

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JANUARY 14, 1957

FIVE CENTS

One Year of Mollet in France

... page 6

Rival CP Factions Present Resolutions

... page 3

Black Year Ahead for the Tories

... page 2

Intellectuals in Hungary's Revolution

... page 5

McDonald Makes a Turn in Steelworkers

... page 2

'MOCK BATTLE' IN THE SENATE: Liberal Bloc in a Token Scuffle Against the Filibuster

By SAM TAYLOR

After massive and historic struggles by the Negro people in the South, and after a campaign in which the Negro vote showed its power in large-scale defections from the Democrats, the vote in the Senate against the filibuster has risen from the 21 mark that was registered in 1953 to only 38.

Supporters of civil rights can take cold comfort from it, and from the performance put on by the Senate liberals in fighting against the filibuster.

Now it will be four years before another attempt can even be made. Meanwhile the filibuster stands in the way of any try at real civil-rights legislation in Congress.

No leading Senate Democrat is willing to claim that any attempt is foreseeable at the congressional opening in 1958, when another presidential contest will be only a year and a half away; at that time it will again be a question of "party unity before civil rights."

The 1953 vote against filibuster was 70-21; this time it was 55-38. This progress, it must be conceded, is small enough when viewed against the backdrop of what has happened in the meantime.

In the Democratic contingent, only five more senatorial votes were scraped up as compared with 1953. The Republicans, their appetite whetted by significant Negro defections from their rival in the last election, raised their anti-filibuster contribution from five to 17, without Eisenhower even raising a finger to help the civil-rights side.

Side by side with the defeat of this "liberal coalition" was the abortive attempt of Northern Democrats to set up a National Advisory Committee in their party. This committee was to be representative of congressional leaders, governors, mayors and national politicians without office. It was to offer an alternative leadership to the conservative control of the party in Congress by the Texas twins, Senator Lyndon Johnson and Representative Sam Rayburn.

This too has been laid to rest for all practical purposes.

HOCUS-POCUS

All things considered, this has been a resounding defeat of liberalism in and out of Congress, and more than that betrayal of democracy. When the smoke had cleared, control in Congress remained in the same conservative hands which have held the reins since 1938.

How much was principle and how much demagoguery is attested to by the syndicated Washington Columnist Doris Fleson who wrote on January 4:

"All factions joined in the civil-rights hocus-pocus designed to convince liberals and conservatives, Negroes and white-supremacists, that a real struggle has taken place on this matter of principle.

"Miracles are always possible, even in such most unlikely places as the U.S. Senate. Nevertheless, on the opening day of the 85th Congress, the stage was again set for another 'great debate' on civil rights, at the end of which all participants and the nation will be left standing precisely where they were.

"The leaders planned it that way. The liberals can claim they made a good fight against overwhelming odds. The Southerners will exult in throwing back an in-

(Turn to last page)

Profile of a Practical Liberal

The power of Senator Lyndon Johnson over what passes for liberals in the U.S. Senate is something to behold. Not only did he effectively squelch the attempt of the Northern liberals in and out of the Senate to challenge his leadership of the Democratic Party for the next two years but he had them singing paeans of praise to boot.

At his disposal are appointments to choice committee seats and log-rolling favors for the passage of special-interest legislation and patronage.

In addition, for a politician on the make, the value of currying favor with Johnson must appear irresistible. And sometimes it pays off—at least in the short run.

A case in point is Senator John Kennedy of Massachusetts. After the November election, Kennedy was one of the first public figures to openly attack Johnson's conservative leadership of the Democratic Party especially on civil rights as a fundamental reason for the Eisenhower victory. Soon afterward Kennedy discovered that his statement was not going to help him get a coveted place on the Foreign Relations Committee. Being a man of courage and principle and a liberal to boot, Kennedy promptly swallowed everything he said.

Senator Kennedy was quoted on December 7 as extolling the "progressive record" of the past Congress and stating that "these successes, due in considerable measure to Majority Leader Johnson's uniquely effective leadership, were largely responsible for our party's victory in last fall's Congressional election."

When the time came to hand out committee assignment, Kennedy was waiting at the trough. He was named to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee over Senator Kefauver, who previously had dipped his head in subservience to the Johnson power, but who had not groveled like Kennedy.

Senator Kennedy is the author of the best-seller Profiles in Courage.

How Far Does the Mideast Plan Go?

Nobody Seems to Know, but Questions Arise Over Its Relevance

By GORDON HASKELL

President Eisenhower launched his new "doctrine" for the Middle East before a dramatic joint session of the 85th Congress. The way in which the official announcement of this policy was made was calculated to give it the maximum weight possible both for the world at large and for purposes of domestic politics. The Eisenhower administration, it would seem, thinks that it has now answered the charge made in recent months that the Middle East crisis caught it in an embarrassing state of political undress.

The "Eisenhower doctrine" for the Middle East is, at bottom, an extension of the Truman Doctrine and the policy of military containment of Russian Communism. The coolness with which it has been greeted from

all sides, even from the side of those who greeted its predecessors with enthusiasm in the past, underlines the contention that whatever the value of the Truman Doctrine may have been in its time and place, it is definitely a vegetable of an outlived season, and unadaptable to the political climes of the Middle East.

The core of Eisenhower's proposal is that Congress adopt a proclamation promising United States military support to any Middle Eastern government asking for help "against overt armed aggression" by any state "controlled by international Communism." This was trimmed out with proposals for increased economic aid directed toward stabilizing the regimes in that area and eventually rendering them immune to "Communist subversion" from within.

If the intentions of the American government are to be taken at the face value of Eisenhower's proposal, the most that can be said about this "doctrine" is that its main terms have so little bearing on the real problems and dangers that beset the Middle East that it cannot influence them measurably, and can only serve to strengthen the impact of Russian charges that the United States is seeking to keep the cold war alive, or to find some pretext for physical intervention for the purpose of subjugating that area. It can only enhance the political influence of the Russians and their local Communist allies, which is one of the serious long-range perils to which the area is exposed.

There are no governments "controlled by international Communism" in the Middle East today, and yet there is danger of war there. No such governments threaten to invade the area from without, and there is no foreseeable danger that any will, except in the context of a renewed world movement toward the verge of World War III. Is the American government really so far removed from the realities of the day that they are propounding a doctrine which is both irrelevant and anachronistic?

Of course, it may occur to cynics that there is at least one instance when America contrived to find a government "controlled by international Communism"

(Turn to last page)

CAN THE LEFT UNITE?

A Symposium on Socialist Regroupment

Another inter-socialist discussion forum is scheduled in New York City for Friday, January 18, when Max Shachtman of the ISL and three other speakers will take up "Can the Left Unite? A Symposium on Socialist Regroupment."

Views will be given by Farrell Dobbs of the Socialist Workers Party, A. J.

Muste of the F.O.R., and J. T. McManus of the National Guardian in addition to Shachtman. The chairman will be Clifford McAvoy.

The subject, which has been widely discussed in many quarters, is sure to evoke a lively discussion. Place of the meeting is the Great Northern Hotel, 118 West 57 Street; contribution \$1.

LONDON LETTER

Black Year Looms Ahead For the Tory Government

By OWEN ROBERTS

London, Jan. 1

New Year is a time for casting horoscopes, and in Britain at this moment the main interest is what the coming year holds in store for the Tory government and British Prime Minister Anthony Eden.

With remarkably few exceptions the general opinion is that the future for Eden and his government looks very black indeed.

The weekly *Economist*, which by its own description stands for "independent progressive Conservatism," looking at the current scene this week is moved, to comment: "The impression is that the government, its breath knocked out of it by the Suez debacle (which its leader does not admit), has reached a dead end; and that its supporters, whatever their earlier views and whatever their loyalty now, are at a loss when faced with the bill for what has happened."

This somber comment by the theoretical organ of twentieth-century Toryism in Britain is matched, to a greater or lesser degree, by similar comments in other publications which have a stake in preserving the present government.

This feeling of frustration and despair accurately reflects the mood now existing within the Tory party itself. For, as the political columnist of Lord Kemsley's *Sunday Times* noted last week, "the Conservative Party is in no mood to throw its hat into the air about anybody or anything, such is the exhaustion left by the crisis."

The *Sunday Times*, however, errs when it refers to the crisis in the past tense; for in fact the real crisis for the Tory party has yet to build up to its peak—and all the signs seem to indicate that it is rapidly climbing toward that point.

A very real indication of the critical situation which now confronts Eden and his government came just five days before Christmas when the electors in the constituency of Melton Mowbray gave the Tories a resounding smack in the chops when voting in a by-election for a member of Parliament. In the general election 18 months earlier the Tory majority in Melton Mowbray was 10,780 votes; this time it dwindled to a mere 2632.

The real importance of the by-election, however, did not rest entirely with the slenderness of the Tory majority; its importance rested with the fact that a by-election was necessary because Anthony Nutting, the previous Tory MP for the constituency, had quit his job as Minister of State for Foreign Affairs and his seat in the House of Commons because he disagreed with Eden's policy in Suez. Thus to the Tory party the Melton Mowbray election became a vote of confidence on its Middle East policies.

PORTENT IN BY-ELECTION

Although the Tories held the seat the reduction in their majority was so great that the election was, in fact, a moral victory for the Labor Party—particularly in view of the Tory expectations of a majority of around 6000 and the admission that a majority of anything less than 4000 would be tantamount to a vote against Eden. Political mathematicians have calculated that a similar swing to Labor in a general election would give the Labor Party a majority of some 200 seats.

Melton Mowbray is predominantly a Tory area and the drop in the government majority sprang from the fact that some 11,000 people who voted Tory in the general election did not even bother to go to the polls to register a vote in the by-election. These disgruntled Tories were not prepared to vote against their party but were prepared to assist in its defeat to the extent that they abstained from joining in a vote of confidence for it.

The social composition of Melton Mowbray makes it fairly certain that the middle-class elements of the Tory party are in revolt against their government, and in particular against Sir Anthony Eden. Their discontent, though aggravated by the war in Suez, has its origin in the large number of economic measures introduced by the Tory government which

AS WE GO TO PRESS, Anthony Eden has resigned as prime minister.

have hit the middle class as hard as the working class.

The rebellious middle-class Tories claim that the credit squeeze introduced by the government prevents professional men and small businessmen from obtaining bank loans and overdrafts and therefore assists the big monopolies and combines to extend their influence. House owners, largely middle-class elements purchasing their homes over an extended period, have had their mortgage debts increased because the government has continually pushed upward the interest rates of banks. And, as a final rub, the steep increase in the price of gasoline coupled with the introduction of rationing following the war in Suez has imposed a further burden on car owners—which also means most of the middle class.

ROCKY WEEKS AHEAD

Six months ago a by-election was held in the middle-class constituency of Tonbridge, and here again the symptoms of revolt were apparent as the Tory majority slumped from 10,196 to 1602. The Melton Mowbray result confirms that, even in face of the violent campaign waged against the Tories by the Labor Party as a consequence of the Suez war, the middle-class Tories have lost confidence in the present Tory government.

Within the next few weeks the electors of yet another constituency will be going to the polling booths to elect a member of Parliament in a by-election. This time the venue is North Lewisham, a South London constituency, where the Tories held the seat in the 1955 general election by a slender majority of only 3236.

North Lewisham is a mixed constituency, containing large numbers of industrial workers and a strong middle-class element. If the middle-class Tories of North Lewisham hold back on anything like the scale as did those of Melton Mowbray and Tonbridge, the seat will fall to Labor.

Most observers predict that the outcome of the North Lewisham by-election will be a determining factor in British home politics in 1957. If the Tories manage to hold the seat the government will feel more secure in the knowledge that when it comes to making a decisive choice the middle classes will, whatever their dissatisfactions with Eden's government, use their votes to keep the Labor Party out.

Should the Tories lose the seat, then those voices in the Labor Party (and there are many of them) demanding a general election now will be considerably strengthened, and it will be difficult for Eden to ignore them. He will be faced with the choice of either calling an early general election or, alternatively, resigning as prime minister and handing over to another of the Tory leaders who can better hold the confidence of Tory supporters.

STRIKE CLOUDS GATHER

In the long run, however, the North Lewisham by-election may be no more than a straw in the wind because in the final analysis the fate of Eden and the present Tory government will be settled in the workshops and trade-union branches by the working class—not the disgruntled middle-class Tories. As the impact of recent government moves becomes more apparent, when prices in the shops begin to climb upward, the anger of the workers will undoubtedly grow.

Already the queue of workers demanding wage increases has lengthened considerably and it is growing every moment.

(Continued on next page)

STEEL WORKERS

McDonald Doing a Reuther To Head Off Opposition

By EMIL MODIC

Pittsburgh, Jan. 7

International headquarters of the United Steelworkers of America has announced that leading members of the opposition Dues Protest Committee have been put on the ballot for the upcoming election.

Don Rarick was nominated for the presidency by 91 locals, a surprisingly strong showing, given the more or less spontaneous nature of the opposition movement. It is an interesting index of the degree to which McDonald was out of touch with the membership and the extent to which he was unpopular with them. William Klug of Milwaukee, nominated for the post of secretary-treasurer by the rebels, also got on the ballot.

The Dues Protest Committee did not do so well in the field of district directorships. Only one candidate, Paul Hilbert, qualified in District 15, the Homestead-McKeesport district in western Pennsylvania. Two other candidates, one in Philadelphia (District 7) and one in South Side Pittsburgh (District 16), claim that they were entitled to places on the ballot but were kept off.

The Dues Protest Committee is consequently planning to seek a court order holding up the election until these men are given a place on the ballot.

The Dues Protest Committee is rapidly losing ground, however, because of its failure to face up to programmatic issues.

After all, Rarick and his group are asking the membership to turn over leadership of the union to them. To date, however, they have given almost no idea of how they would lead and administer the union if they did win. Their program is negative—they are against McDonald, but do not say what they are for.

MORE IS NEEDED

Their program, officially adopted at a nation-wide conference, is as follows: Call a special convention to revoke the dues increase and revoke raises in salaries for the officers; referendum to approve all convention acts; roll-call vote on all convention financial actions; and the election by vote of all international representatives.

The general idea here—strictest union democracy—is all to the good. However, that is not enough.

For one thing, the dues increase probably was justifiable. McDonald's mistake was in not educating the membership to the need for the increase, and then trying to ram it through the convention.

Something else is needed, too. How does the Dues Protest Committee stand on the questions before the union, other than the very important question of internal union democracy?

How does it stand on dealing with automation? On organizing the unorganized? On equality of opportunity for Negro steel workers? On political action and the civil-rights question? On improving the guaranteed annual wage? On a shorter work-week? Rarick does not say.

The only thing he has said has hurt him. He has said he is against the union shop. This has caused many misgivings among his potential supporters.

MCDONALD'S TURN

We have heard that Rarick feels he should stick to the issue which gave birth to the movement—opposition to the questionable actions of the recent convention. Supposedly he feels that going beyond that would jeopardize some of his support. Actually, exactly the opposite is true.

In the meantime, after a poor start, McDonald and the present administration now have a very creditable campaign under way to win re-election.

McDonald's first reaction to opposition was to shout "Trotskyite" at it, call it dual-unionism, and threaten expulsions. In addition, there were some strong-arm tactics employed by some staff men, although it is impossible to say whether they did this on their own or at McDonald's behest.

It looked for a while as if McDonald

was going to try to deal with the opposition the same way his old mentor, John L. Lewis, dealt with opponents in the Mine Workers in the twenties and thirties.

This is the nineteen-fifties, however, and the Steelworkers are not the Mine Workers. It was soon apparent that these tactics would backfire against McDonald.

LINING UP SUPPORT

About three weeks ago, McDonald changed course and apparently decided to fight on the issues. First step in this direction was the announcement that the two leading rebel candidates had gotten on the ballot. There had been much speculation that they would be ruled off on some technicality.

Soon thereafter, McDonald announced a series of six regional conferences with local union presidents. These conferences are to deal with problems of building the union. They give McDonald a chance to meet local leaders, to hear their point of view on contracts and union problems, and to defend his own administration.

It is the first time the Steelworkers have ever done this. These conferences are helping to give the local union leaders a voice in the union and a feeling of belonging.

At the first of these conferences, McDonald has boasted of the lack of racketeering in the union and promised to continue to guard against it. He has defended the union shop, thus replying to Rarick without mentioning him by name.

He has voiced support for a shorter work-week, an improved Guaranteed Annual Wage, and better hospitalization. He has declared that hospitalization and insurance should be made non-contributory. (The Steelworkers at present have a contributory pension and insurance program.) He has attacked the profits of industry, and, significantly, has not breathed a word about union-capital "trusteeship" in industry or any more labor-management "good will" tours of steel plants.

DEBATES DUE

As a matter of fact, for the last few weeks, McDonald has managed to sound for all the world like—shh, don't tell anyone—Walter P. Reuther!

At the first of these regional meetings, held in New York for the New England area, a clue was given as to why the Dues Protest Committee was unable to get any support from dissident district directors.

It will be recalled that last year Joseph Moloney of Buffalo ran against McDonald's candidate Howard Hague for vice-president. It was believed at first that Moloney and other district directors who had supported him might throw in their lot with the rebel group, which would have made it a very formidable movement. At the regional meeting, however, Moloney came out strongly for McDonald and indicated his reason: he absolutely would not oppose the dues increase. To him and the other district directors, this was a very principled question.

The liveliest of the regional meetings will probably come at Philadelphia. This meeting will include the Pittsburgh locals. The big basic steel mills in Pittsburgh are the heart of the opposition (which is probably why the meeting is taking place in Philadelphia).

Rarick supporters and others will have the opportunity to rise to the occasion and debate seriously some of the issues before the Steelworkers at this meeting. It will be a good thing for the union if they do.

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.

Party Battle Crystallizes Around Resolutions

CP Factions Present Rival Statements for Party Vote

By H. W. BENSON

A meeting of the New York State Committee of the Communist Party on December 8 was an event of exceptional significance in the party's internal discussion.

Its 16th National Convention meets in early February to act on a Draft Resolution prepared by the National Committee. In acting upon opposing resolutions on a section of the Draft entitled "On the Party," the State Committee divided sharply into two opposing wings. For this and other reasons, its actions mark another stage in the development of the debate.

For the information of our readers we present extensive extracts from the adopted resolution.

(1) Up to now the only written document advanced for action at the convention was the Draft Resolution. The National Committee had acted almost unanimously in favor of the Draft and only Foster finally voted against it without proposing a substitute. As the fight went on, it was obvious that there was no real unanimity but a basic hostility between two tendencies.

This now receives formal and written expression in two opposing interpretations of an important section of the Draft.

The State majority, the *Gates-Daily Worker* tendency, carried its resolution by a vote of 25-6. The minority, representing the Foster or Russian-Stalinist wing, was defeated 5-27.

(2) The majority is becoming aware of the depths of the conflict:

"We approach the 16th National Convention of the CPUSA with the profound feeling that it may mark a turning-point in our history. Months of discussion prior to and since the publication of the Draft Resolution have revealed substantial differences in our ranks, in the evaluation of the past, and on questions of program, outlook and perspective for the future..."

Meanwhile, Foster issues an unabiguous call for a real drive to smash his opponents. In the national Discussion Bulletin, January 1, he opens up at last:

"The Gates plan to liquidate the party into a so-called political-action organization is the very heart of the threat against the party and its ideology. To defeat this ill-advised plan and to restart building our organization upon the basis of a Marxist-Leninist Communist Party must be made the center of the present party discussion and of the coming CP national convention."

The state minority sharpens up its tone accordingly.

(3) The majority already looks beyond the convention and realizes that the fight has just begun: "though we are on the eve of the party conventions, there are many questions that have not as yet been clearly defined, no less adequately discussed."

(4) Both wings continue to call Russia "socialist"; there is nothing new in that. But the majority faces squarely the cause of the party crisis:

"It is generally agreed that whatever the doubts in the past, the party is in a serious crisis as a result of its extreme isolation from the masses of American people and as a further result of the negative impact of the 20th Congress, the revelations of Khrushchev and the recent events in Hungary. The recognition of this crisis is the beginning of wisdom."

AGAINST MONOLITHISM

(5) On "left sectarianism": Up to now, everyone agreed that "left sectarianism" was the main party error in the past period. But what was the nature and source of "left sectarianism"?

Foster excuses "leftism" by finding a mitigating explanation for it; it was a result of powerful "objective" factors; the party reacted explosively against the attack on it and against the wifelhunt spirit of the cold war. If it was an error, it was justifiable, he indicates.

But the majority ascribes "dogmatism" (here, a synonym for "left sectarianism") to Russian apologetics:

"A major source of our un-Marxist dogmatism was our uncritical reliance upon the Communist Parties of other countries, particularly of the Soviet Union, to interpret Marxism-Leninism for us."

(6) On democracy in the party: Naturally, everyone is effusively for inner democracy. But the Fosterite state minority is eager to reaffirm the principles of "democratic centralism" and "monolithic unity."

No one has succeeded in clarifying what these concepts are supposed to signify to the party. But what they meant in the past is clear: bureaucracy

and an inner totalitarian approach to questions of ideology.

The state majority does not intend to waste time on abstractions but wants to make its position as clear as possible. It proposes:

That we take the necessary measures to strengthen the democratic process in the party and eliminate bureaucracy. To this end we recommend the abolition of the concepts of democratic centralism and monolithic unity. Whether the bureaucratic evils were inherent in these concepts or were the result of incorrect application is not the main issue. What is uppermost is the need to define the nature of the organization as a democratic working-class organization with a common ideology which functions on the basis of majority rule and guarantees the right of dissent."

"TRANSFORM THE PARTY"

(7) The majority proposes to change the name and form of the Communist movement in the following resolution:

"That we consider the transformation of our party to that of a political-action association, guided by the principles of Marxism-Leninism as we interpret, develop and apply them to the conditions of our country. It would be an association of Communists, following class-struggle policies, and based on the working class as the most decisive and progressive force in our country. Its program would emphasize the fight for Negro people as the cornerstone of democratic advance. And it would seek to rally all other democratic sections of American society—the farmer, intellectuals and other middle strata—around the leadership of the working class. The name of our party would be changed to correspond to this change in structure."

It will be noted that under the changed form the Communists would retain their own program and policies as the basis for their movement which they would broadly define as "Marxist-Leninist." What is far more important is that the suggested change in form is the basic motivation for it:

"We do not view change of name and form as gimmicks that will transform our relations. This is clearly not the case. We do believe that it represents the beginning of a process—taking all our changes and reforms into account, on theory and program, on the issues of independence, on internal democracy—that in time will help bring about a change in our relationships for the better."

SOCIALIST UNITY

The process that the authors refer to leads, in their view, toward a new broad movement for socialism which they call a "United Party of Socialism":

"Because it represents a form of transition that would facilitate the struggle for a new and broader party of socialism. It would dramatize to masses of non-party people that the position stated in the Draft Resolution, that we do not have a monopoly on building socialism, is genuine and true and not a maneuver. It would give greater latitude and encourage other forces to come forward and organize for socialism. In effect we are saying by this change we are but one group in America that believes in socialism and we are prepared to make a modest contribution together with you, or independently, in cooperation and sympathy with you, to advance this aim. With this change we will place our movement on a better footing with radical and socialist-minded Americans today. Can this be done within the framework of the party form? Possibly. We believe however it can be done more effectively by such change. And time is important."

(8) On the "United Party of Socialism": This is undoubtedly the most significant aspect of the New York majority resolution, for it poses an immediate

and "central" task for the party and not a mere expression of opinion:

"That we place as a central duty of our party strong efforts toward effectuating a regroupment and eventual unification of various socialist currents in our country. We endorse the general outlook of the Draft Resolution toward the eventual formulation of a united party of socialism as the orientation which should guide our work in the period ahead."

This brief statement is presented as a concrete amendment to the Draft Resolution and was adopted 30-7. The minority on the other hand wants none of it.

"The attempt to make the formation of a united socialist party an immediate goal," its resolution states, "which in effect is what the proposal means, is only a defeatist attempt to leap over difficulties by projecting false, illusory prospects."

What the majority actually suggests is not that such a "united party" be formed immediately but that the Communists make it a central aim and begin to explore all possibilities:

"Will the changes in our party alone bring about this socialist movement?"

"Should we not seek out every possible path for more rapid development of such an organized socialist movement, even if the immediate perspective of united action is as yet extremely limited?"

"What is our relationship to this concept of a more effective movement for socialism in America?"

"There is one view that bases itself on the idea that the Communist Party remains the only instrument for socialist transformation of society in America. It rejects the view of the National Draft Resolution that we were wrong in the past in recognizing that other forces for socialism existed and could come into being. It feels that the Communist Party remains and is the revolutionary vanguard of the working class—though diminished in members and influence, and that in time, with changes in the objective situation, it will grow into the mass party of socialism capable of winning the working class in the struggle for socialism."

"We believe there is, as opposed to the first view, another alternative—looking to the creation of a broader socialist movement in our country, or what is referred to in the Draft Resolution as the United Party of Socialism. Without having the blueprints or the form of such a socialist party or movement, we think it necessary to begin now to explore, make contact with, seek joint activity with other socialist trends in our nation. We recognize that at this time it would be premature and wrong to attempt to merge the small and relatively ineffective socialist groupings in the country. But we believe that a process of stimulation and exploration would reveal new possibilities, especially in the labor movement, which must be the foundation of an effective socialist organization."

TRY-OUT GROUND

What form will the Communist movement take in the future? The authors of the majority resolution adopt no preconceived notions. They are ready and willing to wait upon events:

"We do not propose a categorical answer to all the real and challenging questions involved in this changed outlook. We do propose an approach that on the one hand does not negate the old, but on the other provides for the opening of the new."

"There are those who argue that such a perspective will result in the liquidation of our party. We believe the contrary is true—that it provides our members with the historic mission of Marxists—that looks to the development of a union between the socialist movement and the working class."

"There are those who argue that the dissolution of the party is the prerequisite for anything new. We disagree. We believe our party has a vital contribution to make in furthering this objective. Furthermore, in the evolution of a new socialist movement in the USA it is possible that the Communist Party may become absorbed in this movement or it may develop cooperative ties with it while maintaining its distinct Marxist-Leninist position."

The State Committee meeting, then, became a preliminary try-out ground for issues that will be debated at the National Convention.

Black Year Looms Ahead — —

[Continued from page 2]

A quick check reveals that 3 million engineering workers, a quarter of a million shipyard workers, 340,000 railwaymen, nearly a quarter of a million truck-drivers, three-quarters of a million shopworkers, one million building workers, and 53,000 London busmen are impatiently awaiting the outcome of wage claims they have lodged with their employers. So far the employers are stalling, and when they finally get around to answering, the unions will be preparing new wage claims to meet the increased cost of living which has occurred since the original claims were lodged.

Not even the most optimistic trade-unionists imagine that the employers will come across with the extra wages demanded; they are well aware that the government is actively encouraging the employers to hold off paying wages in an endeavor to avoid an inflationary burst in the economy. Such a situation has an explosive potential, far more dangerous for the government than the rebellion of its middle-class supporters.

And there is always the possibility that more enlightened sections of the

middle class may join in with the organized workers in attacking the government on economic issues. Signs of this are apparent among the bank clerks—usually portrayed as typical middle-class Britons—who have recently embarked upon a big drive and built up a trade union of 100,000 members, and are now demanding a 10 per cent wage increase in answer to the refusal of the banks to negotiate with them through proper negotiating machinery.

Exhausted by its struggle to put over an unpopular policy to the people, and weakened by internal faction fights, the Tory party thus faces a very difficult year in 1957. The Labor Party, on the other hand, faces a year of tremendous possibilities if it has the courage and determination to seize the opportunities which will be coming its way.

The real big issue for the Labor Party in 1957 will be whether to go all out and fight the Tories on a firm socialist program—which poses the necessity of formulating such a program—or whether merely to oppose the Tories as an alternative government which is better fitted than the Tories to manage the affairs of a capitalist economy.

PRO & CON DISCUSSION

Gomulka as 'Democratizer'

A discussion-exchange with Comrade Rudzienski, on "Critical Support to the Gomulka Regime," appeared in the Dec. 31 issue; but before that issue was out, we received a second discussion article from him, of which we publish here the section dealing with Gomulka's "democratization" program. The rest of it deals with the economic analyses in his Oct. 20 speech.—Ed.

By A. RUDZIENSKI

In Gomulka's speech of October 20—that is, in the days of the Polish "cold revolution"—the most interesting aspect is his program of "democratization."

It is true that his criticism of the "cult of personality" is broader than Khrushchev's, because he talks not only about Stalin's crimes but about the system of individual autoeracy going from the Politburo down to the local organizations in the USSR and in all the "Popular Democracies." He demands its destruction and the restoration of internal democracy, freedom to hold one's own convictions, secret election of committees and party secretaries and the right of criticism and opinion.

But he also defends "unity," "discipline," and obedience to adopted resolutions—excluding (so I suppose) the right to form ideological groups and factions, the democratic right of the minority to disagree with the majority, without which any internal democracy is reduced to abstract theory, if not illusion. If the party is to remain homogeneous, compact and monolithic, if the minority cannot openly defend its own position, then how can the party members be assured a right to ideological independence and honesty? and how can the party be assured its ideological free development and vitality?

To be sure, while he firmly demands the democratization of the party and the country as the only way to "build the socialist society, the best and most progressive society of mankind," he denies any right to exist to opposition parties, arguing that they are enemies of socialism. Only the official ruling party has the right to "build socialism"; this is a democratization handed down by the grace of the omnipotent leadership.

To remedy this situation he demands democratic control over the Sejm (parliament) as "the highest organ of national sovereignty," and he promises democratic elections. But according to his statements, participating in the elections will be only the PZPR (the ruling Communist party), in coalition with the controlled Peasant Party and Democratic Party as well as the domesticated Catholics. All of these groups are nothing but shadow parties, controlled by the government and the Politburo.

"ONLY A SAFETY-VALVE"

How about the rights of the old Peasant Party of Mikolajczyk, or of the former social-democrats of the PPS (Polish Socialist Party) which was forcibly merged with the PZPR? If the "National Front" is composed of the official party and two or three domesticated shadow parties, then the elections cannot be free, because the candidates will be named by the government and submitted to the people only for plebiscitary confirmation. The elected Sejm cannot then be an organ of national sovereignty, cannot represent the different currents of national opinion; and the opposition will be only the domesticated, controlled opposition handed down by His Majesty the Politburo.

Of course, through the growth of revolution, any organ—even part of the ruling party—could be transformed in the middle of a rebellion by the spontaneous initiative of the people, but this is another question.

Through the monolithism of the ruling party and its exclusive right to interpret what is "democratization" and what isn't, and how to "build socialism," the Sejm cannot be an organ of real political and democratic control; it cannot be "the highest organ of state authority." It can only be a safety-valve or a poor rostrum for platonic criticism, a showpiece for the people, no more.

Much is written now about Gomulka's personality and his political role and future, both on the right and the left.

Hal Draper called him a Polish Kadar, while Milovan Djilas surmised that he will develop with the revolution and go along with the people. Is Gomulka a Polish Nagy, a quisling like Kadar, or is he a Titoist? or what is he?

Judging by the facts he is not a vacillating Nagy, for thanks to his decision he won a victory over the Kremlin. He is not a quisling like Kadar, and he is much more than a Tito, because he rose to power on a popular revolutionary wave; he was not appointed, but conquered this power backed by the people.

He represents a transition program of concessions to the masses, but he does not represent a revolution. He is a transitional figure, and personifies a transitional period between the downfall of the bureaucratic dictatorship and the victory of the revolution. He is the hero of the bureaucratic "twilight," and the expression of a temporary compromise between the Polish national resistance and the Kremlin, dictated by the historical and political objective situation.

Gomulka—martyrized by Stalin, saved by the de-Stalinization, invested with power by the Poznan upsurge—is for me a kind of Polish Kerensky inside-out. Trotsky has written in anticipation of a similar situation in Russia, looking forward to the decline of Stalinism.

"HOW LONG . . . ?"

I do not agree with Djilas that Gomulka could develop as the leader of the coming Polish revolution, because his past is Stalinist and his program is not revolutionary. Nothing but a transitory program of concessions, it cannot satisfy the masses and solve the social and political problems of Poland. But I don't think that Gomulka could develop to the role of a quisling like Kadar. His past, his stubborn opposition to Stalin, when he was not backed by the masses and deserted by his friends and supporters, his firmness in the face of the Russian Politburo at Warsaw—these seem to me sufficient argument against this supposition. On the contrary, I think that if the Russians try to attack Poland, Gomulka will fight them, and could develop into a hero of national war, just as he is now considered the leader of the Polish national resistance.

The question is how long he can maintain his regime of transition, in a compromise between the Polish resistance and the Russian superior power. This depends entirely on the fate of the Hungarian Revolution, on the pace of the maturing revolution in all of East Europe and Russia, and finally on the ripening revolutionary process in Poland. The political disaster suffered by the Russians in Hungary has strengthened Gomulka's regime, which could not last long without the Hungarian Revolution. The growing revolution in Russia and East Europe is favoring Gomulka's regime.

On the other hand, the victorious revolution will push Gomulka aside, because he is incapable of revolutionary leadership. But the premature explosion of the Polish revolution, before it ripens in Russia and in the other countries of Europe, could end fatally with a new Polish national disaster.

Therefore, the Polish working class, and also its revolutionary left, represented by the students and the workers of Poznan and Zeran, and the left wing of the intellectuals and old revolutionaries in the official ruling party, are giving their critical support to Gomulka, until the time when the rising revolution can replace him with a new revolutionary leadership.

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!

YOU and SCIENCE**Scientists Move Toward More Active Political Role**

By GENE LISTER

At its annual meeting in New York the last week of December, a committee of the American Association for the Advancement of Science issued a report on "The Social Aspects of Science." It is a clear presentation of the contradictions facing American capitalism in its attempt to harness the scientific revolution of our day. Its content is well worth summarizing here.

The conclusion of the group, composed of physical scientists, is that "there is an impending crisis in the relationship between science and American society. This crisis is being generated by a basic disparity: At a time when decisive economic, political and social processes have become profoundly dependent upon science, the discipline has failed to attain its appropriate place in the management of public affairs."

This crisis occurs at a time when scientific ranks second only to military activity is the most rapidly expanding sector of the social structure. The accelerated growth of science (continues the report) is represented by the 15-fold increase in research expenditure from 1930 to 1953. The number of active scientists in the United States has increased in this period from 46,000 to 250,000.

Likewise, there is an increasing speed in the rate of impact of science on American economic and social life. Entirely new industries have emerged from the laboratory in less than a generation, the major ones being the chemical, electronic, nuclear-energy, and pharmaceutical.

UNIQUE IN HISTORY

To quote the report: "This type of direct transformation of scientific to industrial operation is probably unique in human history. Earlier industrial developments were based more on empirical experience than on laboratory science."

Industry and government are placing increased demands upon science, with the result that the distribution of research is overbalanced toward quickly applied results rather than fundamental work. In industry this ratio is 97-3; in federal agencies 90-10, and in universities 50-50.

The areas of research sponsored by the government are predominantly in the physical sciences (87 per cent) and biological sciences (11 per cent); and the social sciences make up only 2 per cent. The military pre-empts the greater part of the federal budget for research; in 1957 this will be 84 per cent.

However, public interests in and awareness of science has not accompanied this rapid growth. There is a shortage of scientific personnel as a result of a breakdown of the educational system. Scientists rate low in public esteem; their knowledge is neglected in favor of "common sense," which, to quote Einstein, is "a deposit of prejudices laid down in the mind prior to the age of 18." Science continues to receive a bad press both in quality and in the amount of time devoted to it by the newspapers, radio and television.

While society has ill used its efforts, science itself has gotten out of balance, this mostly since the development of science has been determined by its users rather than by its practitioners. Science with a "quick pay-off" predominates. The results of physical science are applied before their full social consequences are evaluated and forecast.

Science by its sprawling nature always has a communication problem. This is further accentuated by government control which restricts the flow of information so vital to a healthy science.

The over-zealous application of science has created serious social hazards, such as atomic radiation hazards as well as danger from chemical food additives and industrial fumes, smog and dust. There is also the waste of natural resources and above all the threat of total destruction from all-out war. The contrast between man's ability to control nature and its application to human good is overwhelming.

As part of its conclusion the AAAS report states:

"The determination that scientific

knowledge is to be used for human good or for purposes of destruction is in the control of social agencies. For such decisions, these agencies and ultimately the people themselves need to be aware of the facts and the probable consequences of action. Here scientists can play a decisive role: they can bring the facts and their estimates of the results of proposed actions before the people."

PREPARING REPORT

That the AAAS is considering a more active political role is indicated by a further passage in its conclusion:

"As scientists, we are particularly concerned with determining how we should meet this situation, both as individuals and through our organizations. In marked contrast to other associations, scientific societies seldom consider the social and economic position of their group. Action taken on social problems with a scientific or technological base are sporadic and usually forced. Yet the democratic system is operated to a considerable extent under stimulus from groups, each representing the views and interests of its members."

The need for immediate action, continues the report, is serious. Particularly is this true in the area of the biological hazards of radiation. Since the report of the National Academy of Science six months ago nothing has happened.

After this fine analysis of the state of science in society today, the AAAS is uncertain just what to do. With some hesitation its governing council approved the above report and appointed a larger committee "for the purpose of defining the problems, assembling the relevant facts, and suggesting a practical program, to be submitted to the AAAS board, to implement the objectives of the AAAS in this regard."

It required a year for the original committee to report. Whether the scientists, as such or as citizens, will follow up with more prompt action to meet the threat of the social misuse of their efforts is a moot question. Scientists as a group, with a few individual exceptions, have never been noted for audacious social and political action.

Of course, the larger social problems raised by the impact of science will not be solved by physical scientists, but they can make important contributions on many issues.

World History—Year by Year

The bound volumes of

LABOR ACTION

are an invaluable record of the social and political issues of our day, and a socialist education in themselves. Completely indexed from 1949 on.

1950-54.....\$3 per vol.

Bound volumes of LA are also available back to, and including, 1942, at somewhat higher prices depending on the year. Prices on request. A complete set of bound volumes for the 11 years from 1942 to 1952 is available for \$40.

Independent Socialist Press

114 West 14 Street, New York City

LABOR ACTION • 17" YEAR

January 14, 1957 Vol. 21, No. 2

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

Intellectuals in Hungary's Revolution

More and more information is now coming out of Hungary on the role of the various groups in the revolution. As the documentation becomes more complete, each additional fact gives the lie to Kadar's charge of "counter-revolutionary" elements.

A recent article in *Die Kultur*, a German literary paper, adds to our knowledge on the role of the students and intellectuals in the struggle. Written by Hans Werner Richter, it tells of the development in the Petofi Club in Budapest.

According to Richter, the Petofi Club began its discussions on a limited question, that of the freedom of the artist. But once open discussion took place on this issue, there was no stopping. The fight for freedom in literature led to the fight for freedom in all of Hungarian political life.

The Petofi Circle began its discussions in 1954, after the death of Stalin. Initially, this was a fairly informal center for debate on literary questions. Students and teachers came together to take up the issue of artistic freedom, the possibilities of art in Hungarian society, and so on.

By the summer of 1956, all of Budapest was concerned with the development in the Petofi Club. The last discussions were attended by audiences which averaged 600, and it was, of course, out of their deliberations that one of the first manifestos of the revolution emerged, calling for a free press, free elections, the rights of unions, for what was to become the political program of the struggle.

The three leaders of the club are from backgrounds of great interest. Two of them, Julius Hay and Tibor Drei, were members of the Communist Party; the third Peter Veres, of the National Peasant Party, a member of the government "front." Drei and Veres were novelists of considerable reputation in Hungary, and Hay was considered the most important dramatist in Hungary.

Here again we meet the paradoxical fact that the leaders of the intellectuals and students in the Revolution occupied privileged positions in Hungarian society, that they had every right to expect good jobs and high living as members of the ruling class. But this overlooks their political idealism, a factor which burst into Hungarian life during the past three or four years.

Tibor Drei was a veteran of the Loyalist cause in the Spanish Civil War, a member of the anti-Nazi underground during the German occupation, and, from 1949 on, an "anti-Stalinist" Communist. In July of this year, Drei gave a sharp speech before 5000, criticizing the inadequacy of "rehabilitating" those who had been liquidated. For this and his other activities, he was expelled from the Hungarian Communist Party several months before the revolution broke out.

MEN WITH RECORDS

Julius Hay, the second leader of Petofi, had a membership in the Communist Party dating back to 1919. He was, of course, a victim of the Horthy reaction and fled to Germany where he worked as a dramatist until 1933. When the Nazis took power, Hay emigrated once again, this time to Moscow. He did not return to Hungary until the Russian army broke through in 1945.

It was Hay who, in a speech four weeks before the revolution actually broke out, made a speech calling for the removal of Russian troops, freedom for political opposition, and freedom for Cardinal Mindszenty. This last point is of particular interest. It would be difficult indeed to claim that a militant party member like Hay, veteran of the Hungarian Soviet regime, twelve years in residence in Moscow, political refugee from the

Horthy reaction, was calling for Mindszenty's release in order to restore capitalism.

And finally, Veres had played a role in the Hungarian government after the end of World War II. He was particularly active in the government's post-war program for land reform.

In August of 1955, Veres, Hay and Drei circulated a memorandum among the intellectuals. This was, of course, an operation carried on in secret. In the memorandum they called for a revision of various lies about the past, and for a course of democratization of Hungarian life. They obtained 64 signatures to their document, and when the repression struck, only four writers repudiated their signing.

In this period, the ostensible content of their struggle was still centered around issues of artistic and literary

freedom. But as the fight intensified, it spread. What had begun as a struggle against the Zhdanov line in the arts, against "socialist realism," widened, found support among the broad masses of students and workers, and became a battle for political freedom itself.

At this point, the party began to move against the Petofi Circle. Its meetings were hounded, even forbidden. But an irresistible ferment had begun, and it was too late to stop it.

The discussion spread throughout Hungary. The party realized what had happened, knew that the dynamic of the fight over literary freedom had carried it on to much more serious issues.

It announced, "Various writers in Hungary are taking a hostile position against the party and state power under the mantle of a struggle for freedom in literature." That was on the eve of the "literary" meeting which adopted a political program for the Hungarian Revolution.

NOT BOUGHT OFF

Two aspects of this development deserve particular comment.

The one has already been mentioned: that the first stirrings of the impending revolution took place among the "elite,"

that is, among privileged intellectuals and students. The significance of this cannot be underunderestimated. It means that this stratum cannot be bought off, that the dynamic of the desire for intellectual freedom is stronger and more persistent than the desire for a good apartment, for books and a high standard of living.

This kind of a process has been reported in almost everyone of the Eastern European satellites. It means that the grouping which the Stalinist power was to rest upon is unreliable, or rather that it is, under certain circumstances, revolutionary in its anti-Stalinism.

The second point concerns the Kadar slanders. Julius Hay, Tibor Drei and Peter Veres cannot, by the wildest stretch of the imagination, be called Horthyites or remnants of the old regime. Two of them were Communist militants, the third an official fellow traveler. One of them was a veteran of Spain, the other a member of the party from the days of the Hungarian Soviets.

It was among such intellectuals that Hungarian Stalinism began to break down. It was among them that the first impulse toward revolution, an impulse which traveled through the entire nation, expressed itself. Kadar's "government" of 5000 tanks is, for that fact, a fiction.

A Catholic Philosopher vs. S. Hook

A vigorous and principled defense of academic freedom appeared last year in a place where one would hardly suspect it: during the proceedings of the American Catholic Philosophical Association.

The speech was made by Journet Kahn, of Notre Dame, and it is a discussion of the issue in terms of the traditional, Thomistic metaphysic which is espoused by the Catholic Church in America. The presentation is so striking that it deserves extensive quotation.

"Today the distortion of an essentially sound principle receives another form in the assumption that the moral integrity of the academic profession is contingent upon the holding of certain 'orthodox' positions in the fields of political science, economics, history and philosophy, which convictions alone can guarantee the perpetuation of existing forms of government and economic practices.

"Whether the impetus toward such conformity comes about as a result of psychological pressure exerted by a society at large fearful of its own political vitality, whether it stems from the influence of special economic interests, or whether it is the net effect of legislative investigation into subversive academic activities and the establishing of special loyalty oaths for the teaching profession, such a tendency reveals the attempt of an extra-academic body, in the interest of moral utility, to specify the very objects related to the search for truth.

"Thus the confusion between the morality of the active and contemplative life threatens to destroy the freedom of scholarship and teaching—the right to arrive at conclusions on the basis of evidence and rational method alone....

"The case of the faculty member discovered to be a member of the Communist Party offers no special problem other than directing our attention towards a re-examination of his professional integrity, with the possibility of a favorable judgment by no means excluded. Membership in an organization dedicated to indoctrination and distortion can reasonably lead us to suspect professional incompetence, but to conclude to such a conviction, without examination of the individual case by

a group of professionally qualified peers, is pure injustice.

"The reasoning of Sidney Hook—that ideas are plans of action and that, therefore, intellectual commitment to a political ideology that demands distortion of natural truth *ipso facto* involves the committed to the practice of such intellectual subversion, assumes a metaphysical link between belief and action foreign to the scholastic conception of the prudential order and to human experience itself. Between the simple entertaining of an idea involving no issuance in action and the efficacious belief which is the conclusion of practical reasoning, there lies an area of sincere conviction perfectly compatible with non-activity along practical lines. The reasons for such ineffectiveness in the latter case may be accidental, but very often it occurs by virtue of a natural reason and conscience sufficiently strong to escape the demands of total political commitment.

"Consistency has never been the outstanding characteristic of human nature, and to argue, as does Mr. Hook, from the universal—the clearly stated academic aims of international Communism—to either the guilt or unreliability of every American party member in academic life, is to conceive of ethical science as involving no more than the subalternation of particulars to universals. Such a device saves a good deal of time and effort, but when justice is at stake, it is well to be equipped with something more than formal logic....

"Boards of trustees may use their supervisory power, not to coerce the teaching body to slant its findings towards positions furthering their own interests, but to systematically eliminate from the faculty any member who maintains divergent political and economic views. Even ignoring the fact that such a position degrades the teacher to the level of hired propagandizer, one may ask whether under such conditions a university any longer exists....

"The freedom of teacher and student is not the freedom to sell one's services elsewhere or to buy it in a different

market (education is not, after all, a commercial venture); it is the right to teach and learn in an institution dedicated to the discovery and dissemination of truth regardless of its acceptability to special interests.

"If the sincere believer in democracy and capitalism on the board of trustees cannot conscientiously agree to employment by the university of a professionally qualified socialist, then the trustee has no choice but to hand in his resignation. He is no longer concerned with university education."

The above quotation hardly requires comment. But several things should be pointed out.

First, Kahn is putting forth, in its sharpest possible form, the competence criterion.

Second, on the issue which is most crucial to the use of that criterion, the case of the Stalinist teacher, he sticks to his initial assumptions.

But third, and perhaps the most amusing aspect of this speech, is the fact that the Notre Dame Thomist, the self-avowed metaphysician, here rightly attacks Sidney Hook, the proclaimed naturalist, for... being too metaphysical. Kahn's brief and technical remarks about the relation between the universal and the particular in Hook's thought on academic freedom, deserves careful reading. For, as he notes, "when justice is at stake, it is well to be equipped with something more than formal logic...."

**EVERY WEEK—
Young Socialist
CHALLENGE**
appears as a section in all
regular issues of Labor Action.
Published, and independently
edited, by the Young Socialist
League,
it is the only socialist youth
weekly in the country.
Don't miss it!

The Record of the 'Dirty War' Regime in France

One Year of Guy Mollet

By A. GIACOMETTI

Paris

The government of Guy Mollet has been with us for one year. It is time to survey the damage and to consider the perspectives that remain open to the French labor movement.

The Mollet government has been above all the government of the Algerian war. Its general failure in every respect is a direct consequence of its failure to find an immediate solution to the conflict in Algeria, the basic problem that determines all others in France today.

For ten days after Guy Mollet took office, it seemed as if a permanent solution for Algeria was in sight, as if the government was determined to break the power of the colonialist groups and of their administration.

Mollet appointed the liberal General Catroux as Resident Minister in Algeria, the man who had negotiated the French withdrawal from Morocco a few months before. In a speech, the head of the new government recognized an "Algerian personality" and proposed free elections to a single Assembly.

However, under the impact of rotten vegetables hurled by a fascist mob during his visit in Algiers, Mollet reconsidered. Having forced Catroux to resign, he appointed Lacoste as Resident Minister (Feb. 9), summoned the Algerian nationalists to capitulation (Feb. 27) and obtained special powers from the Assembly on the basis of this policy (March 12).

Ever since, Algerian policy has been in the hands of Lacoste, a product of the selection-in-reverse of the social-democratic party apparatus, and a brutal and cynical partisan of class-collaboration.

Do the rotten tomatoes alone account for the change in policy? Their significance is only a last push that propelled Mollet and the Socialist Party which he heads back into the old groove formed by long habits of capitulation.

The Unlactiferous Ox

Given the distribution of party strength in Parliament, only two majorities are possible for the Socialist Party: one with the right-wing parties, the other with the Communist Party. For the SP, both majorities are prisons from which no independent socialist policy can come forth. The system of "alternate" majorities (on some issues with the CP, on others with the right wing) likewise offers no permanent solution; it could, however, have enabled the SP government to act independently for a time if it had not preferred, from the beginning, the support of the right.

A fourth possibility existed in theory: an SP government could take a radical course, basing itself on the votes of the CP (which the CP could not withhold without losing its popular support even more rapidly). Instead of becoming a prisoner of the CP, it could have appealed directly to the workers and to the trade unions to back up the government's policy with demonstrations and strikes.

This is the policy that was outlined by certain representatives of the left-wing minority of the SP. It would have been difficult to apply in 1946, when the CP was powerful, but it could have succeeded now, at a time when the CP is declining and losing its hold over the working class.

However, the SP today is not the kind of party that is capable of pursuing such a course; to expect it to come forth with a militant policy of mobilizing the workers is like expecting an ox to give milk. This is all the more true as no powerful workers' organizations (trade unions or other) exist that could compel the SP to follow such a policy regardless of the inclinations of its leadership.

In spite of the few possibilities open to the SP on the parliamentary level, the party could have maintained a certain independence if it had not taken the principal responsibility in forming the government: then it could have profitably played the role of an opposition within the government, a role which the liberal Radicals of Mendès-France's tendency played successfully for months.

Such was the perspective which representatives of the left wing (Pivert, André Viénot, etc.) outlined at the party congress of January 1956, suggesting the choice of Mendès-France as head of the government rather than Mollet.

Government Apparatus

Instead, the party chose the worst possible solution: not only did it appoint one of its leaders to head the government, but it chose Mollet, a man who combines personal mediocrity and incompetence with extensive powers as secretary-general of the party and ruler of



Guy Mollet

its apparatus. As a consequence of this choice, the party suddenly disappeared from the political scene as an independent factor.

André Philip, a leading representative of the opposition within the party, wrote in a letter to Commin protesting Mollet's policy:

"...the responsibilities of government have absorbed everything. The party no longer has any existence of its own, and has become nothing more than a propaganda organ at the service of the government. The government has taken the responsibility of resorting to violence (against Egypt) without consulting the Directing Committee, after refusing to convoke an urgent meeting of the National Council and after refusing to permit free discussion in the party through an organ for free discussion. Freedom of discussion is stifled today because the party is held in hand by an apparatus completely at the service of the government."

Given the inertia of the CP, resulting from a policy of support to the government at any cost, compounded by an inner paralysis induced by the crisis of Stalinism; given the withdrawal of the French working class from the trade unions, the impotence of the latter and the absence of any alternative workers' organizations; given the weakness of all the leftist and revolutionary groups; given, finally, the domination of the SP apparatus within the party, paralyzing the socialist minority—there were no serious obstacles left to the capitulation of the party.

Policy of Terror

In Algeria, the consequences of this capitulation made themselves felt most directly and most disastrously.

As soon as Lacoste took office, he proclaimed the following program: military "pacification," free elections after "pacification," then negotiations with the elected representatives of the Algerian people. (Note the resemblance in method between this program and Kadar's promise of concessions after the disarming of the Hungarian insurgents and the dissolution of the workers' councils.)

"Pacification first" became the watchword; in reality it meant "repression first": military terror against the population of the villages (especially by Foreign Legion troops); police terror in the cities (arbitrary arrests, tortures, etc.); suppression of all trade-union rights except for F. O. and CFTC which represents nobody in Algeria; execution of death sentences against captured partisans (a step which even the Faure government had refused to take); establishment of a system of concentration camps (at Ledi, Berrouaghia, Aflou, Djorf, Bossuet, St.-Leu—there is reason to believe that there are others, the existence of which is not admitted by the government); "saturation" of the country with military forces (600,000 at the present time, that is, one soldier for 15 Moslem inhabitants).

While it is true that in addition Lacoste made an attempt at reforms (distribution of land and dissolution of the colonialist city councils), these reforms remain meaningless within the context of repression. The agrarian reform cannot be applied in a country at war, and the city councils cannot be replaced by representative organs of government when all forms of political life have been suppressed.

The Carrot Stays Far Ahead

Throughout spring and summer, Lacoste announced the end of the rebellion in four months. At the same time, he issued a directive to his administration in which he had given up the idea of general elections. Instead, he wrote of "local consultations" which would enable the government "to find the representatives we

may need" by means of a "designation process that remains to be defined."

In June, vast military operations were launched all over the country: "Operation Hope," "Operation Muskel," "Operation Basque." Lacoste and the High Command in Algiers announced that they were about to "smash the rebellion," to disperse the partisan units and to reconquer permanently the zones controlled by the partisans.

On June 6, Max Lejeune, the socialist Minister of War, declared to the Senate Commission on National Defense that "astonishing results" had been achieved in the Northern Constantine region, where "all activity by organized gangs has practically ceased." Lejeune added that the situation remained "tense" in the Aurès mountains and in the Western Oran region (near the Moroccan border), but that the rapid increase of French military strength in the country would improve the situation rapidly. On June 20, however, Lacoste admitted in an interview that the recent operations had not produced the expected results.

The Resident Minister now predicted that tangible results would be achieved "before the beginning of winter." At the same time, the propaganda services of the High Command kept repeating that the partisans were routed, that Kabylia and Northern Constantine were practically "pacified," and that "fellagha gangs" were leaving these regions where "the concentration of French troops exerts unbearable pressure."

On June 27, the office of Lacoste announced that the French services intercepted a "message of the FLN [National Liberation Front] to the Arab League" declaring that "unless a foreign military intervention should take place within three months, the failure of the revolt in Algeria is certain." On September 29, Lacoste predicted "highly significant results" by the end of October.

In November, Lacoste finally declared that the rebellion would be "militarily finished" before Christmas.

No Dent in Algeria

In fact, neither Lacoste's administration nor the High Command have succeeded in making any significant dent on the military and political strength of the rebellion.

Militarily, the average daily losses of the French forces still amounted to 50 dead and 50 wounded by October. To the "saturation" of the country the partisans had replied by breaking up their units into smaller groups and by "saturating" the country themselves. The press continually reports operations by the partisan army, many of them in regions which supposedly had been "pacified" several times over. Individual terrorism in the cities remains active and strikes down highly placed persons among the colonialist groups.

Politically, the insurrection has never been stronger. Outstanding collaborationists of the past period (such as A. Farès, former president of the Algerian Assembly and a large landowner; Salah Mesbah, its former vice-president, and others) joined the FLN between September and December.

There is not the slightest "Kadar" left that could be of any use to Lacoste.

Determining though it is over the course of events, the Lacoste policy was not the only one in existence during these months. Seemingly in contradiction with the activities of Lacoste and of the High Command, the government also followed a policy of negotiations.

Unofficial contacts between SP emissaries (Begarra, Gorse, Commin) and representatives of the FLN took place in Rome and in Cairo. The purpose of these meetings was to explore the conditions for a cease-fire and for the opening of negotiations. The government also discussed the Algerian question with the Moroccan and Tunisian governments, which had offered to serve as mediators.

At the June Congress of the SP, in Lille, a resolution was passed by a unanimous vote calling on the government to negotiate a cease-fire, to begin top-level negotiations, to prepare free elections to a single Assembly, to liberate political prisoners held without criminal charges, to dissolve the colonialist city councils and to proceed to a "purge" of the civil service in Algeria. This motion, which was hailed as a great victory by the left-wing minority, was never seriously considered as a guide to action by the government.

A Sop to the Uneasy

As to the preliminary steps toward negotiations, they were brutally cut off by the capture over the Mediterranean of the Moroccan plane carrying five leaders of the FLN from Rabat to Tanis. This operation, which had been organized by the High Command acting under the authority of Lacoste, was carried out without the knowledge of the government. Nonetheless Mollet took full responsibility for it and covered Lacoste, as he had covered Lacoste earlier on all matters of importance.

In reality, the tentative moves toward a policy of negotiations and peace never expressed a real desire on the part of the government to come to terms with the Algerian nationalists. They were a sop given to the uneasy but credulous rank and file of the SP, and provided the Stalinist leadership with an excuse for their continued support of the government as a "lesser evil."

The most important function of these moves was to feed the mechanism of self-deception in the party: the government hints mysteriously that it is following a secret policy which is progressive and which will nullify the effects of its open policy, which are visibly reactionary; the party militants choose to believe the hints rather than the controllable facts, and give the government the benefit of doubt on the basis of a non-existent progressive "secret policy."

The arrest of André Mandouze (who has since been

Dual Disaster: For France and for the French Socialist Movement...

released on bail) is symptomatic of these contradictions.

Mandouze was a professor at the University of Algiers, a left Catholic and a supporter of the FLN. Because of his good relations with the leaders of the FLN, he was entrusted with establishing unofficial contacts on behalf of the government. On November 10 Mandouze was arrested because of his "relations with the captured leaders of the FLN": the very relations the government had utilized a few months earlier for its own purposes. One government policy was arresting the other, so to speak.

In fact, the most reactionary policy, the one represented by Lacoste, has always prevailed and continues to prevail. Its failures have driven the government to new lies and new failures.

The case of the captured plane is a good instance. To the ordinary citizen looking at the facts, the capture of the Moroccan plane with the FLN leaders was a breach of confidence toward the Moroccan sultan, Tunisian Premier Bourguiba and the FLN leaders, who had all been led to believe that the government was ready to meet them in negotiations.

Moreover it was a disastrous political move because it showed the bad faith of Mollet and Lacoste and because it is based on the theory that the partisan army cannot go on fighting when its political leaders are in prison. This theory is false on two counts.

Firstly, large sections of the partisan army are led by the MNA (the left-wing Nationalists led by Messali), and have no connection with the FLN. Secondly, the partisans have always fought on their own.

Lacoste, however, claims that the capture was a brilliant and daring masterstroke which "beheaded" the Algerian rebellion. But the Algerian rebellion continues with unbroken strength.

Artificial World

Lacoste's explanation for this is that the Stalinist liant and daring masterstroke which "beheaded" the (hence the mass arrests among the leaders and members of the ever more insignificant CP of Algeria and the publicity given to these arrests in the papers). If this theory held true, though, one should have heard of significant sections of the nationalist-led partisan army surrendering to the French forces. Instead, the High Command has been able to produce only three second-rate officers of the partisan army with limited local responsibilities, whose "rallying" is completely without political significance.

Finally, the theory of "foreign intervention" provided the rationale for the incredible Suez adventure, which could have had no decisive influence on Algerian affairs even if it had succeeded in overthrowing the Nasser regime.

In its propaganda, the government has built up a completely artificial world which is completely unrelated to the real one. What is remarkable, is that the government seems to believe its own lies and acts upon them. The price is one disaster after another.

The domestic policy of the government has been dictated by its Algerian policy. Its exclusive aim has been to organize the country for the prosecution of a colonial war.

Its financial policy is characterized by socialist Finance Minister Ramadier's taxes on goods of current consumption, and by the national loan floated by the government to cover military expenses. The shares of the loan are indexed at the Paris stock market and bear 5 per cent interest instead of 3½ per cent, as was the case in the previous state loan of right-wing minister Pinay. The loan attracted mainly capital withdrawing from North Africa and keeping away from productive

investments. Most of the contributions came from banks and insurance companies; only 10.9 per cent came from small investors.

Paul Reynaud, one of the most reactionary politicians in Parliament, declared that subscribing to a share was "not only a national duty but also a good deal."

At the same time wages have been frozen, and a representative of the civil-service union of F.O. has complained that "no government has treated the civil servants as badly as the present socialist government."

As a consequence of the Suez expedition, prices and taxes are on the increase, unemployment threatens because of fuel shortage, and the deficit in the budget is growing. Mendès-France remarked: "It is the first time I have heard of a country organizing its own blockade."

The Cops at Work

In the field of civil liberties, the government has been more police-minded than any of the governments preceding it: neither Faure nor Laniel would have dared to resort to open repression to the same extent as Mollet.

Since February, the government has arrested, among others, the following: the left Catholics Mandouze and Claude Gérard; the libertarians Mulot and Garestier; the Algerian liberal De Maisonneul; the Trotskyist Pierre Frank; two members of the left Catholic MLP; Jean Rousset, Mazur and Janine Weill of the New Left; about a hundred soldiers and workers (of the CP, CGT, New Left, etc.) who demonstrated against conscription for Algeria; several hundred Algerian workers and nationalist cadres in France, including the MNA leaders Mohammed Maroc, Raymond Nait Mazi and Boualem Mansour, who recently won the right to be treated as political prisoners after a heroic hunger strike.

The grounds for arrest are, in every case, expressing opposition to the Algerian war or support of the demands of the nationalist organizations. Some of the persons above have been released, but many remain in prison.

As far as the press is concerned, the paper of the "libertarian communists," *Le Libertaire*, was forced out of existence after the government had seized it seven times, fined it the approximate equivalent of \$8000 and sentenced the editors to a total of 26 months in prison.

The Trotskyist PCI and its paper *La Vérité* are now fighting three trials on charges including "insult and defamation" as well as "threatening the external security of the state"—the former for calling Lacoste's predecessor Soustelle a war criminal and the latter for asserting that Algeria is not a French province. There is no doubt that the government is preparing the same fate for *La Vérité* as for *Le Libertaire*—if it can. The paper has already been fined over \$100 and has been seized numerous times.

This is not all. Under the pretext of "fighting the increase in the cost of living" the government has prohibited the daily *Le Monde* from raising its price from 4 cents to 5 cents. In fact, this is a way of forcing an opposition paper to either go out of business or to sell itself to some interest group.

Finally, the government has suppressed the "Journalists' Tribune" on the French radio, in retaliation against criticism of its policy voiced by some participants.

Gutting the Party

Within the Socialist Party, the policy of Mollet-Lacoste has led to a process of disintegration.

In October, a group in the Federation of Ardennes (a department near the Belgian border), led by Andrée Viénot of the left wing, left the party. Soon afterwards, the only Algerian leader in the SP of any importance,

Benbahmed, also resigned and joined the FLN.

Andrée Viénot, who has been a member of the SP for twenty-five years, wrote:

"Today it is no longer possible for me to remain in a party led by men who, having taken government power, have not only betrayed their promises to the voters but all socialist morality and socialist tradition. To hide the failure of their Algerian policy, they have thrown themselves into a war which, in spite of Nasser's mistakes, appears to the world as a war of aggression and has led us to the brink of a third world war, enabling Russia to strengthen her hold over the Arab world."

Benbahmed wrote:

"For several months I have been wondering whether my place is still in this party where I have worked for thirty years. Clinging desperately to the desire to serve, I had refused so far to distinguish between my loyalty to the SP and my loyalty to the people to which I have the honor to belong. Now circumstances have made a choice inevitable. You know me well enough not to doubt that I am choosing my country. With this decision I am at last reconciled with my conscience as an honest man and as an Algerian socialist."

The leadership of the SP has done nothing to stop these departures. On the contrary, it has contributed to the dismantling of the party by bureaucratic reprisals against the minority.

In a recent ruling, the Directing Committee prohibits party members from criticizing the party in the non-party press (particularly in *France-Observateur*, which has carried strong criticism of Mollet by Pivert and Rosenfeld). At the same time, it has refused to publish an inner-party discussion organ, leaving no alternative to the minority other than submission or expulsion.

Balance-Sheet of Social-Imperialism

In December, the SP leadership expelled Lucien Weitz, one of the most consistent and militant representatives of the left wing, for criticizing the government in the *Bevanite Tribune*, whose French correspondent he was.

There is no justification for this expulsion; Weitz, like the other members of the minority, has conducted himself in an absolutely loyal fashion towards the party. Moreover, the minority is weak and isolated, and in no way a serious threat to the Mollet apparatus. Consequently, Weitz's expulsion is an arbitrary attempt at intimidation directed against all socialist elements in the SP: first and foremost against the other left-wingers (Pivert in particular) as well as against the "honest reformist" types who have now joined the opposition against Mollet (Daniel Mayer, Depreux, André Philip, Jules Moch, etc.).

It is probable that Weitz's expulsion will be followed by more expulsions and more resignations.

When the Mollet government finally falls the balance sheet will look something like this: one year of unnecessary deaths and destruction of material wealth in Algeria; lower living standards for the French working class; greater political power for the bourgeoisie on the domestic level; stabilization of the Nasser regime by turning it into a symbol of resistance against colonialist aggression; delay in the crumbling of the CP by making the SP as unattractive as possible to disillusioned CPers; decomposition of the SP and its elimination as a significant political force.

As a result of the war in Indochina and the reign of Gouin and Ramadier, the SP fell from 350,000 members in 1946 to 100,000 in 1954, and from 4.5 million voters to 2.7 million. There is no telling what the reign of Mollet and Lacoste has done to the remains of this unfortunate party. It may sink to the level of an impotent reformist sect.

SP and SDF Announce Unity Convention for This Month

Darlington Hoopes, national chairman of the Socialist Party, and Louis P. Goldberg, chairman of the Social Democratic Federation, have made a joint announcement that discussions and negotiations aimed at uniting the two organizations had been satisfactorily concluded with an agreement that is to be carried out at a united national convention to take place on January 18 and 19 at the Biltmore Hotel in New York.

The Socialist Party and the Social Democratic Federation have led a separate existence since a split in 1936 was precipitated by the withdrawal from the party of a right wing which formed the Federation. The split was produced after a bitter contest for leadership between the right and left wings of the party. The fight was conclusively won by the latter at the 1934 party convention in Detroit when the then "Militant" group, supported by Norman Thomas, received the support of a majority of the party membership.

In recent years, repeated attempts have been made to restore the unity of the two organizations, but in spite of numerous discussions between representatives, no unity was achieved. Both

groups have, meanwhile, declined considerably in membership and influence, as has been the case to one degree or other with all other radical organizations in the country.

It now appears, however, that the unification will finally be achieved. The terms of the merger have not yet been made officially known.

The idea of union between the two organizations was endorsed again at the national convention of the Socialist Party in Chicago last year, and it is indicated that a membership referendum on the terms of the unity has resulted in something like a two-to-one approval. Opposition in this referendum seems to have been directed mainly against the political documents which had been agreed upon as the basis for the unity by the joint committees of the two organizations, largely on the ground that they make too many concessions to the SDF point of view.

On the SDF side, opposition to unity between the SP and the SDF has been most pronounced in the ranks of the Federation's affiliate, the Jewish Socialist Verband (not to be confused with the Bund, which has its historical origin

in the Jewish socialist movement of Poland). The Verband is decidedly the largest section of the Federation.

At the recent Verband convention in Philadelphia, the proposal for unity with the SP was overwhelmingly rejected; unity with the Bund was rejected by an even heavier majority. The principal leaders of the Verband bitterly attacked the SP and Norman Thomas in defending their opposition to unity, invoking mainly the events of the split more than twenty years ago, and accusing the party and Thomas of factionalism, sectarianism, inability to function in the labor movement, unwarranted hostility to Israel, and giving all sorts of other grounds for rejecting unity.

Leaders of the remaining section of the SDF, who appealed in vain to the Federation convention to join in the unification, seem prepared to unite with the Socialist Party despite the rebuff from the Verband.

One of the results of the unification is expected to be recognition of the merged organization as the American affiliate of the Socialist International, which refrained from such recognition in the past because of the split. Hugh Gaitskell,

leader of the British Labor Party, has been announced as the main guest speaker at the convention.

It has not been indicated what the attitude of the united organization will be toward widening the movement to include the Bund, the Independent Socialist League and the Young Socialist League. The Bund has been known for some time to favor unity with the Socialist Party. Recently, the Political Committee of the Independent Socialist League announced its readiness to support the consolidation of a democratic socialist movement in the United States by uniting with the Socialist Party. The Young Socialist League has a similar position on the question.

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.

Senate Mock Battle —

(Continued from page 1)

sidious attempt to destroy the Southern way of life. The Republicans who could have easily decided the issue in favor of the liberals—both Republican and Democrat—who started the new effort, as usual took a variety of positions designed to protect their special interests.

"Most important of all these interests is the maintenance of the conservative coalition with the Southern Democrats which since 1938 has, in effect, controlled Congress. Under this arrangement, civil-rights votes are traded for support for those tax, fiscal and business policies which are the major Republican concern. The liberals were in such a minority position on the civil-rights fight that the Republicans were able to permit the defection of those GOP Senators to whom the Negro vote is of critical importance."

Even the N. Y. Times' John D. Morris reports on the same date:

"Once the rules fight has ended, according to the word quietly passed in the cloakrooms, the leaders will start negotiations to bring forward civil-rights bills that should satisfy liberal elements of the party without bringing on an unbreakable filibuster.

"But for the time being, at least, advocates of a change in the filibuster rule must settle for an opportunity, through a round of speeches tomorrow, to stage an orderly demonstration against what they call 'minority rule.' In doing so they will redeem a plank in the 1956 Democratic platform that pledged the party to make an effort to modify the filibuster rule."

In another column Doris Fleenon indicated that the whole affair looked like a "mock battle."

Senator Hubert Humphrey of Minnesota, a leading practitioner of the civil rights "hocus-pocus," made his plea directly to Senator Johnson to let the show go on. "Even if we can't change the rule," he said, "we ought to put up a fight for a reasonable civil-rights program. We will ask our Southern friends to at least give us a vote on this issue."

MODEST PROMISES

The civil-rights program that Humphrey envisages is one which is reported to have the backing of Johnson. Or at least Johnson has deemed it wise to leak reports that he is not opposed to any kind of civil-rights legislation and thus not cut himself off from his Northern friends like Humphrey. They are proposing a three-point program:

- Legislation protecting the right to vote of Negroes and those in other minority groups, through federal court injunction if necessary.

NEW YORK

LABOR ACTION FORUM

There will be no Labor Action Forum next Thursday, Jan. 17 because of the following evening's inter-socialist forum at the Great Northern Hotel. See page 1 for announcement of this special event on Friday evening, Jan. 18, which will see Max Shachtman, Farrell Dobbs, J. T. McManus and A. J. Muste in a panel discussion on "Can the Left Unite?"

Thursday after that, Jan. 24, Labor Action Forum will feature Julius Falk, managing editor of the *New Internationalist*, in a talk on the Impact of the Hungarian Revolution on the Independent Left. He will discuss and analyze the views that have been put forward by such publications as Sweezy's *Monthly Review*, the *American Socialist*, the *Nation*, and others.

And on Jan. 31, last Thursday of the month, there will be a special forum, jointly sponsored by both the ISL and the Young Socialist League, to hear a guest speaker, Dr. Don Peretz, on the subject, "Eight Years of the Arab-Israel Conflict." Dr. Peretz is the author of the thesis *Israel and the Arab Refugees*, the most authoritative work on the topic; he has had an extensive career in Palestine as a student, a correspondent during the 1948 war, a representative in relief work, and a research scholar. He is presently in the Foreign Relations Department of the American Jewish Committee, specializing in research on Israel, Egypt, and the Middle East situation.

- Establishment of a permanent federal commission on civil rights with broad powers to investigate but no punitive authority for enforcement. (It is not certain whether this is to include the power of subpoena, without which it would be a powerless commission.)

- Appointment of a separate assistant attorney general to handle civil-rights cases in the Justice Department.

This is indeed a modest series of proposals. It is so modest as to be a weaker one than that proposed by the Eisenhower administration in the closing months of the last Congress.

The Republican proposals promised specific authority for the attorney general to initiate proceedings in behalf of persons who have suffered civil-rights violations. This encompasses far more than the denial of the right to vote, which is often circumvented in devious and legally "legitimate" ways.

The administration also talked of recourse directly to the federal courts by persons whose civil rights have been violated, and for authority for the attorney general to proceed against suspected conspiracies to violate civil rights.

It will be recalled that the Eisenhower proposals sent to Congress in April 1956 passed the House of Representatives after being delayed by the chairman of the House Rules Committee, Rep. Howard Smith of Virginia and Smith Act notoriety.

NIXON'S GAMBIT

In the Senate the civil-rights bills never managed to get out of the Senate Judiciary Committee headed by Senator James O. Eastland of Mississippi. And if they did the filibuster awaited them. Therefore in view of the presidential election, the Senate liberals promptly forgot about civil rights until after the election.

(Continued from page 1)

nism" even when none existed. That was in Guatemala.

If the United States should one day come to the conclusion that all other means of settling the political affairs of the Middle East to an approximation of American satisfaction had failed, and that only the armed forces of this country could maintain a Pax Americana in the area, is it too far-fetched to be apprehensive of how that phrase "controlled by international communism" might be interpreted by an American administration?

POINT 4'S BLIND ALLEY

Now, what about the economic-aid part of the "doctrine"?

Since nothing specific was said about the types of projects the administration proposes to subsidize with its economic aid, it can only be discussed in general terms. And it must be said, that if one goes by the record of the kind of economic aid the American government has given in similar situations in the past, and especially of economic aid in this area, the prospects are none too promising.

Of course, each country in the Middle East is different, and presents different problems. Some of them are oil-rich, and the only economic aid from the point of view of gross cash that they need is a bigger share in the returns of the oil industry. In other cases, vast capital projects are needed to develop stagnant economies with few natural resources.

But in almost all cases, the major obstacle to any serious economic improvement in the Middle East lies in the social structures of the various countries, and in the governments which back them up. The physical, cultural and educational problems in these countries would be hard nuts to crack in the best of circumstances. But as long as their economic and social structures remain unchanged, economic aid from abroad tends to disappear into the pockets of the ruling classes like a stream into the sands of the desert.

Here we encounter again the same vicious circle into which the same kind of policy has run in other parts of the

The only politician to come out of the filibuster hassle with enlarged prestige was Vice President Richard Nixon. As presiding officer of the Senate he handed down a ruling that while the Senate is a continuing body, the Senate filibuster rule is unconstitutional since it denied the majority of the Senate the right to determine the rules of the Senate. Under attack was that part of Rule 22 which specifically excluded a motion to change the rule from closure, thus permitting unlimited filibustering.

However, Nixon's ruling had only the status of Nixon's personal opinion because it was in answer to a parliamentary inquiry and not a ruling from the presiding officer subject to challenge. Thus Nixon was able to appear as the champion of civil rights without in any way endangering the Dixiecrat-Republican coalition in Congress.

If Nixon or the Eisenhower administration were really concerned about breaking the filibuster rule, they could have put the pressure on the Midwest Republicans to vote with the liberals. It is this group, formerly led by Senator Robert Taft of Ohio, which is the architect of the conservative coalition in Congress. Nixon did not use his influence with this group to follow the logic of his opinion, and thus the filibuster remains.

Given this seemingly static situation, what are the changes for the enactment of some kind of civil-rights program in this Congress?

The pressure is building up for the enactment of some legislation. Both parties are under the pressure of the Negro people to translate words and promised into action. There is also widespread dissatisfaction and resentment over lack of compliance with the Supreme Court decision.

This pressure has propelled the abortive and weak-kneed moves against the

Johnson-Rayburn leadership in Congress, the Nixon opinion on the filibuster and the increase in the Republican vote against it, mainly from the Northeastern states.

ON THE HOOK

"The Democratic leadership, although heavily dominated by Southerners, recognizes that it is on the hook of adverse public opinion in the matter, and that it will have to yield some of its sectional prejudices in order to get off. Both the political as well as the social demand for better race laws has reached a point where they can no longer be ignored," writes Washington correspondent Cabell Phillips in the N. Y. Times of January 6.

"Moreover, the southerners, having successfully weathered the assault on their cherished filibustering privilege (with a tacit assist from some of their colleagues among the Republican conservatives), are in a mood to make some modest concession to the majority's clamor for some constructive action on civil rights."

Thus the Dixiecrats are now in a position to offer a few concessions as long as they have the power through the filibuster to prevent enlarging of their largesse.

The Southern racists know that the day is drawing to a close when they can resist the pressure for civil rights with bull-necked indifference. They see the whittling away of their support as even the Republicans are beginning to make serious gestures toward the Negro vote.

This is the way of all reactionary ruling classes and cliques; they offer concessions only when they see their ruling position being undermined by the democratic demands of the people. Now is the time not to be content with the new meager concessions which may be offered, as the Senate liberals led by Hubert Humphrey appear to be doing, but to utilize the growing weakness and isolation of the Dixiecrat racists to press for further and more encompassing civil-rights legislation.

How Far Does Mideast Plan —

world. Both the Russian and the American governments have been able to make economic deals with this or that government with an eye to minimizing the influence of the other side. They have both offered, and given, economic aid with the aim of increasing the sympathy of the ruling groups and of the population at large for their side in the world-wide competition whose aim is to gain allies, or just to prevent the other side from getting allies. As long as the matter rested there, it may have played a certain limited and episodic role in the world line-up of forces, but it went no further than that.

But in all cases there was a difference. This difference resided in the fact that, side by side with their deals with this or that government, the Russians had working for them the local Communist Party which sought to spread its influence on the basis of a popular appeal against the existing regime and social order. In the long run, it has been the success or lack of it of these movements, and not of Russia's contributions to the economic or military development of any given country, which has been decisive.

Every progressive social grouping in the Arab countries of the Middle East recognizes that it is above all their socio-economic system which keeps them poor and undeveloped. It is this growing recognition of awakening populations, and not just their poverty as such, which gives their Communist movements their appeal.

DUBIOUS IMPACT

The American government, however, is blind to this basic fact, even though some of its representatives on the spot have been led to recognize it by their own experiences. Neither this Republican administration nor its Democratic predecessors have shown any glimmering of recognition that it exists. In fact, as rulers of the dominant power in a capitalist world, they are convinced that their mission is to stabilize these social systems, not to undermine them.

These truisms about the very severe limitations on any prospects of a fruitful effect of American economic aid are

repeated here only because there may be a tendency in the liberal-labor movement to feel that the correct approach to the Eisenhower "doctrine" is to whoop up its economic aspect, while minimizing its military side.

What impact is the Eisenhower policy likely to have on the American political scene? At the present juncture it is difficult to say.

The Democrats appear angered at the Republican strategy, which went through the elections claiming that things were improving in the Middle East and assuring the people that America would not get embroiled there even after the British-French-Israeli invasion of Egypt. Now, they feel, Eisenhower is seeking to get political support by claiming that the country confronts a major crisis, and demanding a virtual blank check on the basis of this claim. Since he has put them on the spot by the dramatic manner of his announcement, they seem to feel that they cannot oppose him point-blank, but should confine themselves to restrictions and limitations on the powers he seeks.

Events may surprise us all, but it does not seem likely that the situation in the Middle East appears dangerous enough in the short run to force a major debate on the bases of American foreign policy in the Democratic Party or in the country at large. Before such a debate can take on the proportions and weight which would make it a factor in the real politics of the country, much stronger political winds must be blowing than now seem to ruffle the air in Washington.

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

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