsburgh is the situation at the Columbus, Ohio plant. This was one of the real trouble spots during the strike; a determined back-to-work movement was tried there, aided by the reactionary Governor Frank Lausche of Ohio. A company union has been formed there, too, which has gone so far as to petition for an NLRB election to decertify the IUE.

Beneath the surface of election-year calm in labor relations, Westinghouse is maneuvering to weaken and destroy the union.

SPOTLIGHT

(Continued from page 1)

as heinous a case of imperialist black-jacking as the post-war world has seen. For more on Suez, see page 3.

Suppressing Parties

Let's suppose that history has taken a different turn and Russia is still On Our Side as it was in the honeymoon period of the wartime Grand Alliance, that (let's say) the cold-war enemy is still the Axis:

The West German government's suppression of the Communist Party would, in that case, be denounced roundly—and by the most respectable people—as evidencing the lingering poison of Hitlerite totalitarianism; it would be explained that the inherent German tendency to outlaw rival parties goes back to Nietzsche, Hegel, Attila, Prussianism and the institution of student dueling; that the Hunnish soul has an immanent, intrinsic, innate and inseparable counter-finitude for the party system of democracy, and that once you start suppressing parties you don't like, why, the sky's the limit.

Fortunately, it would be a little difficult to tangle this up with the German Soul or the Prussian Spirit, since the lead in police-suppression of the Communist Party has been taken by non-Prussian Americans, all imbued with triple-tested American Souls and 100-proof American Spirits.

But it's still true that once you start suppressing parties you don't like, the sky's the limit.

It's bad enough when done in this country, but it takes on still an added aspect when perpetrated by a government full of neo-Nazis.

The Communist Party in West Germany has been one of the most discredited in Europe. If, recently, it showed signs of

an upturn in its appeal, that has been strictly in response to the failures and sins of the Adenauer government and the inadequacy of the Social-Democratic opposition. This indeed underlines the meaning of outlawing the CP at this time.

The same goes, incidentally, for Bonn's suppression of right-wing parties, including parties organized by neo-Nazis themselves, where such organizations cannot be shown to have acted outside the framework of legality.

Honest John's War

Earlier this month, *U.S. News & World Report* ran an article on an outfit we hadn't heard about before: the U.S.'s special atom-war army now training in Northern Italy. If the experiment works out, says the magazine's correspondent from Verona, the same setup will be used to transform the whole army and all its contingents scattered over the globe in Europe and Asia. So think about this:

This "Southern European Task Force" of 6000 is designed to carry on "tactical" atom-warfare. The weapon it is organized around is the Honest John missile launcher, put together to hurl nuclear explosives. The targets in wartime would be troop concentrations, convoys, etc.

The whole military setup is reorganized around this design. Mechanized infantry is used, now, merely to guard the new deadly weapons against attack. They will use special vehicles to protect the troops against atomic fallout. Instead of battalions, regiments, etc., the force is organized in highly mobile and semi-autonomous task forces that can hit-and-run. The assumption is that they will often be cut off from contact with command in a fluid pattern of battle.

Since the training is longer, the army is coming to realize that it can't use short-term draftees. "Wanted: elite corps," says a subhead.

They hope that with such U.S. units at hand, Italy need contribute only 3½ divisions, instead of 10-15, to guard the northern frontiers....

While you're thinking about it, try to envisage the face of a war that would range and rage over Europe along the lines of this future which is being planned for us....

And not only Europe.

CP Hacks Are Selling The Same Old Goods

By C. SPEARE

New York, Aug. 16

The Communist Party supporters who welcomed the 20th Congress as a move toward inner-party democracy and realism may have found the Jefferson School's Summer Forums somewhat disenchanting.

At the July 17 forum, William Mandel and David Goldway—discussing "What Should the Attitude Be of American Marxists Toward the Soviet Union?"—shut their ears to Khrushchev's solo and sang a hymn to the Soviet Union: that "great land of socialism... where every worker owns his own house and the word 'mortgage' isn't in the dictionary.... Where every child has a high school education, and where a high school diploma is equivalent to a United States university degree."

They averred that due to the downgrading of Stalin by the present "courageous collective leadership," only a few more minor legal reforms were necessary to ensure absolute democracy for the people. "If this is true," came a query from the audience, "how do you explain the Polish workers' uprising in Poznan?"

Barely had the final "n" in Poznan been uttered when Stalinists in the crowd shouted the speaker down with cries of "Trotskyite—disruptor—hair-splitter," etc. Chairman Mandel, ostensibly shocked, protested: "Brothers, sisters, please! this is a democratic meeting! Quiet, please!"

When an embarrassed hush had settled over the audience, and the speaker prepared to continue, Mandel interrupted: "Now that order has been restored, I declare the speaker out of order!"

Truly, the new "democratic" Stalinism in action!

A short time later, Goldway chided "those among us who were not independent enough before" as now being "too independent."

SEEKING NEW FRONT

Two weeks later, John McManus, Max Gordon and David Goldway prophesied on "What's Ahead for the American Left?" to a dwindling audience (only about one hundred people attended). McManus, editor of the *National Guardian*, rehearsed his "McManus Proposals" which had called for "A Third Party, based on the principles of socialism."

These proposals, it may be recalled, when delivered before the American Labor Party's State Committee meeting in December 1954, were unanimously rejected, since in effect, they would have meant nothing more than dissolving the ALP and reorganizing it under a new name. The same holds true today, of course, but McManus isn't troubled with the insignificant problem of having no forces, no support, let alone no voters, to justify such a proposal.

Max Gordon gave a boost for the independent Stalinoids: he thought the CP was in pretty bad shape, while "The enormous [sic] groups of uncommitted socialists [sic] around such publications as the *American Socialist*, the *Monthly Review*, and the *National Guardian*, have not been discredited, but are growing organizations with fresh ideas." He speculated on the possibilities of an NAACP-ADA-Liberal coalition splitting a left wing off the Democratic Party and combining with organized labor to form a labor party, for which a united Stalinoid Front ("modernized Communist Party") would act as a nucleus.

Several speakers from the floor gave this line a further play by identifying themselves as writers for these Stalinoid publications and congratulating the CP for its new forthright position, while speaking of their own increased circulation. (This latter claim is quite untrue, according to this writer's best information: all these publications have experienced a declining readership in the last year.)

At the August 14 forum (by this time the attendance was down to about 50) Carl Marzani and David Goldway wound up the series with a discussion of "The American Road to Socialism."

Marzani put forward the following

new-hatched theory: "The H-bomb has made war an impossibility—see, for example, the stalemate in the Suez crisis; if war is impossible, then it follows that civil war is impossible; therefore, we cannot have a proletarian revolution... Marx and Engels said that peaceful transition to socialism was possible if socialists could be voted into the government in large numbers.... At the historic Twentieth Congress of the Russian Communist Party, the great socialist leaders of the Soviet Union reaffirmed this principle.... The American road to socialism will be a slow, progressive one."

A speaker from the floor asked just wherein this new line differed from Browder's "Progressive Capitalism." Marzani answered: "The only difference between Browder and me is that he said he would shake J. P. Morgan's hand, and I wouldn't, because I know he wouldn't offer it to me in the first place!"

NOT WITH THE TRUTH

When questioned about the future of the American Communist Party, Marzani asserted that "The Communist Party has no intentions of dissolving.... It will reform itself into a more democratic structure; but I can't say this will happen in two or three years—it may take twenty-five or thirty years. The Communist Party has been and still is the only active, militant, and effective socialist organization in the United States."

He went on to say that since 1923 the CP has issued about 500,000 membership cards. "Of these," he said, "twenty-four out of every twenty-five either dropped out or were expelled [this would make the current membership around 20,000—C.S.] because they didn't like what was going on or because they couldn't adapt to iron party discipline.... I wonder if maybe it wouldn't have been better to have less discipline and more members."

During the discussion period, an LYLer demanded that the CP renounce "the defensive position it has held the last ten years and take up an offensive one. What the Communist Party must do is establish a mass socialist party that can defeat the capitalist class, immediately!" This "novel" idea was greeted by a round of applause from the Stalinists.

To sum up the Summer Forums, it is apparent that the CP is floundering around without any real policy at all: no electoral objectives, no activities, and a progressive organizational deterioration. There is confusion and disagreement among the leadership, and the rank and file wonder about things in hopeless bewilderment.

Only one thought prevails: a continuing, fantastic, fanatic devotion to Moscow, based on lies and illusions. Meanwhile, crises deepen and foundations crumble; Stalinism cannot live with the truth.

NEW YORK

LABOR ACTION FORUM

THURSDAYS at 9 p.m.

Aug. 30—Bogdan Denitch
THE CRISIS
OVER SUEZ

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

114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, New York City

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

Send for our free book list.

LONDON LETTER

Left Wing Made BLP Take a U-Turn on Suez Crisis

By OWEN ROBERTS

London, Aug. 14

The London *Daily Mirror* has many faults. It tends to devote a large proportion of its space to comic strips and photographs of scantily clad females displaying large busts. When it deals with political issues it usually lines up with the more conservative elements of the Labor Party.

But with a circulation well over the four million mark and a daily readership of more than eleven million, the *Mirror* is often able to reflect the feeling of a large proportion of the British public with uncanny accuracy. When it gets its teeth into a big issue it does so in a big way and carries with it a large section of the working class. And dealing out the full shock-treatment of the modern tabloid it hits out hard.

Today was a political day for the *Mirror*.

In screaming black headlines, six inches deep and across the full width of its front page, it delivered a message to Sir Anthony Eden. In four words it summed up the feelings of millions of people throughout Britain.

The four words were: **NO WAR OVER EGYPT!** And then it proceeded to devote nearly three pages to telling the government exactly what so many people in Britain feel.

If Eden, said the *Mirror*, allows himself to be goaded into rash deeds by his own bold words, by the din from the saber-rattlers and gun-boat diplomats, or by applause from France, he will find himself in a position that could be resolved in one way only—by his own resignation as prime minister. The *Mirror* then lashed out at the "belligerent right-wing newspapers" which are urging the government to take violent action over the nationalization of the Suez Canal.

It named the newspapers as *The Times*, *Daily Mail* and *Daily Express*. These newspapers, it said, had advocated appeasement toward Nazi Germany before the war but now that the adversary is a minor power called Egypt "these cardboard heroes are demanding savage and instant revenge."

The *Mirror* could have added many other names to the list of newspapers in favor of violent action against Egypt. For immediately Nasser's nationalization of the Suez Canal was known, almost every paper in Britain jumped on what it thought would be the bandwagon, and began waving the Union Jack and writing in a fashion reminiscent of the Boer War.

JINGOISM

Newspapers which in the past have been prepared to condone every tinpot totalitarianism from South America to South-east Asia suddenly could not write the name Nasser without spitting the word "dictator" into the middle of the sentence. Journalists who have been prepared to turn a blind eye to savage repression in Kenya, Cyprus and Okinawa suddenly stirred up from their beer mugs to demand that the British government act with bloody haste in order to defend the "freedom of the Suez Canal" for all the countries of the world. As the British military machine went into action, newspaper columns were crammed with the usual pictures of called-up reservists saying goodbye to their children, or leaving their wedding breakfast with a tearful bride bravely waving in the background.

But the jingoism and flag-wagging seems to have lost its magic. The tramp of steel-shod soldiers' feet and the chorus of bawdy barrack-room ballads are no longer popular music in Britain. And the newspapers which dived into the pool of patriotism headfirst are now being pelted with brickbats by their readers who prefer the firm ground of common sense.

One of the papers floundering deep in the mire of its own making is the *Daily Herald*, official mouthpiece of the Labor Party. Immediately after the nationalization of the canal it ran a tub-thumping editorial under the headline: "NO MORE ADOLF HITLERS!" Colonel Nasser, said the *Herald*, was acting like

Hitler in the Middle East; Britain and the "other powers" should swiftly show Nasser that they are going to tolerate no more Hitlers. "There is no room for appeasement," was the ominous note on which the editorial closed.

The *Herald* obviously thought it was peddling a popular line, but it soon discovered otherwise. "Your rabid support for imperialism dismays me," wrote one woman reader. "Is not Eden trying to restore his shattered reputation by this venture," she asked, "and are you not assisting him?"

Another reader, R. L. Fagg (who stood as Labor candidate in the now-famous Tonbridge by-election reported in a London Letter some weeks ago), said that he had written to *The Times* saying that its editor obviously felt so bad about the Suez Canal he should fly there and jump in. "I invite you to do the same thing," said Fagg to the editor of the *Daily Herald*.

COOKIES FROM TORIES

However, the *Herald* is not alone in Labor circles in pursuing a right-wing line on the Suez issue. It keeps company with a number of the eminent leaders of the Parliamentary Labor Party.

On August 2 Hugh Gaitskell, the leader of the Parliamentary Labor Party, made a speech in the House of Commons which brought dismay to many Labor Party members. Reading his speech now it seems carefully hedged in with all manner of qualifications and diplomatic subtleties. The *Sunday Times* neatly summed Gaitskell's speech up when it said, "not only did he have a saving each-way bet on the side, but he covered himself by including every starter."

But what he did not do was to come out firm and strong against the war-like poses of Eden and his government, nor did he oppose economic sanctions against Egypt. And this is just what the great majority of the Labor Party wanted him to do.

The wrath of Laborites can be imagined when, two days later, they could read in an editorial of the *Daily Telegraph*, an organ of the Tory extreme right, that "Any attempt to describe the Western Powers' firm stand over Suez as further evidence of Tory imperialism

has been nipped in the bud by Mr. Gaitskell's courageous support in the House of Commons."

The *Telegraph* also tossed a cookie to the right-wing elements of the French Socialist Party, when it continued, "But firmness is supported not only by Britain's Socialist Opposition; it is also vigorously advocated by the French Government. M. Mollet and M. Pineau, both staunch Socialists, have been the most consistent advocates of the firmest possible measures to meet the Egyptian challenge."

Another "socialist" who has got right out on a limb is Herbert Morrison, one-time deputy leader of the Parliamentary Labor Party who was beaten by both Gaitskell and Bevan when he fought for Attlee's mantle last year.

HE WASN'T NERVOUS

Making one of his now infrequent speeches in the House of Commons, he said that he was in favor of taking the issue to the United Nations so long as it could be expected that the UN would do something; but, he added, the UN had got to stop dodging "vital international issues." Just what this meant was revealed when he went on to say that if the government decided to use force "it might well be the duty of MPs, including myself, to say we would give them support."

He advised the Tory Government: "Be careful and judicious by all means, but don't be too nervous. If we are nervous we shall begin to evolve a situation in which countries can set themselves up against international practice, international morals, international standards."

This spirited speech of Morrison's brought rousing cheers from the Tory benches—but on the Labor side it was met by the left-wingers more with pity than anger. Pity that a man could become so frustrated that, because the long-sought prize of Party Leader had eluded his grasp, he could blindly toss overboard the very last vestiges of principles left from the time when he refused to fight in the imperialist war of 1914-18.

Morrison, however, is a has-been in the Labor Party. Gaitskell has yet to become one. And when the annual conference of the party meets in October he will have to face his critics.

Already he is beginning to try and draw his horns in a little and yesterday he summoned a special meeting of the Labor Shadow Cabinet which decided to urge a recall of Parliament, now on its long summer vacation.

Gaitskell, it appears, is learning what the *Daily Mirror* made plain today—the British people have no intention of being swept off their feet in a war with Egypt.

Suez Co. Sabotages the Canal

Besides Egypt on the one side, and the British-French-U. S. imperialist combine on the other, there is another party of interest in the dispute which is taking a hand, whose officials, led by general manager Jacques Georges-Picot, are trying to save themselves.

After all the French government (in-between its screams for Nasser's blood) has said that the canal, after being grabbed away from Egypt, should no longer be under the private company. This would presumably mean that the gentlemen of the international financial set who have run the canal up to now would be out no matter who wins in the fight. The prospect was unpleasant to them. They sought for a lever to put them back in the picture.

On August 9, a N. Y. *Times* dispatch from Paris candidly reported that the finance-capitalists were seeking to pull out the canal pilots and line them up on the side of the company. It was, of course, a squeeze on Egypt, but correspondent Callender also wrote: "There seems reason to infer that the company's motive is to cling to all its legal

rights and to bring pressure on the Western powers to pay more heed to those rights than they have yet done."

The next day manager Georges-Picot threw forth the suggestion that after the canal is duly "internationalized" by the Big Three, the company should remain as the operating agency for the military occupation. On August 14 he claimed that he had the bulk of the canal pilots sewed up (Egypt denied this) and that "we can, from one day to the next, bring traffic to a halt in the canal."

During the London conference itself, on August 20, the British government officially threw its support to the company's campaign to take the canal pilots away from the canal unless Egypt capitulates.

This is out-and-out blackmail, and, among other things, underscores the touching morality of these imperialists who decry Egypt's action in the name of justice and humanity. They pretend that their only concern is to ensure uninterrupted and free shipping through the canal, and just to prove that Egypt can't do this, they will themselves shut down the waterway.

Bevan Is Out of Step

By HAL DRAPER

We are in receipt now of the August 3 issue of the Bevanite organ *Tribune* which headlined "Stop This Suez Madness!" and helped to spark the revolt of the British Labor Party left wing against the Tory policy on Suez.

The leader-article is indeed a vigorous appeal against Eden's saber-rattling. It is particularly outspoken in characterizing the initial stand taken up by the Labor Party leader, Hugh Gaitskell.

When Eden made his first statement, Gaitskell (says *Tribune*) "outdid the Tories in suggesting ways of putting pressure on Egypt." And "The proposal made by Mr. Gaitskell and gratefully adopted by the government—blocking Egyptian funds in Britain—is indefensible in law or morality."

The article ends: "Mr. Gaitskell's reactions to the crisis were those of the most orthodox Tory. The rank and file, by every means open to them, must speak for Britain."

"Labor's duty is clear," it says. "It must oppose the hysterical campaign against Nasser and his nation; to which at present some Labor politicians and the *Daily Herald* are making a disgraceful contribution."

"It must fight the Tory plan to bully Egypt, and defend her where her demands are justifiable. It must protect Britain from being hustled into the use of force, which would mean an acute danger of world war."

"It must insist that Britain should return to fidelity to her pledge to assist in building the High Dam."

IN THE UNDERTOW

There was a notable difference in tone and approach, however, in the article on an inside page signed by Aneurin Bevan himself.

This is not simply because a good part of it is devoted to an attack on the Nasser dictatorship itself and its failure to solve the internal problems of the country. That would be all to the good, if put in the context of the leader-article's support to Egypt's rights as against foreign imperialist intervention.

Not one word in Bevan's article, however, concedes any right to Egypt's side in the dispute, or in any way supports Egypt against the British threats of armed intervention.

On the contrary, he comes out for "internationalizing" the canal (other waterways as well) under a "world authority, to be policed and administered by that authority." He does not refer to the UN.

He specifically states his agreement with Eden that "no one nation should be able to hold up the commerce of the world."

He makes no critical or other reference to the actual "internationalization" proposal of the Big Three, with which his own formulation is not in contradiction as far as Suez is concerned.

He virtually says in so many words that in nationalizing the canal Egypt was taking away property that doesn't belong to it.

He sneeringly remarks at one point that "getting the British out of the Canal Zone," he hoped, "would have sufficiently sated national pride . . ." as if freeing one's country of a foreign military occupation is simply a matter of hurt feelings.

He descends to a very strange depth of unthinking petulance against Egypt when he actually demands whether Egypt intends to "treat the canal like a medieval caravan route, levying toll for the right of way?"—as if levying toll in the canal were a Nasser invention.

He charges that Nasser "permitted, and certainly connived at, the most virulent anti-Western propaganda from Cairo," without any comment on the fact that this charge (France's favorite) mainly refers to Egypt's support of the Algerian fight for freedom.

This is the tone and content of the whole article. It inevitably looks, to any one who reads both the leader-article and Bevan's, that while the editorial board sprang to an anti-imperialist and internationalist-socialist position, Bevan was carried away by the chauvinist undertow that accompanied the first Suez hysteria in Britain.

YOU and SCIENCE

American Science Dedicates Itself to War

By GENE LISTER

The orientation of American scientific efforts toward profits and preparation for war is apparent to even casual observers of government and industry today. But when the total in dollars of the funds expended for "national security" and industrial research are coldly presented, the imbalance of a science which is applied for destruction and profits, rather than for its great human potential, is even more appalling. And considering the means for destruction already at the disposal of capitalism, the threats of tomorrow's technology from today's science are overwhelming.

Even the dramatic triumph last year of the Salk vaccine does not provide sufficient counterbalance to hide out-and-out misuse of science. This is not to depreciate the scientific achievement of polio's conquest. That is an indication of what could be done if all science were applied to constructive efforts. But the swift rush for industrial profits in polio vaccine production, which nearly resulted in a national health catastrophe, is all too typical of the exploitation of scientific results today.

The following analysis of current expenditures for scientific research and development in the United States is based upon publications of the National Science Foundation, a government agency. These studies, issued within the past year, are titled "Federal Funds for Science" and "Science and Engineering in American Industry."

The over-all expenditure in the United States in 1953 for research and development has been estimated at about \$5 billion. About two-thirds of this was expended by private industry; the remainder by educational institutions, government agencies and private foundations.

However, over one-third of industrial research was financed by the federal government, either by direct contract or procurement. All in all, the government paid out over \$2 billion for research in 1953.

These figures compare with a total for American science of \$150 million in 1930, and \$350 million in 1940, by all types of organizations.

'ONLY THE GOVERNMENT . . .

The \$5 billion total research cost in 1953 should be put in perspective against the government's defense spending of nearly \$44 billion in the same year. It can also be compared to a national production (that is, total value of goods and service from all sources) of about \$365 billion in 1953.

That such a large program of government spending for research is inevitable nowadays is clearly indicated in the statement of Chester I. Bernard, chairman of the National Science Board, in the 1955 report of the National Science Foundation: "the promotion of science is not merely important but an urgent national problem requiring the cooperation of many private, educational and industrial institutions, and in many respects support and leadership by state and federal governments. It seems quite clear that the urgency will increase with the growth of scientific knowledge and its application through technology, with increasing specialization and complexity . . . in the last 15 years a revolution has occurred in scientific work that much of it now calls for exceedingly expensive structures and equipment for accelerators, observatories, high pressure apparatus, ships, electronic computers, etc., which already have outrun the financial capacity of private resources, and this will increasingly be the case. Only the federal government, that is, all the people, will be able to meet the deficiency after all possible resources have been utilized."

The really indisputable fact is that the United States scientific efforts, spurred on by government policy, are harnessed to war preparation and large corporation profits. Of the government's budget for sciences, 85 per cent is directly controlled and administered by the Department of Defense. The remaining functions are relatively slighted, as is shown by the follow-

ing breakdown of government funds for science in 1954:

	In Millions
National Security	\$1,823
Transportation and Communications	98
Social Security, Welfare & Health	73
Agriculture	54
Natural Resources	43
Education & General Research..	21
Finance, Commerce & Industry..	9
All other functions	14

While the sum under "National Security" (war preparation) is \$1,823 million, all the other headings put together get only \$312 million. And one might make a shrewd guess that under some of these other headings, too, there are war-preparation items tucked away, or that the specific projects under these headings have been angled toward or distorted by the same end—death rather than life.

The heading "all other functions" include about \$6 million for labor and manpower and a half million for housing and community development.

CONCENTRATION

In private industry, research follows the usual pattern of greater and greater concentration of resources into fewer and larger corporations. Nine industrial groups account for nine-tenths of the estimated total industrial research in 1953. These were electrical equipment, aircraft, motor vehicles, chemical, machinery, professional and scientific instruments, petroleum, telecommunications and fabricated metal-parts industries.

The emphasis on the science and technology of automation and air warpower is reflected by the fact that two industries, electrical and aircraft, account for forty per cent of the total dollars expended.

The distribution of research reflects also the accelerated trend toward concentration in American industry with scientific knowledge providing the power for both profits and weapon superiority. All other uses of science are largely neglected.

Eighty-five per cent of industry's research funds can be attributed to nine per cent of the companies engaged in scientific research. Over seventy per cent is incurred by the 375 largest companies with 5000 or more employees. These 375 companies represent only 2 per cent of the total number of firms with active research programs.

SCIENTIFIC AGE?

Little is heard today of the ameliorative effects of private philanthropy on capitalism's ills. The feebleness of its efforts are evident in the low expenditure of research funds by the private foundations. In 1953 such foundations spent only \$26 million for research, that is, only one half of one per cent of the total in the United States. Even here some of the funds were drained off into atomic energy research of a type which ultimately contributed to atomic warfare.

Considering that the privately endowed foundations are now almost the sole source of research in the broad social, educational and humanitarian fields, the minute expenditure of funds for human welfare is all too apparent.

Considering the whole picture, science in the United States as shown by the allocation of its funds reflects the social and economic preoccupation with profits and war preparations. The social sciences, with a low payoff in dollars, are neglected. Thus while apologists like to call this a scientific age the glitter of a misdirected science cannot hide the basic irrational nature of capitalism in decay.

YOU'RE INVITED

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

By BOGDAN DENITCH

Blessed are the meek. Everything comes to him who waits. Etc. Fourteen years ago, at the beginning of the war to defend democracy against racist fascism, over 100,000 American citizens of Japanese descent were driven from their homes along the West Coast and herded into concentration camps. Two recent news items revive this episode from time's obscurity.

A N. Y. Times dispatch (Aug. 12) from Los Angeles has a heart-warming moral to stress after describing the condition of the Nisei on the West Coast in the war: a persecuted minority, segregated in housing, education and employment; then picked up on few hours' notice after Pearl Harbor and marshaled into concentration camps; then discriminated against for years after the war. But justice triumphs:

"The transformation of Japanese-American status in the space of a few years seems an example of the Biblical precept that the meek shall inherit the earth. One can imagine all kinds of contrasting eventualities if they had not accepted their wartime tribulations with such patience and forbearance."

The article goes on to add: "nearly all of them, hindsight has shown, were very loyal to the United States."

It was indeed a notable case of being asked to turn the other cheek: You are a member of a persecuted minority; you and your family are shipped off to a detention camp without any semblance of legality; you lose your meager property (there are still today 20,000 claims for over \$130,000,000 to be settled for losses of property suffered during the war); you are then asked to prove your loyalty by signing an oath and enlisting while your family remains in the camp for the duration of the war.

But understand—the returned Nisei veterans and their families were greeted in many communities with signs saying "No Japs Wanted." Most found that their farms and other property had been "purchased" for a song by white neighbors, and as recently as five years ago they were subject to all kinds of legal discrimination. But they "accepted their wartime tribulations with forbearance," and now fourteen years later the papers can write that this minority is "well on the way" to first-class citizenship.

Not there yet, of course; maybe they weren't meek enough. But at last "on the way."

DISLOYAL?

There are some questions that might arise in the mind of a democrat. Would it have been wrong for this minority to have demanded its rights, as good Americans are supposed to do, and unmeekly struggled against the obvious injustice they suffered?

Would it have been proof of disloyalty for the Nisei to have been more reluctant to enlist in an army that was fighting a war with the slogan (among others) made famous by Adm. Halsey: "Your job is to kill Japs, kill Japs, and then kill more Japs—burn the bestial yellow apes out of the islands."

Another question arises: If Japan were not today lined up more or less with the U. S. in the cold war, would the powers-that-be have opened their eyes so quickly (after only 14 years) to the compelling power of meekness, even now?

As a sidelight it is also interesting to note that while two-thirds of the Nisei lived in California before the war, the proportion today is much smaller. Even members of a "meek" minority sometimes get tired waiting for their inheritance.

There is another side to the story of the Japanese-Americans. While in the camps, the Japanese-Americans had to "prove" their loyalty. The proof consisted of taking an oath, the form of which was obnoxious to many, and enlisting. However, a number reacted to the camps and to the treatment they received by renouncing their citizenship rather than taking the oath.

Most of these attempted to regain their citizenship after the war ended. The court cases in question have dragged on and

on; as of now, about half of those who renounced their citizenships are still suing. It seems that it is much easier to forget the crime of the liberal Roosevelt administration against common humanity than the act of "disloyalty" of the few who renounced their citizenship under what the Justice Department admits were "coercive influences."

'FORGIVE THEM OUR SINS . . .'

However, even this story, we learn from the press, has a happy ending. The Justice Department has decided to stop contesting just 157 out of almost 3000 cases, and these lucky few will become citizens immediately.

One might add that the criteria used under the new "liberalized" policy require that a Nisei shall have demonstrated his loyalty to the United States as follows:

- He must have taken the first step toward restitution by a loyalty declaration while still in the detention camp.
- He then must have either served or offered to serve in the armed forces.
- He must satisfy the Justice Department that he renounced his citizenship "through fear or apprehension."
- In the case of a wife she must have been coerced and acted in unison with her husband.

Then, if the applicant meets all these qualifications under the new "liberalized" policy he may get his citizenship back.

Of course there is and has been no talk of any kind of restitution to the people involved for the unjust treatment they suffered. It is sufficient that they shall have proven their unquestioning loyalty and willingness to fight for a society that treated them as second-class citizens and applied the race-guilt theory to their people as a whole. The reward for this loyalty—fourteen years later—is the small headline in the press informing the world that Japanese-Americans in the U. S. are "gaining equality."

We presume that the whole Nisei community will show appropriate gratitude to a society and a social system that so generously forgives a minority for the crimes committed against it.

Some cynics may point out, since there always are people who fail to see things in perspective, that most of the property involved is still in the hands of those who picked it up during the war.

One would feel a little bit cleaner and less cynical, however, but for the fact that by and large the liberals supported this racist crime during the war, as did also the Stalinists. It is one of the brighter parts of the record of the Socialist Party and Norman Thomas that they courageously protested the outrage during the war and fought it with all the meager means at their disposal.



LABOR ACTION

August 27, 1956 Vol. 20, No. 35

Published weekly by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone: WAlkins 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

Young Socialist CHALLENGE

August 27, 1956

Edited and Published by the YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE

FIVE CENTS

The GI Education Program Showed That It Could Be Done

By EDWARD HILL

At a time when there is considerable discussion of the defects of the American educational system, particularly its inability to train sufficient numbers for various technical jobs, the country quietly observed the passing of one of its most far-reaching educational experiments last week: the GI Bill of Rights.

The GI Bill was made into law on June 22, 1954. Under it, veterans received their tuition and a subsistence of \$50 a month for unmarried men and \$75 for the married. This was subsequently raised to \$65 and \$90. In addition, there was an allowance of \$500, part of which went to tuition, but the remainder could be applied to books, fees and other expenses.

As the New York Times put it, "When President Roosevelt signed the bill . . . many educators 'viewed it with alarm.' Some even warned that institutions of higher education would become little more than hobo camps."

This conservative point of view was refuted by the actual program. As it developed, the GI Bill revealed a tremendous hunger for education on the part of the army veterans, and the impact of their presence on campus, many educators now agree, was to raise the academic level.

The first point is an especially interesting comment on the society.

When the bill became law, the experts anticipated that half a million veterans might take advantage of the educational provisions. This was almost immediately revised upward, to a million. The reality reached a million and a half.

As a result of this, the colleges were caught napping. Facilities were strained to the full, classes were jammed, and

there was an inevitable negative effect academically.

But another tendency asserted itself. The veterans turned out to be anything but the "hobos" anticipated by the conservatives. Older (their average age was 27) and more mature, the veterans were generally conceded to have given a boost to the academic level throughout the nation.

This was, of course, reinforced by the fierce competition which developed around admissions to graduate and professional schools. It allowed many colleges and universities to raise their academic standards.

These two aspects of the GI program are especially interesting in their social implications. For one thing, it reveals the extent of the desire for education which is latent beneath the surface of America's class-structured system of colleges and universities.

For another, it demonstrated the ability of those who wanted an education to stand up to rigorous academic standards.

And yet the measure was allowed to remain only a "veteran's bill"; it never became the part of a long-range public policy on education.

That it didn't is strikingly evident from the deal received by Korean veterans. The eligibles under this law have numbered only 350,000. In general, these veterans have not received the sympathy and support of the public which marked the demobilization of 1945-6. And as a result, their benefits are something less than those of the World War II veterans under the GI Bill.

Under the present setup, a single veteran receives \$110 a month, a married \$160. But that's all. There is no \$500 allowance for tuition, books, fees, etc. Those expenses must come out of the \$110 or \$160.

As a result, the amount left over for subsistence (even if it isn't corrected for the rise in the cost of living) is considerably less than for the World War II veterans. Because his political power was not as strong, the Korean veteran has taken a licking.

ITS ACHIEVEMENTS

But then, does this mean that the World War II GI Bill was a failure? Is that why they've gone back on it for the Korean veterans?

The figures announced last week when the program terminated give the lie to such a claim.

The bill trained 238,000 teachers, 450,000 engineers, 180,000 doctors and nurses, 113,000 scientists, and 36,000 clergymen. The largest number receiving assistance under the bill went into various "business" training courses, 33 per cent of the total. But still the social gain to American society and the opportunity afforded to individuals was tremendous.

One need only contrast the figures on engineers for the GI Bill period and the present. At the peak of veterans' graduation, 50,000 engineers received their diplomas. Today, the number is halved to 23,500.

The engineering figure is particularly interesting in the light of the concern which America's corporations are showing for the fact which it defines. At various meetings, in articles and speeches, big-business spokesmen have argued for some kind of program to increase the number of technicians. The motive for

this is not, of course, altruistic: the technicians are a requirement of American capitalism, and the businesses are seeking a way to have the society pay the cost of filling their needs.

And yet no one has seriously proposed a long-range program. One would think that the GI Bill would lead to some kind of speculation.

Its figures demonstrated what is possible in America, even on the limited scale of a veterans' program. The cost, over a period of twelve years, was some \$14½ billion dollars, i.e., a fraction of what has been spent in the same period for armaments.

And its impact was not limited to technical education! One consequence of the bill, as described by Benjamin Fine in the Times, was that "The GI Bill discounted the theory, held in some quarters, that only those able to afford it should take graduate studies. It has given impetus to a fellowship program sponsored by industry and the federal government."

Another consequence which conservatives saw in this federal aid to education did not come to pass. At the time of the debate over the bill, there were those who prophesied that it would lead to a government dictatorship over education, that it would destroy the freedom of the colleges, that it was (horror of horrors) "socialistic."

But the program was set up so as to allow freedom of choice to the individual veteran and freedom of administration

to the college or university. Sectarian schools, state universities, private colleges, all were recipients of government money and none were required to change their teaching or methods of instruction. In the cases of various fly-by-night outfits which were set up with the intention of cashing in on the deal, there was a certain amount of policing, but it stopped at a criterion of academic competence.

POTENTIALITY

Now the bill is finished with. The Korean veterans will receive their limited benefits for a little while longer, and then the whole thing will be forgotten. It will be remembered as a brilliant appeal to a special-interest group, but its success will not be generalized in terms of the social needs of education in this country.

Those youth who are fortunate enough not to be involved in a shooting war will return home from their army stint to face America's "normal" class-stratified educational system. The businessmen will continue to moan about the failure of the country's schools to graduate enough technicians to staff our prosperous corporations.

But the GI Bill, in a limited way, goes far beyond the implications of appeal to a special-interest group. It was a startling demonstration, even in its incomplete form, of the possibilities in the society, in terms of talent and ability, which can be encouraged if we break through our class education.

Calif. YSL Camp Hits the Spot

Over 35 members and friends of the Young Socialist League attended the first Summer Camp of the West Coast YSL, held last month. The camp was organized jointly by the Berkeley and Los Angeles units, at Big Sur State Park, California.

The park is located about a mile inland in the southernmost reaches of the giant California redwoods. The camp site was located in a grove which was only a ten-minute walk from the Big Sur River. The campers were able to take advantage of the park facilities for swimming, softball and hiking, as well as participate in a rounded educational program.

Charles Walker gave a presentation on Russian-Polish relations since World War II, and related his historical analysis to the events in Poznan. Ted Enright approached the Poznan events in terms of a comparison with the June Days of 1953 in East Germany. And Stan Weir discussed the implications of the workers' uprising in Poland from the point of view of its impact upon the international working-class movement.

American politics was covered in a discussion by Don Thomas. He discussed the Negro struggle, politics in America at the present time, and the perspective of a labor party in the United States. The educationals were marked by a high degree of group participation.

In addition, the camp was enlivened by the presence of a jazz contingent from Pasadena which helped to attract campers from other parts of the park. The result of this rather unusual form of propaganda was that the Sunday afternoon session turned up a group of Saturday night jazz fans ready and willing to discuss the problems of socialism.

Come to the YSL Camp

When?
Monday, September 3 (supper) through Sunday, September 9.

Where?
At Mountain Spring Camp, Washington, New Jersey. (Directions on, and arrangements for, getting there available on request.)

What?
Educational program (classes led by Hal Draper, Max Shachtman and others). Swimming. Sports. Games. Socials. Dancing. Sunshine. Excellent cuisine.

How Much?
For the whole camp period: Room in lodge—\$40. Cabin—\$38. Dorm—\$35.
For the weekend of Sept. 8-9: Room in lodge—\$14. Cabin—\$13. Dorm—\$12.
Cost pro-rated for other periods or odd meals.

What Is To Be Done?
You register in advance—immediately; that's required. Enclose a \$5 deposit with each full-period reservation, or a \$2 deposit with each weekend reservation. Make checks or money orders out to Max Martin.

Young Socialist League, 114 West 14 Street, New York City

Enclosed find \$.....deposit for the following number of reservations:

.....Full-period —Weekend only Other (please specify)

NAME..... ADDRESS.....

Tunisia Hears the Rumbles of Class Conflict on Nationalization

By ANDRE GIACOMETTI

Paris, Aug. 13

Inside independent Tunisia, the nationalist regime headed by Habib Bourguiba is likely to be divided in the near future by internal class antagonisms and divergent social programs.

On the one side, pressing the bourgeois-nationalist government leaders, is the Tunisian Trade Union Federation, the UGTT.

Timely, therefore, is an interview with the secretary-general of this Tunisian workers' movement, Ahmed Ben Salah, which this correspondent managed to obtain at the end of last month.

Needless to say, the views he expresses in his answers are his own, not necessarily those of independent socialists, but they constitute an informative document about a too little known organization which is a crux for progress in the Arab world.

As can be seen in the interview, Ahmed Ben Salah underemphasizes differences with the government heads. For obviously diplomatic reasons, some of his answers are very general. Here we present some background, including some earlier statements of the UGTT, made on other occasions.

Tunisia occupies a leading position among the Arab states, and also on the African scene. As long as Algeria remains under colonialist rule, it is the Arab country most likely to develop along progressive lines under the leadership of a powerful and advanced labor movement. For this reason Tunisia represents an alternative both to the feudal protectorates of the oil companies and to the Peron-type dictatorships that are bidding to replace them.

Much depends, therefore, on the course of action followed by the working-class organization which enjoys the confidence and support of the Tunisian people.

Unlike other mass supports of the nationalist government (such as the farmers' union UNAT and the Artisans and Merchants Union UTAC), the UGTT places strong emphasis on nationalization and industrialization.

PROSPECT FOR INDUSTRY

In a statement published last April in *Le Monde* (Paris), Ahmed Ben Salah criticized the idea that the future of Tunisia was necessarily agricultural:

"Industry is a source of wealth and our mineral resources are not yet fully explored; neither, by the way, is our land. . . . We are categorically in favor [of industrialization]. We are always told that we lack power resources and technical cadres. . . . We therefore demand that important funds be allocated for the rapid training of technicians in French schools. Also credits should be set aside to find a solution to the problem of power. The problem does not seem insoluble to us, even without recourse to solar power. In any case, at the present time the power needs for a light industry, for processing the country's raw materials, are not considerable. The construction of a few thermal plants and of an oil refinery would provide the neces-

Contrast

In contrast to the British Laborites' revolt against their government's Suez warmongering (see page 3), the leaders of the French Socialist Party at the head of the government still continue their role as executioners of the Algerian liberation forces.

A clipping on our desk from the *AFL-CIO News* gives additional evidence of how the French reactionaries are chortling over this job that "socialists" are doing for them. It refers to a radio address by the AFL-CIO representative in Europe, Irving Brown:

"Gen. Weygand, famous wartime general and now a rightist political leader, was quoted by Brown as having said: 'Thank God we have a Socialist government to try to carry out policy this time. If the right wing were in power and trying to put down the revolt, we'd be branded Fascists.'"

sary fuel and would save substantial costs. . . . There are sufficient raw materials to justify such industrial equipment. . . . It's all a problem of investment."

As far as nationalization is concerned, the UGTT has always favored its extension to all French companies operating today under concessions "generally granted under dishonest conditions" by the former colonial administration. These companies control mostly transportation, electric power, mining, and partly agriculture.

"For us Tunisians, nationalization means returning to the State what belonged to it in the first place; for us workers, nationalization means orienting our resources no longer toward capitalist profit but toward the people's welfare."

Furthermore, the UGTT considers that an extension of nationalization is a condition for full employment—an urgent problem in a country where 600,000 people (17 per cent of the population) are unemployed.

COMPETING POLICIES

On the agricultural question, unlike the farmers' union, the UGTT advocates an extension of cooperatives ("similar to those existing in Israel," the secretary-general has said).

These are some of the more important differences in emphasis that reveal dif-

ferences in policy and program, within the broad coalition represented by the "National Front."

Broadly speaking, we have here two competing policies: a labor policy tending toward socialism, and a policy which seeks to spread individual prosperity by strengthening the smallholders and the independent petty bourgeoisie. The reactionary right wing, represented by some merchants in the cities and by the big landowners, has been pushed out of the political picture, along with the followers of the Old Destour and the followers of Salah Ben Youssef.

After the last elections, the trend toward differentiation, within the "National Front" was slowed down to some extent, mainly because the Neo-Destour Party under Bourguiba shifted to the left and aligned itself on the UGTT program: nationalization of the *habous* lands owned by the Moslem church; unification of the legislative system and abolition of the religious courts; abolition of the legal privileges of the royal family; nationalization of the railroads; abolition of polygamy—these are among the measures that reflect the influence of the UGTT on the government.

TENSIONS

Nonetheless, tensions remain, particularly on issues of economic planning. Recently the UGTT sharply criticized, for the first time, the government's economic policy, or rather, absence of an economic policy. This is not surprising; like all socially heterogeneous parties, the Neo-Destour has built-in brakes to guard against all effective reform policies. It is therefore probable that, within months, the UGTT may take steps to form its own party, either as a new Tunisian Labor Party or by turning the Neo-Destour into the equivalent of such a party.

Interview with Tunisia's Labor Leader

Following is the text of an interview by our French correspondent André Giacometti with the secretary-general of the Tunisian Trade Union Federation (UGTT), Ahmed Ben Salah:

Q—Could you briefly outline the history of the UGTT?

A—After the war, the Communists attempted to capture the trade-union movement in Tunisia as in all other countries. But an outstanding militant, the late Farhat Hached, who was then the secretary of the Federation of Labor in the city of Sfax, did not accept this situation and took the lead in forming independent unions. On January 20, 1946 a congress was called by the independent unions and the Tunisian Federation of Civil Servants, at which the UGTT was founded.

Ever since, the UGTT has grown continuously. It soon received new members from everywhere, but also began to disturb the colonialist authorities, who resented the development of a Tunisian trade-union movement under an independent Tunisian leadership.

The repression started on August 5, 1947, at the time of a general strike. The young trade-union movement emerged strengthened from this first encounter. The colonialists continued their policy of repression against trade-unionists, but neither dozens of killed (Sfax, Enfidaville, Djebel Djelloud, Potinville, etc.), nor several decades of prison sentences, nor hundreds of years of expulsion sentences, were able to break the Tunisian trade-union movement, which continued to assert itself on the national and international level.

Among other things, the UGTT has given a social content to the political demands of the nationalist movement. It has played a major role in the conflict with France, and had to pay with the

life of its secretary-general, Farhat Hached, who was murdered on December 5, 1952.

Q—What is the present position of the UGTT in Tunisian society?

A—The UGTT, which now has a membership of 200,000 members, occupies a leading position in the economical and social life of the country. It has very good relations with the other national organizations which are in agreement with its general social and economic policy. It publishes a weekly, *Saout El-Amal* (The Voice of Labor) and a number of monthly and bi-monthly bulletins on the local or Industrial Federation level. As to our representation in Parliament, there are 23 deputies out of a total of 97 who are trade-union functionaries at various levels.

[The UGTT is also represented in the present Tunisian government, which came into office last April as a result of the landslide victory of the "National Front" at the polls. The ministries occupied by the UGTT are agriculture, communications and education—A.G.]

Q—What, in your opinion, are the main problems before the Tunisian working class at the present time and the main tasks of the UGTT in the immediate future?

A—The most important problem before the working class is to determine the over-all economic and social orientation on which the general policy of an independent Tunisia will be based. I am convinced that all other problems, such as full employment, a guaranteed minimum wage, social security, adequate housing, which are part of a general improvement in the material and cultural standard of living of the working class, can find satisfactory solutions within the framework of a progressive orientation.

To ensure such an orientation, the UGTT is now doing a great deal of groundwork on the local level, to continue to deserve the confidence of the working masses and of the leaders of the

BOURGUIBA'S LINE

As this article is put in type, a dispatch to the *N. Y. Times* (Aug. 20) reports that Premier Bourguiba has announced that the Tunisian government would never nationalize foreign enterprises but that he "yielded a little to a clamor on the Left for more socialism."

The bow to the left was, according to the dispatch, these words: "In some fields, nationalism [nationalization?] is justified and even necessary. I refer to the railways and to transport facilities of vital interest to the people." But his stress was on the sanctity of private property and on the pledge that "foreign capital has nothing to fear." He also promised the creation of a national bank of issue.

The class questions are unfolding, now that the national question has been effectually solved.

On the Algerian question, the outstanding fact is the unqualified all-out support that all representative Tunisian organizations give to the Algerian nationalists. At the end of July, Ahmed Ben Salah said in a speech that "Algeria will conquer her independence against all odds; if necessary, all of us will mobilize to help fight for the liberation of martyred Algeria."

A less fortunate consensus also exists on supporting the Algerian FLN (right wing) rather than Messali Hadj's MNA (left wing).

With respect to the Egyptian regime, Ahmed Ben Salah declined to take a position in the present interview, but he has spoken more clearly on other occasions.

Commenting on a project of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions to set up a Middle East regional federation of trade unions, he remarked on the difficulty of cooperating effectively with semi-legal and undeveloped trade-union bodies. In this connection he said, "In these countries, when you so much as mention trade unions, they put you in prison as a Communist," adding that he was not talking about all Arab countries but only some.

country. In most cases, it succeeded in getting its point of view accepted. We expect this action to show results in the near future.

Q—Do you have plans for the future evolution of Tunisian society as a whole?

A—The evolution of the country has to take place as rapidly as possible. We cannot wait any longer. Science advances very rapidly and it is immoral to withhold this progress from the masses. Of course, this evolution has to be guided, and the UGTT works with all national organizations (women, students, doctors) to elaborate a general plan which will bring about profound changes in the structure of Tunisian society.

Q—Do you encounter any opposition?

A—Opposition? No; sometimes lack of understanding and obstacles. We shall fight by all means at our disposal to break them down.

Q—Does the UGTT consider independent political action?

A—Events must be allowed to follow their natural course. The differentiation in the outlook of people will occur and the laws of history will come into their own in Tunisia as they have in other countries.

Q—What is your view of the recent decision of the USTT to dissolve and to join the UGTT? Can a similar decision be expected of F.O. and CFTC [Algerian sections of the corresponding federations in France]?

A—This decision only registers a factual situation. For some time now the USTT has practically ceased to play a role in the Tunisian trade-union movement. As to F.O. and CFTC, they are branches of trade-union organizations in France. I consider their continued existence in an independent Tunisia as illegal.

Q—Do you have plans for a closer coordination of the independent trade-union organizations on the African continent?

A—The UGTT has worked for a long

(Continued on next page)

Labor-Liberal-NAACP Bloc — —

(Continued from page 1)

there be no mistake about that. Roy Wilkins of the NAACP pointed out that, "passages in the plank dealing with the Supreme Court decision on public school segregation are totally meaningless."

The N. Y. Post, which supports Stevenson and Kefauver, editorially called it "a weak garbled plank" on August 16, and stated the following:

"The issues were perfectly plain. What the Platform Committee had produced was a document essentially acceptable to the most reactionary Southern forces. The indignant noises made by a few Southern spokesmen when it was first released were largely synthetic; they simply muddled the air. In fact the majority plank was a decisive victory for the Southern legions."

SOUTH PLAYED TOUGH

The Post's point about the "synthetic" nature of Southern reaction to the plank as adopted has to be underscored. The above-quoted column by Mrs. Roosevelt, for example, uses it to pretend that the platform gave something to both sides. This is exactly why the Southerners registered their opposition while obviously gratified by the outcome.

For the fact of the matter is that the Southerners received the most that they could have possibly hoped for. The platform could not say anything less than it now does without losing the Democratic Party its Northern labor and Negro support.

Senator Sparkman of Alabama (Stevenson's 1952 running-mate) stated in so many words that the "South got the best that it possibly could," when interviewed over the air on the night that the platform was adopted. Governor Hodges of North Carolina echoed this view, which is clearly that of every responsible Southern leader.

If some Southerners keep making disgruntled noises, and utter threats of a "states-rights" ticket—as in South Carolina, for instance—it is for two reasons: (1) to placate the more demagogic and irresponsible Southerners, whom Southern reaction has unleashed and needs in the struggle against the Negroes, and (2) to keep the pressure on Stevenson going, so as to make sure that he understood what the convention decision meant, because Southern reaction knows

so well, even if the labor movement does not, that the only way to get anywhere politically is to be tough.

FOOTBALL GAME

From the outset, it was evident that both leading contenders for the presidential nomination, Stevenson and Harriman, regarded the civil-rights question as a football to be kicked about in their efforts to get the convention's bid.

Ever since 1952, Stevenson had gone out of his way to let Southern reaction know that it had nothing to fear from him. Both Stevenson and his 1952 campaign manager, Mitchell, had made a number of trips to the South to pacify the Southern Democrats and win their support. He had been so successful that the South came to the convention largely ready to support Stevenson. His "moderation" line had convinced them.

Thus, when the first balloting took place, he won a majority of the votes from six out of the eleven Southern delegations. But even this is not the full story.

Texas, which voted for its "favorite son, Senator Johnson, would have undoubtedly switched to Stevenson had a second ballot been necessary. The Texas delegation, under the leadership of Johnson and House Speaker Sam Rayburn, faces a forthcoming fight with Governor Shivers, a racist extremist, and needed to show its "independence" on one ballot to be able to counter Shivers' charges that they are "Stevenson stooges." Shivers, who supported Eisenhower in 1952, is one of the few Southern leaders who vehemently opposes Stevenson.

Moreover, many other Southern votes would have gone to Stevenson, had not Truman's fight for Harriman opened up possibilities of a stalemate. With this condition existing, the Southerners, or rather, many of them, wanted to use the new elbow-room for maneuvering, in the hope that a dark-horse candidate even more desirable might emerge. Most of these votes would have undoubtedly been cast for Stevenson on subsequent ballots, once this possibility was recognized as over.

SYNTHETIC LIBERAL

When Harriman entered the campaign, he counterposed himself to Stevenson along the lines of militant "New-Dealism" versus conservative "moderation."

In San Francisco, the Republican version of how to keep the South happy on civil rights turned out to be a shade stronger than the Democrats', but here too the DixieGOP racists got what they wanted. More on the Republican show next week.

He would lead a fighting liberal campaign, unlike Stevenson, who could only be counted on for timidity.

This perspective presumably included the civil-rights issue, and indeed, as the convention approached, Harriman let it be known (off and on) that he favored a platform statement endorsing the Supreme Court decision in some fashion or other. Harriman, being anathema to the South, could hope for no support from that quarter, and thus had nothing to lose from such a gambit. In addition, all efforts he had made to woo the Southerners had failed any way.

Harriman, of course, lacks a particularly distinguished record on civil rights as governor, having extradited a number of Southern Negro fugitives from chain-gang "justice" back to the South. But his strategy for attempting to defeat Stevenson could only be one of winning Northern liberal support away from him.

Stevenson thus felt under compulsion to sound an "immoderate" note or two, and in a sidewalk interview on August 6 stated that, "the platform should express unequivocal approval of the court's decision." This gave Harriman an opportunity to revise his strategy, and his supporters began immediately to canvass Southern delegations. As reported by the N. Y. Times, the following day, they informed the Southerners that Stevenson was "too liberal" on civil rights and that Harriman was the South's best bet for a sympathetic approach to its "problems."

The gesture having been made, Stevenson campaigners immediately moved toward taking it all back, as LABOR ACTION detailed last week. Having made his one "liberal" pitch and then letting it be taken back, Stevenson lapsed into a profound silence which lasted until the fight was safely over and the South had won.

STEVENSON'S TACTIC

Harriman's "Operation Dixie" failing, he proceeded to return to the "militant" pose. While he himself kept quiet, and while Truman's testimony before the Platform Committee claimed to be against "moderation" on all questions except civil rights, his supporters let it be known that they were going to present a "strong" plank to the drafting committee.

Congressman Celler from New York, Harriman's representative on the committee—regarded as an "outstanding liberal," whose reputation ought to but probably won't take a nose-dive after his behavior at this convention—diffidently offered the stronger plank to the committee behind closed doors. The Southerners and the Northern capitulators said "No!" and he meekly withdrew his offering, voting for the majority plank which emerged.

This plank, a victory for the South, was adopted with all of the Northern "liberals" voting for, and the five Southerners in opposition. What a lesson for the labor movement and liberals on how to make a political fight!

Stevenson's tactic was transparently clear. Except for an occasional statement, like the one referred to above, designed to give his liberal and labor supporters some feeling of justification for being "madly about Adlai," Stevenson was and is the man standing for "harmony" and "unity" between the labor-liberal bloc and the Southern racists. Both after the adoption of the platform and in his acceptance speech, he stressed that the Democratic Party is a "national party," containing both the "North and the South."

Moreover, Stevenson's personal fortunes at the convention depended upon maintaining this "harmony," i.e., on liberal capitulation to the white-chauvinists. Several New York afternoon papers headlined their convention stories on August 16 approximately as follows: "Stevenson Nomination Certain, As Civil Rights Fight Fails."

This represents an accurate picture of the situation, for only a vigorous fight on civil rights, in which the "liberal"-Southern coalition around Stevenson would have had to split up, could have endangered his chances for the nomination.

The triumph of Southern reaction on the civil-rights question and Stevenson's victory were inextricably interwoven.

For this very reason, an all-out fight by the Truman-Harriman camp for a strong program might have been expected. It never developed. While Truman willingly went to great lengths in his desire to knife Stevenson, even branding him a man who could not win, he was not ready to wage a fight over civil rights.

The difference if any between the Truman-Harriman line of demagogic "militancy" and the Stevenson theme of "moderation" did not extend to civil rights. On this question there existed a "united front" of reaction between both presidential hopefuls.

"OUR FRIENDS"

The shabby role played by both contenders for the presidential nomination was not confined to them alone. A wide variety of "liberal" politicians, "friends of labor" whom union leaders ask workers to vote for, and other "liberal" shining lights, played their anti-civil-rights parts to the end.

The behavior of Congressman Celler has already been noted, as has that of Harry Truman. The latter not only testified in favor of a weak plank before the platform committee, but had a special role of dishonor during the "debate" on the floor, being granted unanimous permission to make a speech upholding the majority plank.

Mrs. Roosevelt, whose reputation as a "friend of the Negroes" is an exaggeration, contributed more than a tiny bit to the reactionary outcome. Her contribution to the struggle of the Negroes in recent months has been to play down the fight for integration, and instead counterpose other issues like the need for housing for Negroes, etc.

At the convention, she openly ranged herself on the side of the capitulatory majority plank, urging the Negroes to concern themselves with the "wisdom of leadership for the whole country, and not for any particular group alone."

AMONG THE MISSING

Hubert Humphrey, erstwhile liberal, ADA leader, and the man who helped lead the fight for a strong civil-rights plank at the 1948 convention, "was" (as Irwin Ross reported in the N. Y. Post on August 16) "nowhere to be seen as the 1956 fight began." Humphrey, in hot pursuit of the vice-presidential candidacy, asked by Ross for his opinion on the majority plank, said: "I haven't read it."

But alas, he just couldn't manage to convince the Southerners that he had lived down his youthful "radicalism."

There are others on whom the roll should be called. There are the two Negro congressmen: Congressman Dawson of Illinois, who supported the majority plank; and Congressman Adam Clayton Powell of New York, who although not a delegate to the convention, had informed a press conference several weeks ago that he would fly back from Europe, where he was going on a visit, to participate in any fight that would develop. Powell was nowhere to be seen.

The foregoing "liberal" politicians all participated as supporters of the majority position, or participated not at all. But it must be recorded that even the best of the "liberal" politicians did not exactly cover themselves with glory.

Senator Lehman, for example, undoubtedly the most liberal member of the Senate, has been hailed up and down the country for leading the floor fight. Yet it is a fact that on the previous night in a TV interview, he had queasily hedged in response to questions about the plank that (it was being reported) the Platform Committee would recommend. Obviously, even his backbone needed stiffening, and that stiffening was accomplished in the next 24 hours.

In their August 15 column, the Alsops reported an interview with Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the NAACP, in

(Turn to last page)

Tunisian Interview — —

(Continued from page 6)

time within the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions for the coordination of the independent trade unions on the African continent. The recent decision of the ICFTU Executive to organize a conference of African trade unions before the end of this year is a great success.

We have great hopes for this conference, and we expect it to have considerable repercussions in Africa, a continent which is still in part occupied by countries who fail to understand the sense of history.

The three North African trade-union federations have already laid down a common policy in a joint meeting [held in Brussels]. This is a good point of departure for the all-African trade-union meeting.

Q—What is your position on the Algerian question?

A—The Algerian problem dominates the whole of the North African situation. Nothing can be achieved that is lasting, either on the domestic level or in the relations between France and North Africa, as long as Algeria does not recover its independence. Our position is one of solidarity by all means with our Algerian comrades, on the basis of the recognition of the Algerian people's right to self-determination.

Q—Do you take sides in the conflict between the MNA (USTT) and the FLN (UGTT)?

[For background, see LA, Aug. 13, for "The New Labor Movement of North Africa." In Algeria, the left wing is the MNA, led by Messali Hadj, with its associated trade-union organization USTA; on the right wing is the FLN ("Front") with the UGTA.]

A—Practically yes: those who are in contact with us, and who sought it in the first place, are the people of the "Front." However, we are not against Messali, who remains for us one of the great North African personalities in the fight of the North African people for political emancipation.

On the trade-union level, the USTA has hardly any members in Algeria; it has members in France. Therefore, as Bothereau himself agreed, to admit the USTA to membership in the ICFTU would have implied the acceptance of a new organization in France besides F.O. For this reason, among others, we supported the application of the UGTA to the ICFTU. The latter organization has accepted its affiliation, and I consider this as a victory of free trade-unionism and as a demonstration of the maturity of the young Algerian trade unions and of Algerian nationalism as represented by the "Front."

Q—What is your position on the conflict between Israel and the Arab states?

This is a delicate problem for our young nation and for our conscience. We have always publicly advocated a peaceful settlement outside of any international rivalries.

Q—What is your opinion of the Egyptian regime and, in particular, of the situation of the Egyptian trade unions?

A—I have no first-hand knowledge of the Egyptian regime and of the real basis of its power. I cannot make a judgment founded on the contradictory reports of the various press agencies, so I prefer to abstain for the time being.

For us, the important thing is to establish, in our own country, a healthy democratic regime.

July 26, 1956

Labor-Liberal-NAACP Bloc — —

(Continued from page 7)

which Wilkins expressed his bitterness over the civil-rights situation. They concluded their article on this note: It is possible to have respect only for Wilkins, on the one hand, and the Southerners, on the other. For they are the only ones at this convention who really mean what they say, and who feel deeply, about their respective views on civil rights. All of the others, the vast majority of delegates and non-delegate politicians, do not really care about the question one way or the other; for them it is a factor to be taken into account only in regard to other concerns, how to win the election, or how to win the nomination.

It is a judgment which all workers and all liberals should ponder deeply.

AT THE CAUCUS

There were others at the convention who cared about civil rights. On the morning of August 15, after the platform committee had released the text of its proposed civil-rights plank, a hastily called caucus met at the Congress Hotel in Chicago. The organizers of the gathering were Wilkins, Walter Reuther, and Joseph Rauh, national chairman of ADA.

Little has appeared in the press on this caucus, although it alone was responsible for what little fight did take place at the convention. The N. Y. Times strangely appears not to have carried a word about it.

The skeleton for the Congress Hotel caucus was provided by the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, an informal association of trade-union leaders, liberals, Negro leaders, etc., which held a rally on civil rights in Washington some months ago. At least, the Congress Hotel gathering appears to have been called in the name of the Conference, and on the initiative of Reuther, Wilkins and Rauh.

Providing the flesh and blood of the gathering were several hundred delegates, the bulk of whom were trade-unionists, who can be called the labor-NAACP-ADA bloc present at the convention. While the press has provided little information on the trade-union leaders present at the convention as delegates, and the unions themselves have been reticent on the subject, there can be no doubt that there were scores of labor delegates present, perhaps as many as 200.

A large section of the Michigan delegation consisted of UAW people; the Pennsylvania delegates contained many United Steelworker officials and secondary leaders in their midst; among the California delegates AFL leaders from that state were to be found, as well as others.

These unionists were the heart of the Congress Hotel caucus, bringing along the rest of their delegations, by means of the pressure that labor can exert.

Present at the caucus meeting were some 600 persons, probably over half of whom were delegates. In addition to Reuther, Wilkins and Rauh, James Carey of the IUE played a prominent role in the meeting.

ROLLING BALL

Present also were a host of liberal politicians, who were there on the initiative of the unionists and under their prodding: Senator Lehman, Senator Douglas of Illinois, Governor Freeman of Minnesota, Mayor Wagner of New York, Mayor Dilworth of Philadelphia, Senatorial candidate Richards of California, Governor Williams of Michigan, and several others. These men were later to get the credit for "leading" the "fight" for civil rights, although without labor pressure in all probability they would not have lifted a finger.

Certainly, it took labor's initiative to

get the ball rolling, inadequate as the ball was.

The caucus decided to wage a fight for a stronger plank, and adopted amendments to be offered. It arranged for securing enough signatures from the Platform Committee, for a minority report, so that the matter could come to the floor. The 14 worthies whose names were quickly secured had apparently not written a minority report on their own, nor had liberals like Lehman endeavored to instigate such a minority report before the caucus meeting. Labor's pressure was required before even the most elementary step could be taken.

The caucus agreed to wage a fight for a rollcall vote; Senator Douglas subsequently announced that his delegation (Illinois) would conduct a "stand-up" strike until Chairman Rayburn recognized him to move a rollcall. The delegates then dispersed, heading for caucus meetings of their state delegations. The Michigan, New York, Pennsylvania, California, Illinois, Minnesota, and perhaps other delegations were swung.

SOME OF THE BOYS

A radio interview with Mayor Lawrence of Pittsburgh, a typical "liberal" politician "friend of labor," immediately after the Pennsylvania caucus meeting, provided vivid clues as to what must have gone on in many of these state caucuses. The following is a fairly accurate paraphrase:

INTERVIEWER: Well, Mayor Lawrence, what did the delegation decide to do?

LAWRENCE: Well, er-er, some of the boys thought the plank should be strengthened a bit, so we'll support the amendments.

Q—Do you feel the majority plank to be inadequate?

A—Not at all, I think it's a fine plank on civil rights, but some of the boys thought it should be strengthened a bit, and I—er-er, went along with the majority.

Q—Well, did the delegation think the plank too weak?

A—Well, er-er, I'm sure that everybody thinks it's a pretty good plank, but some of the boys... and I went along...

Q—[Several more questions along the above lines].

A—Well, er-er, ... not a bad plank ... but some of the boys...

One could see how torn he was between his almost instinctive desire to support the capitulation, and the labor pressure that had just been turned on him inside the Pennsylvania delegation meeting. And one can be certain that this was not the only instance of its kind.

The rest was history, viewed by millions.

Allowed ten minutes to present their case, out of a total of thirty for the "debate," the two-minute speeches were duly made. Rayburn gavelled through the vote, declared the amendments defeated and the platform adopted. The New York delegation waved its banners for the floor, yells for a roll-call were heard, Rayburn banged his gavel, and it was over.

Why the extent of this ignominious collapse of the opposition?

For one thing, the labor-NAACP-ADA caucus started late, beginning its convention activities the same day on which the decision was to be made. They had allowed the following to go by without any contest:

(1) The seating of the Dixiecrat "lily-white" Mississippi delegation of Eastlandites (despite Reuther's reiterated statement that "you can't have Eastland and us in the same party") over a more liberal delegation which asked for recognition.

(2) The stacking of the drafting subcommittee of the Platform Committee, as well as the Platform Committee itself, in favor of Southerners and capitulationist Northerners.

(3) The arrangements for the "debate," which had been scheduled for a short evening session well in advance.

Indeed, the bloc acted as if the plank took it by surprise and it had not previously thought it would have to fight for its position. But this is not true.

THEY GOT NOTHING

That labor's fight was "too little and too late" resulted from what was its underlying failure at this convention. It did not conduct a systematic, consistent, and all-

out fight for its civil-rights position, regardless of where such a fight would have led and what its consequences would have been. It was unwilling to gear its entire convention policy, primarily its presidential endorsements and activity, to its fight on civil rights.

The unionists, in their overwhelming bulk, could be found in the Stevenson camp on the question of the nomination. But that of course meant that it was allied with its enemies on civil rights and other questions. The logic of this could only limit and vitiate labor's attempt to appeal for support for a stronger civil-rights plank.

Moreover, within the Stevenson camp, labor made no effort to wage a battle against the South for the control of the candidate; it applied no pressure on him. It made absolutely no effort to use the nomination as a lever for gaining support for its position. It gave Stevenson a blank check and he made it payable to Southern reaction.

There was a moment during the convention when Stevenson's chances took a turn for the worse. Right after Truman's hard-hitting declaration that Stevenson could not win, a boom for Harriman began. It was an opportunity for (say) Reuther to have put the squeeze on Stevenson, to demand his support for a strong civil-rights plank and his pressuring his non-labor supporters to do likewise in return for labor's stepping in to quash the Harriman boom and start the band-wagon rolling for Stevenson.

But Reuther did nothing of the kind. Without exerting the slightest pressure on his candidate, Reuther went to work for Stevenson.

The Michigan delegation gave up its original intention to cast a first-ballot vote for "favorite-son" Williams; the New Jersey delegation did likewise with its "favorite-son" Governor Meyner; and Stevenson's victory was assured. And in return labor got nothing.

HOW TO FIGHT

What a contrast the Southern delegates presented! They utilized every opportunity, every inch of room for maneuvering to gain their end on civil rights.

Though the majority of them were committed to Stevenson at the convention's outset, the first sign of a possible stalemate found them switching to "favorite-son" holding operations, in the hope of getting an even better dark-horse candidate, thereby guaranteeing that Stevenson would make no move displeasing to them. They had been organized from the beginning, having two steering committees, one composed of all Southern members of the Platform Committee, the other of the chairmen of the delegations from the 11 Southern states.

Some of the Southern delegations even went so far as to nominate and vote for "favorite-son" candidates, so that they could utilize the nominating speeches for denunciations of the plank—this plank which was the best they could have gotten and which gave them all they could hope for—and thereby show that they meant business.

The Southerners' maneuvers around the nomination, as well as their other activities at the convention, were a function of their civil-rights views. But the labor-liberal position on civil rights was kept as far away as possible from the power conflict.

Only part of the explanation is Walter Reuther's personal infatuation with Stevenson. Beyond this the explanation for labor's failure resides in its commitment to the Democratic Party, no matter what, its refusal to lead and fight that might lead to the breakup of the Democratic Party, its lack of an alternative to the Democratic Party.

Had labor struggled effectively for its position of support to the Negro struggle, then the unholy alliance behind Stevenson would have had to crack, and he would have had to align himself with one side or another. Such a fight could have led to the breakup of the Democratic Party as well, and thus to the beginning of the road which leads to an independent political party of labor.

In the end, the Negro struggle had to be betrayed because there is not yet a political instrument, a labor party, to carry it forward.

A Walk on the Plank

The Democratic civil-rights plank as adopted was a victory for the Southerners in four important respects:

(1) Naturally, the plank contains pious expressions which platitudinously refer to the rights of all citizens and state that all men are created equal. It mentions efforts to "eradicate discrimination based on race, religion or national origin." Not once, however, does it attack segregation. Instead, it favors "equal opportunities for education," and opposes "illegal discriminations" of all kinds.

These formulations are acceptable to the Southern racists because they claim to afford the Negroes equal opportunity without discrimination under the "separate but equal" formula.

(2) Unlike the 1952 plank, this one says absolutely nothing about federal legislation to "eradicate" the "discriminations." It merely calls for further "efforts" to end "discrimination" in regard to voting, employment, "security of the person" and education.

One of the two minority amendments dealt with just this point, substituting the language from 1952's platform which called for federal legislation.

(3) Not only doesn't the platform pledge implementation of the Supreme Court decision; it does not even state approval of it. It merely records that "Recent decisions... have brought consequences of vast importance to our nation..." and that we reject all proposals for the use of force to interfere with the orderly determination of these matters by the courts."

Some liberals, clutching at every straw to "soothe" the Negroes, have already claimed that this sentence is a blow at racism, since it can be interpreted to mean that the Democrats are against the use of force by Southern racists to prevent integration. It is a ghastly joke, one which Stevenson may well play with as the campaign unfolds.

In the first place, Southern reaction does not need force on the whole; it has the governmental power of the Southern states and the inaction of the federal government on its side. Secondly, to de-

plore the violence which is vented against militant Negroes without doing anything about it is absolutely standard with Southern (and Northern) politicians.

The minority proposal would have inserted, "we pledge to carry out these decisions but—" before the sentence rejecting the use of force. As can be seen, the total effect of the amendments can hardly be regarded as either militant or radical; on the contrary, mild is the only term for them. Nowhere did they concretely spell out what implementation was being proposed.

But even these weak changes were unacceptable to the South, and the South had its way.

(4) The plank contained a subsequent reference to the Supreme Court which gratuitously informs the American people that it is one of the branches of government in the United States, and it refers to the "law of the land." This too may be utilized during the campaign in an attempt to convince people that the platform does in some way or another bow to the Supreme Court decision. Nothing could be further from the truth.

What the plank actually states is that Supreme Court decisions are "part of the law of the land." This point received much attention from Senator Sparkman during the radio interview already referred to.

He explained that the meaning of this language, which he stressed was carefully chosen, consists of recognizing judicial decisions as being only "part" of the law of the land, but having no more weight than other "parts," such as (for example) various state "nullification" or "interposition" laws. For Sparkman, the Supreme Court has its "part" of the law and the South has its "part."

Let no one think that this represents Sparkman's own interpretation of the language employed in the platform. A number of times during the convention, radio and television commentators pointed out that Southerners on the Platform Committee enunciated this point over and over. This language was used with full knowledge as to the "interpretation" which the South placed upon it.