BACKING ANOTHER DARK HORSE

The Eisenhower doctrine (seems curious) should have a doctrine these days) has backfired once again. This time the trouble is coming out of Lebanon. The U.S. Marines were sent there when the pro-West government of President Camille Chamoun found itself in a difficult situation, as most governments do when they lose support from their population.

However, Chamoun’s plight is minor compared to the U.S. position. The Eisenhower Doctrine commits this country to support any pro-West government in the Middle East as being a “good” government, by force if necessary. This brilliant strategy was formed on the assumption that the only anti-West government would be a pro-Soviet government.

But now the U.S. State Department is faced with the horrible fact that opposition to Chamoun’s government includes not only Nasser supporters but religious groups, personal rivals, various political factions, tribes with strong national feelings, etc. However, much they might disagree with each other on the many issues confronting their small nation, they are opposed to the occupation of their country by the U.S. armed forces.

That they found this common bond in the moment of crisis makes it very difficult for Uncle Sam to decide what to do. If there were an internal affair to be settled by the people of Lebanon themselves, this is it. Trouble is, everyone knows that (except Eisenhower, Dulles, Wall Street and Co.), so here is the U.S. holding a wet paper bag again. One wonders if Uncle Sam is waiting to get that hint so frequently voiced by the exploited of the “underdeveloped” countries: “YANKS GO HOME.”

It was just a small clique of political benchmen headed by President Chamoun of Lebanon whose call for help brought American marines ashore on the beaches near Beirut. Chamoun’s term as President expires Sept. 24 and because the Lebanese constitution forbids a second term, he wanted to amend it so as to succeed himself for another term as President. It was this that sparked the so-called civil war in Lebanon. It was a case of adding “insult to injury” in view of the many grievances the masses were suffering from.

Not only are the masses opposed to Chamoun in the main, but also it was reported that the majority of the parliament of Lebanon was opposed to him, as we gather from the following report:

“Speaker Adel Assasyen, whose past record aligned him with the West, took the drastic step of cab­bing a protest to President Eisen­hower and to the U.N. Security Council. Another pro-Western leader, Emilie Bustani, a member of the foreign affairs committee,”
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Multi-Millionaires in Politics

With the announcement of Nelson Rockefeller, grandson of the founder of the nation’s first oil dynasty, as a candidate for Republican Party nomination for governor of New York State, the voters of the most populous state may have a choice for governor between two multi-millionaires. The incumbent governor of that state, W. Averell Harriman, Democrat, son of a famous railroad tycoon, is expected to run for re-election. Both men are up to their ears in ready cash and it should be a bimillionaire campaign.

It is interesting to note, that of late, there has been a revival of gentlemen-of-means in politics: amongst the Republicans, Herter, Lodge, Saltonstall of Massachusetts and young Freylinghuyzen of New Jersey, while amongst the Democrats, such as G. Mennen Williams, Jack Kennedy, Adlai Stevenson, Joseph S. Clark, William Fulbright and others have been drawn into the political arena.

Some of the founding fathers of the country, who played a prominent role in its formation, such as John Hancock, George Washington and Charles Carroll, were some of the wealthiest men in the colonies. The rich men of the new-founded nation met in secret and drew up the U.S. Constitution. The first president-elect, Washington, was said to be the richest man of the country at that time, according to Charles Beard. For some time thereafter, the aristocracy of wealth took a prominent and direct part in politics.

But with the commencement of the industrial revolution in this nation, about a hundred years ago, the men of wealth, turned their at­tention to the building of business dynasties and left the personal direction of political affairs in the hands of party bosses and machine politics. The machine politics was a reflex of the machine age. The capitalist class were content to have their hirelings running the political machine while they gar­ry gold. And it sure was a golden age for them. The ground­work for the massive fortunes of the Rockefeller and Harrimans was established during that period.

With the turn of the century, particularly since the first World War, the growth of monopoly capi­tal, giant trusts, big business, the relationship between business and politics have become more inter­dependent and interwoven. The direction of political affairs in the twentieth century has become more in­creasingly important to business, particularly to the real big shots. Internally they are faced with ri­valries among themselves calling for delicate arbitration in the in­terest of capitalist class unity. Further, the antagonism between big and large businesses made its resolution a perennial political problem. And, lastly, how to fool and exploit the mass of people, the working class, and make it politically palatable requires political acumen.

On top of all the above internal political problems, the big wheels of industry and politics are face to face with continuous dangerous inter­national problems. How to re­concile the rivalry and conflicting (Continued on page 2)
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Every few years there take place investigations in Washington, D.C. which suggest scandal and cause political embarrassment to the existing administration. Under Harding in the 20’s it was the Tea­pot Dome scandal; under Truman it was the General Vaughn affair; and now under Eisenhower it is the Sherman Adams case.

The dirt unearthed is designed specifically for political reasons, with an eye to the coming elections. Such exposures are calculated to weaken the political and moral standing of the party that’s in. Out of which the opposition hopes and stands to cash in. Need­less to add neither the Democratic or Republican party is free from scoundrelous episodes. Both are full of them, known and mostly unknown.

In this writing we are not in­terested so much in the Sherman Adams case per se, its many de­tails, pro and con, its moral aspect. That is a separate and contradic­tory treatment which is amply re­quired elsewhere, to wit, the capitalist press for those who want to follow it.

An even more important matter is to discuss and try to understand the basis for this contradictory moral aspect, or the ethics of the matter. Our starting point, there­fore, is morality in general, the stuff it is made of.

What is moral or immoral is very much debatable. There prev­ails little unanimity and much difference. What some consider right and just, others consider wrong and unjust.

Different nations have varying concepts and standards of moral­ity, depending upon their state of social development and gradation. For instance, in modern so-called western civilized nations (capitalist), such as the U.S., Britain, Ger­many, France, etc., there is an a moral standard that more or less coincides. In another category we might place the peoples of the Near East with a differing stand­ard. In the third category there are peoples, say in Africa and other remote parts of the world who are completely backward, and who still lack back to a primitive, non-civilized way of life. Their morals are equally primitive, vast­ly different from ours. Then there are the new nations of socialism with a brand new way of life and morality. Again, even within the ration, wherever there is private property and class composition, there exists a dual standard, (even though not formally recognized) one for the rich and another for the poor.

How do we explain these differ­ences and variations? Some will contend, the others are all wrong and we are right. The proponents of western civilization (capitalist) will assert, “we represent the highest form of ethics desirable and possible, to which the rest have yet to evolve, because of their
The image contains a document featuring text discussing political and philosophical themes, including matters of morality and class. The text appears to be an excerpt from a larger work, potentially a historical or political analysis. The document discusses the nature of morality, the role of materialism in shaping human behavior, and the dynamics of class conflict and economic systems. The text also touches on religious and ethical frameworks as they relate to politics and society.

From the text:

"MORALITY AND ITS BASIS
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When workers toil, they are not only their Republican "leaders" but also their Democratic "leaders" (Senators and Representatives) who supported the Eisenhowers' call for troops." (Chicago Sun-Times, July 18)

It is becoming ever more evident that Eisenhower's backing of such a "dark horse" as Chamoun was a political gamble that is not paying off as well as the Battle in the Lebanese parliamentary opposition, which could result in them picking a "successor" for President other than Chamoun, it would put the Eisenhower administration on the proverbial spot, that is, in a position of ridicule throughout the world.

Thus the United States would become the laughing stock among all the nations, a most unenviable position indeed! And for this, the American citizens could "thank" not only their Republican "leaders" but also their Democratic "leaders" (Senators and Representatives) who supported the Eisenhower's call for troops.

Opposition to the U.S. intervention in Lebanon was voiced by a number of other members of the United Nations, who could not be considered "pro-Soviet."

In the House of Commons opposition to Macmillan's intervention in Jordan (another backing of a "dark horse," King Feisal) was developed, with 251 members, mainly laborers, voting against 314 conservative members who supported Macmillan. L.D.
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national material interests of the world capitalist powers would tax the wisdom of a Solomon, let alone a Dulles. Such capitalist rivalry has led to two World Wars within memory of adults. It also helped to spark the uprising of Russian, Chinese and other workers to expel the "leaders" of their own country and establish their own rule and order. In each case the dominant and of­ other institutions by changes in the moral and social conditions, the material conditions of life, produced by progress in the economic field is what constitutes human or social evolution. Where the production arts are pri­ materialist is the view that to existing and practiced than among the God-fearing and loving capitalist businessmen.

Materialism in its scientific and philosophical sense simply means this:—that the material world and all its phenomena is the all-exist­ ing and fundamental reality. It is the only thing there is; everything, including man and his ideas. From this standpoint, matter is primary, and mind and morals, secondary. All human and social phenomena, with a worldly origin, are a reflection of the every-changing worldly pro­ cess Matter is in constant flux, so is every aspect of a society changing, ever reflecting it. It is all a never ending evolutionary process.

It can reasonably be stated that morals or ethics are a HUMAN matter, a social institution. Inani­ mate matter certainly possesses none. But even in the animate kingdom, say among the animal-students of types of animals, dogs, elephants, monkeys, there is little indication that they have the degree of social organization that we have with a conscience. To be sure they have consciousness, but even that in a low stage of development nowhere nearly approximating the human. This makes the animal moral and human consciousness a is a QUALITATIVE one. With the former, consciousness or thinking is impulsive; the latter (human) is capable of reflecting, generalizing, formulating theories, inventing tools etc. Conscience is the faculty of thinking, of ideas. Conscience has to do with a PARTICULAR kind of the human and animal. What might be called a moral attitude, a reason­ing of what is right and wrong, good and evil.

When it is said, that so-and-so has conscience, or a good conscience, it is meant that that person has a definite sense, a conviction of right and wrong.

Morality, as a human institution in the class society of the ancien­ tions, economic, political, philos­ ophy, art, science. It varies and changes with the times and social conditions. It is determined as all other institutions by changes in the material conditions of life. It is determined largely by material need, individual as well as a group.

Naturally, individual need at times dictated an action contrary to the welfare of the group, be it a primitive tribe or the modern state or nation. In that event his (the cap­ nals have a job on their hands to teach and train the workers to understand the material world and their capitalist morals."

The economic base, the mode of production and appropriation, is the foundation and determines the entire social organiza­ tion, religion, art and morality are correspondingly primitive. The higher up we go, the more advanced the production technique, the more nearly it approximates and resembles modern capitalist institutions and ethics.

The economic base, the mode of production and appropriation, is where we seek and find the ex­ planation for the morals and the contradictions between them. It is clear that the answer to the conflicting concept of the feudal nobility with its "divine Right and property and the former, its property interest.

The economic base, the mode of production and appropriation, is the material condition of life, produced by progress in the economic field is what constitutes human or social evolution. Where the production arts are pri­ materialist is the view that to existing and practiced than among the God-fearing and loving capitalist businessmen.

Materialism in its scientific and philosophical sense simply means this:—that the material world and all its phenomena is the all-exist­ ing and fundamental reality. It is the only thing there is; everything, including man and his ideas. From this standpoint, matter is primary, and mind and morals, secondary. All human and social phenomena, with a worldly origin, are a reflection of the every-changing worldly process Matter is in constant flux, so is every aspect of a society changing, ever reflecting it. It is all a never ending evolutionary process.

It can reasonably be stated that morals or ethics are a HUMAN matter, a social institution. Inani­ mate matter certainly possesses none. But even in the animate kingdom, say among the animal-students of types of animals, dogs, elephants, monkeys, there is little indication that they have the degree of social organization that we have with a conscience. To be sure they have consciousness, but even that in a low stage of development nowhere nearly approximating the human. This makes the animal moral and human consciousness a is a QUALITATIVE one. With the former, consciousness or thinking is impulsive; the latter (human) is capable of reflecting, generalizing, formulating theories, inventing tools etc. Conscience is the faculty of thinking, of ideas. Conscience has to do with a PARTICULAR kind of the human and animal. What might be called a moral attitude, a reason­ing of what is right and wrong, good and evil.

When it is said, that so-and-so has conscience, or a good conscience, it is meant that that person has a definite sense, a conviction of right and wrong.

Morality, as a human institution in the class society of the ancien­ tions, economic, political, philos­ ophy, art, science. It varies and changes with the times and social conditions. It is determined as all other institutions by changes in the material conditions of life. It is determined largely by material need, individual as well as a group.

Naturally, individual need at times dictated an action contrary to the welfare of the group, be it a primitive tribe or the modern state or nation. In that event his (the cap­
in the Chicago Daily News (July 19) entitled "We're Again Risking War for Unattainable Goals," and in an angry retort declared as follows: "The presence of British troops in Jordan reinforces this worry that while we may profess to the noblest of intentions about preserving the independence and integrity of pro-Western nations in the Middle East, we really mean to protect the oil fields for the West." Mr. Kennedy at last will have returned important questions towards the conclusion of his editorial, to wit: "Even in the event that we are able to avoid war, will anything have been settled permanently by our intervention?" "Will the presence of American and British troops in the Middle East diminish the growing nationalistic tendencies abroad that retard the ambitions of the Arab world?"

Mr. Kennedy declared that the answers to these questions are "fairly obvious" to him, but "are not the conclusions being reached by the present leaders of our two major political parties."

He deplores the policy of the past, that of buying "friends in the Middle East with our oil" (as Mr. Dulles) and 

"for a "failure," and this was "indicated by the violent revolution in Iraq—a country helped substantially by the United States and Great Britain and considered a powerful friend of the West."

Mr. Kennedy ends his editorial with these ominous words: "Having embarked upon another perilous adventure, Mr. Eisenhower will need all of his fabulous luck to pull us through with a whole skin."

The Tax Burden

The fear of another world war is not the only reason why Mr. Kennedy is opposed to the U.S. armed intervention in the Middle East. There is the tax burden which is bound to become heavier the more involved that the U.S. becomes in Eisenhower's "perilous adventure."

Mr. Kennedy would have to pay his share of the increased taxes to the government, without any recompense to him. It so happens he has no investments abroad that need "protection" such as Standard Oil's, Mr. Kennedy's "business holdings," mainly in publishing, and within the United States, at "home." So it's natural for him to criticize and condemn Eisenhower's (that is, Wall Street's) policy toward the Middle-East. Mr. Kennedy in the same section of his editorial to the capitalists that have been more or less lumped together under the term of "isolationists."

Nevertheless, many workers would be inclined to sympathize with Mr. Kennedy on the score of increased taxes, even though "Ike's Mid-East Police Action" might result in a return of prosperity. But there is even less recompense for them than for Mr. Kennedy.

Workers do not own any "businesses," either at home or abroad. In fact, they do not even have their "jobs," with which they do not get any "protection" at all from the government; as the unemployed can testify, who at present number well over 3 million workers. Even during the period of the post-war prosperity (the 1940's and '50's) the workers had steady jobs in the main. But when slack times came, as in the present business recession, many of them were laid off. Neither the government nor the armament industry could prevent unemployment, such being the nature of the "free-enterprise system," capitalism.

This is something that Mr. Eisenhower failed to tell the U.S. Marines when he said they have been sent "to preserve" for the Lebanese the "same freedoms that we have here at home."

What kind of "freedoms" do we have "at home?" They are as follows: Freedom for the capitalists to profit through the exploitation of wage-labor. Freedom for the capitalist employers to hire whom they please, and fire the workers when they have already used them up and can no longer "make a profit" from them. As we can see, it is actually capitalist freedom.

As for the workers, it was summed up by one labor job: "I am a free American explo- laborer, that is, free of much if not all, and I get another one soon, and exhaust my un-employment compensation, I will be free to starve."

Cause of Arab Revolts

What is the actual cause of the revolts that occurred in Lebanon and in Iraq? Is rebellion an inherent characteristic of the Arab people, as some would imply? Let us answer that question. Rebellion is no more, or less, inherent in the Arabs than it is in any other people, including the American. The real cause of the revolts there is mainly economic and political. As a matter of fact, for centuries the so-called "Great Powers" have been interested in the causes for many centuries to exploitation by foreign powers and native exploiters. This is the "fuel" that feeds the revolts, including the "aggressive nationalism" of the Lebanese and Nasser of Egypt. The masses are stirring and the native rulers must do something.

British, French and American imperial cap- italists, in their greed for profit, had monopolized the main resources of the Middle East, particularly oil. And having geared European industry to the use of this oil, they are now in the sorry plight of coming to terms (less "protection") than they did in the past with this "aggressive nationalism" of the African countries.

The British and French imperialists had al- ready experienced severe "losses"; to cite one of the latest, that of the Suez Canal, taken over by Egypt. They still feel angry, not only at the Egyptians but also at the U. S. for having vetoed their attempt (invasion) to retrieve that loss.

Now the British and French are ironi- cally gleeful, at seeing their ally, the U. S., attempt- ing the same in the case of Lebanon, the Im- perialist’s holding which stands in danger of being liquidated like that of his cousin, King Farisal, in Iraq.

American interests, such as Standard Oil of New Jersey, have already millions of dollars worth of investments in oil fields and refineries in the Middle East (in Iraq, Saudi-Arabia, etc.). This fact has been given quite a bit of pub- licity in the press recently, possibly because there is no need to suppress or conceal it. Furthermore, "foreign invest- ments" are an accepted "business way of life."

But to foster the pretense that the U. S. Marines went "to preserve their freedoms" was too much for some of the American journalists and editors to stomach.

One of them, John S. Kennedy, in his editorial August 1958
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ike's Mid-East Police Action

Not so long ago President Eisenhower was proclaimed by his admirers as being the great leader who brought peace to the nation by ending the Korean War. For this, they said, he would be remembered in history. But times have changed since then, and some say, the man also. This time, by ordering direct intervention, that is, the sending of an armed force into Lebanon (the U.S. Marines on July 15th), Eisenhower may go down in history as the President who started a bigger war than his predecessor, Truman. Already the armed intervention is being called "Ike's Ed-Eisenhower,

It is remarkable how quickly President Eisenhower carried out the orders of Wall Street, for, in effect, that's what it amounts to. He not only listened to Wall Street but, dictatorially, the U.S. Congress itself. There was no vote at all taken on the issue.

It was reported in the press that only twenty-nine (29) of President Eisenhower's 43 Representatives called to the White House to hear the President announce his decision to intervene by force. When one of them posed the question whether the U.S. might become involved in an authentic civil war in Lebanon, Eisenhower was reported to have replied impatiently that the revolts were "Moscow inspired." When two of the Democratic Senators questioned whether the Eisenhower Doctrine was applicable, Dulles was reported to have retorted that "international communism had inspired the revolt in Lebanon."

In spite of the smell of oil about the whole issue, it was apparent that the Senators and Representatives swallowed the glib tales about the "communist bogeyman" dashed out to them by their Wall Street masters. But it is not so easy to be wondered; it's a steady diet they have been fed with right along, and for that matter, so has the whole nation.

Eisenhower also broadcast similar tales to the American people in Lebanon. He said to the thousands of marines stationed there: "You are helping the Lebanese to remain free. You are there at their invitation—as friends—to preserve for them the same freedoms that we have here at home." (It is not known whether any of the marines replied that they had heard that one before.

Oil Policies

Encouraged by the American armed inter- vention in Lebanon, the British, by now much alarmed over possible loss of their oil interests, sent their troops to Jordan to prop up the tottering government of the United Nations, which stood in danger of being liquidated like that of his cousin, King Farisal, in Iraq.

American interests, such as Standard Oil of New Jersey, have already millions of dollars worth of investments in oil fields and refineries in the Middle East (in Iraq, Saudi-Arabia, etc.). This fact has been given quite a bit of publicity in the press recently, possibly because there is no need to suppress or conceal it. Furthermore, "foreign investments" are an accepted "business way of life."

But to foster the pretense that the U. S. Marines went "to preserve their freedoms" was too much for some of the American journalists and editors to stomach.

One of them, John S. Kennedy, in his editorial
IMPRUDENT WASHINGTON D.C.

Sherman Adams, Presidential assistant, said to be the second most powerful man in Washington next to the President himself, who exercises Presidential powers, particularly since Eisenhower's illness, warned before a Congressional Committee, investigating the handicapping Bernard Goldfine, a textile tycoon. The prudent President Eisenhower, whose support Adams is expected to be as "clean as a hound's tooth," who has in the past threatened to throw out any officeholder guilty of unethical practices, also admitted the "imprudence" of Adams, but said: "I need him."

When the Democrats were in control in Washington, immoderately sporting around in mint coats and such, they were charged with corruption by the Republicans. Now the tables have turned, as the Republicans sport their vicious coats, with the Democrats shouting corruption against their political adversary. When the Republicans were in power, they caught with the "goods" they admit "imprudence," not corruption, nothing like that! When their political twin-brother, the Democrats, are caught in the act, then it is sure to be corruption, in their eyes. The same is true about the Democrats. They may admit from time to time acts of imitation, never, however, corruption practices. The fact of the matter is: that political corruption is the accepted thing, not at all shocking to the American people, nor is it a capital offense. It can be found to be untouchable, "a square," that would be shocking to the man on the street.

The bizarre antics in the investigation of the Adams-Goldfine affair, such as stolen papers and hidden microphones, may side-track some viewers; however, the disclosures already reveal valuable lessons, to wit:

1. The relation between business and government is close. The government in Washington was founded by the PROPERTY OWNING CLASS of the nation. The powerful merchant class of the colonial period were succeeded by their descendants in 1917, the banking institution of last century, who were in turn succeeded by the banking capitalists of this era. But they are all of the same privileged element, different sections, but capitalist to the core. These were organized and have control of the affairs of government ever since. The institution and officeholders of government are essentially the instrument and servant of the dominant class in the country—under capitalism—

A LOOK AROUND

BRITAIN'S CYPRUS PROBLEM: If the British have their way the Greeks and Turks on the island of Cyprus are going to join in a "partnership" with their benevolent Colonial rulers whether they like it or not.

Greek Prime Minister Constantine Karamanlis said, in rejecting the British offer of a "partnership," that he would like to see a republic in Turkey. Shoring up of sovereignty of the crown colony with Greece and Turkey after seven years of joint administration apparently left the Greek and Turks cold and unhappy. However, the British let it be known they intend to go ahead with the plans anyway as the only means of preventing "dreadful catastrophe." Sir Hugh Foot, governor of the crown colony said British would not be deterred by the Greek threat opposition to the "temporary setback." Seems to us the above statement spells "dreadful catastrophe" anyway you look at it—least for British rule. GERMANY: D WORK DUTY: A flicker of hope appeared in the press recently when it was reported the 339th Field Artillery Veterans Association of World War I adopted a the rich capitalist class.

That there is an intimate relationship between Goldfine and racketeers as a class is moral. If it clashes with the official capitalist morality, it is not of their own choosing. This morality stems from the class and economic situation in society and inherent in it.

We will say with Engels that "A really human morality standing for international solidarity between the memory thereof, will first be possible in a stage of society in which class antagonisms have been surmounted and, in practical life, also forgotten."—(Anti-Duhring, page 94)

R. Daniela