

# ISL Is Off the "Subversive List"

By MAX SHACHTMAN

## LABOR ACTION

JULY 28, 1958

TEN CENTS

### Middle East Intervention is Another Blind Alley For Peace and Democracy: U.S. Troops Must Get Out!

By GORDON HASKELL

The military intervention in the Middle East by the American and British governments is an attempt to achieve by means of gunboat diplomacy objectives which the tides of history have put beyond their reach. Even if the ends sought were desirable and achievable, the means used are detestable, dangerous and incompetent. That is why the governments embarked on this adventure appear to have the keen insight and organized purposefulness of a man lost in a strange city in the middle of a snowstorm crashing his way down an open manhole while in the grip of delirium tremens.

If the figure appears exaggerated, it is only because of the known personal sobriety of the men in Washington and London responsible for this action. Yet it is admitted on all sides that this military intervention brings humanity once again to the brink of a worldwide military catastrophe. And the bulk of informed opinion, both throughout the rest of the world and in the United States itself, and on all sides of the political spectrum, condemns this action as dangerous and ineffective.

As socialists, we join with all sectors of democratic public opinion who condemn and reject the imposition of policy by great powers on weaker nations by means of force. Call that by any name you will, it is the essence of imperialism. We have condemned it, and will continue to do so, when it is done by Stalinist Russia or China, and we condemn it when it is done by the United States or any other power, no matter how democratic or progressive its own domestic regime may be. Any claim that the specific circumstances in the Middle East are an exception to this general proposition is without merit.

#### What Are the Problems?

What are the problems in the Middle East which this intervention is supposed to "solve," or at the very least in the solution of which it is supposed to play a vital role? Lest bias enter into the statement of the problem, we pick almost at random a description of what is at issue from a New York Times editorial (July 19):

"The terrain on which the battle was fought was therefore fogbound. It was also obscured by the fact that the real power politics and economic factors behind the actions taken could not be used to their full value. Everyone knew that the basic issues were whether the Middle Eastern countries still independent of Nasser's domination were going to remain independent, and whether the priceless sources of oil were going to be jeopardized and perhaps lost to the West. There was also the question of whether the United States could retain any prestige in the Middle East if friendly nations and statesmen were destroyed without our taking action."

The Times editorial does not deign to mention "Communist domination of the area" as one of the issues involved, though this forms one of the chief themes of

the defenders of the administration's policy. It is no oversight. If this area ever comes under the rule of Stalinism the political analysis of the period will be able to point to this American-British intervention as a powerful contribution to that result. No one, to our knowledge, has yet claimed that the military landing in Lebanon was decided on to prevent a landing by the Russians, or even that the rebels against the Chaumon regime were led or infiltrated by Communists.

#### The "Communist" Issue

Though the "Communist" issue is not advanced as justification for this military adventure, it is an essential aspect of the government's understanding of and attitude toward the Middle East, and thus enters in many ways into the decision to land troops there. Since the same concepts, in greater or less degree, tend to be common among liberals and in the labor movement, a few words about them are necessary before we proceed to the more obvious issues described by the Times above.

Nasser and his supporters are willing to accept armaments and economic aid from Russia if they cannot get them on at least equal terms from the West. The Russians seek to exploit in any way they can the economic, political, cultural and ideological opportunities opened to them by the giving of such aid. In due course, if Stalinism should develop as a powerful political movement in the Middle East, the importance of these opportunities could become enormous. As long as Arab nationalism remains the dominant political force in the area, it is Nasser or any other leader of that political movement, who can use Russian aid to his own advantage far more than the Russians can use it to theirs.

It is vital to bear this relationship in mind because of the tendency, both in loose propaganda terms and in attempts at political analysis to equate Arab nation-

(Turn to last page)

The acting assistant attorney general of the United States, Mr. J. Walter Yeagley, has informed Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., attorney of the Independent Socialist League, that an order is being issued directing that the League, and its now defunct predecessor organizations, the Workers Party and the Socialist Youth League, be removed from the "list of organizations designated pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450 in connection with the Federal employee security program," that is, from the so-called "subversive list."

This announcement marks a resounding victory not only for the Independent Socialist League but also for all those who cherish democratic rights and civil liberties and who have worked to preserve them in this country against the witch-hunters, thought-controllers, authoritarians and totalitarians of all kinds.

#### A Decade of Struggle

To win this victory for the reversal of an administrative governmental decision which was as unjust and arbitrary as the procedure for maintaining it was outrageous, required more than ten years of tenacious struggle by the ISL, its attorneys and its friends. The full story of the fight is summarized elsewhere in this issue of LABOR ACTION.

The attorney general is now in a position to point with pride to the fact that his office took only ten years in which to grant an elementary requirement of justice, in contrast to the authorities of some other countries who are perhaps less prompt in granting it. His Washington administration partisans may also boast that under the conservative Eisenhower regime the ISL was finally accorded a hearing, protracted and preposterous though it was, that was refused us under the liberal regime of Truman which initiated the abominable concept of the "subversive list" and the no less abominable procedure connected with it. It may even be—or so it is thought by some—that the attorney general can congratulate himself on the wisdom of the sudden decision to remove the ISL and the other two organizations from the list, rather than risk the consequences of a decision by a federal court to which Attorney Rauh warned he was preparing to take the case if administrative satisfaction was not obtained.

It is obvious that this decision repudiates the findings and recommendation of the hearing officer appointed by the attorney general himself to preside over our case. But, true to the principles of the bureaucratic mentality and manner, the office of the attorney general seeks, through Mr. Yeagley's letter, to cover the repudiation by a whitewash of the hearing officer, with which it is plainly less concerned than it is with a whitewash of its own inglorious record.

#### "No Foundation in Fact"

It finds that there is "no foundation in fact" for the charge of personal bias against the hearing officer, and it rejoices in its finding that we had a "fair and impartial hearing."

But in the very next breath it declares that "the attorney general, however, is not satisfied that the evidence adduced at the hearings meets the strict standards of proof which should guide the determination of proceedings of this character." This assertion, which must sound so noble, so judicious, so lofty to the uninformed, would sound less sanctimonious to those of us who closely followed the actual procedure as well as the hearing in the case if we did not remember so vividly the downright refusal of the attorney general's office for years to establish any standards of proof, let alone strict ones, and the failure of the repeated efforts made during the hearing itself by our attorney, Joseph Rauh, to obtain from the representatives of the attorney general—from his attorneys in charge of our case or from his hearing officer—any statement at all of the standards by which the case was being heard.

It is surely safe to assume that the evidence (if that is what it can be called) submitted at the hearing of the ISL case by the government was the very most that the attorney general ever had at his disposal from the day that the Workers Party and later its successor, the ISL were put on the "subversive list." If the attorney general, in the fullness of judicial fairness and majestic objectivity, now expresses his dissatisfaction over the evidence adduced by his own office because it does not meet the "strict standards of proof" he rigorously insists upon as

(Continued on page 2)

#### INSIDE THIS ISSUE

- German Social Democracy** . . . page 6
- "National Guardian" and Nagy** . . . page 4
- Negroes and the Trade Unions** . . . page 7
- Recession Spreads in Europe** . . . page 4

# ISL Off "Subversive List" — —

(Continued from page 1)

his guide, it follows plainly and incontestably that:

His attorneys in charge of prosecuting the case against us at the hearings had no basis, certainly no adequate basis, and certainly no basis upon which the attorney general is prepared to stand, for pursuing the case against us. And that:

The hearing officer he appointed had no basis for concluding that the evidence presented against us justified his recommendation that the ISL be retained on the "subversive list." And most important of all, that:

The office of the attorney general had, from the very beginning, no evidence to justify the listing of our organizations—not only from our standpoint, but from the attorney general's own "strict standards of proof which should guide," or rather, which should have guided him from the outset.

If it is not merely elementary justice that we have been finally granted by the attorney general, but the full justice to which we are entitled, these conclusions would dictate a public statement by the Department of Justice that for more than ten years it was guilty of a gross and flagrant injustice to a political organization, its members and friends, who were subjected to the sufferings, harrassments, discriminations and disabilities notoriously associated with the "subversive list." Amends for much of the sufferings endured during this decade can never be made. The attorney general, however, does not think in terms of any amends at all, even in line with what is plainly indicated by the terms of his own decision.

## No Endorsement of Organizations

His letter concludes, and so graciously, with the statement that "This decision does not constitute in any way, however, an endorsement of the organizations by the attorney general or the Department of Justice." We are bewildered over what law or regulation requires or authorizes the attorney general to vouchsafe an "endorsement" to political organizations, and what organizations other than ours he has "non-endorsed." But, what's fair is fair! And it seems no less than fair if we add that while we are jubilant over the somewhat belated decision of his Department, our acceptance of it does not, for the reasons partly indicated, constitute in any way an endorsement of the attorney general or the Department of Justice.

In any case, the removal of the ISL, the WP and the SYL from the "subversive list" does not in the least degree diminish our opposition to the list itself and to the whole concept behind it. It remains vicious and reactionary. It was conceived in the spirit of legal and political cowardice, and that is how it is maintained to this day. It is based upon the proposition that the government has the authority to grant or to deny people the right to practice political activity, that the practice of politics requires a governmental license. Such a concept was proper to the Czarist autocracy in Russia and it en-

forced it by police measures in practice. It was and remains proper to the Stalinist autocracy wherever it reigns. It is based upon the belief that the people should be ordered by the government to entertain and advocate some political opinions and to refrain from others which are disagreeable to the authorities.

We stand by the elementary democratic principle that the holding, advocating, exchanging, confrontation and pursuing of political opinions and programs, and that free association of individuals to advance their opinions, is an unfringeable right of all people. For the government to issue a list of proscribed organizations is an outrage upon the people and a subversion of this democratic principle, since it subjects such organizations and their members to obloquy, discriminations, and harrassments that the government has no right to inflict upon them or upon the rest of the population which has the right to listen to such organizations as it pleases.

## Hallmark of Despotisms

Only despotisms arrogate to themselves the authority to deny the people their right to read and to hear the political views of others by denying the latter the right to write and to speak. Even limitations on these rights, such as are represented by proscription lists and "subversive lists," are an assault upon democracy implicit with the concept that the government is the benevolent guardian of an idiot people that cannot be trusted to form its own political judgments, instead of being the representative and therefore the servant of a people perfectly capable of making its own decisions and inalienably entitled to make them freely.

It is a cowardly concept, furthermore, because it seeks to escape the obligation of the government to bring to court for a fair trial any individual or individuals it claims have violated the law. Or, alternatively, it seeks to escape the obligation of the parties in government power to confront the political arguments of their opponents and critics on political grounds. It cravenly denies political opponents the right to a fair hearing, either in the court of public opinion or in the court of law. The fact that such opponents may be Stalinists or Fascists, people whose political views are as abhorrent to us as they are to many others, makes no difference to us so far as their democratic rights are concerned, except, perhaps, to underscore the importance of maintaining the democratic rights precisely of those with whom we differ most thoroughly.

The practice of "subversive lists" not only limits or denies the political rights of the proscribed groups and organizations, of the weak or strong minorities. At one and the same time, it also limits or denies the right of those among the people who would seek to inform themselves of the views of such groups, or offer them political support and the right of those among the people who want to oppose them politically.

The "subversive list" must go, along with all other forms of witch-hunting, thought-control, and persecution for political opinions which eat away the foundations of democratic rights.

## Thanks to All

Our joy over the victory represented by the attorney general's decision is matched by our pride and our gratitude. The victory is the work of many—many comrades and many friends. To the Workers Defense League, which took over our case from the very beginning, at the depth of the witch-hunt and the unpopularity of radical "causes," and fought it through to the very end, goes deep and lasting appreciation—and in particular to Vera Roney, its national secretary and to its former national secretary, Rowland Watts, our first champion in the case.

To our counsellors, Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., and his associates, Isaac Groner, John Silard and Daniel Pollitt, who worked so brilliantly and untiringly in the case for all these years, without fee and without any reward but the satisfaction of their libertarian convictions, goes warm and respectful thanks.

To Norman Thomas, to Harry Fleischman, the former national secretary of the Socialist Party, to Daniel Bell, historian of American socialism and an editor of *Fortune*, to Dwight MacDonald, the eminent journalist—who did not share our views but who testified in our behalf at the hearing—goes our respectful esteem for loyalty and truth.

To all others, not so well known, who stood by us and helped fight the listing, who contributed generously in more than one way, goes our profound gratitude.

And to the comrades and sympathizers of our own organization, who were staunch and obdurate, who could not and would not be frightened off by difficulties, intimidation and persecution, who were firm and fearless in their attachment to the socialist movement and the socialist ideal throughout this period, go our most affectionate greetings and the pride of being associated in a bond that cannot be broken.

## INDEX

### Ten-Year Struggle Against The "Subversive List" As Recorded By Labor Action

For the convenience of persons interested in the full history of the ISL's fight against the Subversive List, we give here an index of articles which have appeared in LABOR ACTION since 1949 bearing on this question. In each listing, the first number stands for the month, the second for the day, the third for the page, and the last for the year, 3-21-1, 49 means March 21, p. 1, 1949.

WP sympathizer cleared 3-21-1, 49. Shachtman testimony 3-21-3, 49. ISL letter to attorney general 5-9-1, 49. Court of Appeals on list 8-22-4, 49.

ISL sees Justice Dept. on list 2-12-7, 51. Shachtman barred from Calif. campus because of list 11-26-8, 51. Supreme Court decision on list 5-14-2, 51.

ISL files formal protest with Dept. of Justice on listing 5-11-5, 5-14-3, 54. Dept. of Justice's "Grounds and Interrogatories" for listing, and the ISL's reply (text) 9-28, 53 special issue.

ISL demands hearing 1-11-2, 54, 11-29-1, 54.

Attorney general sets hearing 4-7-1, 55. Shachtman passport case, text of court decision 7-4-4, 55. Preliminary hearing begins 7-25-1, 55. Report on first week of hearing 8-1-6, 55. ISL charges hearing officer with prejudice, demands removal 8-1-6 & 7, 55. WDL forms committee on case 8-8-1, 55. Hearing recesses; attorney general letter on hearing examiner 8-8-1 & 8, 55. Text of ISL appeal for removal of examiner 8-15-7, 55. Brownell retains biased examiner (text) 9-19-1 & 8, 55. Case still stalled 11-21-8, 55.

Attorney general to resume hearing 3-19-8, 56. Reports on hearing: reports are contained in the issues of May 28; June 4, 11, 18, and 25; July 2, 9, 16 and 23. A travesty on democracy 9-10-1, 56.

The government's summary and proposed findings 10-15-6, 56. The ISL's proposed findings and brief (text) 1-7-6, 1-21-7, 2-4-2, 57. Hearing examiner finds against ISL 12-16-3, 57.

Exceptions and Brief filed by ISL attorneys against hearing examiner's findings 1-27-6 & etc. 58. "Clear violation of due process," Rauh letter to attorney general 2-10-1, 58. "One Hundred Days" calendar summary of 10 years of struggle against list 4-21-2, 58. Rauh letter demands decision and threatens court action 6-30-2, 58. ISL removed from list July 28, 1958.

## Text of Justice Department's Letter

Assistant Attorney General  
Internal Security Division

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
Washington  
July 16, 1958

Joseph L. Rauh, Esquire  
1631 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Rauh:

This is with reference to the recommendation made to the attorney general by the hearing officer in the proceedings under Executive Order No. 10450, involving the Workers Party, Independent Socialist League, and Socialist Youth League to the effect that the aforementioned organizations be retained on the attorney general's list of designated organizations.

As you know, hearing in this matter was commenced on July 18, 1955, and was interrupted when you filed an affidavit of personal bias against the hearing officer. The hearing resumed on May 21, 1956 after investigation established the charge had no foundation in fact. An examination of the procedures followed in this matter clearly indicates that you were afforded a fair and impartial hearing despite your repeated protestations to the contrary.

The attorney general, however, is not satisfied that the evidence adduced at the hearings meets the strict standards of proof which should guide the determination of proceedings of this character. As to reopening the proceedings for the presentation of additional evidence, I am informed by the attorneys in charge of the case that this is impracticable due to the passage of time, the demise of possible witnesses, and the unavailability of others in the absence of subpoena power. A further factor in this regard is the recent death of the hearing officer.

Accordingly, an order is being issued directing that the respondent organizations be removed from the list of organizations designated pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450 in connection with the federal employee security program.

This decision does not constitute in any way, however, an endorsement of the organizations by the attorney general or the Department of Justice.

Sincerely,

J. WALTER YEAGLEY  
Acting Assistant Attorney General



# ISL Triumph Over the "List" Climaxes a Decade of Struggle

By ALBERT GATES

The removal of the Independent Socialist League, Workers Party and Socialist Youth League from the "Subversive List" by order of the attorney general vindicates more than a decade of struggle by the Organizations and demonstrates the possibilities inherent in a continuing intransigent and persevering struggle for democratic processes. The victory is not ours alone. The myriad efforts and actions, tiring, at times seemingly hopeless, expended in behalf of the organizations since 1948 were not for them alone. We were always perfectly aware that a successful outcome of our case against the attorney general would be a victory for civil liberties and democracy for all movements and individuals.

Although the case did not reach the courts for a constitutional test of the List, which was the hope of the Workers Defense League, our counsel, Joseph L. Rauh and Isaac N. Groner, and ourselves, the validity of the List has been irreparably damaged. The very first hearing granted by the Department of Justice to any organization was enough to demonstrate the miserable criteria for the listing and the reprehensible methods of "proof" employed by its agents in protecting and defending the List. Having experienced that first hearing, we were confident that our case would have won in a court of law and thus have spelled the legal death of this political index expurgatorious.

## DECADE OF HISTORY

How did this all come about in the first place? The list was drawn up and applied by the Department of Justice during the beginning of the Truman Administration (as a matter of fact, as early as 1944) but not made public until 1947. In the dark of the night, without notice to organizations it planned to list, and of course, without hearings of any kind, the cataloguing began. To be sure, the government conceived it as an "employment" list to guide its departments and agencies acting as employers. When the government finally publicized the list, for the first time the many organizations contained thereon first learned of their listing. Under the Truman Administration, the List became an active instrument in government policies. Its publication was an unstated directive to the country at large to use it. State and local governments adopted the List for their regions. Industry employed it as well.

The hysteria which began with the publication of the index containing alleged subversive organizations (including the Japanese Cherry Tree Association of 1905) reached its apex during the days when Senator McCarthy dominated the Washington scene. But it should never be forgotten that the creation of the List preceded the period when McCarthy became a national figure in American politics and his name symbolized anti-democratic, administrative and bureaucratic acts. The unsuccessful efforts of the organizations to learn why they were listed and their similarly unsuccessful requests for a hearing were uninfluenced by McCarthyism; the legal bureaucrats of the Department of Justice needed no instructions from the Wisconsin demagogue.

In 1948 and 1949, the Organizations tried repeatedly and without success to get a hearing from the Department of Justice. It was then that we sought legal help. We were determined to challenge the List and make the necessary civil libertarian fight. Our first disappointments came in seeking an attorney. There were not many ready to lend their legal skill to do battle in behalf of constitutional democracy. Lawyers were evading involvement in "subversive" cases for fear of the harm it might do their more pleasant and lucrative practices.

Fortunately we were not really alone. There was the Workers Defense League and its former secretary, Rowland Watts,

than whom no one is more devoted to the cause of democracy and civil liberties. They alone made it possible for us to begin the struggle.

This writer well remembers the first hopes in our fight when we presented the



Joseph L. Rauh, Jr.

facts of our cause and Rowland Watts enthusiastically embraced it and promised to do everything in his power to help us. And he did. The first step we took was to demand a hearing from the attorney general. This was in 1950. Since we were now represented by counsel, namely Watts, the attorney general, although not ready to grant a hearing, agreed to meet with representatives of the ISL. In January 1951, Max Shachtman, the writer, and Watts journeyed to Washington for a meeting with the Department. We did so even after the attorney general refused to advise us what charges existed against the Organizations. However, we were prepared in written and oral form, and argued our case against the charges, never presented, which we assumed might make up the government's case.

It was a memorable occasion, exceedingly instructive in the arts of bureaucratic obstinacy and malice. We met with Mr. Raymond P. Whearty, who informed us that he was on the committee that drew up the List, and that it was drawn up after great deliberation and care! He was most sorry that he could not inform us of the charges (this was not provided for in the Presidential order!). He was most sorry too that the Organizations could not have a hearing (not provided for in the order!). However, he would listen to us and that, he advised, was really a great favor, since even that was not provided for in the order!

## WIRED ENCOUNTER

We talked and talked, referred to fact after fact, blindly refuting the government's case, of which we had literally no knowledge. With a show of good will, Mr. Whearty made a commitment that the case of the ISL would be reviewed, but not that of the Workers Party or of the Socialist Youth League, because, so far as they were concerned, there was no question in his mind that there would be no change. Our meeting ended on this note of commitment, solemnly given. Of course, it was never kept, and we doubt that it was ever intended to be kept. For at least two years thereafter, our repeated requests for the results of the review were either not replied to, or were answered with transparent evasions.

In consultation with Rowland Watts, we pursued our next step: to get an attorney and to force legal action in Washington. Watts arranged for us to meet Joseph L. Rauh, whom we knew only by reputation. The three of us journeyed to Washington once more and had a long session with Rauh, as a culmination of which Rauh agreed to take our case. We were certain now that we were on our way. In 1952 came the election of Eisenhower, and with that, the issuance of a new Presidential order. The important aspect of the new order, which otherwise retained all the rotten provisions of the old one, was the right of hearings within a given period of time to organizations. With the announcement of the new order, we immediately requested a hearing.

The List by now had uses that exceeded the bounds stretched by even the most enthusiastic witchhunters. Sensitive and insensitive areas of government activities embraced the List. This was particularly true in the Passport Division of the State Department, which repeatedly violated the constitutional right of free travel by citizens of the country. As an outcome of the listing of the Organizations, Max Shachtman was refused a passport solely on the grounds of the listing of the Organizations. Rauh filed suit against the State Department, the result of which was a historic decision of the Court of Appeals in Washington, presided over by Justice Edgerton, which broke the back of the Department's passport policy. Although the decision could not resolve the question of the List itself, it asserted that the List had no legal standing and the State Department could not use it to refuse a passport to anyone requesting one.

## HEARING BEGINS

This was a good start. After the passage of another considerable period of time, the hearing on the Subversive List case began on July 18, 1955, two years after the Department of Justice had presented its Statement of Grounds for listing the organizations. Edward M. Morrissey was appointed as Hearing Examiner.

The opening hearing was a farce. Rauh, joined by his co-counsel, Isaac Groner, requested to know what standards were to operate in the hearings. The reply was that there were none! A request that the government make an opening statement of what it intended to prove was refused by its attorneys and denied by the hearing examiner. A demand that the government state whether it was charging the organizations with being "big C" Communists (referring to the organized Communist movement) or "little c" communists (referring to theoretical doctrine), was denied by the Hearing Examiner, who, immediately after ruling, inquired of Mr. Groner what the difference was. A request that the Fund for the Republic be permitted to take a film history of the very first hearing on the List was denied. Such repeated rulings led Rauh and Groner to protest the Hearing Examiner's bias to Attorney General Brownell and call for his removal. This was denied after weeks and weeks of delay.

Ordinarily, the hearings should have recommenced shortly afterward. But this was no ordinary situation. The weakness of the government's case had become readily apparent in the opening hearing. It had planned the introduction of several exhibits from LABOR ACTION and *The New Internationalist*, and some citations from the writings of Lenin and Trotsky. The government had already set itself up as the authority on the meaning of Marxism and the place of Lenin and Trotsky in socialist history; on the basis of its self-proclaimed authority on socialism in general, it would pass on the legitimacy or illegitimacy of organizations. It had not a single witness to place on the stand. This was its case! When the Department observed the manner in which our counsel had prepared the case and what the Organizations were pre-

pared to produce as evidence, it stalled the convening of the hearing to prepare the Government's case all over again.

## A NEW CASE

A stepped-up harassment of members and sympathizers of the ISL began all over the country by agents of the FBI. An intensive effort was made to get witnesses against the Organizations among former members, college professors, and people once in the socialist movement who might be indifferent or hostile to it. The hearing did not reopen until May 1956, and in the intervening months the government succeeded in dredging up (and it wasn't easy at that) two witnesses. Professor Geroid T. Robinson, of Columbia University, who knew nothing whatever about the issues in the case and had never heard of the Organizations nor ever seen their literature, agreed to be a witness in response to a demand upon his "patriotic" duty. He came to the hearings and spent two and a half days reading volume after volume of Lenin's writings on which he "qualified" as an expert; but—as the legal expression goes—he could not read from Trotsky's writings because he could not "qualify" as an expert!

The other witness was the ineffable James Burnham, who thrice refused the crown, but several days before the reopening of the hearing, could not turn his ears from the earnest plea of the government to do his duty! For all his admitted reluctance and repeated refusals to appear, he saw his duty and he did it according to his lights—and was well paid, too, for expert services! The philosophic mask did not hide the reactionary-conservative, who treated the hearings to a sophisticated dissertation in defense of the art of lying in behalf of political strategy. He could not, even with his various skills, avoid the impression that he was not a very reliable or disinterested witness.

Robinson and Burnham, a host of exhibits taken from the writings of the ISL, the WP and SYL—these made up the government's shallow, unavailing case.

Against all of this, the ISL produced not only its own members, but eminent, independent and unimpeachable witnesses, all of them in political disagreement with the organizations, such as Norman Thomas; Daniel Bell, an editor of *Fortune* magazine; Harry Fleischman, former secretary of the Socialist Party; and Dwight MacDonald, an editor of *The New Yorker* magazine. Their testimony was unrebuted and in several cases there was no cross-examination to speak of. In addition to these, our counsel produced exhibit after exhibit to refute the government's case.

## MORRISSEY'S FINDINGS

The result was not unexpected by us. Mr. Morrissey, after months of delay, in part occasioned by his illness (we have since learned that he has died), made his findings and recommended that the organizations be retained on the List. His findings are outstanding in the manner in which they completely ignored the witnesses for the Organizations and relied on the discredited testimony of Robinson and Burnham. Thomas, Bell (whose testimony is not even referred to), MacDonald and Fleischman were disregarded as witnesses because they were not members of the Organizations and, in the opinion of the Hearing Examiner, could not therefore know the organizations. Their testimony was invalid, whereas the testimony of Robinson and Burnham was accepted completely and without question. The evidence of the Organizations was ignored and the long testimony of Shachtman rejected as self-serving.

Except for going through the formality of awaiting the decision of the attorney general on the recommendation made by his appointed hearing examiner, we were prepared through our counsel to proceed to court, where we hoped to test the List legally. The attorney general, after being asked twice for his decision, was advised that court action was being prepared. It was at this point that the surprise ruling delisting the organizations was received by Rauh. With that ruling a long ten-year fight for justice ended.

We sound only one note of regret: no court test of the list can be made by us in our administrative victory. Our hope was for such a test because we wanted

(Continued on page 7)



## Is the Recession Spreading In Britain and West Europe?

By HERMAN G. ROSEMAN

"Thus far," said *The Economist* of June 21, "the world has stood up remarkably well to the impact of the recession." While there is some truth to this, there is no known law of capitalist development which requires that all economic downswings originate in the U.S. European capitalism is independently developing its own recession, the first signs of which are apparent. Industrial production in early 1958 was either at a standstill or declining in every capitalist country in Europe save France. The great five year expansion of the European economy—an expansion which in 1953-57 saw an annual average increase in industrial production of almost eight per cent—has in the past few years been slowing down and has now come to a halt.

European capitalism faces the same basic problem which has especially plagued the American economy in recent years, namely, an inability to maintain an expanding, full-employment economy without a creeping inflation. But inflation, even if mild, presents a much more

serious threat to the European economies than to the American. This is so because the European nations suffer from chronic balance-of-payments difficulties (the "dollar shortage") which, coupled with slim gold and dollar reserves, always poses the danger of financial collapse. The only way this situation can be remedied is through increased exports, which are impossible so long as export prices do not fall. Yet despite immense gains in productivity, prices tend to creep upwards.

### DILEMMA

Thus European governments are faced with a policy dilemma: increases in productivity (which theoretically should improve Europe's competitive position in world markets) require such great investment that inflation is induced; but any government policy which is strong enough to stop the slowly spiralling price level tends also to reduce investment and thus choke off the necessary gains in productivity. The baby seems to have swallowed the bath water.

The policy response of European governments has generally been to try to slow down the increase in investment. This was done quite wisely in 1955, when all sorts of monetary and fiscal restrictions were imposed by the various governments. The rate of growth of investment and production slowed down as expected; but such a slowdown generally has a cumulative effect, and in this instance it led to the stagnation and incipient decline of production and income which now faces most of Western Europe.

The lead in this recession seems to have been taken by Great Britain, where industrial production has not advanced since the draconian measures of the Conservative government in 1955. The recession there was precipitated by the still sharper measures of the government in September, 1957, when speculative movements led to a sudden, considerable loss in dollar and gold reserves. While these measures certainly quickened the pace of events, the fact that manufacturing investment had been falling since the early part of the year indicates that the recession was already slowly developing. In fact, it is possible to trace back the oncoming of the recession still further. The construction of new dwellings has been falling since 1954. New orders for machine tools have been declining since 1956, and new starts of factory buildings since 1955.

### CONTINUED DECLINE

Other signs point to the continuation of this decline in the coming period. A recent survey of 554 British manufacturing firms brought forth the report that more than three-fourths of them now have excess capacity. About half of the firms reported that as of May, 1958, approved plans for new investment were lower than a year earlier, while less than a fourth reported larger plans. More than half reported lower profit margins, while only 5 per cent reported an increase. In view of the success of this type of data in calling the turn in the U. S., it is impossible to avoid the conclusion that the British economy is in for a continuing recession. Already in mid-spring, 1958, unemployment was roughly 50 per cent higher than a year earlier (having risen, in very round figures, from 300,000 to 450,000), and manufacturing production was 5 per cent below the 1957 peak.

### LABOR ACTION • 19<sup>th</sup> YEAR

July 28, 1958 Vol. 22, No. 15

Published every other week by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone WAtkins 4-4222—Re-entered as second-class matter July 26, 1957 under the act of March 3, 1874.—Subscription: \$2 a year; \$1 for 6 months.—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: GORDON HASKELL  
Assoc. Editor: HERMAN BENSON  
Business Manager: Mel Slank

Editorial Board:

GORDON HASKELL MAX MARTIN  
HERMAN BENSON SAM BOTTONE

## The "National Guardian" And the Nagy Execution

By SAM BOTTONE

It is inconceivable that the Russians and their Hungarian puppet regime could have misjudged the world-wide repercussions to the Nagy murder. What were the specific and precise details and circumstances leading to the murder of Nagy, Maleter and other leaders of the Hungarian Revolution are a matter for speculation.

But on one count there seems to be widespread agreement: it signifies a policy turn inside the Stalinist empire and a strengthening of the monolithic tendencies inside the regimes. The period of liberalization and "all flowers blooming" has come to an end and the fierce struggle between Moscow and Belgrade has once more broken out into the open.

While the international repercussions are portentous, it has also had a devastating effect upon those who consider themselves "true friends of the Soviet Union." In the U. S., caught in the middle between their "pro-Soviet" friendship and the blatant cynicism that the executions represented are those who find their political expression through the *National Guardian*.

### THE "NATIONAL GUARDIAN"

The *Guardian* in an editorial on June 30 found the execution "shocking and appalling" and that "something surely has gone wrong" within the Russian bloc. This was followed by further statements July 7 and July 21 by the editors and Cedric Belfrage. The attitude, as expressed by Belfrage, is that they "will not stand silent while that cause [socialism] is dragged again through a mire of terror where socialism reigns and torn to pieces where the fight remains to be won."

They were reacting on the one side to the expressions of horror by those who can not be smeared or silenced with the charge that they defend murder in Algeria or terror in Mississippi, and to the monolithic response of the Communist Parties defending the executions on the other. Thus, instead of developing a clear position of defence of Nagy and the Hungarian Revolution, the *National Guardian* chose to make its stand on the sole grounds of "questioning the methods of justice used in the Nagy Case. . . ."

While their expression of shock and horror at the return to the methods of Stalin's reign are genuine, the way in which they have expressed it has left them open to a demagogic but not ineffective argument from *The Worker*.

To the *Guardian's* protest of the secret trial and the political execution, *The Worker* replied: your regretful concern at the extreme penalty after a secret trial is touching but the accused were guilty of high treason. "Facts are facts," *The Worker* stated, "even when they are hard."

### WEAKNESS

And this is the weakness of the *Guardian* protest. They protested the imposition of the death penalty on the grounds of opposition to the death penalty as such, and they charged the executions would alienate public opinion in the West. But they did not answer that Nagy and Paletter were guilty of no crime other than participating in the revolution of the Hungarian people against Russian and Stalinist oppression.

There is justification to a protest over the denial of a fair trial. Any democratic, and above all a socialist, society has to have a fair and impartial judicial system as one of its cornerstones. But what is involved here is not a legalism, even a valid one. It is whether the leaders of a social-

ist revolution were executed or whether the leaders of an imperialist counter-revolution were executed. This is the substantive political issue. And this is precisely what the *National Guardian* has chosen to avoid.

In its latest editorial statement the *Guardian* under the avalanche of criticism (the letters to the editor ran 2 to 1 supporting the executions) stated that its editorials do not "indicate a change in the *Guardian's* course with respect to the socialist world." But why not? What is the basis of friendship and support for a social system which produces regimes characterized by reigns of terror, political murders, oppressions of minorities and above all the denial of the most rudimentary form of democracy for the mass of the people?

### WHY SUPPORT GOVERNMENT?

Or at the very least: even if it is felt that on general historic grounds this social system, or its economic base should be "supported," what reason is there for refusing to denounce and oppose a government which besmirches and betrays all that may be thought to be progressive in this social system by its destruction of liberty and rule of terror?

The experience at the hands of the Russian and Communist Party press should also be illuminating. The Stalinists have attempted to amalgamate all critics of the Nagy executions with the murders of Algerians, henchmen of Batista, white supremacists in the South, purveyors of nuclear war and the enemies of socialism. This is the kind of "argument" the *Guardian* has itself been forced to resort to in its past defense of indefensible acts of the Russian government. Sometimes being on the receiving end of this "method" of argumentation is more politically instructive than many a theory about the abstract "progressiveness" of an economic system.

### Strange Coincidence: Nagy and Rajk

All the communist papers in Hungary have published a resolution voted by the workers of Csepel factory in connection with the execution of Imre Nagy. The text reads as follows:

"The workers of the Csepel steel combine unanimously approve the justified verdict concerning the group of traitors and conspirators, Imre Nagy and his accomplices, who, acting under the order of the imperialists, tried to put our people under the yoke of exploitation."

It is interesting to compare this text with that adopted by the workers of the same Csepel workers on September 19, 1949, after the condemnation of Laszlo Rajk, the then secretary of the communist party. Both resolutions are identical. Here is the text of the 1949 resolution:

"The workers of the Csepel steel combine unanimously approve the justified verdict concerning the group of traitors and conspirators, Rajk and his accomplices, who, acting under the order of the imperialists, tried to put our people under the yoke of exploitation."

The only change is that in place of Rajk, the writer has now put Nagy. There is also another change; instead of Matyas Rakosi in 1949, it was Janos Kadar who now ordered the execution. Rajk was rehabilitated seven years later, just before the revolution.

During the revolution of October-November 1956, the Csepel steel combine was one of the most important bastions of the workers fighting for freedom and democracy against Soviet tanks.

ICFTU Spotlight

## SPOT-LIGHT

### Footnote to Revolution

A footnote to the revolution that overthrew the regime of the unlamented Argentine dictator, Juan Peron, offers another example of the way in which international oil companies play politics. They often support whichever regime offers the greatest profits.

The Argentine government has just concluded an agreement with six oil companies calling for the investment of \$800 million. The story in the *N. Y. Herald Tribune* of July 21 concluded with the following information:

"Two former Argentine Presidents—Hipolito Yrigoyen and Juan Peron—were overthrown soon after trying to liberate Argentina from dependence on Britain by making the country self-sufficient in oil.

"There is now evidence that British naval units, based on the Falkland Islands, provided munitions for the disarmed Argentine fleet which played a decisive role in the revolution against Mr. Peron in September 1955.

"With an oil settlement in sight, foreign investors are converging on Buenos Aires from all parts of the world. At this moment there are twenty different economic missions here."

### Educational Blacklist

"There is a virtual blacklist existing in the American university world that is as mean and cruel as the blacklist in the communications and motion picture industries," according to Dean Louis M. Hacker of the School of General Studies at Columbia University. College administrators, he declared in a speech, frequently lack courage to "restore to academic life men who have been discharged from teaching posts simply because they refused to answer questions about their private lives by legislative committees."

ACLU Bulletin

### 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.

## POLICY FOR YOUTH

The following article by Tony David Smith, a member of the Executive Committee of the British National Association of Labor Student Organizations, is a fairly general statement of resurgent youth and student opinion in England today. Needless to say, Challenge is in sympathy with the point of view of Comrade Smith. We too look toward a new, unified and militant socialist youth organization in our country. We also hope that American socialist youth can more and more make their voice heard among the socialist students of Europe and Asia.

By TONY DAVID SMITH

I am one of the several million individuals who enjoy a special historical privilege. It is a privilege that carries with it a number of special obligations, special passes, special duties. In the year 1958 we are fortunate enough to be under the age of thirty. This means that we shall probably live just long enough to see a completely new society established. Or, at least, if all fails and the whole of civilization is blown to pieces we at all events will have the slight compensation of knowing that in no way has it been our fault.

A strange new light is breaking over Europe. It is the light of youth. A new generation is waking to political consciousness and as it does so it becomes necessary for those who are already awake to see that all goes well. A similar movement occurred in the thirties but failed. And it seems to me that it failed for lack of a decent political philosophy. Just as now, a generation was craving for a new belief; but their intellectual hunger had to be satisfied with either the hard crust of Stalinism or the bitter stone of Fascism. It will always reflect to the discredit of the leaders of those times that they did not succeed in preventing this happening.

### A NEW FEELING

Those of us who have been helping and watching the campaign for nuclear disarmament in recent months will have noticed the political naivete that has gone together with the profound sincerity of the people who for years have thought in terms of rock 'n roll rather than of human survival. Gradually it is coming clear to them that every problem that has ever concerned them is reflected in this struggle against war. Nothing has any meaning any more until this struggle has been won.

Those of us who walked to Aldermarston and heard the cheers of the crowd and saw twelve thousand people gathered

in front of those weird concrete posts and wire-netting surrounding an odd concentration-camp-type world of espresso architecture and atomic reactors, all of them listening to a clergyman from West Germany speaking in the middle of the New Forest on an Easter Monday—a fantastic combination of circumstances—realized that we had been thinking, as we never had thought before.

### STRUGGLE AGAINST WAR

It was a new feeling. We were using the only tool that a post-war childhood had given us—a scrupulous obstinacy, a blind refusal to believe what we are told, a blank inability to conform, the will to rebel because to acquiesce is a psychological impossibility. A whole generation to whom the Prime Minister's face, as someone wrote the other month, is inexpressibly absurd.

There is only one more basic lesson to learn before a political philosophy can be forged. To be silent is to acquiesce.

Whatever happens the world cannot afford to lose this argument. Or else another generation perhaps the whole of civilization will be left to bleed itself away into the hell of total war.

### INTERNATIONAL PLANE

We have to develop on an international plane. Any plan for the future must be based on the assumption that it will work for everybody from Greenland to Korea from Florida to the Cape of Good Hope. And the society we hope to build must be one in which everyone is a partner because everyone is responsible.

To find this we must first destroy colonialism, imperialism and class domination, for wherever these institutions exist civilization is historically indigested. To do this we have to begin at home. All political change has to be unilateral (like charity).

Only by working to break down the class nature of education, by creating opportunity for all, by ensuring the success of whatever institutions we already have that are working toward this new society—parties, trade unions, campaigns—can the first step be taken. Unilateral action is the only practical method because it is the most democratic—it encourages the others without dictating to them; it is a demonstration of solidarity because it is a gesture of trust.

For instance, only by disarming unilaterally can we help and give impetus to the movements all over Europe that are working for the same ends. All political work of his kind tends towards a similar end, the frustration of the capitalist power over society. And in the East as well, the end is similar, because it tends towards the frustration of totalitarian power and bureaucratic prestige.

One of the things learned from history is the necessity for the unity of the socialist movement. We have to work with everyone we can. This is necessary because we have to fight harder than ever before. We are fighting for our lives.

## "Remove Troops From Mid East" Say Anti-War III Pickets at UN

By A. S. KNOB

Radical youth in New York City took the lead last week in mobilizing opposition to Western intervention in the Middle East crisis.

Within twenty-four hours after President Eisenhower ordered Marines into Lebanon, the Committee Against World War III, an ad hoc group mainly composed of democratic socialists, pacifists and libertarians, organized a spirited picket line in front of the United Nations.

Over fifty youths from all five boroughs of New York participated in the demonstration, which demanded an end to "the move toward World War III" and called for the preservation of the right of self-determination for the Arab peoples.

### PICKET SIGNS

The signs on the picket line and the leaflet which was handed out to passersby compared American and British imperialism in the Middle East with the Russian suppression of the 1956 Hungarian revolution. "Russian troops in Hungary; U.S. troops in Lebanon means suppression; no more war; remove all troops from the Middle East," were among the signs.

The picketeers, who were watched with great interest by hundreds of visitors to the UN (that body was then in the midst of a debate on the question) declared that while they did not support the politics of Nasserism, they defended the rights of the Arab peoples to "determine their own national destinies under forms of their own choosing."

The ranks of the demonstrators were greatly depleted by those individuals who were unable to come because of occupational necessities. It is estimated that close to 100 people would have taken part had not the demonstration been held at the inconvenient hour of three p.m.

The picket line was followed this week by a joint protest meeting of the Young Socialist League and International Socialist League on the Middle East crisis. Michael Harrington, national chairman of the Young Socialist League, and Gordon Haskell, editor of LABOR ACTION, spoke at the meeting.

In addition, the New York Students Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy endorsed its adult affiliates call for removal of foreign troops from the Middle East along with the use of arms equipped with nuclear war heads.

### WAY TO WAR

The picket line of the Committee against World War III warned of the

sharply increased danger of a world wide nuclear holocaust. "American intervention," its leaflet asserted, "is not the way to peace, but to war." It accused the U. S. government, by following a "reckless military policy . . . based upon such futile devices as the Baghdad pact" of allowing Russia, "a government which has destroyed the national independence of the peoples of Eastern Europe, falsely to pose as the sole defender of the national rights of the peoples of the world."

Calling for an end to American support of "military and totalitarian dictatorships such as those of Franco in Spain, Trujillo in the Dominican Republic and Batista in Cuba," the leaflet declared its opposition to "another Suez-type campaign, the first of which drew the attention of the world away from the Russian rape of Hungary."

The substitution of a United Nations army for an American one, the picketeers stated, would be merely a repetition of the Korean war, for a UN army would "be little more than a thinly veiled disguise" for direct Western intervention, blatantly denying the rights of the Arab people to decide their own destinies.

### WELL RECEIVED

The hurried distributions for the picket line were received enthusiastically. Especially in Harlem and at different summer school campuses, people expressed sympathy with the aims of the demonstration, solidarity with the aspirations of the Arab peoples for self-determination and freedom, and fear at the threat of World War III.

Reporters from various papers, including a number of foreign periodicals, covered the demonstration for their publications.

The imminence of a nuclear war provoked a strong protest from the adult SANE group in N. Y. which plans a prayer procession through the metropolitan area of Manhattan for the annual Hiroshima Day demonstration on August 6. The student SANE group is actively engaged in support of the memorial march.

Put this week on your reserve list—Sept. 1 to Sept. 7

FOR THE

## ANVIL CAMP

"a vacation with an education"

at the HUDSON GUILD FARM, Andover, New Jersey

swimming      volley ball      baseball      badminton

and a lecture schedule that can't be beat

Herbert Hill      Prof. Robert Alexander      Bayard Rustin      Samuel H. Friedman  
G. August Gerber      Darlington Hoopes      Herman W. Benson      Michael Harrington  
Max Shachtman      Maurice Spector      B. J. Widick      Paul Jacobs

for full information on rates, travel information, the lectures, etc. write to  
ANVIL, 36 E. 10 St., N. Y. 3, N. Y.

NEW YORK YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE

presents

A Series of Summer Classes:

## Politics and the Post-War World

Wednesday, July 30

Western Europe

Speaker: Sam Bottone

Wednesday, August 6

Colonial Revolutions and American Aid

Speaker: Sy Landy

Wednesday, August 13

Socialism As An Alternative

Speaker: Tom Marcel

All Classes Wednesday Nights at 8 PM

Labor Action Hall, 114 West 14th St., 3rd Floor



## A DISCUSSION ARTICLE

**A Discussion of the SPD Congress — I****The German Social Democracy**

By MICHAEL HARRINGTON

The first official reports of the Congress of the German Social Democracy held at Stuttgart, May 18th to 23rd, are now reaching the United States. And even though the minutes are incomplete and unedited, they allow us to get a fairly good idea of the directions in the SPD. Three important substantive issues were discussed during the first four days of the meeting: foreign policy, domestic economic policy and the new draft program. A fourth question, that of how to elect functionaries to the Party leadership, was also debated but it will not be treated here since it does not really bear upon the ideological changes which are taking place in the German Social Democracy.

In general, the Stuttgart Congress reveals that the German Party is moving in the same general direction as the Austrian (which also recently published a Draft Program) and the British. The majority are in the process of abandoning many of the older, Marxist traditions, and moving toward the conception of the "Party of all laboring men" as counterposed to the "Party of the working class." However, as should be apparent in the course of this article, it would be wrong to label this a simple retreat toward the right. In particular, this theoretical trend is taking place within the context of an intensified commitment to struggle against German atomic rearmament and for disengagement in Central Europe. This very fact should be an indication of the complexities which are involved.

**Ollenhauer's Speech**

The first political address which the Congress heard was Erich Ollenhauer's speech, "Peace and Freedom Through a Socialist Policy." One axis of his thought, and a major one, was anti-bomb action: "Every thinking man," he told the Congress, "must devote all of his energy to putting an end to the insanity of the arms race. The demand, 'Struggle Against Nuclear Death, Struggle Against the Nuclear Arms Race' is a simple imperative of reason." This conception, central to the foreign policy deliberations of the Congress, was linked to two other points: German reunification, disengagement. Ollenhauer pointed out that German integration into a nuclear NATO would imperil unification, and this was one of the reasons he opposed it. Disengagement was put forward as an alternate policy, as a beginning which would move in the direction of international, controlled disarmament.

At the same time, Ollenhauer placed a considerable emphasis upon a socialist policy as part of the alternative to the arms race. He called for an end to the purely negative anti-Communism of the West, and demanded a policy of massive aid to the newly independent colonial nations. And he specifically put forth the conception of Social Democracy as an alternative to both capitalism and Communism. Another reporter for the majority, Fritz Erler, took up the question of NATO (Ollenhauer had made it plain that he was not calling for a break with NATO), but his criticisms did not go the point of questioning the alliance itself.

**Oppose Atomic Arms**

During the discussion, there was near unanimous support for the anti-bomb campaign, for opposition to atomic arms for Germany, and in favor of a policy of seeking disengagement. On one point, however, the SPD leadership was overruled from the floor. That was the issue of Algeria. Ollenhauer had argued in favor of Algerian self-determination. But at the same time, he advised a policy of moderation with regard to the French Socialists (the SFIO) within the Socialist International. He defended this position on tactical grounds, holding that a sharp attack on the Mollet leadership would not really serve to help the Algerians. There was considerable militancy shown from the floor on this point, and some dissatisfaction with Ollenhauer's tactical conceptions.

The debate came to a head on a peripheral motion, one which sought to strike a reference in the foreign policy statement which said that the Algerian revolutionaries bore some responsibility for blocking a peaceful settlement. One delegate commented that this was to bracket the victim with the murderer. The opposition point of view was upheld, and the leadership wording was stricken by a vote of 191 to 160. This was not so much a substan-

tive victory as it was an indication of how high feeling ran among the delegates on the question of Algerian freedom.

The second major point before the Congress was domestic economic policy. This more or less merged with the later debate on the Draft Program, but it was treated as a separate point on the agenda. The motivation for the official resolution was given by Heinrich Deist, and centered around several interesting propositions: the necessity to seek a rapprochement with small and medium sized business; the definition of socialism in terms of a mixed economy; an "ad hoc" approach to the question of nationalization.

**Private Ownership of Property**

The SPD, Deist argued, must recognize that the Marxian prediction about the disappearance of small and medium sized business has not been fulfilled. Moreover, he continued, the central problem before Germany was that of the concentration of economic power in huge units and here a certain community of interest between workers and small and medium businessmen was apparent. Therefore, he proposed that the Party recognize the rights of such business units, both now and in the future. "A party which recognizes the private property of middle and small employers as a healthy basis of economic activity . . . cannot any longer make the elimination of private ownership of the means of production a central demand," he said.

But at the same time as he argued against the concept of a completely socialized economy, Deist did not come out against nationalization. On the contrary, he argued that the Party must look toward the nationalization of certain industries (mines, for instance), and that it must seek to institute an over-all system of public control over the commanding heights of the economy. In general, Deist's arguments were for an ad hoc and experimental policy on these questions. What he rejected was a commitment to the general abolition of private property in the means of production. His thought (and even his specific use of terms) was clearly influenced in all of this by the present majority tendency in the British Labor Party and by John Strachey's theoretical work in particular.

During the discussion of Deist's report, there were sharp attacks from the left, but none of them took the form of counterposing a really flexible left wing policy (the speakers from the floor were, it must be said, limited to 10 minutes apiece). However, on one question and interesting exchange did take place. A speaker from the floor had attacked Deist's assertion that socialization inevitably involved the danger of bureaucratic statism by calling for shop councils and trade union control in public industries. Deist ridiculed the conception of the shop council as "visionary" and argued that the trade unions could not take over control of production without giving up their main function which was defense of the workers against the employers. This proposal, he said, would effectively make the union an employer!

**Middle Class Society?**

In part, the change in economic policy seems to have been based on the theory that German class structure no longer fits the old analysis, and that a new description requires a new policy (one of the majority speakers called for the "unity of theory and practice"). But another element was more immediate and political. Deist, and others, argued that the SPD could not become a majority Party unless it appealed to elements outside of the working class. Between 1918 and 1933, he argued, it was socialist "dogmatism" which prevented the Party from really achieving a victory! It was along this line that various majorityites attacked their critics as utopians who were without a political program which could reach a majority of the German people.

The last political debate on which the minutes are available concerned the new Draft Program. (Unfortunately, the last day of discussion is missing, and this was presumably the point of the debate over "mass" versus "working-class" Party.) The reporter for the majority was Wilh Eichler. From his speech—and without either the complete record of the Congress or the full text of the Draft Program—the reports in the American press that the SPD has made a major break with its past traditions appear to be somewhat exaggerated. To be sure, Eichler specifically abandoned the conception of the Party as an authority on "ultimate things," as the source of a total *weltanschauung*, but this is neither surprising nor unhealthy. At the same time, Eichler stated his own respect for Marx—who was constantly referred to throughout the Congress as the founder of modern socialism and the moving spirit of the German workers movement—and his ultimate definitions of the human function of socialism

derived in general from the tradition of Marxian humanism.

Eichler, like other speakers for the majority, was clearly taking pains to build a bridge to sections of the petty-bourgeoisie and to German Catholics and Protestants. The latter seem to figure prominently in the move to do away with an official Party philosophy. Eichler also reasserted some sound socialist points. For instance, he rejected the welfare state as a substitute for socialism on the grounds that it "does not basically alter the mode of distributing property and wealth," and he called for a more basic transformation of society. He, like Deist, defined the basic problem as one of bureaucracy and the concentration of power, and rightly identified socialism with both political democracy and free, popular control.

**The Russian Revolution**

In one aside, Eichler, speaking for the SDP Majority, made a very interesting point with regard to the Russian Revolution. He had just been talking about the anti-socialist character of Communism, and then went on to add: "But here, I must in all fairness say that the revolutionaries of the Russian October Revolution did not plan the Stalinist terror apparatus. They sought to free the workers and peasants from the yoke of capitalism and social and human degradation." This conception of the October Revolution as a fight for socialism, at least subjectively, is a very illuminating point to come from the leadership of the German Social Democracy.

Thus, the three major issues debated in the partial minutes now available to us saw the SPD declare in favor of a militant anti-Bomb campaign, for an economic policy quite similar to that of the present British Labor Party leadership. The Party also embarked upon the discussion of a Draft Program which moves it quite a distance from some old and sterile dogmatism and from some old but still relevant truth. The Congress' action on the Draft Program, it was constantly emphasized, is tentative and is intended to serve as a basis for discussion, and not as a binding decision.

I do not intend to try to make an evaluation of the Congress in this article. For one thing, there is not enough space, for another, I feel that the subject deserves an article in itself. However, a few preliminary comments are in order.

**General European SP Tendency**

First of all, the conceptions propounded at the SPD Congress are part of a general ideological tendency in European socialism. The British and Austrians, as has been remarked, have already moved in this direction. But then, the discussion which attended the formation of the Union of the Socialist Left (UGS) in France also treated many of the same questions, and in a quite revisionist way, but from the perspective of left socialism. The point to be made in this connection is an important one: two processes are going on in European socialism. On the one hand, we can distinguish a tendency toward the right, i.e., conceptions of socialism as just around the corner from the Welfare State, a vogue for control and administrative body and stock-purchasing projects; an abandonment of a sharp conception of the class character of capitalist society.

But this tendency toward the right often bases itself on the honest and intelligent perception of real facts: It is true, for example, that the fate of the petty-bourgeoisie has been other than as Marx imagined it. This certainly requires reconsideration (and on this count, the comrades of the UGS have done us a service by bringing such a point up for debate). In other words, we cannot counterpose a sterile dogmatism to the revisions within Social Democracy. The points they raise (class structure, electoral majority, danger of bureaucratic stratification, etc.) are not the simple fantasies of an imagined "reformism." They are quite real. That one must disagree with their solutions is clear—even as one sees the reality of the problems which they raise.

**A Basic Question**

An excellent model of how not to react to these developments is given by Pierre Frank in the January, 1958, issue of *Quatrième Internationale*, the organ of the Trotskyist tendency headed by M. Pablo. Frank accurately and truthfully characterizes the ideas of Yvan Craipeau in *La Révolution Qui Vient* as un-Leninist and having similarities to the traditional ideas of reformism (Craipeau's book is a reflection of a major tendency in the UGS). Frank is right in his characterization—but, so what? The democratic socialist left of today cannot debate the ideas of the democratic socialist right by simply labeling them. This Craipeau understood and he took upon himself the difficult task of thinking through some of the real problems before the movement. The Frank reaction is a caricature of the wrong way to respond.

It is in this spirit that we must approach the tendencies within the German Social Democracy and particularly the new majority. They have raised real and basic questions, they have recognized new developments. (It must never be forgotten that it was Bernstein, and not Luxembourg, who saw the appearance of the new middle class; and the fact that his crisis theory, or lack of it, has been disproved cannot change the fact.) As I hope to show in an article in the next issue, our task in light of the SPD Congress is a serious one of reflection and fraternal debate.

# The Negro Workers Status And the U.S. Trade Unions

The following is a portion of an address delivered by Herbert Hill, labor secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, before the Tenth Constitutional Convention of the United Furniture Workers of America, AFL-CIO on May 13, 1958. The whole address may be found in the June-July, 1958 issue of Crisis, official organ of the NAACP.—Ed.

By HERBERT HILL

Because the Negro citizen is playing such a decisive role in the current civil rights conflict the matter of developing a firm and secure economic base within the Negro community is of the greatest importance. The disparity in the economic status between Negro and white workers and their vulnerability in terms of economic distress are clearly indicated by the facts on unemployment and income distribution.

During the week of March 9, 1958, 14.4 per cent of the total non-white civilian labor force in the United States was unemployed. The comparable rate for white workers was 6.9 per cent. Although only one out of every ten persons in the labor force is non-white more than one out of every five persons currently unemployed is non-white. The non-white unemployment rate as estimated by the Census Bureau is higher now than at any time during the last eleven years in which the Census Bureau has reported unemployment statistics by color.

## UNEMPLOYMENT RATE

The non-white unemployment rate today is approaching the level recorded at the time of the 1940 census when the United States was still recovering from the post 1929 depression. Non-white unemployment was then 18 per cent; today it exceeds 14 per cent. Unemployment among non-whites since the 1949-50 recession has remained consistently high. At no quarterly point has it fallen below 6 per cent and on a number of occasions even prior to 1957 it exceeded 8 per cent.

Almost without exception during the entire period since the 1953-54 recession the unemployment gap between white and non-whites has been greater than prior to 1954. During the past three years the non-white unemployment rate has been almost, consistently, more than double the white unemployment rate. This would indicate that very limited progress has been made in securing for the Negro worker the same relative degree of employment stability that the white worker enjoys. It is clear that the differential in employment stability between white and Negro workers has been extended both in years of prosperity as well as in years of economic decline. All available data clearly indicates that the ratio of unemployment among non-whites as compared to that of whites has been steadily increasing since 1951.

In 1953 the typical Negro worker earned an average of \$364 a year in wages or salary; the white worker in that year earned \$956; that is two and one half times as much. By 1954 the average wage or salary income of a Negro worker had risen to \$1,589 while the average white worker earned \$3,174. This means that the income of the white wage earner was

still twice as much as that of the Negro. (Statistical Abstract, 1956, page 311.)

In 1954, 17.6 per cent of all white families in the United States were living on an annual income of \$2,000 or less but of non-white families 42.3 per cent were living on an annual income below \$2,000.

It is, therefore, evident that despite great changes in the employment and occupational characteristics of Negro workers in the last decade, the economic level of Negroes remains substantially below that of the white population.

## STATUS OF NEGRO WORKER

In many industries in basic sectors of the American economy the racial practices of the trade union certified as the collective bargaining agent will be the decisive factor in determining the status of Negro workers. All too often there is a significant disparity between the declared public policy of international unions and the day-to-day reality as experienced by Negro wage earners in the North as well as in the South. It is not enough simply to formulate proper convention resolutions and policy statements. It is not enough to make speeches and distribute civil rights tracts. It is not enough to hold interminable civil rights conferences with more speeches and resolutions. What is needed today is to invoke the full power and authority of the organized labor movement in eliminating discriminatory racial practices where they exist in the workshops of this country.

Statements of policy are necessary and welcome but totally inadequate in resolving conflicts unless backed by decisive organizational authority. Unfortunately, there has been a tendency to substitute hollow ritual for vigorous action when conflicts develop within local unions in matters involving the rights of Negro workers. Invariably the leadership of most national unions will take the right position, but frequently too late and will often act only after a prolonged crisis. When a local union brazenly defies an order of a state or municipal fair employment practices commission and refuses to end its discriminatory practices, the national trade union leadership must act immediately, not one or two or three years after a valid complaint has been filed with a governmental agency or with the Civil Rights Department of the AFL-CIO, or after a fair employment practices commission has issued a cease and desist order.

Such delays often permit the enemies of organized labor to mobilize support for anti-trade union measures and serves to alienate Negro workers from the trade union movement. It is no accident that newspapers in Ohio have cited the discriminatory practices of some building trades unions in urging that Negro workers support "Right to Work" proposals in their own interest.

## FRONTAL ATTACK

In addition to three international unions which have anti-Negro exclusion provisions in their constitutions (Brotherhood of Firemen and Engineers, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, and the National Postal Transport Association), there remain a significant number of segregated local unions and unions where colored workers are excluded by tacit consent. The national leadership of the AFL-CIO must immediately initiate a frontal attack on these blatant violations of basic AFL-CIO policy decisions and against the many separate lines of progression based upon race found in collective bargaining agreements.

The organized labor movement in America has made many important contributions in the struggle for full civil rights for all citizens. The NAACP deeply welcomes this support and is proud of its long years of cooperation and joint activity with many trade union organizations. Now more than ever before when this country is faced with a grave national civil rights crisis it is most important that the trade union movement give top priority to eliminating the vicious evils of racial discrimination and segregation at the work place and within the entire American community.

# CROSSCURRENTS

## UI-SC Picks NY Ticket

The "United Independent-Socialist Campaign Committee" has announced that it has agreed on a slate for the coming electoral campaign in New York State. John T. McManus, managing editor of the *National Guardian*, was to be the gubernatorial candidate, and Dr. Annette T. Rubinstein, former American Labor Party officer, was to run for U.S. Senator. We say "was to," because Corliss Lamont offered himself as a candidate for one of these posts after the Committee's nomination had been made public. It appears that Lamont had originally declined to be a candidate, but changed his mind with the flare-up in the Middle East. Obviously some change will be made to permit Lamont's well-known name to head the ticket. [For a full analysis of the political significance of the "United Independent-Socialist Conference" which chose this Committee, see the July 14 issue of LABOR ACTION.—ED.]

The *Militant* story announcing the nominations refers to the sections of the platform adopted by the UI-SC which attack American imperialism. It does not refer to any changes in the original draft on the question of the struggle for democracy in Stalinist countries. Can we conclude correctly that any attempt to change the platform in the direction of "more emphasis on the relationship between democracy and socialism," as is the delicate way of putting it currently in the SWP's literature, has been dropped?

## CP Goons Attack SWPers

A group of Communist Party goons attacked three members of the Socialist Workers Party at a July 4 picnic sponsored by the *People's World*. The SWP

members claim they had been invited by *People's World*. They were attacked and beaten up as they sought to leave their car at the parking lot of the picnic area.

The local leadership of the CP has maintained silence about the goon-squad tactics of their people. But the July 12 issue of the *People's World* carried the following apology:

"The *People's World* regrets the outbreak of rowdyism that disrupted the July Fourth picnic at the Johnston ranch. Whatever elements of provocation might have been involved in the incident, these were only compounded by the strong-arm tactics of self-appointed bouncers, who acted without authorization from any responsible representative of this paper. Such tactics are grist for the mill of those who desire to isolate and destroy the *People's World* and what it stands for. To the sincere friends of the paper, whose holiday was marred by the incident, we extend our apology."

We note that the apology is only to the "sincere friends" of the PW, and not to the victims of the attack about whom it is even insinuated that they may have "provoked" it. But to anyone who knows the long-time relationship of the PW to the CP, even this "apology" signifies that much has changed in the world.

Is it possible that the Nagy murder has gone to the heads of some of Khrushchev's local admirers? The "good old days" when political opponents were liquidated after secret trial may have come back for the Kremlin. But for American CPers to conclude that the "good old days" are back when they could strong-arm their enemies in the radical movement would be premature, to say the least. Come to think of it, it never worked too well even in the best of days for the American CP.

# ISL Beats "List" — —

(Continued from page 31)

to complete the struggle in behalf of democracy. But we are of the firm conviction that the role of the List has been fundamentally questioned. No one can again use the List without doubting its integrity. The very first administrative hearing, the first opportunity given an organization to challenge the action of the government, resulted in a defeat for the Subversive List.

## PRUDENCE DECIDES

Prudence rather than justice dictated the action of the attorney general. The McCarthyite wave has subsided. The higher courts have been ruling in favor of the Bill of Rights, constitutional rights of due process and civil liberties. The chance of a stiff legal rebuke on constitutional grounds by the courts was too big for the Department of Justice to take, particularly since its successes in behalf of bureaucratic encroachments on the Constitution and anti-democratic processes in the courts have been missing.

We regret that in this wonderful struggle we made, so many did not find their way to join in common effort. The ten-year effort was financed by the organizations, their members and sympathizers and the WDL. Our lack of money more than once threatened the continuation of the case. An enormous devotion and pride of organization contributed to the final success of our efforts.

We reiterate our appreciation to those who fought the good fight with us:

- Roland Watts, former secretary of the WDL and now counsel of the American Civil Liberties Union; the champion of our case and the tireless friend of all those victimized by the bureaucratic governmental drive against non-conformism, radical and socialist thought;

- Vera Roney, who succeeded Watts in office and who continued the work of the WDL in behalf of the case;

## WORKERS DEFENSE LEAGUE

- The Workers Defense League, which means what it says as a defense organization in the field of civil liberties and does something about it; which deserves the support of the entire labor and so-

cialist movement;

- Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., our superb counsel, who gave so much of his thought and efforts to our case, and gave it freely as he has done in so many instances in behalf of civil liberties; Ike Groner, his co-counsel, and a tough fighter; Dan Politt, associated with Rauh, who went through the early phases of the case with us;

- The witnesses who came to testify in our behalf even though their views separated us: Norman Thomas, Daniel Bell, Harry Fleischman and Dwight Macdonald, all of whom displayed solidarity in our democratic struggle and came at a time when so many shirked the fight;

- The members of the WDL Committee on the ISL Case, who freely joined the committee, recognizing its importance in the democratic struggle: Lewis Coser, Kermit Eby, James T. Farrell, Waldo Frank, Frances R. Grant, Rev. Donald Harrington, Irving Howe, Nancy Macdonald, and Meyer Shapiro.

- The friends and sympathizers of the Independent Socialist League, the former Workers Party and former Socialist Youth League;

And most important of all, the members of the organizations who never flinched or fled the struggle. Without whose steadfast and repeated support we could never have seen it through.

A NEW PAMPHLET, JUST PUBLISHED IN ENGLAND

Russia from Stalin to Khrushchev by

TONY CLIFF

22 pages 15 cents

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

A Marxist Classic  
Rosa Luxemburg's  
The Accumulation  
of Capital

Yale Univ. Press .....\$5

Labor Action Book Service  
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.



# U.S. Get Out of Mid East — —

(Continued from page 1)

alism, or Pan-Arabism with Stalinism, or the spread of Stalinist influence. (Don't both denounce Western imperialism?) Once this equation is achieved in the popular mind, the next step is all too easy: the local drive of Pan-Arabism is identified with the world drive of Stalinist imperialism. And measures which have been accepted in the U.S. rightly or wrongly, in the struggle against the latter are justified in dealing with the former.

## Strategic Air Bases

There is one other aspect of the cold war which intrudes itself into the Middle Eastern picture. That is the American government's reliance on strategic air bases all over the world as an essential part of the strategy of "instant retaliation." As long as the existence and security of such bases is considered of paramount importance, it is also necessary for the United States to see to it that governments rule in the countries where such bases are located which are "friendly" to the United States. They may be utterly reactionary, despised and hated by their own peoples and everyone of democratic sympathies throughout the world (Franco) . . . no matter. Until the United States has a sufficient supply of operational ICBMs, the bases must be held at all cost.

That is one of the aspects of maintaining "friendly statesmen and nations" mentioned in the *Times* editorial. But the central fact about American policy in the Middle East (as it is in most of the rest of the world) is that it is not and has not been directed to create and preserve "friendly nations" but only "friendly statesmen," or put more bluntly and truthfully, friendly rulers.

## Opposing History's Trend

Here is the way C. L. Sulzberger, chief *Times* foreign correspondent puts it in the same issue of that paper:

**"We have ended up supporting outdated regimes and opposing history's trend. Of our principal friends concerned with the Middle East, Britain and Turkey are widely disliked because of imperialist memories, an equally detested France has been excluded from the area, Israel is hated and Iran is weak and uneasy.**

**"Today we find ourselves backing the Chamouns, the Saudis and the Husseins against the tide of Arab renaissance. And, by our military interposition side by side with Britain, we have sacrificed those pretensions to moral grandeur we had claimed in the United Nations."**

The picture is clear enough. One would suppose that what follows from Sulzberger's analysis would be a demand that the United States withdraw from its disastrous adventure, stop "supporting outdated regimes," and align itself with "history's trend." How else could this country hope to arrive at a policy which has some chance of success, let alone to regain the "pretensions to moral grandeur" which have been forfeited?

## "Arighing the Balance"

But despite the picture he has painted, Sulzberger remains a victim, like so many other Americans, of the notion that the trend of history can be reversed by a really consistent and massive application of American might. For here is how he concludes:

**"The existing mishmash cannot possibly be stabilized where it now is. Having embarked on an audacious expedition, we have to follow through. One way or another, a new and pro-Western government must be installed in Iraq and Nasser must be shrunken to size.**

**"Otherwise, no matter how long Lebanon and Jordan totter along, they will fall between the jaws of a hostile Baghdad-Cairo nutcracker when our troops are withdrawn. If we can't aright the balance in Iraq and eventually in Egypt, some day we must ignominiously retreat. But in order to aright that balance, we may have to gamble on still more risky adventures than those begun this week.**

**"Such is the logic of the situation. But logic has rarely featured our Middle Eastern policy."**

"Arigh the balance!" How fair-minded and reasonable that sounds. But what is really meant, and the only thing that can be meant, is that the United States use its military might to impose on the peoples of Iraq, Egypt, and presumably the other Arab countries of the Middle East, regimes which will be as hated by the peoples of that area as the ones which have been overthrown during the last decade.

## The Logic of Disaster

We must agree with Sulzberger that if there be any logic to the present military intervention, that is indeed the direction in which it points. Everyone recognizes that the immediate cause of the landings was not some drastic turn for the worse of the situation in Lebanon, but rather the successful revolution in Iraq. But the Iraqi rebels have taken measures which have

reduced to a minimum any legal cover for such intervention. They have shot King Faisal and other government leaders who might have appealed to the United States for help in the name of the "legitimate government" of the country. They have announced that they intend to honor their oil contracts, and have posted guards to prevent sabotage of oil installations. They have even said they do not intend, at this time, to withdraw from the Baghdad Pact.

**But the logic of the intervention and of the massive military build-up in Lebanon still points strongly in that direction, despite American and British announcements that "in the present circumstances" no further action beyond the occupation of Lebanon and Jordan is contemplated. In fact, the logic is so strong that public opinion in this country should be warned to watch out for some drastic change in the "present circumstances" which could "justify" the occupation of Iraq. Allen Dulles and his Central Intelligence Agency were caught flat-footed by the Iraq revolt. But it is not to be assumed that they are utterly without resources in that part of the world. If the demand is strong enough for some sort of "incident" which would "justify" American occupation of the area, it is not beyond the realm of possibility that such an incident could be created.**

But how about the charge of aggression against Nasser's United Arab Republic in the case of Lebanon, and the related charge that the overturn in Iraq and the imminent danger to Hussein's regime in Jordan which follow from it are additional examples of "indirect aggression" by Nasser? Is not stopping aggression a just and proper use of military force? And if the United Nations is unable to muster the forces and the decision to intervene in time, is it not better for the United States and Britain to proceed directly than to permit the aggression to continue?

## The Drive of Pan-Arabism

Let us put aside the question of whether the United Nations observation team in Lebanon was hoodwinked. It is clear that whatever the complex internal origins of the Lebanese revolt may have been, it was supported, encouraged, and probably assisted materially by the UAR. The same is true for the rebels in Iraq, the opposition in Jordan, and so forth. Radio Cairo and other official and unofficial spokesmen of Nasser's regime make no effort to conceal their sympathies and intentions. But what follows from all that?

If broadcasts from Cairo constitute "aggression," then the Russian charge that Radio Free Europe and the Voice of America are "instruments of aggression" is just as valid.

**Nasser's aim is to unite all the Arab countries into one vast Arab nation. This aim, from an abstraction debated by intellectuals in every Arab capital has been concretized and given a driving political force, specially in the Middle East, by the formation of the United Arab Republic. The actual extent of Nasser's ambitions cannot be known, and in any event are not too important. What is important is that the anti-imperialist yearnings for freedom, self-determination and the dignity of the Arab masses in the Middle East are currently rallied around Nasser and the idea of uniting their countries with the UAR until it embraces the whole of the Middle East at least.**

As socialists and democrats we may have all kinds of doubts, questions and reservations about the political and economic character of Nasser's regime. We might even believe that democrats and socialists in the area would do well to begin right now to seek ways of building up political organizations and economic institutions which could offer resistance to Nasser's authoritarian methods and tendencies. But of one thing we are certain: if resistance to certain aspect of Nasserism are to develop in the Middle East they can only do so as a result of the evolution of social classes and political tendencies in the area, not imposition from outside.

## Evolution of Struggle

As a matter of fact, what is happening in the Middle East is almost a classical example of the evolution of the struggle for independence and self-determination in an under-developed area. As long as the immediate struggle is against the foreign imperialist power, everyone tends to unite in a single, socially and politically undifferentiated movement for the purpose of achieving that goal. That is Nasserism at its present stage. Once independence is won and secured, and only then, do the different social and economic classes begin to contend for their own particular interests inside the new political framework. It is then that the unity of the struggle for independence can give way to a healthy democratic differentiation. (We are talking here only of tendencies and a general formula which does not apply to countries where a developed working class has arrived at political self-consciousness during or before the time the struggle for independence has reached a critical stage.)

**As we have said, we may have all kinds of doubts and reservations about Nasserism. But about one thing we have no doubt at all. Nasserism and its spread are above all the business of the peoples of the Middle East. This movement does not and cannot threaten the peace of the**

**world within the foreseeable future. Hence neither the United States nor any other power has the right to seek to "aright the balance" in the Middle East by force of arms.**

What is true about the political expansion of Pan-Arabism is doubly true about the oil of the Middle East. The United States and Western Europe have no more right to use military force to "secure" for themselves the oil of the Middle East than they do with respect to the bananas of Guatemala or the jute of India. Only when the advanced industrial countries are willing to share their own wealth on an equal basis with the rest of the world will they have the right to demand that the wealth and resources of smaller and weaker nations be "secured" for mutual use. Any demand for United Nations control of the oil of the Middle East will only make sense when it is incorporated in a program for international control, on a voluntary basis, of the oil resources of the whole world. Otherwise, such a demand, is, whether its advocates realize it or not, simply an attempt to impose imperialist controls over the wealth of weak countries under a mask of internationalism.

## The "Wall Street Journal"

Even the *Wall Street Journal*, which reflects the views of high financial circles in the United States, recognized this clearly in a series of brilliant editorials on the Middle East crisis.

**"So far as Middle Eastern oil is concerned," said the Journal on July 21, "the Arabs have little use for it except as a means of revenue. Since the Western world controls both the transportation and marketing of oil, an Arab federation would be foolish not to come to some kind of acceptable terms. Mr. Nasser has the Suez canal and the canal still serves the West. One of the first actions of the Iraqi rebels was to announce that they would honor the oil agreements and that they had posted guards to protect the oil facilities from damage."**

And the same editorial concludes:

**"We are not supposing that it will be easy or simple to accommodate to this new nationalism in the Middle East. We will still be left with great problems. But the alternative seems to be far worse. Unless we intend to create our own little principalities in the Middle East, and be prepared to police them endlessly, we have got to face the reality of Arab nationalism that Mr. Nasser represents."**

The issue could not be stated more simply or bluntly. That is what "arighting the balance" in Iraq and Egypt would mean in practice. It would mean that the United States has embarked on a 19th century-type imperialist course of exercising sovereignty over the Middle East via a combination of direct military force and puppet principalities. But this is not the 19th century. The world pressures on America are far too great to permit this kind of a reversal of time. Since the American government appears to be incapable of conceiving of an alternative policy we have a situation in which "logic has rarely featured our Middle Eastern policy," that is, in which this government blunders around like a drunk in a storm.

## Withdraw the Troops!

Public opinion must be aroused to put an end to this impossible and dangerous situation. An "ignominious defeat" in the Middle East, that is, the withdrawal of American-British troops under the pressure of world public opinion without having achieved any of their objectives would be the least disastrous development we can think of. There has rarely been such deep and widespread questioning of the fundamental premises of American foreign policy as we have witnessed in this country during the last few months. Perhaps a bit of "ignominy," a public humiliation would be the best and cheapest way for the people of the world and particularly of the United States to drive this questioning toward the crystallization of a serious alternative set of premises.

**As this is written, it appears that the United States government is being dragged, kicking and screaming, into some sort of a summit conference. Khrushchev's taunts, the rising storm of opposition by the Labor Party in Britain, the world-wide rejection of American policy even by many governments which have heretofore been closest to the State Department—all this contributes to this outcome. The Russian veto of the Japanese proposal for increasing the function of the United Nations in Lebanon as a way of extracting the United States appears to indicate that the Russians would prefer to keep the US pinned down there while they exploit their world-wide propaganda triumph to the maximum. It is a spectacle, and a lesson which the world will long remember.**

We have been and are for a democratic foreign policy for this country. In this instance, this means: get American troops out of the Middle East. Align the U.S. with the democratic desires of the peoples of the area. Help them to quickly overcome their backwardness by large-scale economic aid. That is the only way to advance rather than retard the development of democracy and progress in that area, and to strengthen the peace of the world.