

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

OCTOBER 22, 1956

FIVE CENTS

STEVENSON'S H-BOMB ISSUE:
NOBODY TALKS ABOUT FOREIGN POLICY

... page 2

Asian-African Students Meet at Bandung:
Third-Camp Socialists Combat Stalinism

... page 5

Mollet Cracks Down on Socialist Critics

... page 3

This Is the Price Labor Pays to Back Stevenson and the Democratic Party

Liberals and the 'Devil Theory' of Nixon

By MAX MARTIN

One of the more obscure points in the current election campaign is the degree of enthusiasm which various liberals and labor leaders have managed to generate for Stevenson. To be sure, the pitch of fervor for the Democratic standard-bearer this year does not reach the heights of excitement over "Adlai" which prevailed in liberal and "egg-head" circles in 1952. All observers have noted this fact: a fair amount of

reluctance exists among Stevenson supporters. Nevertheless, the enthusiasm appears to be of respectable proportions, and reluctant as some may be, vote for Stevenson they will anyway.

Given the more clearly conservative character of the candidate and his campaign, as compared with the previous presidential election, and the unmistakable betrayal on civil rights, the liberal and labor supporters of Stevenson might have been expected to show a good deal more traces of embarrassment than they do.

To be sure, the common-garden-variety liberal has managed this year, as in the past, to ignore the basic facts of Democratic Party political life. But even the more perceptive, more principled, and more "radical" liberals find it possible to support the Democratic candidates without too much blushing.

The Progressive, one of the better liberal journals in the country, is an excellent case in point.

(Turn to last page)

SPOT-LIGHT

Question of Climate

For Americans, surely a lurid light was cast on the witchhunt climate of this country by a recent event in Canada.

James S. Staples was a clerk employed at a Royal Canadian Air Force base near Ottawa. A Russian embassy secretary cultivated his acquaintance presumably in the hope of getting some information or other. Staples admits drinking with the Russians, borrowing money from them, and continuing to see them despite their obvious attempts to milk him for information.

He was fired by the government, after all this, as a security risk.

Now clearly this is no U. S.-type of case where a man is fired because of something his mother did in 1905; or because he continues to associate with his brother-in-law in spite of the fact that the latter once signed the wrong petition for a dog-catcher; or because of some secret informer's denunciation to an anonymous loyalty board.

Yet some of the most influential newspapers in Canada, including the *Toronto Globe and Mail*, denounced Prime Minister St. Laurent for the dismissal as "McCarthyism in Ottawa," and political leaders of the opposition parties did the same. They pointed out with justice that Staples had no information to give (in U. S. language, the post of clerk was not "sensitive"), that the government did not question his loyalty but only his judgment, and that he had no right to appeal.

We hope it's clear we're not defending the St. Laurent regime in this matter when we say that, from this side of the St. Lawrence, it is the contrast with Washington that impresses us.

In Canada a government "security" firing is blasted by conservative elements,

(Continued on page 6)

By BEN HALL

James Everett Gordon was fired last month. You remember him; he is the father of two Negro children who tried to break down school segregation in Clay, Kentucky.

In South Carolina 24 Negro teachers were fired for refusing to sign "loyalty" oaths repudiating the NAACP. Ironically, where integration has moved forward, Negro teachers have been dismissed as all-Negro schools are shut down; but no whites, of course.

By now, at least 450 Southern Negro teachers have been dropped. "The battle for the rights of the qualified Negro teacher," says NAACP secretary Roy Wilkins, "is most certainly a part of the battle for desegregation."

In Texas the NAACP is being driven out of legal existence by a state law that would force it to reveal its membership lists and thus make its supporters sitting-duck victims of racists. It refuses and fights in the courts for open survival. And the bus boycott movement goes on.

All this is only partial testimony to that most momentous event in American life: the fight for democracy, for desegregation and civil rights continues in the South.

For the moment, this most gigantic fact is overlooked. The school term has begun, the period of crisis momentarily passed. The Deep South remains immune from civilization and integration; the election fanfare occupies the front pages, while all the candidates and their promoters shove the big annoying issue under the carpet.

Organized labor is on record in support of the Supreme Court decision. Long ago George Meany criticized Stevenson for evading the question; the AFL-CIO set up a special fund to help the victims of the fight for democracy in the South. Yet . . . where is organized labor now?

More particularly, where was it in those critical days when racist mobs gathered in the streets of Clay, Sturgis, and Clinton, while brave Negro children walked into school under the protection of state troops?

There were no labor representatives on the scene, virtually no news reports in the union press; there was no appropriation from the AFL-

(Continued on page 7)

Reuther Pays the Price

A revealing example of labor's shamefaced queasiness about speaking out on the Negro struggle, because of the need to cover up for Stevenson, is evident in the current issue of the *Auto Workers* magazine "UAW Ammunition," devoted almost entirely to the issues of the 1956 election campaign.

The issues are considered in 15 short articles under 15 headings. "Civil rights" is not one of these headings. The subject is not discussed under "States Rights," or "Equal Educational Opportunities for All," or "On a Free, Democratic Society."

The section which does discuss civil rights is entitled, as a change, "REPUBLICAN RECORD on Equal Opportunity."

(There is no section on the "Democratic Record.") Mention—just mention—of the Supreme Court decision on desegregation occurs here only in a sentence criticizing Eisenhower for failing "to promote acceptance" of the decision.

The big space, with a big cartoon, is given to . . . a comparison of party votes on the Senate's filibuster rule! There is not a single critical statement about the Democratic Party—only about "Dixiecrats."

This is the price that Walter Reuther pays for being "had" in the same party with James O. Eastland.



Stevenson Works Up an Issue on H-Bomb But Nobody's Talking About Foreign Policy

By SAM TAYLOR

The Democrats' leading problem in this presidential campaign has been to find an issue around which to center their bid for the White House. This search proceeded with mounting urgency as November 6 approached.

The widespread reports of voter apathy have quickened the attempts to find some line to draw between the Stevenson and Eisenhower candidacies. Now in the closing weeks of the campaign, Stevenson believes that he has found such an issue—banning tests of super-H-bombs.

At the time of the national conventions in Chicago and San Francisco it would have been difficult, if not impossible, to guess that the Democrats would attempt to make this the "main issue." In a sense, it is an act of desperation, quite aside from the very real importance of the danger of radioactive fallout from the testing of H-bombs [on which see LA for July 30].

Even so, insofar as Stevenson raises the H-bomb issue at all, it's a good thing. A second look at his statements on the point, however, are liable to disappoint anyone who is trying to work up enthusiasm.

For one thing, he and his supporters have been (no doubt deliberately) ambig-

uous about whether he is proposing to end tests on all nuclear bombs or only on the real big multi-megaton H-bombs. It sounds as if he would like to give some people the right to think he is doing the former, while committing himself only to consideration of the latter.

Secondly, in his big speech on the subject he was flanked by Senator Symington, the leading big-armor jingo in Congress, and both of them counterposed to H-bombs the building of a bigger air force and military establishment. In Congress, of course, the Democratic line has been to attack Eisenhower for cutting down on "defense."

Thirdly, both Stevenson and Senator Anderson (who stood with Symington at Stevenson's other flank) have boomed it up for more work on the Inter-Continental Ballistic Missile program. This directly negates any real content in Stevenson's election talk about the H-bomb tests. For the guided-missile program makes no sense whatsoever without the nuclear warheads which they are to carry.

In other words, Stevenson is utilizing his H-bomb issue as demagogically and misleadingly as any other (non-egghead) politician.

LEAD BALLOON

This has become the issue because the other issues, or rather evasions of issues, have not evoked any widespread interest in the campaign. The New York Times in a survey of vote interest found it to be lagging in almost every section of the country. From the West Coast the Times reports, "this year's presidential campaigning is going over like a lead balloon." And this general attitude is expressed in the Times reports from other sections of the country.

In no other campaign in recent years has there been the comment that the differences between the Republicans and Democrats are so narrow that many voters do not see enough difference to get excited about who wins. This attitude has become widespread enough so that Stevenson has found it necessary in several major speeches to argue against this feeling.

The narrowing and blurring of differences on domestic issues has become more apparent especially after the dismal record of the Democratic-controlled 83rd Congress. Stevenson may argue that the difference is that the Democratic Party represents all the people and trusts the people, while the Republicans do not; but after the enthusiasm of the Democratic leadership for the natural gas giveaway bill which gouges consumers and benefits the oil and pipeline companies, it is more a matter of rhetoric and demagoguery than of the record of the Democratic Party.

THE DEBATE THAT ISN'T

While domestic issues have received the major emphasis thus far, foreign policy has been shunted aside. Even Stevenson's H-bomb proposal is not presented in terms of foreign-policy considerations but mainly of the dangers of fallout. Except for quips and jabs against the off-again on-again gyrations of the secretary of State and his boastful statements foreign policy has been the deliberately forgotten issue.

It is difficult to take exception with the statement made by President Eisenhower at his October 11 news conference commenting upon the issues in the campaign:

"In foreign affairs, no one has debated so far as I know, on general broad policy. But the debate has been on, are we competent or are we not competent. Do we know the right people, I guess, or what

don't we know. I don't know exactly what the argument is. But it's not down to issues. It's the whole management." Syntax aside, that's it.

On one and only one point has Stevenson directly challenged Eisenhower's foreign policy. And it was a first-class disaster for him, which made even his liberal supporters publicly hold their heads and groan.

This was his ignorant charge that it was the Eisenhower administration that was responsible for political, financial and moral support of the Peron dictatorship in Argentina.

As Eisenhower, Dulles and Dewey were able to prove in speeches and statements, somebody had sold Stevenson a bill of goods. The long record of coddling Peron belongs to the Truman Democratic administration, and it is all public, even to the loans which Stevenson made a big point.

We say "somebody sold Stevenson a bill of goods" because we're willing to assume that he would not knowingly have been such a falsifier as to make that speech of his if he had known the facts.

What follows is that this touted intellectual, who is supposed to be so well equipped above the eyebrows to lead the nation, was not in the least aware of one of the big things the U. S. was doing in the Western Hemisphere.

CENTRAL FACT

That's apart from the fact that the whole Peron issue is hardly the central problem in what is happening to U. S. foreign policy as a whole.

There has been an increasing awareness that something is wrong with U. S. foreign policy. The entire Western military alliance is showing signs of cracking at the seams.

The fundamental U. S. strategy built about NATO looks less and less impressive; there is increasing talk of Western European Union independent of the U. S.; there is the Suez crisis and the revolutionary ferment in North Africa; the Southeast Asian Treaty Organization (SEATO) exists only on paper, and the Middle East Treaty Organization was still-born; the Stalinists have adopted a less belligerent posture and have begun to make offers of economic aid to the same Southeast Asian nations.

Everybody but the official spokesmen in Washington know and state that American foreign policy is a shambles. And yet the presidential candidates have eschewed discussion of foreign policy.

It is all too easy to criticize Dulles' statements on the art of brinkmanship, on the "unleashing" of Chiang Kai-shek, on the bluff of massive retaliation, of the failure to "do something" about Indochina, on doubletalk on the Suez Canal, on the growing Russian influence in the Middle East. But what is Stevenson's alternative on any of these questions? Absolutely nothing whatsoever.

TALKING SENSE?

Stevenson has made a great point of the fact that the Eisenhower administration has not told the American people the truth. In the 1952 campaigning Stevenson captivated liberals with phrases about the necessity of "talking sense" to the American people. He stated, "what concerns me is not just winning the election, but how it is won, how well we can take advantage of this great quadrennial opportunity to debate issues sensibly and soberly." And he has repeated this profound thought in 1956.

But there is not one aspect of foreign policy which he has debated sensibly or soberly or at all. At a news conference on October 1, Stevenson was asked a question on Washington's handling of the Suez crisis. His answer was typical of how he has "soberly" debated every single current foreign-policy issue.

First, a criticism: "It is no secret that I do not think much of the recent conduct of our foreign affairs."

Second, a refusal to deal with the situation: "This is an area of vital concern to the United States and to our allies, and I don't think that any comment or

criticism by me at this crucial moment would serve a constructive purpose.... I do not want to add to the difficulties of the president and the secretary of State in this delicate situation."

The approach to foreign policy is typical of Stevenson's performance at every crucial juncture in the past four years. He demonstrated it at the time of the Que-moy-Matsu madness and during the final months of the Indochina debacle. It is the approach of the "responsible" irresponsible or the "crackpot realist."

We never learn what Stevenson thinks an alternate policy should be, if he has an alternate, but only that he has "misgivings" about the way it was carried out. Thereupon semi-professional egg-heads proceed to hail this as "mature self-searching thought."

Eisenhower is right. There is no difference on "broad general policy" involved in the campaign, but only the "management" of the present policy.

The Democratic standard-bearer has rightly criticized the Republican administration for "an alarming lack of understanding" of the revolutionary forces at work in Asia and Africa. But he has not once stated what he thinks of the policy under both Truman and Eisenhower of supporting the colonial powers or else evading support to the colonial peoples struggling for independence.

WHAT DOES HE OFFER?

We can see where he stands by looking at a roughly analogous situation in the United States—the surging struggle of the Negro people for full equality and rights. Here Stevenson has attempted to evade the issue and ended up by compromising on civil rights in order to win the support from the Southern reactionaries. This is the same type of justification used to support Western colonialism: the U. S. is opposed to colonialism, it is stated, but it is necessary to have the support of the Western European colonialists in order to stop Russian imperialism.

U. S. foreign policy is in a crisis not because Dulles is a congenital blunderer who flies off to overseas conferences at the drop of the hat. With the exception of some rhetoric, the Eisenhower-Dulles foreign policy has continued along the lines established under the Truman administration.

It continues inherent dependence on a military emphasis to foreign policy and the problems of Stalinism, alliances with reactionary and conservative regimes, support to colonialism, stress on establishment of military bases all over the world as well as boastful and arrogant display of U. S. economic and political might—policies which proceeded to the brink of world war in Indochina and Quemoy-Matsu.

These are some of the foreign-policy questions which have not and will not be discussed in the campaign.

~~~~~

**The New York Independent Socialist League and Young Socialist League sinisterly invite you to hunt witches at our Halloween Hassle which is scheduled for the dark of the moon at 9 on Saturday, Oct. 27**

There will be thaumaturgical refreshments, necromantic dancing, folk-dancing and other hocus-pocus, as well as cabalistic conviviality and, of course, demonic drinking. We're on! Witch sighed, "Are you on?" If so, on to

**Labor Action Hall  
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.**

~~~~~

They Still Need Help

In September the U. S. Chamber of Commerce, through its Labor Relations manager, sent out secret letters to its member associations. The letters began: "This is a confidential letter to alert you to a type of union tactic that may so on confront your members. The United Auto Workers union is seeking to promote a nationwide boycott against the Kohler Company of Kohler, Wisc."

It then relates that resolutions to achieve the boycott have been appearing before local government bodies and others, denounces them as "disruptive and unfair," and asks letter recipients to write "your key members on a confidential basis, asking them to inform you if a union seeks to have them stop doing business with another employer who does business with Kohler."

William Barton, who signed the above confidential letter, is appealing for employer solidarity against the Kohler strike.

The union needs some class solidarity on its side.

We wish to remind readers of one helpful thing they can do.

Last month we reported that the Kohler strikers had appealed for contributions of children's clothing and we asked our readers to help. A bundle was sent by the New York branch of the Independent Socialist League and it received the following letter acknowledging its donation:

August 27, 1956

Dear Brothers:

On behalf of the more than two thousand families presently on strike for more than two years, we extend to you our appreciation for your continued support to their justified cause. Your contribution of clothing helps make it possible for the striking members of UAW Local 833 to continue their fight against the unfair labor practices of the Kohler Company.

With every good wish, we remain,
Kohler Local 833 Executive Board,
Per JOHN STIEBER,
Financial Secretary.

The strike continues. We are certain that additional contributions will be appreciated. Clothing is needed by two-year olds whose dads have been on strike for the whole of their lives.

You many send contributions directly Sheboygan, Wisc. Or if you prefer you may bring packages to the ISL Hall at 114 West 14 Street, New York City.

Third Camp vs. Stalinist Views Tangle in Chicago

By SAUL BERG

Chicago, Oct. 9

Chicago saw its largest political forum in some years on Friday Oct. 7 when a panel representing disparate political tendencies discussed the subject, "What Next for the American Left?"

The participants were Max Weiss, for the Communist Party; Harvey O'Connor, a long-time fellow traveler associated with Paul Sweezy's magazine *Monthly Review*; Bert Cochran of the *American Socialist* group of Stalinoids; A. J. Muste, the well-known pacifist spokesman; and Sid Lens, the anti-Stalinist socialist author of *The Counterfeit Revolution* and other books.

About 800 were in the audience. The meeting was held under the auspices of a committee of individuals but its inspiration, including the title, was largely the work of the Cochran group.

What would have been fundamental today for a confrontation of socialists with the CP would, of course, have been an analysis of the world significance of the 20th Congress of the Russian CP, and the CP's consequent protestations of change. But this is precisely the topic that Weiss, O'Connor and Cochran wanted to avoid.

The topic "What Next for the American Left?" was designed so that these three, each in his own way, could brush aside fundamental considerations and attempt to keep attention focused on their ideas about regrouping the "left" in the U. S. without any reference to such "external" matters.

Weiss, for the CP, made a hack speech full of delightful euphemisms such as his reference to the "oversimplified relations" that existed for many years between the American CP and its "brother Marxist parties in other countries."

O'Connor said practically nothing, except to reaffirm that he was willing to cooperate with anybody, and express his impatience with Sid Lens for mentioning Russia!

COCHRAN

Cochran's speech reflected his group's change in perspective since the post-20th Congress Stalinist crisis. These people, after splitting from the Trotskyist group, originally aimed to operate among the CP's periphery, where their line that "Russia is part of the socialist world" would meet with approval. They thought then in terms of attracting a few Stalinists while actually playing the role of a satellite to the CP itself. But the Khrushchev confessions, by destroying the Russian halo and the American CP's infallibility in the eyes of the Stalinist faithful, caused the Cochran group to raise their sights. They now think of replacing the CP with a regroupment of independent Stalinoid tendencies in which they would participate as part of the leadership. This Cochran links with his long-held idea of a broad "American"

approach tied to the conception that we don't have to worry about Russia, which will evolve into socialist democracy anyway.

At the forum, therefore, Cochran's line was to attack the American CP as already dying from its record of flipflops tuned to Russian foreign policy, and to call for a broad "socialist" educational society to be formed by the present splinter groups.

He went on to acknowledge the accuracy of the anti-Stalinist speakers' charges against Russia but urged leaving such questions in order to concentrate on rebuilding the "socialist" movement in America. This line of "let's not talk about Russia" is, of course, simply his disguise for the opinion that Russia is "part of the socialist world." What it proposes is rebuilding the Stalinist movement in America, not a socialist movement.

MUSTE AND LENS

Muste and Lens both made good presentations of a Third Camp socialist position accompanied by detailed criticism of the historic role of the CP in America and of the Russian regime. They insisted that no group in this country could stand for socialist freedom if it justified slavery elsewhere in the name of "socialism."

In general, the meeting was superior to the Carnegie Hall meeting held last May in New York insofar as a good internationalist socialist position was put forward as the alternative to the CP and its satellites.

A large number of LABOR ACTIONS and *Anvils* were sold on the forum's literature table, which was opened to all "left" groups in addition to the tendencies represented by the speakers.

British CP in the Throes

Like their similars in the American Communist Party, the British CP leaders are feverishly exerting themselves to keep the party apparatus under their accustomed control while still allowing rank-and-file discontent to blow off steam.

The provisions for steam-blowing, however, have not been seen in the CP for quite a while, and were made necessary by the internal convulsions that have followed the 20th Congress disenchantment.

When the new party secretary John Gollan came back from his recent visit to Moscow, a special party conference was promised by the end of the year. This conference has now been postponed to March of next year.

Although one of the hot items on the agenda is "party democracy" (in addition to "the British Road to Socialism"), the conference itself will afford the members no opportunity to make any decisions. Not being a party congress (which has not been called), it has no powers whatsoever. Its sole function is steam-blowing.

The organization of the pre-conference discussion is in the hands of two commissions appointed by the leadership.

Meanwhile the leadership has issued a long blast against *The Reasoner*, the factional organ published by dissident CPers Saville and Thompson. It is widely believed to be a preparation for their expulsion. However, the convulsion inside the party seems to be of such dimensions that it is not at all certain that Gollan can handle it in the usual brutal fashion.

Philadelphia LABOR ACTION FORUM Albert Gates

Sunday, Oct. 28 at 8 p.m.
Secretary, ISL

THE CHOICE IN THE '56 ELECTION

St. James Hotel, Rm. 304
13th and Walnut Streets

Mollet Cracks Down On Socialist Critics

By PHILIP COBEN

As premier of France, Guy Mollet is in the van calling for imperialist intervention against Egypt and is presently engaged in leading French colonialism's war against the Algerian people. As head of the French Socialist Party, Party President Guy Mollet is assiduously holding up the hand of Premier Guy Mollet.

The latest is that the SP leadership has moved to suppress its members who write articles in the press criticizing what Mollet and his regime are doing.

The social-democracy's ire was aroused particularly by anti-imperialist articles written by Marceau Pivert and Oreste Rosenfeld for *France-Observateur* (Paris) and by Lucien Weitz for the *Tribune* (the London Bevanite organ).

All three belong to the Paris region section of the SP (Federation of the Seine), which recently adopted a sharp resolution of criticism directed against the government's policy.

The resolution said it was madness to think of using force against Egypt, supported the principle of Egypt's right to nationalize the Suez Canal, and recommended that the whole dispute be referred to the UN.

Marceau Pivert is a well-known left-winger in the French SP. At the last party convention the right wing succeeded in dropping him from the national committee at the same time that it obtained party endorsement of its Algerian policy. Oreste Rosenfeld is a prominent socialist lawyer long-active as an anti-colonialist. Lucien Weitz is the *Tribune's* regular Paris correspondent.

Before taking these repressive actions against party critics, the SP leadership had sharpened the ax against the British Labor Party. In September a member of the party executive committee, Lucien Peyrassol, writing in the SP daily *Le Peuple*, had raised scandalized hands at British Laborite John Strachey's attack on... Anthony Eden.

Strachey accused Eden of "being the instrument of French colonialism." The French social-democrat felt the thrust come home.

It is true that Lucien Weitz's dispatches to the *Tribune* were not merely gentle wrist-slaps against the Paris government's policy. In fact, they were hard-hitting denunciations of French war-mongering over Suez.

'CULT OF THE CABINET'

To give an idea of what Mollet didn't like about them, here are some excerpts from Weitz's story in *Tribune* of September 14 over the title "When Socialists Become Small-Town Jingoists":

"How have our Socialist ministers allowed themselves to wallow in war hysteria? Why have they so readily replaced the language of Socialism by that of imperialism and adopted the flag-wagging tone of smalltown jingoists made apoplectic by the knowledge of their failing power?..."

"Suez is a diversion from the tragedy of Algeria. Stumbling on from pitfall to pitfall, the government wants to retrieve its failure in Algiers by striking at Cairo...."

"Foreign Minister Christian Pineau [also an SP leader], throwing to the winds all his efforts in past months to lower the international temperature, swallowed his principles and started wailing pitifully over the poor small investors in the Suez Canal Company. Cosmopolitan high finance could never have hoped for a more tear-jerking defense...."

"... And soon you could hear Socialist ministers declaring that it would be all over when an expeditionary force, in four days' fighting brought Nasser to see reason...."

"From the Socialist Party, there hasn't been a peep. We may be immune from the cult of the individual, but we fall heavily for the cult of the cabinet when its members are drawn from our party...."

"The parties of the Right and Center are working for the downfall of the Socialists. They foresee the time when Mollet will have to climb down over Suez, but will still bear the taint of his pro-



Guy Mollet

imperialist policy. Then will come the day when he can no longer hide his failure to solve the Algerian problem, which will have to be written off like Indochina. "That will be the day when there is no longer any point in keeping Mollet in office...."

"Meanwhile, within France, things go from bad to worse. Inflation marches on. To finance the war, the government has floated a 200 million pound loan on terms that will bring scandalous profits to speculators. For the rest of us, the cost of living goes up and up...."

Although the Socialist International has kept the silence of the grave on these altercations between its member social-democracies (and the French SP leadership is not daring to bring its complaints before the international body), another International has been moved to demur at Mollet's doings.

The International Confederation of Free Trade Unions has asked the French premier for an independent investigation of charges that political prisoners in Algeria, including trade-union leaders, are being brutally mistreated.

LACOSTE'S TERROR

The *AFL-CIO News* reports, "The request was touched off by a report from Algerian free trade-union sources that General Secretary Aissait Idir of the Algerian Trade Union Federation (UTGA) was among prisoners beaten by guards because they collapsed after standing for six days in the blazing sun as punishment for a hunger strike started in protest against compulsory salute of the French flag."

(The French resident-general in Algeria, who is conducting the war, is another SP leader, Robert Lacoste.)

ICFTU General Secretary Oldenbrook is insisting that "this intolerable state of affairs" in the Algerian prison camps be ended.

The brutality charged is not untypical, according to other accounts. An article by a French school teacher Henri Munier, in *France-Observateur* for August 9, related incidents such as the following as taking place in an area which according to Paris had been "completely pacified" in June:

"March 27: Helicopter operation at Semaoun by colonial infantry. No contact with rebel forces, but six civilians killed, among them Hadj Aballache, a 70-year-old notable. Next day, in the paper: 'Fellaghas [guerrillas] Surprised in Their Lair.'"

"In June: At Maken, a youth throws at a French convoy a grenade found at the scene of a fight with rebel forces. He is shot down. The village is burned and 5 peasants killed.

"At Aourir (pop. 1500) after surrounding and searching the town, the army collects all identity cards. All men are ordered to pick them up the next day at the office. When no one shows up, the army returns and finding only women and children, burns 95 per cent of the town."

Read the
NEW INTERNATIONAL
America's leading Marxist review

15 LAUNCH FUND FOR SP TIME ON TV, RADIO

A "Committee for Full Political Expression in 1956" has been formed by 15 sponsors to give the Socialist Party's candidates "minimum access to TV and radio time" by raising a special fund.

Among the sponsors are Norman Thomas, Kermit Eby, Louis P. Goldberg, Sidney Hook, Murray Kempton, A. J. Muste, A. Philip Randolph, Joseph Schlossberg, Upton Sinclair, and Rowland Watts. As the committee makes clear, not all of these are necessarily for either the SP candidates or for socialism, but sign the appeal in order to further "free political discussion" in this age of TV when "free speech is a prohibitive luxury."

"We ask you to contribute to a TV and Radio Fund to make possible the presentation of a point of view which will be virtually barred from the air without your support," they write in a circular letter, asking for remittance of contributions to the committee at 303 Fourth Avenue, N. Y. C.

The GOP will spend over \$2 million for TV and radio, they point out; the Democrats \$1 million. "Spokesmen for democratic socialism will have practically no access to public communication in view of these expenditures," unless their appeal is heeded.

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

Pro

To the Editor:

I read the Independent Socialist League's statement concerning the 1956 elections, yesterday in LABOR ACTION.

I found the political analysis of the presidential campaign to be well written. Indeed, I agreed with most of the points discussed.

I find the ISL's support of the Socialist Party's presidential candidates, Darlington Hoopes and Samuel H. Friedman, encouraging. I am sure that I speak for the Socialist Party in Illinois. Because Illinois is one of those states where the ballot laws are so undemocratic as to make it virtually impossible to place our candidates on the ballot, we are running a protest write-in vote. Particularly in such a campaign is support such as yours welcomed.

Fraternally,
HAROLD CHARBNAU
Chairman,
Socialist Party, Illinois

Chicago, Oct. 10, 1956

Con

To the Editor:

I think you err in advising your readers to vote for Hoopes and Friedman of the SP. You say this does not mean voting for the program of the SP, but casting a protest vote against capitalism. So far, so good. I have no use for those radicals who refuse to vote because they have disagreements with each of the socialist parties. A vote for any one of them will be understood as a vote against capitalism and the old-party sell-out on immediate issues.

But the protest vote should be concentrated where it can be most effective. The SP is not running a campaign at all and is making no effort to get on the ballot. It went through the motions of nominating a ticket only to please its left wing. It is difficult in the extreme to persuade people to write in the names of two candidates, and to get them to do it in the proper legal form. A lot of these write-ins will be botched up and the ballot will be thrown out on technicalities. The SWP has made some efforts to get on the ballot, but they just haven't had the strength to make it in many places. Moreover, their political line on Russia is so objectionable to the better informed socialists that the SWP would be hard to sell.

I think the only intelligent thing to do is vote for the SLP. They are going to be on the ballot in more states than the other two combined, including some difficult and pivotal states like Illinois. For this reason, a vote cast for Hass and Cuzzini is more likely to be counted. I agree that they are sectarian, that they isolate themselves from the labor movement, ignore immediate demands, and refuse cooperation with everybody. Yet I think these shortcomings are of lesser moment—if you want to consider programs—than the fact that the other two socialist parties are lined up in the two imperialist war camps. The SP is in the U. S. war camp, and Sam Friedman in particular is virtually a jingoist and has been for years. The SWP is in the other camp.

The SLP is in the third camp, and this is a fact of the first magnitude, more important than the secondary objections which can be made against it. Yet, since the public at large and the capitalists in particular know nothing of these differences between the left parties, I might still vote for one of the other two

if I thought such a vote would be effective, that is, counted. It is certain that the SLP is going to get the "socialist vote" in this election, and we should do all we can to swell it, and not divide it, under the circumstances which now prevail. Finally, for you to urge a vote for the SP in the hopes of promoting unity with it, is to give a tactical aim too great a role in determining a largely political question. It is slightly opportunistic. Look, the SDF and the SP haven't united yet, after years of close cooperation. I favor the unity you want, but not at all costs.

Fraternally,
VICTOR HOWARD

Chicago, Oct. 9, 1956

The write-in nature of the SP candidacy is, of course, a point that had to be considered, but we felt that a good deal more important was the first and general consideration the ISL statement gave, which Comrade Howard doesn't mention: because of the SP name and tradition, the proposal for a socialist protest vote "in its general sense" can be most easily explained in terms of voting for it.

The considerations that followed regarding the SP are similar to those we already gave in 1952, when the ISL also recommended a vote for the SP candidates; plus the new reference to the SP left wing's unity proposal. We fail to see why this approach raises the specter in Comrade Howard's mind of "unity at all costs" or "opportunism."

Comrade Howard says he might be for voting SP "if I thought such a vote would be effective, that is, counted." We do not derogate his consideration, but it is hardly a "principled" one, deviation from which is "opportunistic." In any case, it is very like a long-standing argument against voting for any socialist minority candidates which we do not believe outbalances the reasons we have given.

We therefore reiterate to our readers our recommendation that they vote socialist by voting for Darlington Hoopes and Samuel H. Friedman.—Ed.

SLP, SWP KNOCKED OFF N.Y. BALLOT BY DESAPIO

Both the Socialist Labor Party and the Socialist Workers Party have been knocked off the ballot in New York State through a crudely anti-democratic trick engineered by Tammany boss Carmine DeSapio, who is also Secretary of State under Governor Harriman.

The ruling was handed down October 5 by DeSapio's executive deputy, after a hearing in which the minority parties' lawyers riddled the case with charges of fraud. Both parties had submitted more than the required number of petition signatures to establish their place on the ballot. Democratic Party machine henchmen had brought objections to invalidate the nominating petitions.

In Dutchess County, for example, the politician who did so was also the election commissioner, who then passed on his own objections. In another place, the Democratic agent who did the job openly told the press that he had acted because of "his firm faith in the two-party system"—i.e., he was against having more than two parties. This two-party idealism was discovered to be a former Democratic county committeeman.

In Michigan, the Democratic administration under Governor "Soapy" Williams pulled an even rarer maneuver when its Secretary of State ruled out the legality of even write-in votes for the offices of president and vice-president. Earlier this year the minority parties had been ruled off the ballot on a technicality.

According to this Michigan ruling, anyone who, in that state, writes in for the top offices will have his entire ballot invalidated. Basing themselves on the shameful ruling, radio stations in the state are now refusing any time to the victimized parties.

In the current issue of its paper the SLP's campaign takes the form of asking for a write-in vote for its candidates in a number of states including New York, Michigan, California, Ohio, Connecticut, and others.

The New York and Michigan rulings will be contested in the courts.

BOOKS AND IDEAS

For Socialist Trade-Unionists

A Guide to Automation

By BERNARD CRAMER

From London comes a very valuable addition to the socialist library on the subject of automation: a 48-page booklet by Michael Kidron entitled *Automation: The Socialist Answer*.

Kidron is associated with the *Socialist Review* in the left wing of the Labor Party, and with Tony Cliff, whose book on *Stalinist Russia* is known to our readers. In fact, Kidron is also the publisher of all of these works. This time he has done an excellent job as a writer.

One thing has to be said lest anyone think that, coming from Britain, Kidron's pamphlet may be lacking in relevance to American readers. The contrary is true. As Kidron stresses several times, there has been more experience on the subject in the U.S., and therefore he seeks to bring to the British reader a most helpful digest of the American experience, together with some very enlightening examples from British developments.

Second thing to be said is that the booklet is written very largely from the angle of the socialist trade-unionist, that is, it is primarily concerned with asking and answering questions about the impact of automation trade-union problems and the "socialist answer" to these trade-union problems. By the time Kidron is through, he has presented an excellent program for progressive labor in meeting the new developments.

Only toward the end does he treat of the connection between automation and the socialist future, and then quite briefly.

Kidron does not spend very much time in describing the technical advances in automation (this material can be found in many places) but jumps right into the question of what it means for labor and what should be done.

MEATY ANALYSES

Here are some problems he takes up: (1) First: speedup. He quotes John Diebold's book: "Automation provides the answer to the human problem of machine pacing and subordination of the worker to the machine." That provides the leitmotif. Shall automation be used to subordinate the worker to the machine? The trade unions can see to it that it is otherwise.

He goes on to show that automation means speedup not just incidentally but that is used for that end consciously and systematically. Automation is used, among other things, to reduce the now inevitable waits and hesitations in the process of production which permit some breathing-space in the minute-to-minute exertions of the worker. "The individual worker becomes less and less able to set his own work pace. Even the single shop or section loses its power to adjust speeds."

In this connection he mentions the "epic 22 weeks' strike at Westinghouse" as pointing the direction for trade-unionism in insisting on control of automation's consequences.

(2) "Health and Conditions": the booklet stresses the effect of automated processes particularly on the mental health of the worker, with some interesting material.

(3) "Shift Work": Because the great expense of automated machinery means that the plant cannot be allowed to be idle, there must be a struggle over how many shifts there is to be, over shift pay, overtime, etc. Automated industries tend to work men longer hours.

(4) "Safety": Automation tends to make normal operation safer, but "Industrial injury, when it does occur, is grave."

(5) "The New Job": Since automation changes the classification of jobs, introducing new classifications and combinations, "what rate are they going to get? who is going to fill them?" How

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.

prevent employers from breaking down the demarcations between trades, with pressure on one trade to do the work of another at lower rates?

(6) "The Changing Composition of the Work Force": "automation is the technical revolution which, for the first time, makes the distinction between manual and mental labor, between workers by hand and by brain, meaningless."

(7) "Retraining": How can the process of upgrading be kept under trade-union supervision under the new conditions?

(8) "Seniority."
(9) "Whose Jobs Are Scrapped?"—"No skill can claim immunity from the threat of redundancy." Can the auto assembly line be automated? What happens when even the most complicated skills are duplicated and outdone by automation? "Finally, the office worker is just as vulnerable to automation, if not more so."

(10) "Relocation of plants"—i.e., the problem of runaway plants to less industrialized and less unionized areas.

(11) "Automation—How Fast?"—The booklet warns there is no reason to expect that automation will be introduced so slowly that working conditions will be able to adjust without unemployment.

(12) "The Growth of Monopolies": Only the biggest combines can afford the most complete changeover to the new techniques; those who can't afford it will fall by the wayside.

(13) "Monopolies and Markets": The London *Economist* wrote, "Automation cannot occur without the effective demand—probably widely distributed demand—to buy the extra goods." Where will the new mass markets come from?

(14) "The Myth of New Employment in New Industries": Is it true that unemployment caused by automation can be taken up by employment in the new industry of automation itself? No—for one thing, the automation of the automation industry itself is not only possible but under way....

From this point, Kidron discusses trade-union program, on such subjects as a shorter work-week, trade-union control of layoffs, the Guaranteed Annual Wage, "Open the Books," strike tactics, industrial unionism, union democracy and "The Need for a Political Program." Finally, in one page, there is a sum-up of all this in "The Transitional Program for Automation."

It is a meaty and compact booklet, with not a sentence wasted on anything which does not go straight to the point of the topics discussed. Written in a more discursive style, it would have taken three times the space; as it is, it compresses into very clear and concise, simple form the heart of a good book on the subject. For this, the 25 cents it costs is practically a give-away.

YOU'RE INVITED

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



LABOR ACTION

October 22, 1956 Vol. 20, No. 43

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

Editor: HAL DRAPER
Associate Editors:
GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL
Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

NEW YORK

LABOR ACTION FORUM

Thursday, Nov. 1

The Minority Parties and the Election

The Socialist Groups discussed by

GORDON HASKELL

The Stalinoid Groups discussed by

DON HARRIS

Labor Action Hall

114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

Asian-African Students Meet at Bandung: Third-Camp Socialists Combat Stalinism

By EDWARD HILL

A valuable story of anti-imperialist youth activity emerges from reports on the recent Asian-African Students Conference—the meeting of the “Bandung” youth—which took place last May.

At the get-together, according to a piece in the *Socialist Bulletin* of the Indonesian Socialist Party (*Partai Sosialis Indonesia*), the major ideological tendencies in the modern world met head-on, with the socialist youth putting forth a Third Camp line.

Officially, the Bandung student conference was “to strive for co-operation among Asian-African students in the educational and cultural field, especially in circles of higher educational training and universities in the interests of development, guided by the spirit of the Bandung Conference.” However, the actual meeting was something else again. Instead of discussing cultural exchange and student matters, the delegates wound up putting on a microcosmic Bandung Conference of their own, and the chief point of discussion was political, not cultural.

As soon as the conference was announced, the Stalinists moved into high

YSL WEEKEND CAMP HITS A NEW HIGH

Over sixty comrades and friends of the New York Young Socialist League participated in a weekend camp at Mountain Spring in New Jersey.

The camp was held on the Columbus Day weekend, in a burst of Indian summer weather. There was hiking, sports, folk dancing and social dancing, even swimming, as part of the recreation program at the camp.

In addition, an educational program of four lectures developed a lively discussion of socialist politics and ideas. Gerry McDermott, a socialist historian well known to YSLers through his participation at previous camps, spoke on the Civil War and on the American labor movement.

His talk on the labor movement was particularly interesting, concentrating on a careful, empirical analysis of the development of a single local in one industrial city. Through this careful recounting of the day-by-day events of the struggle, useful insights were gained on the usual generalizations.

Two other talks were given by Mike Harrington. The first, on Bertolt Brecht, led to a lively discussion of the relation between art, society and the individual psychological problems of the artist. There were some interesting exchanges on the continuity between the despairing, almost masochistic, quality of Brecht's expressionistic period and his embracing of Stalinism.

Harrington's second talk was based around a discussion of James McGregor Burns' new book *The Lion and the Fox*, the first “political biography” of Roosevelt. This discussion raised, of course, the whole question of the relation of the Roosevelt and New Deal myths to current liberal politics.

In every sense of the word, the New York unit's camp was a big success. The weather was marvelous, attendance high, the program interesting.

The possibility of a winter camp, probably somewhere in the East, is now being considered.

gear. They worked primarily through the International Union of Students (IUS), a long-standing front of theirs, and made the Bandung meeting part of the IUS work-plan for Asia.

According to our Indonesian comrades, the Stalinists attempted to take over on every level of the organization of the conference, from the International Committee down to each national committee. And indeed, the Stalinist youth almost succeeded in their purpose. The International Preparatory Committee, according to the Indonesian report, was heavily infiltrated by Stalinists, and the various national committees included a prominent, coordinated Stalinist element.

THREE-WAY FIGHT

However, the Stalinists did not succeed in taking the conference over. Two other tendencies were in Bandung to struggle with them: one a pro-American grouping; the other socialist and Third Camp.

The spearhead of the pro-Western sentiment at the Bandung youth Conference was the delegation from the Philippines. As the Indonesian bulletin put it, the pro-Western forces were almost exclusively concerned with keeping the Stalinists from taking over the whole conference and they were willing to take a disruptive role if that was the price.

But it is the account of the socialist role at the conference which makes the most fascinating reading.

The Stalinists were, of course, making the most out of anti-colonialism. To combat this, the socialists put forth a position against colonialism “in all of its manifestations,” whether Russian or Western. As part of this program, the socialist group present organized a demonstration in support of the Algerian Revolution.

It is interesting to note that this Third Camp line (against both Western and Russian policy) developed right out of the ideological struggle at the Conference. For the author of the report in the *Socialist Bulletin*, the term socialist simply stands for a position opposed to that of the two power blocs.

STALINIST TACK

The Stalinist attitude at the conference, as at the previous Bandung meeting, was, of course, all smiles and agreement. They were led by the student delegation from Stalinist China and sat through harsh attacks (the Philippine delegation charged that it was useless to deal with the Stalinists at all) without really becoming provoked.

And there was the tactic of arguing that Stalinism is primarily an Asian force, imperialism a Western force, and that therefore all Asiatics should support Stalinism. Here again, the socialist student reply was in terms of a consistent anti-imperialism, an assertion of the right of self-determination as against any interference, from East or West.

This ideological struggle was complicated by the fact that various governments saw the conference as a place for propaganda, and paid their delegations' expenses. This resulted in the presence

of some quasi-official spokesmen for the foreign policy of various countries.

The Egyptian delegation, for example, was a government-financed group, and it hewed to the official Egyptian line. Interestingly enough, the Egyptians worked out a close arrangement with the Chinese Stalinists, and the two pushed the same view on the Israel question. Indeed, the Egyptians threatened to walk out of the conference if the Israelis were invited.

With regard to the outcome of the conference, the Indonesian report does not go into detail. The Bandung meeting was not an action kind of affair, and the really important development was the three-cornered ideological struggle between the pro-Americans, the Stalinists, and the socialists with their Third Camp position.

ANTI-IMPERIALIST

The bulletin is especially interesting when it summarizes the socialists activity at Bandung and makes a point about the Algerian issue: “In facing the problems connected with various political and ideological currents and directions, there was only one decisive guidance for them [the socialists youth] and that was who was on their side, that is to say, who among the groups is clearly supporting the struggle for freedom. . . . And fortunately the socialist current at Bandung at that time could be directed to anti-colonialism in Africa, particularly resisting the Algerian colonial war waged by the French, though at the time a French socialist was holding the reins of government.”

This point is, of course, crucial. The socialists adopted a simple criterion—who is anti-imperialist—and they saw that it was absolutely necessary to make a public demonstration against Mollet, to dissociate themselves from the imperialist action of the French social-democracy. In every way, the actual events at the conference seemed, from this fairly brief report, to be pushing the socialist delegations present in the direction of a fairly explicit Third Camp program.

As the writer in the Indonesian bulletin understood: “On the problem of colonialism . . . the Western socialists have not yet taken a concrete course . . . [but] the Asian socialists should straightforwardly become the mouth-piece [of the struggle], and the fighters. Because, if this is not the case, then the place of the socialists will be taken by other groups, in this case by the Communists, who will get a better place for development with their stand of anti-capitalism and anti-imperialism of the Western world. . . .”

It is heartening to understand that our Asian comrades took this militant Third Camp line at the Bandung student conference. As the Indonesian report notes, ideological struggle is of particular importance in backward countries where intellectuals often play a leading role. It would be tragic if the field had been preempted by the spokesmen of the rival imperialisms.

But as it was, the delegates to the

Asian-African student conference heard the voice of anti-imperialism, east and west, a socialist voice which was not afraid of stating a position against Mollet and for the Algerian revolutionaries. And that means that the conference heard the voice of the Third Camp.

Cal Tech Students Get A Lesson in Democracy

An answer to a perplexing and topical question has been sought from President Eisenhower:

“Can a young American today look upon and listen to spokesmen for unpopular political philosophies without thereby jeopardizing his future security clearance for government employment?”

The American Civil Liberties Union's Southern California Branch put the question to the president after the collapse of an “Open Forum” program established by a group of students at the California Institute of Technology in Pasadena. Believing there existed a “restricted atmosphere” for discussion of public affairs on the campus, the students scheduled talks by representatives of minority political parties before persons wishing to listen.

The state chairman of the Socialist Party spoke at the first “Open Forum” and answered students' questions. A representative of the Communist Party was scheduled to appear at the next meeting, and an invitation was extended to Gerald L. K. Smith of the Christian Nationalist Party.

Before the second session, however, several students asked whether their attendance at a forum addressed by a Communist might later constitute grounds for a denial of security clearance. When they took their problem to Attorney General Herbert Brownell Jr., an assistant of the Justice Department replied that his office could not answer the question. The meeting then was canceled.

In his letter to President Eisenhower, Robert S. Vogel, chairman of the ACLU Southern California Board of Directors, commented:

“We may well wonder why these young people chose to give such attention to extremists. However imprudent their selection of speakers may have been, it is clear that they wanted honestly and openly to satisfy a normal curiosity concerning the views of such obscure spokesmen and perhaps confirm first-hand the general rejection of such views.”

“Those of us who, in our mature years, walk the sensible middle-of-the-road need often to remember that we may have settled on this moderate course only after exploring the edges of the road and the kinds of people who travel there. Such youthful exploration cannot safely be denied to those who walk behind us, lest blind conformity replace open-minded choice among alternative courses of political thought and action.”

Vogel pointed out that ACLU's only concern in the Cal Tech matter was to “preserve on campuses throughout the nation the courage of free inquiry.” He expressed hope that the president would issue a “forthright statement to dispel the uncertainty which now clings about this question and to remind American youth of their most precious intellectual heritage—the courage to be curious and the freedom to inquire.”

—ACLU Weekly Bulletin
Aug. 27

YSL FORUM • NEW YORK

Friday, Nov. 2
8:30 p.m.

IS THERE A CHOICE
IN THE '56 ELECTION?
A Pre-Election Forum

Labor Action Hall
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

NEWS AROUND THE WORLD

The ISL Program in Brief

Anti-Franco Manifesto

Cracks in the Spanish dictatorship of Franco are multiplying. When, in an authoritarian regime like this one, there grows up a strong opposition within the heart of the ruling class itself, the writing is on the wall.

The unrest prevalent in the officers corps of the Spanish army was given formal expression in a manifesto drawn up by officer members of the Juntas de Accion Patriótica, the "Young Turks" of the military cadre. This manifesto was first submitted to the army chiefs and is now being circulated privately all through Spain.

The document bluntly describes the situation:

"Disorganization among the ruling classes of Spanish society... is a visible and well-known phenomenon... the ruling classes have not even solved the economic problems, and they go on weaving the net of their own imprisonment."

The officers go on to say that "fortunately" not all of "the ruling classes" are in this sad state of trying to maintain "a mandarinat which is precipitating itself into chaos."

There follows a direct attack on Franco as "blind... following the eternal cycle of all dictators." It goes on to describe the "alarming symptoms" shown by the government's lack of authority and prestige, the quarrels inside the government and between the government and the church, the "poverty and practical enslavement of the working classes," and it touches a popular chord in attacking Franco's concessions to U.S. bases: "The surrender of Spain and her strategic areas to the Americans in exchange for a biblical bowl of lentils, perhaps even less;... it has created new Gibaltars by ceding air naval bases vital to our independence to the Americans..."

"It has lost its following among the youth..."

If we have to choose between "Spain or General Franco," we have to choose "Spain," they say.

The document ends with the demand that Franco must "surrender his powers." The manifesto was gotten up by high ranking officers of five military garrisons—Madrid, Barcelona, Seville, Valencia and Valladolid.

Beset from the military side, Franco is also bedeviled by the demands from

the working class for the promised raises in wages. In a speech in Salamanca, delivered before selected Falangists, Franco did not even refer to the promises nor to the commission which is supposed to be studying the question. Instead he indicated gingerly that conditions did not permit "improvement in the standard of living of the Spanish people."

Cleaning Up Mauritius

In anticipation of Princess Margaret's tour of the British colonies, *Tribune* started a series on conditions in the places she will visit. First was on Mauritius, the British-held island in the Indian Ocean east of Madagascar, which figures little in our news.

Relatively, Mauritius is a "prosperous" colony, enjoying the ten-year boom in sugar, which is the basis of its virtual one-crop economy. Production has been high and the "plantocrats" (sugar barons) have been getting rich. But not the Mauritian workers.

So public buildings were cleaned up, but the princess will not be toured through the plantation camps and workers' slums, where thousands of Mauritian live in shanties built of mud, straw, cowdung or old gasoline cans. "They exist on wages barely above the subsistence level, which pay for only one meal a day."

The majority of workers are paid on the basis of a 77-cent day rate. The highest level of workers get \$13.50 a month, plus an end-of-crop bonus which can go to a maximum of \$27.30 but of course usually doesn't.

Work in the sugar plantations is seasonal; few work all year. There are no unemployment benefits, only a meager public dole. In March of this year, one eighth of the economically active population of the island were unemployed.

Although the free primary education is not compulsory, there are not enough school seats for the children who want to attend, even in densely packed school rooms.

Britain has recently conceded some long overdue constitutional changes, in proposals for more self-government. The island Labor Party is powerful, and can win in the 1958 elections; it is pledged to a public-ownership program. The British constitutional proposals have included a system of proportional repre-

sentation (which doesn't obtain in British itself) in the hope that this will weaken Labor representation in the legislative council.

Racism in Fiji

To take another British-run island that hasn't made headlines; the race problem in Fiji is the subject of an interesting article in an Australian monthly. Richard Aspinall, a radio commentator, discusses the growing friction between the Fijians, Indians and Europeans on the island in the South Pacific. He blames the Europeans' racism.

"On landing in Fiji," he writes, "I was warned; 'Don't touch the race-relations problem—forget it.' But it is impossible to forget it when the European in your company refuses to recognize the Indian whom you know. Nor is it possible to forget it when, being entertained in an Indian home your host says, 'You are the first European we have had opportunity to entertain.'"

Relations between Fijians and Indians are excellent. (Most Fijian Indians today are Fiji-born and have only weak cultural links with India.) But—

"Unhappily this is not so at the top of the colonial social tree. Something of the Europeans' prejudiced attitude has infected the Fijian nobility. And the Eurasian generally despises both the Indian and the Fijian while envying the European. Of all groups the European is the most outspoken on the race relations issue..."

It is the common pattern in the native upper classes.

'Socialism' in India

Janata, the Praja Socialist Party's weekly in India, has concisely commented with statistics on the Nehru regime's pretensions to "socialistic" policies. Since the figures are striking, we give the passage below at the risk of scaring off non-mathematical readers. (A rupee is worth about 21 cents; *lakh* means 100,000, and *crore* means 10 million.)

"...As is well-known, during the last two decades, the rich have become richer and the poor poorer in India... Between 1931-32 and 1950-51, while incomes below Rs 25,000 fell from 81.9 to 65 per cent of the taxable income, those exceeding Rs 25,000 rose from 19.1 to 35 per cent.

"The sharpest increase was in the case of incomes exceeding a *lakh* of rupees, from 3 per cent in 1931-32 to 12.9 per cent in 1950-51. If corporate incomes are also taken into account the pattern of change in income distribution will be even more regressive.

"The first Five Year Plan, which, according to Dr. John Matthai, is 'not a plan but a program of piecemeal development,' only tended to sharpen the inequalities.

"In the urban sector, profits made by industries increased from Rs 318 in 1950, the pre-plan year, to Rs 511 *crores* in 1954, whereas during the same period the wage and salaries bills rose respectively from Rs 193 *crores* to Rs 207 *crores* and Rs 39 *crores* to Rs 42 *crores* only. In other words, while the share of industrialists in the net income from increased industrial production rose from 57 to 67 per cent, that of the workers and employees declined from 43 to 33 per cent.

The position is no different in the rural sector. Rich peasants have turned out to be the real beneficiaries of the community development and national extension service projects.

"At a seminar on community projects held some time ago in Lucknow under the joint auspices of the Lucknow University and Cornell University of America, it was pointed out that the community projects were accelerating the pace of economic and social differentiation in the countryside and that a new rural gentry was fast coming into existence.

"The Taxation Enquiry Commission stated in its monumental report published last year: 'during the period since the beginning of the war the comparatively large landholders, particularly such as have been growing cash crops, have improved their relative position, especially in those parts of the country where significant land reforms have not taken place.

SPOTLIGHT

(Continued from page 1)

while in the U.S. the same dismissal could not have gotten a peep of protest from any liberal quarters whatsoever. The latter would more likely congratulate the government on at last finding a "security risk" who actually resembled a security risk.

In America on this issue the left wing of bourgeois politics begins where the right-wing conservatives leave off abroad. Take almost any Tory politician in England as well as Canada, and his views on civil liberties would be denounced in an ADA convention as "ritualistic liberalism."

View with Alarm

In a talk to businessmen in Sacramento last month, Governor Knight of California made some interesting statements, echoing those economists who wonder how the present type of prosperity can continue indefinitely on the basis of a Permanent War Economy.

First, here's how the San Francisco *Chronicle* reported what he said:

"Governor Knight devoted most of his talk to stressing the prosperous growth of California and the nation, but he concluded that 'there is a serious side to the situation that all of us must consider while we view the past, present and future through economic rose-colored glasses.'

"I need never tell you, however, that there never has been a receptacle, including a horn of plenty, that couldn't be emptied faster than it could be filled."

"The governor went on to observe that

during the last decade the rate of capital investment in the United States 'has, for the first time in history, not only faltered but actually is entering what might become a long-term downswing.

"This is not true in California, which is a relatively new state, industrially speaking, but it appears to be true for the nation as a whole.

"The reason for this decline in the amount of capital investment, not in California but in the nation in general, lies in government's constantly increasing demands for more and more money for its operation."

"If trends toward heavier taxation continue, 'the prophecy of Karl Marx will come true,' said Knight, and capitalism will be destroyed."

So, one sees, Knight himself angled the whole discussion toward the favorite pitch of the GOP's extreme right: the present taxation level is "creeping socialism" or just as bad; government is too big; etc.

However, the economic reality behind the fears he expressed is that the "government's constantly increasing demands for more and more money for its operation" are not due to welfare-statism (let alone socialism) but are primarily due to the insatiable needs of the military establishment and its past, present and future expenditures, which swallow up the taxpayer's dollar.

In the War Economy, the government's purchases of arms provide the market which, in the bad old days of depression, could not be supplied by workers' purchasing power.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Get Acquainted!

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

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

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE

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

- Please enter my subscription:
- 1 year at \$2. 6 months at \$1.
 - Payment enclosed. Bill me.
 - New sub. Renewal.

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

The Price That Labor Pays — —

(Continued from page 1)

CIO fund, at least none was announced. The unions are now in hiding. An official AFL-CIO handbill, sent out by its Committee on Political Education (COPE), lists the vital election issues and the stand of the top candidates; it does not even mention civil rights or the Supreme Court decision.

News columns in the regular daily press featured events in Kentucky and Tennessee. But the official AFL-CIO News couldn't find an inch in its weekly issues and still hasn't gotten around to it. In this, it was representative of the union press in general.

Most symptomatic, and most disappointing, was the attitude of *Labor's Daily* during the critical events in Kentucky and Tennessee. It simply appeared day after day without any reference to the fight between Negro school children and segregationist mobs. It was as if it had never happened. The editors were aloof. Not only no editorial comment but not even a straight news coverage.

Of course, there were news items aplenty about civil rights in general but nothing about the fight in the streets in particular.

Fleeing from the Firing Line

Yet, *Labor's Daily* celebrates its fourth anniversary this month reminding its readers of its record of hard-hitting, outspoken independence. Many of its claims are justified. It is unquestionably one of the most progressive labor publications in the country, many cuts above the stilted, official union press. Its failure to note a fight in front of Southern schools could hardly be an accidental oversight.

Is it possible that *Labor's Daily*, in this case, was not so independent? As the official publication of the International Typographical Union, was it perhaps under pressure to avoid getting mixed up in such a "controversial" issue?

We must remind our readers again that most union papers responded to the school demonstrations with a deadly silence. They just don't want to get "mixed up" in it. The general attitude of diffidence and evasion was openly expressed by at least two unions: the Glass and Ceramic Workers Union and the International Association of Machinists.

In April the AFL-CIO *Glass Workers News* published a little article, critical of discrimination in general. This offended a local leader from Knoxville, Tennessee, who penned a protest in the June 30 issue arguing:

"Segregation is a well-considered and time-tested American policy. Ample evidence is available to show beyond a reasonable doubt that segregation . . . rests upon moral and ethical principles and not upon blind and unreasoning prejudice. . . ."

This was enough. The editor fled quickly from the scene.

His reply is worth printing in full because it undoubtedly expresses the feelings of conservative leaders in conservative unions who prefer to remain silent:

"As I said in a recent issue of the *Glass Workers News*, segregation is a controversial issue and it is my humble opinion that it will take years to work out a solution of this problem. For my part, I would rather not continue with the subject of segregation; probably I should have omitted the first discussion of this problem. We have many good members in the South as well as in the North and our beliefs on the subject are quite a way apart. Our union's stand on segregation is just one way—as expressed by our Constitution and By-laws as the answer. There is no use in having an internal feud in the organization over this problem; we say again—it is a hot issue."

'Hands Off' Line

A resolution on "anti-discrimination" was adopted by the Machinists Union at its national convention last month in San Francisco. Here is how it is summarized in the union newspaper:

"Strongly reaffirmed Union's position that everything should be

done 'to raise the economic, social, and cultural standards of all members and their families, regardless of the area in which they live, or regardless of race, creed, color or religion.' Called for accomplishing the program 'through the application and use of trade-union principles without becoming involved in any of the current controversy regarding the integration decision of the Supreme Court.'

Nothing could be clearer: a fight takes place between democracy and anti-democracy; the Machinists Union doesn't want to become involved.

We wonder how the union would react if it was subjected to the same sanctimonious evasion. Suppose, for example, it were engaged in a bitter national strike facing violence and terror and the very life of the union hung in the balance; and suppose the AFL-CIO Council resolved to endorse the general union principle of free collective bargaining but resolved, too, not to be "involved in any of the current controversy" regarding the Machinists' strike. Who could blame the Machinists for despising such a cowardly action?

But in Kentucky—

When it was discovered that members of the United Mine Workers union were joining in the racist mobs at Sturgis, Kentucky, UMW Vice-President Thomas Kennedy, according to the *New York Times*, repudiated them in a public statement. It seemed that the union had intervened firmly in this case on the side of democracy and against segregationist reaction.

Very good; but the full text showed that the union was far from making a strong campaign. Later a UMW national convention took no action as far as is known.

While most unions were hiding their heads, one of the few forth-

right denunciations of the Kentucky mobs came from Kentucky. In its issue of September 12, the Kentucky Labor News published by the State Federation of Labor editorialized:

"When several hundred inflamed and angry citizens of Sturgis, Kentucky last week ganged up on nine Negro youngsters and prevented their entering Sturgis High School, we were disgusted and deeply ashamed. . . . We think Governor Chandler was legally and morally justified in sending state troopers and National Guardsmen to Sturgis to prevent the possibility of a man-sized riot developing out of the mob demonstration."

A few weeks before, the editors had criticized six of the state's representatives in Congress for voting against a civil-rights bill.

Later, when state Attorney General Ferguson found a formula for the Clay-Sturgis school boards, one that they quickly used to drive out the Negro kids, the *Kentucky Labor News* in mild but definite fashion repudiated him and predicted final victory for integration.

Rare Voices

Naturally the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters continues to speak as the representative of Negro workers and as the voice of those in the union movement who realize what momentous issues are at stake.

In its paper the *Black Worker* (September) it headlines the Kentucky riots: "Mob Rule Shame of U.S.A.," and demands strong state and federal action to enforce anti-segregation. It reports, too, that A. Philip Randolph, union president, had presented a strong civil-rights plank to both party conventions. At the AFL-CIO Executive Council he voted against the endorsement of either party ticket.

The National Maritime Union's *Pilot* writes briefly on September 13 of the "Battle in Dixie":

"The united labor movement can be counted on to dedicate its healthy influence in public affairs to hasten the day and shorten the road to the inevitable victory of democracy, decency and justice. In the meantime, a new type of hero is being created in these towns. They are only children, but they are in the traditions of the great heroes who fought and suffered throughout our history to defend the democratic ideals this country has stood for."

And the *Catering Industry Employee*, published by the hotel union, pays homage to "Mrs. Gordon and Those Kids" in its October issue. But these are voices, thin and few. Where is the labor movement?

Where Are They?

If we can't expect much from those who are concerned only with the most narrow aspects of trade-unionism, oblivious to the big social and political problems of the days, where is labor's socially conscious, progressive wing—the mass industrial unions, the garment unions, the auto workers?

It is their responsibility to show the way to their more reluctant

brethren. We should have expected big feature articles in their press during the events last month in Kentucky and Sturgis; little was forthcoming.

Where were the mass meetings, resolutions, demands upon all the candidates to take a clear position on the right of Negroes to go to school in Sturgis, Clay and Clinton; reporters sent to the scene; a call upon the AFL-CIO to give material aid to the victims of the fight, to build its fund for civil rights and to use it?

They were all but silent. The United Auto Workers belatedly recognized the struggle in the streets of Kentucky and Tennessee only when it came time to drum up votes for Stevenson and only for that narrow purpose.

"It is interesting to note," said Reuther recently, "that Governor Clement of Tennessee who supports Stevenson used troops to implement the Supreme Court decisions in Tennessee but Governor Shivers, a friend of Eisenhower, used troops to block implementation in Texas."

What should be a ringing call to rally to the struggle for democracy in the South is turned into an excuse for a pitiful whitewash of the Democratic Party. It is common knowledge that Stevenson was the accepted candidate of the Southern right wing as a whole and that the Democratic Party controls every state in the Deep South where Negroes are suppressed; and that candidate Stevenson, the artful dodger, had nothing to say in plain English about Clinton-Sturgis.

The Light of Truth

The fight for democracy in the United States today is centered in the fight against school segregation in the South and everything connected with it; labor needs democracy to bring unionism to the unorganized South; Negro and labor face common tasks.

But more: The Negro people who spearhead the fight where it counts are largely a race of workers and an inseparable part of the labor movement. But the unions support a candidate and a party which turn away from their fight for democracy; labor's progressive wing is silent because the Democrats are embarrassed.

It seems obvious: the best sections of the union movement shrink from a militant fight on behalf of the Negro because they know that the Democratic Party cannot stand the light of truth.

Here, in almost crude form, is evidence of labor's great failing: in order to continue supporting the Democratic slate, organized labor is compelled to mute the call for democracy, progress and civil rights.

WEEK by WEEK . . .

LABOR ACTION screens and analyzes the week's news, discusses the current problems of labor and socialism, gives you information you can't find anywhere else.

A sub is only \$2 a year!

The 'Devil Theory' of Nixon — —

(Continued from page 1)

In its current (October) issue, *The Progressive* editorially announces its support of the Stevenson-Kefauver ticket. Now unlike the *New York Post*, the editors of *The Progressive* are not very sanguine about the Democratic Party program. On the contrary.

Nor are they under any illusion as to what forces would control Congress after a Democratic victory in November. On the contrary.

"LITTLE TO CHOOSE"

The very editorial which endorses Stevenson makes these facts quite clear. It states:

"On the basis of their platforms, there is precious little to choose between the Republicans and the Democrats. Both documents are masterpieces of evasion, heavy-laden with florid verbiage calculated to conceal rather than reveal the position of the parties on the overriding issues of our troubled times.

"The Democratic Party plank on civil rights is humbug. . . .

"On other issues of domestic policy, Democratic phrasemakers held out more alluring promises to independent liberals, in the fields of social security, resource development, and farm and labor legislation, than did the Republicans, but there was nothing to indicate that the Southern Bourbons who dominate the congressional committees would not go on throttling liberal legislation if the Democrats control the next Congress, as they do the current Congress. . . .

"Both parties expended many words on the urgent issues of foreign policy, but the independent voter who struggles through them comes away with the conclusion that neither is in a mood to face up to the stubborn realities of world politics." (Italics added.)

It would seem that this well-merited exposure of Democratic pretensions leaves little footing for the editors to take a firm stance waving the Stevenson banner.

NOWHERE TO GO

Nevertheless support Stevenson they do. Why?

The major reason, of course, resides in the absence of a significant different political party for them to support. So long as labor does not organize its own political instrument, it and the liberals feel obligated to remain the followers of the Democrats, on a "lesser of two evils" basis. There is nowhere else for them to go.

But this is the objective reason which dictates labor and liberal support to the Democrats; only a few trade-union leaders and liberals are even dimly conscious of it. To understand this does not require having LABOR ACTION'S position on the elections, but it does require a high degree of radical political consciousness; it demands some kind of desire, even if only in the form of occasional twinges of regret, for breaking out of the old-party framework.

But what do these liberals themselves say are the reasons for their endorsement of Stevenson? Why do they think that Stevenson's victory would be a significant, desirable gain for labor and the people, despite their awareness of the truths about the Democratic Party?

TWO ARGUMENTS

The Progressive editorial is instructive on this score also:

"The president's age and the state of his health vest the Republican choice for the vice-presidency with extraordinary significance. The unanimous selection of Nixon, under the special circumstances which prevail this year, robs the Republicans of any serious claim to the support of independent liberals. No one who ponders the record (see 'The Trouble with Nixon' on the following page) can seriously believe that he has the capacity to unify and govern the country if death or disability removed Eisenhower from the presidency. . . .

"...the Democrats have put together a hopeful and appealing ticket in Adlai Stevenson and Estes Kefauver. . . .

"Mr. Stevenson made an excellent record as governor... he displayed a rare honesty and humility. . . .

"In the four years that have followed he has shown an unusual capacity for growth... the old humility happily

survives. His is still a probing, brooding mind restlessly on the hunt for creative ideas... his willingness to listen, his determination to think, and his courage to move to advanced positions in the face of the facts. . . .

"...his dedication to a philosophy of progressive legislation within the framework of political democracy. . . ."

Two distinct elements are present here. One, not so heavily underlined in *The Progressive* as elsewhere, is the fear of Nixon and "Nixonism." The other is a feeling that Stevenson is personally superior, from the point of view of progressive political positions, to both the program of the Democratic Party and to its congressional and party leadership.

As a concomitant of this second strand there is also the feeling that Stevenson can somehow or other meaningfully counterbalance the conservatism of the Democratic Party and its program, so that a Democratic Party victory will mean a victory for the more liberal Stevenson—as they view him—over this conservatism to a degree significant enough to justify support to the Democrats.

ANTI-NIXONISM

First, on Nixon. Without in anyway contradicting the reactionary and opportunistic picture of the GOP's vice-presidential candidate held by the liberals, we must state that the hysteria being whipped up over Nixon exaggerates the real situation to an incredible degree.

Reports have it that in Liberal Party and ADA circles a veritable frenzy is created every time the possibility of Nixon's accession to the presidency is mentioned. Mutterings about "fascism" resulting from Nixon's occupancy of the White House can be heard. And the like of that.

But even on a less frenetic scale, Nixon and "Nixonism" play a large role in the liberal campaign for Stevenson. A perusal of the *New York Post* for a week demonstrates this clearly. *The Nation*, which had been toying with the idea of favoring Eisenhower for its own Stalinoid "peace line" reasons, opted for the Democratic ticket immediately after the Republican convention in an editorial which gave only one reason for its decision: Nixon. And it was indicative that the very issue of *The Progressive* which called for support to Stevenson carved as its lead article a lengthy analysis of and attack on the vice-president by editor Morris Rubin.

This is representative of much of the motivation for the pro-Stevensonism in liberal ranks.

A PROPOSAL

All of this recently brought forward a semi-facetious proposal which will serve to illustrate a point provided you don't take it too literally. Namely:

Since the Democrats are mainly worried about Nixon becoming president in the event of Eisenhower's death or incapacitation, and since there is little significant difference between Eisenhower and Stevenson, so much so that the Democrats in Congress spent most of their time supporting Eisenhower's program this past session: what the Democrats should have done was to nominate Eisenhower for president and Stevenson for Vice-President. The Democrats' Eisenhower-Stevenson ticket would certainly defeat the GOP's Eisenhower-Nixon slate, in view of the widespread distrust of Nixon in Republican ranks, and thus the Democrats would win the election and accomplish their primary political task of preventing Nixon from ever becoming president. . . .

This playful fantasy, in its own way,

goes to the heart of liberal electioneering.

Some of the liberals' campaign line on Nixon may be inspired by a conscious recognition of its value in securing votes for the Democrats, but much of it represents honest and sincere feeling. This feeling, however, is out of proportion to the real situation.

RIGHT WING?

For as much sympathy as Nixon may have from that loose amalgamation of McCarthyite, Knowlandite and old-Taftite forces which make up the GOP's extreme right wing, the fact is that this right wing has been fairly decisively defeated in the Republican Party, and that the Eisenhower-Dewey-Brownell group maintains control of the party. The censure and eclipse of McCarthy, the power of the GOP so-called "liberals" such as Sherman Adams, the quiescence of the right wing at the Republican convention, Nixon's "New Look" in this campaign—all are signs of this fact.

There do not exist sufficient reactionary forces in the country today for the triumph of the right wing in the Republican Party, let alone in the country. (And if there did, as all experience with extreme reaction and with fascism demonstrate, support to "lesser evil" liberal capitalist politicians is not the way to defeat them.)

Nixon's nomination was in part a sop to the right-wing, and his becoming president might give the right wing a certain measure of renewed vigor, but it would not, in the absence of other events and situations, lead to the triumph of the Republican right wing. The very opportunism and malleability, the very unprincipledness which liberals discern in Nixon's character, would overcome his current affinity for the right wing and enable him to play the role of representative of the dominant "liberal" GOP wing. His "New Look" campaign shows that he is capable of this to a sufficient degree. The continuation of the present brand of mediocre "liberal conservatism," with a slightly more reactionary twist, would be the result, not the developments which the liberals fear so much.

BOGYMAN

In fact, the common elements in the liberals' excoriations of Nixon tend to be mutually contradictory. On the one hand, as we mentioned, they mutter darkly about his right-wing affinities, but, at the same time, they heap scorn on his chameleon-like unprincipledness. Now, if the man has no principles (as we are told by all liberal anti-Nixonites), then it follows that he also has no right-wing principles.

If he is a machine-made opportunist who is ready to cut his cloth to anybody's measure, then it follows that, as president, he will be as readily manipulated by the real powers—that be as... Eisenhower. That's all!

The effort to build him up as a veritable devil is ludicrous. The Democrats have to have someone to run against; and since they have no visible basis for running against Eisenhower, and since it is no longer feasible to run against Herbert Hoover, a new bogymen has to be created larger than life-size.

All of this, to be sure, is no defense of Nixon. It is directed only to the qualitative difference which the liberals pretend to see between the No. 1 and No. 2 man on the GOP ticket, and which they use to substitute for the fervor otherwise lacking in their support of Stevenson. If you can't work up a head of steam for someone, at least you can try to get agitated against his opponent.

The second strand in this type of liberal justification for supporting the Democrats requires briefer examination, for we have taken it up in LABOR ACTION at some length.

THE PERSON AND THE PARTY

It is not a matter of denying that Stevenson is a shade more liberal than the Democratic congressional leadership, and certainly more so than the Eastlands and their ilk. There is no reason to believe that Stevenson personally objects to school integration or to dispute the claim that he even personally favors it. *The Progressive* is right: in this sense he is "superior."

But this does not settle the relevant question. And that is: will he do any thing for his "personal position," or will he capitulate to the reactionary forces in the Democratic Party, those forces from whom *The Progressive* rightly says labor, the Negroes, and the people in general can expect nothing?

And on that, the record is clear. If Stevenson's Southern trip after the 1952 campaign—a trip of appeasement and conciliation with the racists in the course of which he won their current support to his nomination and candidacy—is not sufficient proof, does not his role at the Democratic convention clinch matters?

What did Stevenson do to stop the shameful betrayal of Negro rights? Nothing. On the contrary, he did his best to guarantee it, down to the last minute work of his campaign managers to convince the labor-liberal-NAACP forces at the Chicago convention not to call for a role-call vote during the token debate on civil rights.

And what does he do today during the campaign? A few mild criticisms of Eisenhower's "inaction"; a proposal that the president should call a senseless and futile conference on integration so that "both sides [i.e., the oppressed Negroes and their racist oppressors] can talk things over"—not a word about any federal enforcement; a few gingerly stated phrases favoring the Supreme Court Decision, balanced by a quick statement of support to the Democratic civil-rights plank, so as to assure the racists that they have nothing to worry about.

NO CAUSE TO CHEER

What's the good of Stevenson's personal "superiority" then, when he makes it abundantly evident that he will subordinate his more liberal and humane views to their reactionary, inhumane ones?

And even if he wanted to do something for his superior position, how could he under the present party structure, when, as *The Progressive* correctly points out, the Democratic Party reactionaries and white-chauvinists will dominate the halls and committees of Congress and the party machinery, just as much as they dominated the Chicago convention?

For Stevenson to attempt to do something about what may be his personal views, he would have to start a fight, which would willy nilly lead to splitting the Democratic Party, breaking up this obsolete and outmoded conglomeration of diverse elements; which would lead to a new political realignment, toward a new party, a labor party. And neither Stevenson nor any other capitalist politician, is going to do that.

For this reason a real fight for civil rights could not be made in Chicago, and was not made, and for this reason Stevenson's election will not help the Negro people secure equality, regardless of what Stevenson's personal opinions are.

That is why liberals of *The Progressive* type face a dilemma. Once conscious, articulate liberals like those to be found in the pages of *The Progressive* recognize these facts, they will have little justification left for cheering the Democrats to win, little justification for supporting Stevenson. For this reason, and because the distinction between the Democrats and the Republicans is so slim, they can only base their election position on the "Stevenson myth" and the devil theory of Nixonism.

VOTE SOCIALIST! Write in Darlington Hoopes and Samuel H. Friedman for Pres. and Vice-Pres.

In Illinois, for governor and lieutenant-governor, write in the names of Kellam Foster and Donald R. Anderson.

To cast a socialist protest vote, Labor Action recommends a vote for these candidates of the Socialist Party.

**Don't miss a single week of
LABOR ACTION
A sub is only \$2.00 a year!**