

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

From Italy: Rejoinder to Silone

... page 6

Raymond Aron vs. Rosa Luxemburg

... page 7

An Ice Idea by Admiral Byrd

... page 3

Hoffa Becomes a Labor Statesman

... page 8

FEBRUARY 27, 1956

FIVE CENTS

It's Stalin's Turn At the Guillotine

By GORDON HASKELL

The twentieth congress of the Stalinist party of Russia is still in session as LABOR ACTION goes to press. It is far too early to attempt a serious analysis of what this congress reveals about the policy adopted by the top circles of the ruling bureaucratic class, let alone the much more episodic and hence elusive question of what this congress may mean with regard to relations inside these circles.

The lack of full information available will, we are sure, serve as a very feeble restraining influence on all manner of "experts" and pundits in the field who are already filling the daily and weekly press with definitive analysis of what the congress "means" as well as sure-fire reports on exactly who is doing what with which and to whom inside the Kremlin clique.

That every leading Stalinist, without exception, is today unanimously and enthusiastically for collective leadership and against the "distortions" and "arbitrariness" of the "cult of the individual" which prevailed for the past twenty years is clear. There is not a single man to rise today to say a good word for the "guiding genius of our party, the great Stalin," just as there was not a single man from among this assembly to say a word against him and his rule as long as he was alive.

In one sense, the servility with which they all stand ready to denounce Stalin (or to listen to denunciation of him and his works without a tremor) is more disgusting than the servility with which they used to applaud him.

For at least in those days they might have claimed in their own defense that, since there was arbitrary individual rule, to fail to applaud might cost a man his skin. But in this day of "collective" leadership, party "democracy," "sanity" and "legality"—as they say—isn't there one

man, just one, among the close colleagues and associates of the hangman of the Russian Revolution who could rise and say, "Well, the old villain may have carried things too far, but we should not forget that those were hard times, and a stern hand at the tiller was needed..."

Let those who would proclaim this "new era" of democracy ponder that, at least for a moment.

That with the present nets many fish will be caught cannot be doubted. The flourishing of Deutscherism and pro-Stalinism in all its varieties can be confidently predicted. If the present trend is continued, all kinds of political mushheads will arise to insist that if the dead dictator is denounced, that must mean dictatorship is on its way out.

(Continued on page 7)

IUE Wins Compensation For Westinghouse Strikers

By JOHN WILLIAMS

The decision of the Pennsylvania Department of Labor and Industry, granting unemployment compensation to Westinghouse strikers because of a "lockout," was an important victory for the International Union of Electrical Workers (IUE).

It made Pennsylvania Westinghouse workers eligible for approximately eight weeks of unemployment compensation at a maximum of \$35. The state department ruled that the strike had become a lockout, and under Pennsylvania law that is the only circumstance which makes workers on strike eligible for such pay.

The decision undoubtedly was the result of pressure put on Democratic Governor Leader by the IUE. It might be added that this "friend of labor," whose election was determined by workers' votes, took five months before coming across with some help, and that he did so only after Westinghouse showed such arrogance in turning down his own arbitration proposals.

In New York, Westinghouse workers are also collecting unemployment pay. In that state, the lockout basis is not required; compensation is collected after a waiting period.

In New Jersey, where 11,000 Westinghouse workers reside, no unemployment pay is permissible, nor are there any real attempts being made by that "friend of labor" Governor Meyner. This great Democratic Party liberal—who can be so outspoken against racketeers and on other safe issues—is very quiet indeed about pushing for at least a lockout clause in the New Jersey unemployment law, one similar to Pennsylvania's, not to speak of unemployment compensation

Tanks-to-Arabs Deal Bares U.S. Duplicity in Middle East

By HAL DRAPER

Last week the U. S. State Department was caught in the act of secretly shipping tanks and other war material to Saudi Arabia, at the same time that it has been sanctimoniously condemning Russia for inflaming the Middle East crisis by selling war goods to Egypt, and indignantly telling Israel that it had to hold up any decision on selling it the planes it requested.

A comparison of dates further revealed that the deal with Saudi Arabia had been made soon after the to-do over the Egypt-Moscow deal, or (if we go by another version put out by Washington) not long before this deal. It hardly matters in either case.

In fact, in spite of the understandable nation-wide gasp of astonishment and indignation at the naked hypocrisy which the government revealed, it did not require this incident to unmask the unctuous pretenses of our moralists from Foggy Bottom. Soon after the disclosure of the Egyptian arms deal with Russia, Secretary of State Dulles had openly and publicly proposed that Egypt buy its arms from the U. S. instead; everything would be all right, he indicated, if the arms to kill Israelis came from good democratic sources rather than from bad totalitarian factories.

Naturally, this self-revelation was a piece of diplomatic idiocy, and Dulles withdrew it in order to clear the road for the moralistic propaganda and press editorials about how it is the wicked Russians who are putting the match to the Middle East tinderbox, etc.

Certainly now, not a figleaf remains on Washington policy in this area, which is of a piece with its reactionary imperialist policy everywhere else in the world—no special case.

In case it has to be recalled to readers, it must be borne in mind that the leaders of Saudi Arabia are as committed as the dictators of Egypt to an official position looking to aggressive war against Israel. (See LA for last Nov. 14 for quotations from its ruler.)

DEAD-END LINE

The incident vividly points up also the futility of what has been one Israeli government (and Zionist) response to the situation—that is, aside from its provocative policy of "massive retaliation" as in the notorious raid on Syria. As we wrote last November:

"In their demand for a 'security pact' with the U. S., the Israelis think to purchase a precarious safety by tucking themselves under the wing of the big world overlord, the U. S., and, from this 'secure' perch, thumbing their nose at the local hoodlums—'Just dare to touch me, and I'll call my Big Brother on you...'

"Thus the Israelis only turn themselves into another pawn in the big game going on, without even the slightest insurance that at some propitious moment they will not be traded off with complete cynicism for some castle or king."

Propitious moment? This is hardly a propitious moment—what with a presidential election coming up, for example—but still the State Department has not been behind schedule in flaunting its complete cynicism.

The affair highlights the disastrous consequences for Israel of relying on "security pacts" with one side of the imperialist cold war in the world; of relying on military power-politics (its own or the more massive Washington type) instead of a progressive political approach to win the Arab peoples against their own rulers.

For decades Zionist policy in Palestine worked to subordinate itself to some big

(Continued on page 4)

Beware, Expert at Work

Reporting a Pravda article rehabilitating the name of Bela Kun—the man who ran the Hungarian Soviet Republic into the ground, and who became a staunch Stalinist supporter, only to be liquidated by Stalin along with other henchmen in the '30s—the Times added an authoritative bit of interpretation by its leading ignoramus Harrison Salisbury.

Kun, says Salisbury, was "linked with Trotsky." Because when he was shot, it was "as an agent of Leon Trotsky" (like everybody else in the Moscow Trials and the great purges).

Of two others who are being rehabilitated, "in their younger days both were linked with Trotsky"—i.e., he explains, in the revolution (like every other old Bolshevik).

From this "inside" dope comes the winged conclusion: "This link strengthens the suspicion that the anathema pronounced on Trotsky's name by Stalin may be lifted by Stalin's heirs, at least as regards the early revolutionary and immediate post-revolutionary years."

This crude piece of stupidity and political illiteracy by Salisbury can stand as a model of the type of mushheadedness briefly discussed in the accompanying article.

PROFITS OF RISK

Profits, we have been told, are a reward for risk. We find it puzzling, then, to find General Motors, U. S. Steel and others on top of the profit ledger while mine workers are not listed at all.

They take a risk that should be worth a pretty profit. In 1955, 413 coal miners were killed in industrial accidents, topping the 1954 figure of 395 by 18. Others were injured: 19,710.

Yet, profits are indeed a reward for risk: mine owners are rewarded handsomely for the risk taken by more than 20,000 killed and maimed coal diggers.

Westinghouse Fight Is the 'First Automation Strike'

By BEN HALL

Westinghouse has been on strike for four months. At last a faint glimmer of the decisive importance of "time-study" penetrates the daily press.

In resisting the right of the company to time-study production workers and decree how fast and how hard they shall work, the union (IUE) has begun the first effective fight against speed-up in mass production industries, a fight evaded by other unions in manufacturing.

Even now, the labor press seems oblivious to its critical importance. On February 11, the *AFL-CIO News*, official weekly, manages to spread the Westinghouse strike over its front page without once mentioning the time-study demand, even in passing.

But Stanley Levey, in the *New York Times* on February 19, at least brushes across the dispute in its full meaning. "Because of the time-study issue," he reports, "some economists have called the Westinghouse stoppage the first automation strike." Here falls a shadow of the future: for all mass-production unions are faced with the introduction of automation.

And they will have to meet it. As Levey explains, after time-study was momentarily set aside, "Tabled or not, the time-study is still the key issue in the strike and it may become the key issue in other labor-management negotiations."

Discussions of speed-up at UAW conventions, for example, are always on the agenda, are always settled to no one's satisfaction, only to rise again and again. If the Westinghouse workers defeat the company, speed-up comes up for action in a new context.

SWORD IN SHEATH

For the first time since the wartime coal strikes, union solidarity is being tested on a national scale under conditions of combat. The united labor movement has already poured over two million dollars into strike aid for Westinghouse workers.

This is big money; it staves off desperate need and keeps morale high. But huge as it is, it is only a supplement.

No financial contributions can possibly replace what the strikers lose in pay. If 50,000 strikers were each taking home \$70 per week they have lost \$3,500,000 a week in a strike that has lasted 18 weeks.

What spurs them on is a deep union-consciousness; a realization that workers must hold together against their boss to maintain human dignity. And this they do, in the face of scab-herding, injunctions against picketing, arrests.

It was in the strike wave of 1945-6 that the basic union-consciousness of the American working class, in its organized majority, was displayed for the first time. The big strikes were all "cold" battles of endurance. The factory gates were shut; small token picket groups huddled about fires; the companies made no effort to reopen; no scabs; no fights. Sometimes they even forgot to picket, but the unions won by sheer, almost impassive, class solidarity.

Since then, there has been no end of talk about class harmony and community of interests between worker and employer. Just a few weeks ago, a United Steelworkers local and the Great Lakes Steel Company in Ecorse, Mich., signed a solemn joint "Declaration of Principles" pledging to settle their little frictions by friendly agreement.

But behind it all, lies the pervasive union solidarity of the working class, its consciousness of the need for its own class organization and its readiness to fight.

In the face of this national experiment at union-smashing, Westinghouse strikers remind us that in the sheath sets a sword.

IUE Rejects Co.'s Tricky Maneuvers

By GERRY McDERMOTT

Pittsburgh, Feb. 20

Westinghouse strikers in Pennsylvania received an unexpected shot in the arm when the state government this week declared that Westinghouse was guilty of a lock-out and that strikers were eligible for unemployment compensation. Over half of the strikers live in Pennsylvania.

Under the state ruling, strikers are eligible for compensation dating back to the middle of last December.

Actually, the strikers have not yet received any money, and perhaps never will. The company has appealed the ruling to the courts and will fight it bitterly. But at any rate, the ruling was a psychological lift.

This is the latest development in the complex and bitter strike. Other aspects of the picture shape up as follows as this is written:

(1) Before the lock-out ruling, Westinghouse had turned down the offer of fact-finding to be carried out by an impartial staff selected by the governors of Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, and West Virginia.

(2) Westinghouse has offered a very tricky counter-proposal loaded against the union in every way. They will let the fact-finders appointed by the governor arbitrate one thing only: how many fired strikers are to be reinstated. Obviously the company can't lose on this.

On the time-study question, they still agree to postpone the issue 90 days. They are willing to have fact-finding on only one issue: whether or not their package offer is the same as GE's. If it is not, they will match GE's—if the union will accept a five-year contract.

The catch is that it would mean nothing even if Westinghouse offered more than GE—if the speed-up issue isn't solved. Unless the speed-up issue is solved, the company can take back most of its raise through rate-cutting.

MISTAKE

It is apparent now that the union made a mistake in agreeing several weeks ago to postpone consideration of the time-study issue for 90 days. The union apparently interpreted Westinghouse's offer on this matter as a sign that the company was getting ready to settle. It wasn't.

Strikebreaking activity has been stepped up. More strikers have been fired. A company union, the "Westinghouse Electric Workers," is now openly gathering signatures for a decertification election.

On the whole, however, the ranks remain steady. About a third of the strikers have found other employment, and many of them have some other member of the family at work. Strike aid is run efficiently.

The fact that most Westinghouse employees have high seniority is an advantage to the union; it means that by and large, the present employees have been working regularly for a long time and are better able to withstand a long strike. Strikers' children are usually old enough so that wives can work during the emergency.

It is interesting to speculate on why Governor Leader of Pennsylvania has decided to give the strikers unemployment compensation. It is certainly more help than can usually be expected from "friends of labor" in office. The state government has stated loftily that giving compensation is no more a sign of partiality to the strikers than is denial of compensation a sign of partiality to employers; it is humanitarian considerations that decide.

It so happens that the governor is currently involved in a bitter fight with big business in the state over a tax program. The leader administration is the first Democratic administration in the state in twenty years, and its whole program has been sabotaged by big-business lobbyists almost beyond recognition. The state government is in such a mess that some school districts have been unable to pay their school teachers for months, due to lack of funds.

In part, the governor's latest move may be explained as a way of striking back at the big industrialists who pull the strings in the senate.

Beck-Hoffa War Hung Up in N. Y.

In New York, a fight for control of the Teamsters Joint Council, representing 125,000 truck drivers, is stalemated. The local outbreak is part of a far more significant struggle for control of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters between President Dave Beck and Vice-President James Hoffa.

No one in the top leadership of the Teamsters has moved a finger to rid it of racketeer infestation; but while Hoffa has been publicly charged with direct links to active racketeers, Beck has been accused of tolerating Hoffa, with whose support he was elected union president. In the fight between them, honest men may come into their own.

The Hoffa-supported candidate for president of the Teamsters Joint Council is John T. O'Rourke, president of Local 282. O'Rourke was the key Teamster official who rallied to the support of the ILA gangs in the fight for control over the New York waterfront. He spoke at their mass meetings and urged workers to vote against the AFL in NLRB elections.

Dave Beck supports the incumbent Martin T. Lacey in a fight to prevent Hoffa from extending his influence on the East Coast. Significantly, Lacey is supported by Thomas L. Hickey, leader of Local 807. Hickey was a key man in the fight against the ILA and an enemy

of underworld infestation of the Teamsters.

The outcome will decide whether racketeering gets a stronger hold in the New York labor movement. So far, Lacey has received 192 votes and O'Rourke 181. But 42 votes have been impounded and thereby hangs the tale.

These 42 votes were cast by six paper locals, newly chartered by the Teamster national office over the protest of the Joint Council. These locals are all pro-O'Rourke, locals that were formerly affiliated to the old AFL so-called "United Auto Workers" union (not the CIO), a union which took in anything except auto workers.

By now, the AFL-CIO Committee on Ethical Practices has decided to investigate the pseudo-auto union for corruption; its manipulation of welfare funds, a favorite racketeering amusement, has become public knowledge. Hoffa and O'Rourke, who hug the ILA, have given hasty refuge to these fragments of the outfit. And these in turn hold the balance of power in voting on the Teamsters Joint Council.

The Committee on Ethical Practices may begin with an investigation of a two-bit outfit, easily disposed of. But if it persists it will hit up against a powerful machine in the Teamsters Union. And if it takes the fight for honest unionism seriously, it must persist.

LABOR SCOPE

Teamsters Jailed... Miami Rally... Versatile Reporter

By BEN HALL

On December 10, 1955, *District Fifty News*, published by the United Mine Workers, reported its experience with a group of Teamster racketeers in Minneapolis.

District Fifty, Local 12106, had called a strike in 1953 against a linseed oil plant of the Archer, Daniels, Midland Co. What happened to the strike was revealed on November 22, when a jury in federal court convicted four Teamster Union Officials and a company vice-president of bribery. James W. Moore, the vice-president, paid \$5,000 to the four convicted Teamster officials to break the strike.

The four: Sidney L. Brennan; Eugene Williams; Jack Jorgenson; and Gerald Connelly.

MIAMI RALLY

Hotel workers have been on strike in Miami for ten months. Last month, the local Central Labor Union protested against the televising of the Steve Allen show from the struck Saxony Hotel. Hotel owners went to court and succeeded in having the CLU and its 75,000 members cited for contempt on the grounds that their actions violated an injunction against advertising the strike.

The reply of the labor movement was impressive. On February 9, a huge mass

meeting of 10,000 unionists assembled at Bay Front Park, the first of its kind in Florida labor history. George Meany and Walter Reuther were featured speakers, emphasizing the fact that this strike receives the active support of the new federation.

VERSATILE REPORTER

Speaking of strikes and such, what happened to A. H. Raskin? The last we heard he was labor editor of the *New York Times*. Has he had a new assignment foisted upon him?

Seems he now writes about vacations and amusements. Like the full-column *Times* article on February 19 headed "Miami Beach Sets Its Summer Lures."

"This bustling winter resort is making preparations for its busiest season," he writes. There are cool breezes; honey-mooners and college students take trips; hotels are resplendent; facilities are lush; rates are cut... he tells all about it. It sounds great and we were restrained from rushing down to enjoy some of America's finest fresh-water fishing only upon recalling the strike. Raskin had forgotten to mention this "bustling" activity.

Very lax reporting. Someone, perhaps the advertising manager, ought to inform the labor editor of the *Times* that there is a strike on.

PHILLY FORUM HEARS TALK ON UNION POLITICS

By FRANK HARPER

Phila., Feb. 12

A Labor Action Forum discussed the subject "United Labor and the '56 Elections." The discussion was led by Joseph Arnold in the absence of the scheduled speaker, Max Shachtman. Comrade Shachtman, who was confined to sickbed, sent his regrets to the audience. The national chairman of the Independent Socialist League will be the speaker at another Philadelphia LA Forum in April.

Arnold centered his remarks on the relationship of the new AFL-CIO to the Democratic Party. Rarely in U. S. history has there been a political party so full of contradictions as the Democrats. It is an organization of big business, little business, and of the labor movement. It is a party of the most advanced of the unions and the most reactionary of Southern lapholders. This is the party from which labor in 1956 will in all probability seek to gain promises and concessions.

The speaker speculated that the unions, despite their 15,000,000 members, will be able to get little. Nevertheless there is little likelihood that in 1956 the

AFL-CIO will become politically conscious enough to form a political party of its own, a labor party. Rather the speaker foresaw a number of struggles for control in the Democratic Party between labor and the machine elements.

The united labor movement, which is making an honest effort to sweep its own house clean of racial discrimination, finds itself aligned politically with the foremost proponents of racism in the South. Will labor dare to support a presidential candidate who does not stand firmly for implementation of the Supreme Court orders for integration? On the other hand will any candidate of the Democratic Party dare to antagonize and alienate the Southern wing of the party? In a year when such questions are so sharply posed, socialists can play a very constructive role in giving these struggles a social content and urging labor to run its own candidates and to form a labor party.

The audience participated in a lively question and discussion period. A very welcome announcement was made of a local Young Socialist League organizational drive. The ISL pledged its full support to the efforts of this sister socialist organization.

SUBSCRIBERS—ATTENTION!

Check your NAME—ADDRESS—CITY—ZONE—STATE appearing on the wrapper.

If there are any mistakes or if anything is left out, especially the ZONE NUMBER, cut out your name and address and mail it to us with the corrections clearly printed.

20-9

If the above number appears at the bottom of your address, your subscription expires with this issue.

RENEW NOW!

AN ICE IDEA—

Cold Turkey from The Admirable Byrd

By L. G. SMITH

As Damon Runyon used to say, a man is bound to run up against a lot of screwy propositions in his life.

In the January 29 issue of *This Week* magazine the redoubtable Admiral Byrd comes up with a whopper: *Why not take all the agricultural surpluses the government has piled up, and bury them in Antarctica?*

Byrd calmly and coolly (if one may use the expression) makes it clear that the proposal is feasible and even simple from a technical point of view:

"Below the snow line, as far south as Little America the temperatures never get above freezing. Contrary to popular belief, the temperatures within the Antarctic Circle average about 40 degrees colder than in the areas within the Arctic Circle. . . .

"The navy has a piece of equipment that digs a continuous trench in snow. In one day it can dig a trench 12 feet wide, and half a mile long and six feet or more in depth. . . . Winds would take care of covering the trenches with névé." (Névé is the snow-ice mixture which covers the Antarctic.)

There you have it. And we defy any reasonable person to be against it. As Byrd says, it is a ready-made, cost-free, permanent deep-freeze, and you wouldn't even have to cover the hole.

Frozen Foods on the Hoof

But a sceptic may wonder (if there is anyone capable of scepticism about such a self-evident proposition): How about the cost of shipping all that stuff down there?

Byrd is a practical man, and appears to have gone so far as to get an estimate on the job (whether by asking for competitive bids, he does not say):

"The United Fruit Company estimates it could handle all this butter [the \$175 million worth the U. S. now has in storage] in 35 refrigerated ships, at a cost of something like \$250,000 a ship. This adds up to \$8,750,000, which is slightly more than the government spends in one year to store that butter in this country. When you consider that once the butter is put underground at Antarctica there are no charges on it for the five or 10 or 15 years it may remain there, you will appreciate why I feel that the Antarctic freezer proposal at least warrants serious consideration."

Byrd says that the government spent \$332,929,579 to store surplus food in warehouses in the U. S. last year. The government now has almost six billion dollars worth of surplus crops in storage.

The butter is the least of it. Wheat, cotton, corn and who knows what all else is there.

And once the plan is adopted, absolutely nothing would stand in the way of also supporting beef, pork and lamb prices in the same way wheat and cotton are supported now. The animals could be slaughtered and the meat frozen and carried down that way.

Or they could be shipped down on the hoof and just left to freeze to death, which would save the slaughtering fees.

All About Congealed Labor-Power

As a matter of fact, we are sure that only space limitations prevented the admiral from bringing out all of the possible angles to this business.

For instance: You may have noted that in the description of the cost of shipping the butter to Antarctica, he did not mention the cost of shipping it back. Not a careless oversight, I assure you.

Since more butter is piling up every year, what reason is there to think that once the butter and the other stuff is down there it need ever be shipped back? Out of sight, out of mind. . . . and better still, out of the market.

After all, the president himself has explained in his farm message that the real trouble nowadays is that these big surpluses have a depressing effect on prices.

There is another possibility which the good admiral does not mention, we assume because it is not timely right now at the height of the boom when there is full employment and even a manpower shortage.

But if once again, as in the past, manpower (that is, people) should be in surplus, why couldn't they be stored down there also?

After all, the whole deep-freeze industry got its start when a fellow up in Alaska caught a fish through the ice on a real cold day. It froze solid the moment he pulled it out of the water. It took him a couple of hours to get to camp and build a fire, and when he thawed the fish out, it began to flop around in the pot.

Of course, we can't be sure that if we took a lot of manpower down there and froze it in, it would be as good as ever when we got around to defrosting it again (say, in the case of need for soldiers in a war), but then experiments could be carried out.

Or, alternatively, if the deep-freeze method should prove impracticable with respect to human beings, the unemployed could be shipped down there to live off the surplus food.

After all, during the last big depression it was pointed out by the solid business interests that it would not do to simply let the surplus population work with the surplus factories and consume the surplus products, because that way no one could make a profit off the rest of the economy. But if we sent all the surpluses, animate and inanimate, down there, no one left is likely to care too much if they find a way of getting together and making ends meet.

How to Kill Two Goats with one Byrd

I am sure that it is only the novelty of the idea which staggers the imagination and prevents it from developing all the potentialities of Admiral Byrd's marvelous proposal. But there is one final (for the moment at least) aspect which, I am sure, must have suggested itself to every reader who has followed us this far.

All these surpluses are serious only if there is peace in the world.

If a really big, bang-up war should develop, they would disappear overnight. As a matter of fact, one of the reasons Byrd gives for wanting to store them in the first place is that they might be needed in a future war. Otherwise, we may assume, it would be even more logical to propose that the United Fruit Ships dump their cargoes at a good spot short of Antarctica—a good deep spot.

They are only a problem for capitalism as long as peace continues. But if there is no war, another kind of surplus will be building up over the years: a surplus of atomic and hydrogen bombs.

So. . . there is the most perfect solution of all! Once all that stuff is safely shipped, the trenches dug, it is buried, the wind has blown the névé over it. . . . drop some surplus hydrogen bombs on it!

Aside from solving the problem of these particular surpluses once and for all: what with all that butter and wheat and corn and eggs and cotton, it would make the damndest mushroom-shaped frozen pancake you ever did see!

A more fitting monument to the capitalist system could hardly be imagined.

ON THE JIM CROW FRONT

By BETTY PERKINS

Aatherine Lucy, the Negro co-ed who was suspended after riots against her 3-day presence on the University of Alabama campus, will be readmitted if a federal court so orders, officials of the university board declared. Student support for her readmittance is growing, as 80 per cent of the student body was reported pledged to a "no violence" policy in this case.

Five hundred students have gone further and, in the face of racist threats and abuse, signed a petition asking Miss Lucy's restoration to classes.

"The petitions circulated at the university had run into heavy opposition because they were received as an endorsement of desegregation, although the text included a statement that it meant to imply no position on the subject," reported the *Times* Feb. 21.

Up to now, Tuscaloosa, Ala., in which the campus is located, has had no White Citizens Council, the current version of the Ku Klux Klan. However, at the end of the first week of tension, a rally of 15,000 was led by rabble-rousing Senator James Eastland (D., Miss.) and its avowed purpose was to form a local Council.

Among the sentiments expressed were that Attorney General Herbert Brownell has been brain-washed by Communist fronts and that the egg- and rock-throwing riots on the campus were a "typical American manifestation."

It is interesting to note that no group will accept responsibility for the campus riots. The students say that less than 5 per cent of the student body participated even at the height of the demonstration and these were mostly "inebriated fraternity men."

The students have backed up their stand with numerous resolutions from different campus groups blaming the faculty and officials for suspending Miss Lucy and demanding compliance with the law. As the president of the student body said, "Most of us are strong segregationists. But we're not for violence." Labor leaders at once denied the charges of the university president that laborers formed the main body of rioters.

In addition to all of the many and good proposals that have been made to compel obedience to desegregation from the University of Alabama, the following approach deserves consideration also.

The South today is just emerging from a state of semi-colonialism and dependency upon the North, a struggle begun in the 1880s and known to historians as the New South movement. A vital factor in this growing industrialism is the acquisition of a large group of well-trained technicians and professional people.

As an ad in the *New York Times* recently stated: "Internationally Known Engineering Company, Producers of Aircraft Equipment, will locate an additional permanent facility in a large eastern seaboard city. . . . This new facility is contingent upon the procurement of acceptable technical personnel, specifically: designers, draftsman, detailers, checkers and layout personnel. . . ."

If this trained labor force is denied the South, the rate of industrialism will be slowed and eventually stopped. Therefore, anything that hurts the state universities, which bear the largest share of this training, hurts the industrialists (even those in the Citizens Councils).

Therefore, there are two simple but effective weapons in the hands of the academic world that can be used against Southern university racism: (1) Refuse accreditation of University of Alabama graduates. As one graduate student said, "I feel as if my diploma has been torn in half. These demonstrations have made my degree depreciate in value that much." If Northern universities such as Chicago, Columbia, etc., refuse transfer students, what value would a future degree from Alabama have?

(2) Obtain the blacklisting of the University of Alabama by the American Association of University Professors. This would have the effect of assuring that no really good professor would accept a position there, and those already at Alabama who have high professional standing will soon leave. Governmental grants for research too will soon be stopped by inadequate personnel. The South cannot afford to have its universities destroyed—and therefore it would have to integrate them.

More Support to Miss Lucy

By BETTY PERKINS

The Catholic Church in the South has moved in several cases to lend its prestige to desegregation.

A Negro priest was assigned to three small parishes in Louisiana and the parishes were closed when the members refused to accept him. Plans were announced to complete integration in the Catholic schools by September 1956. And a Jesuit priest attacked a resolution, offered by parents of his students asking for an indefinite postponement of integration as un-American, un-Catholic and un-Christian.

In reaction, bills have been introduced into the state legislature directed against mixing the races in private schools.

The outcome of this church policy has been considerable progress in the South for Catholic influence among Negroes.

Recreation leaders of ten Louisiana cities voted to close recreational facilities rather than open them to Negroes. The resolution was not an official act but an expression of "sentiment."

Atlanta already has unsegregated golf courses and Baltimore has desegregated all park facilities and public beaches. Nashville became on January 26 the third Southern city to order unsegregated golf courses.

A federal district court ordered an end to racial segregation in St. Louis public housing. The ruling applied to four projects, two white and two colored.

The chairman of the St. Louis Housing Authority announced that the board had decided not to appeal this ruling and would judge future applicants on the basis of need only.

Racial segregation in the Maryland National Guard has been ordered abolished immediately by the governor. All units of the Maryland Guard, including air units, will be open to Negroes.

Major General M. A. Reckford, who refused two years ago to desegregate the National Guard (claiming greater

efficiency for a segregated basis), agreed to comply within 24 hours.

The NAACP had been planning court action on behalf of fifteen Negro officers when the governor's ruling was made.

Negro students have been admitted to many Southern universities without arousing unfavorable incidents. The University of North Carolina admits Negroes to both undergraduate and graduate schools, while Louisiana State University admits Negroes to graduate schools only.

At the University of Arkansas a Negro student was elected president of his dormitory, and the University of Louisville in Kentucky has had several Negro athletes on its teams.

Young people in Southern universities have shown themselves far more liberal in this respect than have their elders.

A recent order of the Interstate Commerce Commission required an end to racial segregation on all coaches and waiting rooms for interstate passengers. This order also required twelve railroads and two bus companies to cease and desist from these practices and to file notice of compliance by January 10. Although two railroads, the Southern Railway and the Richmond, Fredericksburg and Potomac Railroad, indicated they would comply, no notice has yet been filed with the commission.

In general, it seems that the railroads plan to follow a segregation policy in waiting rooms on the local level, while following an integration policy on coaches and trains and interstate waiting rooms. Southern racists, including supposed law-enforcement officers, who replace the segregated signs taken down by the railroads, are still holding out.

Get All Your Books from
LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 West 14 Street, New York City

PRO and CON: DISCUSSION

"ONE-SIDEDNESS" IN ISRAEL-ARAB CONFLICT

To the Editor:

I had hoped Hal Draper would come to grips with the main point of my critical comment on last week's LABOR ACTION. Instead he reveals to me that my criticism stems from "a tendency to be soft on Zionism." Maybe so, maybe not. I won't let this tempt me to wonder out loud about Draper's motivating "tendencies."

I asserted that Hal Draper's insistence that the Israelis have "a special responsibility for a democratic solution" and that "we have a right to make our demands on them first" is basically unfair. I think also that it has in his writings led to a "one-sided" emphasis and condemnation. *Gentle chiding* is the most that is the portion of the Arab nationalists.

Draper skirts around this by accusing me of failing to maintain a distinction between "blame" and "special responsibility." Because, says Draper, the Israeli working class "considers itself politically and socially more advanced" "we have a right to make our demands on them first" even though greater blame may belong to the Arab governments.

What is not given adequate weight is the fact that in the long run the Israeli position is inherently and necessarily defensive. The periodic, criminal and suicidal Kibyas, the preventive-war moods or the military adventurism of the Herut movement do not negate this key factor.

The provocative, retaliatory attacks by Israeli forces on the Syrian outpost and Jordanian Kibya grow out of an underlying panic and despair, that prompts a desire to force a political and/or military showdown under conditions presumably more favorable to Israel. The Arab strategy seems to favor a temporary postponement of the "second round" for which they organize and prepare. Time, said the Pakistani foreign minister last week, is on the side of the Arabs.

The tragic reality behind this panic is what Draper tends to underestimate and, occasionally, to minimize. That reality is the frank, open and avowed determination of all Near Eastern Arab nationalist movements to "eradicate Israel as a state." For the dominant wings of these movements one could even leave off the words "as a state." This determination is not a transient goal created by provocations nor is it only the policy of the most chauvinist groups or feudal elements.

Even the most advanced sections openly and proudly proclaim this crusade of eradicating Israeli independence and statehood (see the communications from the Lebanese or Syrian socialists to LA).

In other words the central and guiding strategic policy of the Near Eastern Arab nationalist world toward Israel is anti-democratic to the core. Zionist crimes and tactics cannot be permitted to distract attention from this near decisive factor. Somehow this doesn't evoke Draper's wrath. He is amazingly gentle when he does refer to it.

I repeat, when one national grouping seeks deliberately to destroy the other's independence and nationhood it is presumptuous to address demands "first" to the intended victims just because they are more "advanced."

To appreciate this one doesn't have to

equate "the needs of the Zionists with the needs of the Jews" nor to condone the dangerous, provocative behavior of the Israeli forces.

Parenthetically, why this snobbish attitude to the Arab nationalist movement? Don't they too have "advanced" sections? or has Draper fallen for Zionist propaganda about the "backwardness" of the Arabs?

Now for replies to some of the subsidiary points made by Draper. He says that the "peculiar twist to ISL policy" is based on a passage in the ISL resolution. Yes, he included this "twist" in his resolution. This was the basis of some of my voiced reservations and complaints when it was adopted. I voted for it with reservations. Maybe I should have presented an alternative resolution.

Incidentally, the qualifying phrase "not a one-sided one" which is sandwiched in the cited sentence ("a special responsibility—not a one-sided one, but a special responsibility") was inserted in response to criticism. I think that Hal Draper has tended to be "onesided" in his demands that the Israelis assume their "special responsibility."

The needed discussion on "racism," "Zionism," "blood-politics" and "Israeli nationalism" must again wait. This letter to the editor is already long.

Please, Hal, don't jump to conclusions again while you "await discussion" and attribute all sorts of misconceptions to me. No, I do not confuse Zionism with Israeli nationalism nor with anti-Zionist Jewish nationalism (which also believes in the concept of a Jewish nation) but I think you often do lump everything together.

You are, among other things, insufficiently aware that Israeli nationalism, though originating in and organically related to Zionism, has a dynamic of its own and that its policies and activities are determined more by the objective situation of its vulnerable political, economic and military position, than by its inherited ideological superstructure.

ED FINDLEY

REPLY

(1) Comrade Ed has now gotten himself to the point of charging us with "one-sided" emphasis and condemnation," thus moving a step onward from his last letter, in which this aspect was described as "so far, so good." With this, I think, he does actually get closer to what is bothering him.

It cannot be because there actually was any "one-sided condemnation" in my Nov. 14 article ("Power-Politics Behind the Israel-Arab Crisis"). This is very easy to prove.

It happens there were two front-page articles on the subject in that issue. The other was by Al (not to be confused with Ed) Findley. It was Al's article which blasted away at the Israeli retaliation policy. He did such a good job that, when I wrote mine, I just referred to it. Moreover, Al's article did not get around to condemning the Arabs. In fact he wrote, "No matter who is to blame for the new Israeli-Arab bloodshed, no matter who will supply the guns, it is Ben-Gurion who has supplied the Arab leaders with their slogans and atrocity material." (And he proves it.)

Comrade Ed does not attack Al for "one-sidedness."

It was my article which, in its front-page beginning, had a whole section demonstrating, with quotes from Arab leaders, that unlike the Israelis they "officially want war," aim to "eradicate Israel as a state," etc.

Moreover it was my article which summarized its conclusion: "On neither side can socialists or genuine democrats support the politics which are pushing both sets of rulers into heightened conflict."

This, Comrade Ed has now whipped himself up to call "one-sided."

(2) What accounts for this strange thing? I venture a political opinion: Comrade Ed's objection to my article was precisely because of its "plague on both their houses" attitude.

I suspect this from his argument that "in the long run the Israeli position is inherently and necessarily defensive" and its accompanying passage.

I get the impression that Ed's motivation (please note: political motivation) may be the view that, in this Middle East war crisis, we should line up, however critically, as pro-Israel as against any bilateral condemnation.

This would be a very worth-while position to discuss if Ed really holds it. It certainly would be more useful to discuss than his sudden fierceness on that excellent formulation about "special responsibility."

But the only statement he makes about it is definitely not true. It is precisely "in the long run" that Zionist politics makes the Israeli position inherently and necessarily expansionist in the Middle East. I have, I think, proved this on other occasions and am willing to do it again if Ed makes it necessary.

A more rounded discussion of this position would be called for if somebody (say, Ed) turns out really to hold it and put it forth.

(3) "Unfair," says Ed (unpolitically) of our hitherto standard remark explaining why we direct demands for a socialist solution to the Israeli workers in the first place: the business of "special responsibility."

I would be willing to take his objections more seriously if I did not know that Ed himself has always directed his programmatic proposals to the same address as we and just as "one-sidedly" and "unfairly."

All through 1948 Ed was writing for

PACIFISM AND INDIA'S LEFT-WING SOCIALISTS

To the Editor:

In the comments on Comrade Bone's letter, Philip Coben (LA, Jan. 30) once again shows his lack of understanding of Indian socialism. Left-wing Gandhian socialists in India do not have any "social-pacifist antagonism to class struggle" nor their "aspirations toward class-struggle activity and revolutionary perspective" are in any way "in contradiction with their pro-Gandhian sympathies." Here are some excerpts from the Socialist Party's *Statement of Principles*, adopted January, 1956:

"50.*** Revolution cannot restrict itself to parliamentary action. . . . Civil-resistance and class-struggle are but two names for a single exercise in power. . . . An act of civil-resistance or class-struggle must however . . . not make use of lies and violence or seek to justify present murder by an imagined outcome of future health.

"51. Traditional socialists believe that the ultimate overthrow of the existing order cannot be carried out except by (violent) force. The debate of violence in a revolution has hitherto been corrupted by concentration on the single question whether the method of armed rebellion should ever or never be used. The use or non-use of violence in the last stages of a revolution, particularly since the traditional alternatives between parliamentary and insurrectionary action has been supplemented by the third choice of civil-resistance, is a matter of secondary detail. The real question is whether to organize revolution on the basis of non-violence or that of violence. [Emphasis mine.]

"52. While a revolution may regrettably erupt into violence in its last stages . . . participants in a revolution must definitely resolve to organize on the continuing base of peaceful methods. Doctrines which preach the need of violence are incapable of achieving a classless or casteless society***"

It would be good to know from Philip Coben the deficiencies in the above statements, and let us hope that Coben's criticism is above malice.

BRJEN K. GUPTA

It is too bad that our amiable Indian friend, Comrade Gupta, seems to think that this question, the relation between pacifism and class struggle, depends on anyone's "understanding of Indian socialism."

On the contrary, I would suggest to him that an "understanding of Indian socialism" depends much more on a Marxist grasp of the question of pacifism. Of course, that is only my lamentably Marxist opinion, which is by definition Dogmatic and Doctrinaire, but at any rate it should be clear that the matter is not decided by citing passages from anybody's statements. Especially not after I have written terribly long articles about how the Lohia SP wants to base itself on class-struggle militancy! For our analysis of the "deficiencies" of pacifism, I'd urge Comrade Gupta to read—or re-read—the extensive discussion on the question in LA for Jan. 4 and 11, 1954.

But the most curious thing about Gupta's selections from the Lohia platform is they show (as I have been re-

LA on the Israeli-Arab war. His articles were full of proposals for a democratic course for Israel in the war, very good ones too. Scarcely did he present a program for Arab socialists in that war.

When Ed sponsored a resolution on the question for the ISL the following year, his resolution had an excellent program for Israeli socialists. It did not present a program for Arab socialists.

(The only one who has ever presented something like demands on Arab socialists, among us, is—myself. This was in my dispute in LA with Clovis Maksoud, and obviously Ed would have done so too in the same circumstances.)

This channeling of our proposals toward the Israeli workers, rather than the Arab, is explained only and solely by our formulation about the more advanced social and political character of this Israeli movement. Otherwise, what explains Ed's identical practice? I forbear comment on his jibe about "snobbishness."

(4) Ed's history about his reservations, criticism of "special responsibility," etc. does not coincide with my otherwise vivid recollections, but I am not interested in disputing it.

(5) Ed's last peroration leaves me discombobulated. Here I caught him in the public act of substituting "Israeli nationalism" for "Zionism" in his last letter, and he reads me a lecture about what I am "insufficiently aware." Indeed!

HAL DRAPER

porting) that party's drift away from Gandhianism. In effect, the party has repudiated pacifism, i.e., the absolute-pacifist rejection of "violence" as such which is the hallmark of the organized representatives of this school: Peacemakers, WRL, FOR, etc. This confirms what is healthy in the trends unleashed by the Lohia split.

The stand taken by the Lohia party brings it into a different area of controversy regarding the relative place of violence in class struggle and revolution—one that is of long-standing in the mainstream of a socialist movement that rejected the absolutist pacifist principle.

PHILIP COBEN

At last available!

The SECOND volume
of
Leon Trotsky's

THE FIRST
FIVE YEARS
OF THE
COMMUNIST
INTERNATIONAL

384 pages.....Paper covers

\$3.00

All orders must be accompanied
by payment.

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

Tank Deal - -

(Continued from page 1)

imperialism so as to ensure its position against the Arabs. For decades, for dominant sections of the Zionist leadership, the favored imperialist overlord was Britain, under whose wing Zionist colonization in Palestine grew. That orientation reached its dead end under Foreign Minister Ernest Bevin, when British policy took a turn in support of the Arab side in Palestine.

The substitution of American imperialism for the British is a Zionist aim now. It is no less self-defeating, and fatal to the only possible long-range solution of integrating Israel into amicable relations with the Arab world which surrounds it.

For this, an entirely different type of program is needed than the Zionist perspective of making Israel the Middle East branch office of the Atlantic Pact and the Western war camp.

[Next week: "A Socialist Program for Israel in the Middle East Crisis," by Hal Draper—based on a talk on the subject delivered January 13 at a New York symposium.—Ed.]



LABOR
ACTION

February 27, 1956 Vol. 20, No. 9

Published weekly by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone: WATkins 4-4222—Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.—Subscriptions: \$2 a year; \$1 for 6 months (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canadian and Foreign).—Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

Editor: HAL DRAPER

Associate Editors:

GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL

Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

Texas Student Editor Assails Censorship

By TIM WOHLFORTH

"How long will the moneyed oil and gas industries sink their fat fingers into the thin throat of the Texas legislature?" asked Willie Morris, editor of the University of Texas *Daily Texan* in an editorial recently. He soon found out that the Texas oil magnates had also sunk their fat fingers into the somewhat thinner throat of the state university by means of the Board of Regents.

Not long after he had asked the question, the Board of Regents suppressed his reprinting of a N. Y. *Times* editorial attacking the Harris-Fulbright natural-gas bill, and called for stricter supervision of the newspaper. As Regent Claude Voyles an Austin rancher with extensive oil interests in three states, put it "we want to restrict Willie to a college yell."

It is sad to say that on not a few campuses this is exactly what has happened, there being no one willing to stick out his neck and fight for freedom of the press. Slowly the college papers have become mouthpieces for the administration instead of the students.

But Willie Morris refused to accept this restriction. He feels that if the paper is not allowed to comment on controversial issues "it would wind up with editorials calling for students to keep off the grass and to water the campus pansies." (When Willie suggested this editorially, the students instantly responded sarcastically by putting "keep off the grass" signs all over the campus, many of them appearing on areas of bare dirt.)

While it was the editorials on the natural-gas bill that sparked the recent Re-

gents decision, the administration was also dissatisfied with other editorials Morris had written. These have favored integration of the school system, attacked the Shivers administration in Texas as corrupt and urged higher taxes on the gas, oil and sulphur interests.

STUDENTS AROUSED

One of the most promising things about the whole controversy has been the response of the students. As one reporter has pointed out: "his current stand against the Regents has aroused the student body as nothing else since... 1944."

As Morris himself put it, "We've already won in a sense. Students I never thought would have a serious thought have seen there is such a thing as a free press."

Furthermore, the student members of the publications board are solidly behind him. They will have nothing to do with the attempt of the administration and the journalism faculty to weasel out of the situation and thereby appease the Regents by having the paper voluntarily refrain from controversy.

Morris has clearly seen through this scheme and has stated that "to accept any restriction would be fighting cen-

sorship with censorship." With the support given him by the student body, and by people throughout the nation, he feels the Regents will have a tough time sticking to their position.

Thus in a country where there is so much apathy it is still possible to arouse the student body of a large university to fight an encroachment on student rights and freedom of the press. This is even more striking considering that this is taking place in one of the most reactionary states in the deep South.

This is but another sign that the "Solid South" ain't what it used to be. From every corner, from the students, from the Negroes, from the workers, the Southern bourbons are being resisted. It seems doubtful if the Southern capitalists with their multimillion-dollar oil lobbies, with their open shops, and with their White Citizens Councils, will be able to rule the South in such an untrammelled way for much longer.

AGAINST DEMOCRATS

It is very significant that when a Southern liberal student like Willie Morris fights for elementary rights and against the exploitation of the people around him, he comes up square against the Democratic Party, the so-called party of liberalism. The Regents whom Willie Morris is fighting were appointed by Texas Dixiecrat Allen Shivers, who runs the Democratic Party in that state but who in 1952 supported Eisenhower. The Democratic Party in the South is largely under the control of the oil, gas and other big-business interests.

Let us hope that the Southern liberal will see clearly that his struggle for a liberal program leads him out of the

Appeasers at Work

At last report (Feb. 21.) Willie Morris is having trouble with the faculty-student board in charge of the paper.

The board voted a finding that the *Daily Texan* has had "some errors of fact and some instances of questionable presentation." This charged Morris, was the board's attempt to indulge in "direct appeasement" of the authorities by "admitting to guilt."

One faculty member of the board admitted that he was against the editor having complete freedom to comment on issues. "My major hope is that the Regents will decide the board is capable of managing the affairs of the *Texan*," said acting journalism dean Dr. Reddick. He apparently hoped to accomplish this by convincing the Regents that he was capable of censoring the paper himself.

Democratic Party and into the camp of those who are struggling to build a new party, a party of labor in this country.

Willie Morris and his fight for a free press is not an isolated incident but rather a part of a growing trend among the students of the South. In the past few months, students at three great Southern universities have resisted the reactionaries.

Georgia Tech's students refused to bow to Southern bigotry and allow Jim Crow to prevent the holding of a football game. Many students at the University of Alabama have come to the defense of Autherine Lucy and her fight for admission to the university. And now the students at the University of Texas have rallied to the defense of Willie Morris who not only attacked the natural-gas give-away but also favored integration of the schools.

BOURBONS DOOMED

On the question of integration at the U. of Texas, where there are already 60 Negro students, Willie Morris has said, "I'm highly pleased with my fellow students. We will have no or very little problem when more undergraduate Negroes come in next September."

It is to be expected that Willie Morris will continue his struggle and carry it directly to the student body, as he has threatened to do. The students are likely to stand behind him. Even in these relatively apathetic times the American student can be pushed only so far before he responds and demands his elementary rights.

Students in the North can help by lending support to Morris and to all the progressive forces in the South. Let us remember that the Eastlands and Shivers do not represent the whole South but just its ruling class.

Too many tend to take these bourbons for what they claim to be, the spokesmen for the whole South. But their struggle against integration and against the organization of the Southern workers is at best a holding action that is doomed to failure. There is a certain hollowness to their bravado that leaves one with the unmistakable feeling that they realize this too.

They have just as much chance of keeping the Negro "in his place" as they do of holding Willie to a college yell.

CITY COLLEGE • N. Y.

Political Clubs Quit Campus in Protest

By AL BARUCH

Five student political groups at City College in New York have refused to file full membership lists with the administration this semester and chosen instead to move off campus. This latest action climaxes a lengthy struggle at CCNY over the list question.

With a statement that the ruling "solely curtailed political activity and inhibited free expression on the campus," the five clubs, who are banded together in the CCNY Political Action Committee for the purpose of fighting the list ruling, announced their new decision.

The five are: Students for Democratic Action (SDA), the Young Liberals, the Young Democrats, and two Stalinist groups, the Young Progressives of America and the Marxist Discussion Club. A sixth group, the Young Republicans, hasn't yet decided what it intends to do.

Howard Schuman, PAC president, said:

THE AIM OF THE YSL

The Young Socialist League is a democratic socialist organization striving to aid in the basic transformation of this society into one where the means of production and distribution shall be collectively owned and democratically managed. The YSL attempts to make the young workers and students, who form its arena of activity, conscious of the need for organization directed against capitalism and Stalinism.

The YSL rejects the concept that state ownership without democratic controls represents socialism; or that socialism can be achieved without political democracy, or through undemocratic means, or in short in any way other than the conscious active participation of the people themselves in the building of the new social order. The YSL orients toward the working class, as the class which is capable of leading society to the establishment of socialism.

—From the Constitution of the YSL

"We believe the continuation at City College by our five respective political organizations in the face of this would be a compromise of our belief in the principles of academic freedom."

The struggle goes back to November 22, 1954. At that time CCNY's Student-Faculty Committee on Student Affairs passed a regulation requiring that all clubs submit full membership lists each semester to the Student Life Department in order to be recognized as campus clubs.

Immediately many voices were raised against this infringement on the rights of students. But the witchhunt had so reduced the strength of all political tendencies, and so increased the apathy of the general student body, that no effective action was taken to combat this direct attempt to control students' opinions. All that could be done was to protest.

FIGHT WENT ON

The protest was made. The Political Alternatives Club (which no longer exists) and the two Stalinist clubs, the Marxist Discussion Club and the Young Progressives of America, refused to hand in any such list; and SDA, while finally submitting to the ruling in order to stay on campus, did so under the strongest possible protest. But even here the opposition was very weak; with the other clubs wavering and finally submitting, the administration seemed to be winning an easy victory in the cause of the witchhunt.

But during the past 14 months resentment and more organized resistance to open membership lists have allowed the fight to continue.

A petition against the regulation signed by over 1,000 students led to a student referendum in which the vote was 2 to 1 against compulsory lists. This adequately showed how the student body felt.

Secondly, the Political Action Committee was set up. It includes student lead-

ers, both in clubs and in student government, as well as teachers. Its reason for existence is the repeal of the open membership-list requirement.

Even with these two healthy signs, events did not move in a straight line. The clubs still vacillated, with the Stalinists later changing their minds and submitting the required number of names to remain on campus. However, to offset this retreat, Students for Democratic Action went off campus and formed an Upper Manhattan Chapter, in the process more than doubling its membership.

Meantime, in order to relieve some of the pressure, the administration started to grant "concessions" which confused the opposition, but which in no way were opposed to the spirit of compulsory lists. Thus, student names are listed on a Master List under the heading "Members and Officers of Organizations of a Political or Religious Nature." Again, the lists are kept in a safe in the Student Life office and can be opened only with the consent of a student-faculty committee of four.

Yet these ritualistic procedures do not hamper the basic function of compulsory lists: in this day, no security-conscious student is going to have his name on any list. And what student isn't security-conscious, with the draft and its undesirable discharges still ahead of him? The function of such lists can only be to frighten students and increase the stultifying atmosphere on campus.

The clubs realized the dangers of the open list, even though they had complied with the regulation. When they finally saw that by being "nice," the list would remain a permanent feature, they stopped vacillating, and adopted their current stand.

The fight, of course, is not over. The administration has many weapons in its hands, not the least of which is the still existing student apathy. But the increasing militancy of the political clubs is a good sign indeed.

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

A Rejoinder for the Italian Independent Socialists— IGNAZIO SILONE'S POLITICAL COURSE

By LUCIO LIBERTINI

Rome, Feb. 10

I regretfully reply to Silone's answer to my article as his attempt at defense falls far below his intellectual level and a past he does not live up to. Moreover, Hal Draper's "Open Letter" sums up the problem very well, setting aside, as he does, the psychological and pseudo-philosophical considerations, and asking Silone to explain his political reasons for abandoning the Third Camp (actually the socialist movement in general) and for adhering to the Atlantic bloc.

Personally, I do not believe that Silone will continue this exchange, for his reasons are not political but, according to his neat euphemism, "psychological." We may grant Silone's right to play around with pseudo-philosophical considerations, and to hide himself behind an empty and general phraseology; his remarks on Proudhon and "popular Christianity" are a riddle which no one will bother to solve. All this can only concern Silone as an individual.

On the other hand, he has no right to defend himself by falsifying the facts concerning his role in Italian political life and the politics of the Unione Socialista Indipendente (USI).

Silone writes on this point: "After this, to facilitate the unification of the PSU with the PSDI (Saragat) I resigned as secretary of the former, and at the same time I announced to my friends that I would retire from active political life, continuing my struggle as independent writer. So closed for me the parentheses opened in 1941."

This, in good Italian, good English or in any other language, is called a falsification. The merger of the PSU and the PSDI occurred in 1951, and Silone at this time did not retire from political life.

In 1951-52 he expressed solidarity with the independent socialists—I do not refer to his friendliness to Magnani, but to his collaboration on *Risorgimento Socialista*, the weekly of the USI. Then he suddenly joined the PSDI. In the elections of 1953 Silone was the leading candidate on the social-democratic ticket in Abruzzo, in an alliance with the clericals. At the same time, he was the only senatorial candidate of the government parties in this region.

He was badly defeated on both tickets.

We do not know whether this fellow-traveling with the Christian-Democrats has anything to do with the Popular-Christian doctrine (or with Proudhon?) but in any case it is difficult to reconcile his candidacies with a withdrawal from active political life.

USI POSITION

The second falsification concerns the policy of the USI, represented by Silone as a small group of embittered ex-Communists, petrified in an attitude of sterile sectarianism and passively waiting for the crisis of the CPI. The very contrary is true.

The readers of *LABOR ACTION* will remember that in the article concerning the Communist Party in Italy (LA, Sept. 26), I maintained that the liquidation of Stalinism can occur only when an independent mass party of socialism arises to replace it. This is the position of the USI; the USI merely considers itself as a tendency that fights for the unity of all socialist groups and which will fight for a Third Camp position within the united socialist party of tomorrow.

It is worth recalling here that we have achieved indisputable results along these lines: a good showing in the 1953 elections, the defeat of the 1953 electoral-law bill (which Silone, along with the Christian-Democrats, supported) and the rise within both PSDI (Saragat) and PSI (Nenni) of tendencies favorable to a unification of all socialist forces on a Third Camp basis.

On the other hand, Silone himself has always attempted to push us either toward social-democracy or, when this didn't work, toward the sectarian attitude of professional "ex-Communists." Our position, however, I repeat, is exactly the opposite. Silone should be able

We now give the floor back to Lucio Libertini, whose articles in *LABOR ACTION* originally launched the re-examination of Ignazio Silone's politics that has appeared in our columns.

Comrade Libertini, our regular correspondent in Rome, is a leader of the Unione Socialista Indipendente, the left-wing socialist group of Italy. We are also informed that the Italian independent socialists are thinking of publishing the entire exchange of articles on Silone as a pamphlet.

Libertini's original article, "The Case of Ignazio Silone," appeared last November 28. Silone's reply, "My Political Faith," appeared January 30. We gave our own views in "An Open Letter to Ignazio Silone" on February 6.—ED.

to remember this, since most of the first declarations of principle in *Risorgimento Socialista* were written with his direct collaboration.

If one sets aside his falsifications and anonymous insults (I doubt that he will have the courage to name the "imbeciles" he is referring to) Silone, at bottom, only confirms my statements—he cannot do otherwise.

I am amazed, though, that after a stormy life and his recent electoral misadventures, Silone has not learned the elementary lessons of modesty and humility. Contrary to what he seems to believe, there does not exist in Italy a socialist papacy of which Silone could be the pope. There is no way for him to remain above the political struggle, beyond good and evil. In Italy there are only various socialist currents. Their policies may be correct or false but, in any event, obligate them to take responsibility for their actions.

It is amusing, to anyone who knows

the Italian situation, to learn that Silone "defended" Magnani and Cucchi as well as others who left the CP. Nobody asked him for such a defense because no one needed it, and because he did not have the moral and political authority to assume such a task.

The Communists and the many socialists of the PSU who joined together to form the USI merely invited Silone to actively associate himself with their struggle, not in defense of this or that person, but in defense of Third Camp socialism. As far as he is concerned, he simply did not honor his commitments of 1939 and of 1951.

SILONE'S PATTERN

The term "defense" also is an elegant euphemism. His "defense" of ex-Communists consists in either trying to push them into alliances with the bourgeoisie and with the Right or, failing this, into hopelessly sectarian positions which isolate them and render them ineffective. In short, his job is one of political corruption. He tried it with Magnani, and he is trying now with Seniga, although, since the existence of the USI, this little game has become increasingly difficult.

It may be said that Silone excels in the art of those Catholic priests who approach people crushed by adversity or on the deathbed, and wring from them a statement of submission to the church. Just like the most clever Jesuit fathers, Silone follows this pattern with the "Communists in crisis" and, as such, becomes a worthy representative of this Company of Jesus which the "Committee for Cultural Freedom" represents on behalf of American imperialism.

On this subject, Silone writes: "Four-fifths of the activities of this organization is devoted to the defense of cultural freedom in Italy, which is endangered by the remnants of fascism, by a clerical Right and by a part of the state apparatus." I shall return to this matter in a coming article. A documented investigation into United States interference in Italian affairs will show the committee's activities to be precisely the contrary of what Silone claims they are. Above all, it will show how badly the money of the Americans is spent.

BURY THE DEAD

In any case, as far as the Italian socialist movement as a whole is concerned, the case of Ignazio Silone is closed. It now concerns the man Silone, not the socialist movement. Let the dead bury their dead and let us go forward.

It is not true that we are compelled to ally ourselves with one or the other imperialist camp. Only the weak enter such alliances, those who have lost sight of historical perspectives and have succumbed to demoralization and deceit. Even though our struggle remains difficult, the forces which stand for the Third Camp are growing in Italy, in all of Europe and in Asia.

Against the blackmail of compulsory alliances, we repeat what Silone wrote in 1939 with the indicated paraphrase:

"When the socialists, with the best possible [anti-Stalinist] intentions, renounce their own program, put their own theories in mothballs, and accept the negative positions of conservative democracy, they think they are doing their bit in the struggle to crush fascism [or Stalinism]. Actually they leave to fascism [or Stalinism] the distinction of alone daring to bring forward in public certain problems, thus driving into the fascists' [Stalinists'] arms thousands of workers who will not accept the status quo."

LONDON LETTER

Another Turn of the Screw

By OWEN ROBERTS

London, Feb. 17

Tory Chancellor Macmillan today tightened the grip on British economic life. Announcing a new series of emergency measures to meet the growing contradictions of Tory "free enterprise" economy, he made it quite clear that the government intends to keep turning the screw on working-class living standards.

The first victims of the Tory policies are working-class housewives. The subsidies on bread, introduced originally during the wartime years to stabilize prices of basic foods, have been slashed by some \$598 million a year. The subsidies on milk have also been cut by \$564 million a year.

This means that the price of bread and milk will rise and that the consumers will have to pay the \$1072 million previously paid by the state from exchequer funds.

Target number two on the Tory list is the nationalized industries. The chancellor announced that capital expenditure by the nationalized industries had been cut \$1410 million below the program originally planned.

Expenditure by local authorities on community projects is to be cramped and in particular the Chancellor said that plans for further educational developments must be postponed.

Hire-purchase [installment-buying] restrictions are to be tightened up making it more difficult for lower-paid workers to buy things like television sets, furniture and items which necessitate considerable outlay. As from tomorrow anyone wishing to buy a television set or a vacuum cleaner on deferred terms will have to make an initial payment of 50 per cent of the purchase price—which virtually means that the ordinary work-

er will not be able to buy such things without saving a sum equivalent to two or three week's wages.

These measures, announced in Parliament today, follow the raising of the bank rate to 5½ per cent yesterday. This is the highest it has been since 1931—the year of crisis, slump and nearly three million workers on the dole queues.

CHIPPING AWAY

The implementation of these new measures is a clear indication of the difficulties in which the Tory government now finds itself. Since their return to power in 1951 the Tories have followed a persistent policy to secure a distribution of the national income in favor of the capitalist class. While profits and dividends have steadily climbed, prices too have risen; and they have mainly risen because the Tories have kept chipping chunks off the state subsidies which held the prices of basic food-stuffs down.

Reacting to this situation the workers have piled in claims for higher wages. Even the right-wing union leaders, who have since the war held a position of "restraint" in relation to wage claims, have been forced by the pressure of the rank and file to demand higher wages for their members.

The Tories are now screaming about the dangers of inflation, caused—so they

say—by the upward pressure of wages. They aim to rectify this position by making credit tighter and introducing a pool of unemployed, thus weakening the position of trade unions demanding higher wages.

The *Tory Daily Express*, commenting on the raise in the bank rate, clearly outlined the Tory policy: "It may lead to unemployment. It should certainly put a brake on the wild wage claims that were bunged in following the emergency budget last October."

ARMS PRIORITY

But however much the government intends to cut into workers' living standards in an endeavor to solve its crisis, one item remains sacrosanct—spending on arms. In the budget estimates for the coming year, announced today, a sum of \$4227 million is allocated for armaments during the next twelve months—an increase of \$14 million on the last year's estimates.

An indication of the degree of priority afforded to arms can be gained when it is recorded that the combined estimates for the National Health Service, education, pension, sick pay, maternity grants and children's allowances are \$2994 million.

It is obvious that in the situation now existing in Britain the Labor Party left wing is placed in a strong position. It can hammer the Tories without having to continually excuse the Labor government's action in setting in motion the armament program. Indeed the left wing can point out that the present situation is bound to occur in an economy which is predominantly in the hands of private enterprise and that the only answer is a Labor government pledged to wage an all-out war against the capitalist order of society.

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.

Raymond Aron vs. Rosa Luxemburg

By MICHAEL HARRINGTON

In his *Century of Total War*, Raymond Aron, perhaps France's leading pro-American intellectual, "disposed" of the Marxist theory of imperialism with an essay entitled "The Leninist Myth of Imperialism." In doing so, he actually extended his criticism to almost any socialist analysis of imperialism. Moreover, his case is impressively argued, documented with citations to many of the events leading up to World War I. Since this book is now available to the American public in an inexpensive edition, Aron's discussion is particularly worthy of attention.

In the main, Aron's technique is to set up a mechanistic and abstract definition of imperialism, one wrenched from any historical context, and then to refute it with particular examples.

Thus he writes, "There is no relation between the purely economic need for expansion [of imperialist countries] such as should have obtained according to theory, and the actual facts of colonial expansion." And "On the other hand, it would be just as erroneous to imagine that large-scale German capitalism was devoted to the preservation of peace. The truth is that nothing in living reality conforms to this vague concept of 'German capitalism'... In actual fact its activities were varied, contradictory, changing with different individuals and circumstances."

In both of these quotations, Aron's version of a Marxist theory of imperialism emerges. In his version, there is a "purely economic" need for expansion which dictates the actual facts of expansion; for him a theory of imperialism affirms a blueprint. Needless to say, this is mechanically conceived, and it is contradicted by the reality of German capitalism which changed "with different individuals and circumstances."

Clearly, one cannot think of a socialist analyst of imperialism who held any such theory. On the contrary, the socialist analysis poses imperialism as a massive and inevitable tendency of capitalism, but one which is in the historical context of that social system.

The contrast between Aron's version of a socialist theory of imperialism and the actual theory itself can be seen by comparing his analysis of the events that led up to World War I and that of Rosa Luxemburg in her famous "Junius pamphlet" of 1915.

At the very outset a striking fact must be recorded: Luxemburg "admits" every single one of Aron's exceptions, most of them quite specifically, and yet emerges with a subtle Marxist analysis of the role of imperialism in creating the First World War.

CASE OF MOROCCO

To get down to cases.

Aron argues that "none of the colonial undertakings that caused important diplomatic conflicts in Europe was motivated by the quest for capitalist profits; they all originated in political ambitions that the chancelleries camouflaged by invoking 'realistic' motives." His chief example of this is Morocco.

There, he asserts, France, the least dynamic capitalist economy of Europe, was dominant; crises were continually settled by diplomacy; and the interests of the Mannesmann brothers was not actually an interest of German imperialism.

Now take Luxemburg. For her, one of Aron's exceptions becomes an important theoretical factor: precisely because France was an undynamic capitalism, and Germany was very dynamic, a conflict became possible. And yet this antagonism was not the result of a blueprint; it could not be inferred by comparing the "purely economic" needs of the two nations. For their struggle developed out of a historical context which influenced it:

"Thus the war of 1870 brought in its wake the outward political grouping of Europe about the axes of the Franco-German antagonism. . . . Historical development has given to this rule and to this grouping an entirely new content." (Italics added.)

Secondly, the fact that there were many diplomatic settlements is seen by Luxemburg as a function of the fact that the final blow-up would not come until "the imperialist states found a centralized axis and a conflict of sufficient magnitude."

And finally, Luxemburg quite agrees with Aron on Germany's purely economic needs in Morocco, and on the brothers Mannesmann. She wrote: "Germany has few legitimate interests in Morocco. To be sure, German imperialism puffed up the claims of the German firm of Mannesmann. . . . But it was a well-known fact that both of these rival groups in Morocco, the Mannesmann as well as the Krupp-Schneider company, were a thoroughly international mixture of German, French and Spanish capitalists. . . ."

Aron invents a theory of imperialism which makes expansion and political activity a one-to-one corollary of pure economic need. Luxemburg produces an actual empirical analysis of the development of imperialism in its historical setting.

Thus she interprets the German moves in Morocco in terms of its lack of a real interest: "The very indefiniteness of its tangible aims and demands betrayed its insatiable appetite, the seeking and feeling for prey—it was a general imperialistic declaration of war against France."

NO STRAW-MAN

Or to take another, and even more crucial, example from Aron. He argues that German and English capitalism, far from being hostile to each other in the period before World War I, were quite complementary. The naval competition between them—the result of political factors—was the "real" cause of the war.

Here is Luxemburg on the same theme: "Far from standing in each other's way, British and German capitalist development were mutually highly interdependent, and united by a far-reaching system of division of labor, strongly augmented by England's free-trade policy. . . . German colonies were not in need of protection by a first-class sea power." And yet, she also writes, "The naval bill of December 11, 1899, was a declaration of war by Germany, which England answered on August 4, 1914."

Here, once more, Luxemburg's Marxist analysis does not fit the straw-man role which Aron would assign it. She does not deny the influence of politicians, of changing individuals, of rhetoric, upon the historical situation. Neither does she rule out the past. And yet she locates the basic, underlying causation in the imperialist relationship between the two largest capitalist powers.

And the real locus of this conflict she places in an area which Aron hardly mentions: "The position of German militarism—and its essence, the interests of the Deutsche Bank—had brought the German Empire in the Orient into opposition to all other nations. Above all to England." This is a point to be documented by facts and figures, among them the "real" interest of the Deutsche Bank in Turkey, the antagonistic interest of England, especially in Mesopotamia and Anatolia, and so on.

TSARIST EXAMPLE

One last example. Aron points out that Russia was not really imperialist in the Marxist sense of the word prior to World War I. He finds this especially true of the Russo-Japanese War.

Luxemburg writes of Russian imperialism that, because of the actual conditions of its development, "Its strongest strain is not, however, as in Germany and in England, the economic expansion of capital, hungry for territorial accumulation, but the political interest of the nation." And she notes, "The liberal bourgeoisie of Russia criticized the Japanese war so severely as a senseless adventure because it distracted Russian politics from the problem that was to them the more important, the Balkans."

One could multiply examples, but the main point should be plain. A socialist analysis of imperialism is not, as Aron evidently thinks, the making of a blueprint. The "abstract" tendencies of capitalist development must be located in their actual historical context. And they do not manifest themselves according to a schematic diagram.

But by working precisely with the real history of the world in that period, one is struck by the clear relationship between the combatants and economic position and need.

Aron's refutation is irrefutable, but what he refutes is hardly a "socialist" analysis of imperialism.

EAST EUROPE'S EXILES

Comrade Rudzienski here picks up the argument from our last Nov. 14 issue, in which Constantin Gherea wrote on "East Europe's Exiles," criticizing a previous discussion by Rudzienski of Oct. 10.—ED.

By A. RUDZIENSKI

I read with surprise the charge by Constantin Gherea that I support the Polish government in exile, for every reader of *LA* knows that I have been and am fighting against this government because of its reactionary and anti-democratic character. Some "critics" do not understand what they read, and take my objective description of our political enemies as support.

Of course, I support the liberation fight and political fight of the Polish emigration against the Stalinist regime, because this fight represents the continuation of the Resistance and the underground against Nazism and Stalinism; and therefore it is my political obligation to do so, if I do not want to be a secretarian or an agent of Stalinism. Therefore I give critical support to the left wing of the PPS (Polish Socialist Party) and Peasant Party in their fight against Stalinism, while however criticizing their collaboration with the Nationalist Party.

The other confused assertion by Gherea is that I identified the economic and political emigration, which I never did of course. The political emigration is concentrated in Great Britain, France and other European countries and is limited to about 200,000 exiles, while the economic immigration of Polish origin is counted in some millions.

Of course, the economic emigration, especially the Americans of Polish origin, give political and financial support to the political action of the Polish exiles of Europe. It is a matter of public knowledge that the Polish-Americans vote in their majority for the Democratic Party and have generally had representatives in Congress. In differentiating between the economic and political emigration, one cannot deny the political support which the masses of emigrants give to the political fight of the Polish socialists or democratic opposition, under penalty of serving the Stalinist counter-revolution.

Another mistaken and untrue assertion is the statement that the Polish emigration is identical with that of the rest of East Europe and that it does not have special problems and special importance.

Here Gherea separates the emigration of before 1944 from the emigration of

after 1944, and says that for him "the only category which is relevant in this discussion is the emigration of 1944 and after." He forgets that the main Polish emigration dates from 1939, that is, from the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact and the joint invasion of Poland by the Nazis and the Russians.

He also forgets the fact that the Polish people fought against Nazism and Stalinism when all of the other "satellite" countries were collaborating with the Nazis and when Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria capitulated without a fight. Thus, of course, there arises a special role for the Polish Resistance and the Polish political emigration. When the Russians "liberated" East Europe, they encountered pro-Nazi regimes there; quislings, while in Poland they encountered the anti-Nazi Resistance and the anti-Nazi political regime in exile, which had been created after the defeat and the breakup of the "Colonels' Regime."

The government in exile of Sikorski and later of Mikolajczyk had nothing to do with Pilsudski or the "Colonels' Camp," as Gherea erroneously implies. The last democratic government in exile of Poland was under the presidency of Tomasz Arciszewski, who repudiated the imperialist impositions of Russia, the U. S. and Britain on Poland's borders and the Polish government. This is a fact, Comrade Gherea, and you were probably not aware of it. But if you want to write about these problems, you have to know these things.

The special problem of the Polish workers' and peasants' resistance and exile lies also in the 150 years of tradition and struggle for liberation against Russian tsardom, which was so highly valued by Marx and Engels and also by Lenin, and later, the glorious tradition of the Polish working class and its parties, such as the Polish Social-Democracy (SDKPL) of Rosa Luxemburg, the PPS (Polish Socialist Party) the PPS left, the Communist Party; no other satellite country is on the same plane. It is probably that this historical past and the strong influence of the Polish proletariat has given the Polish resistance and political emigration such high combativity, so much strength and so important a political role.

The left wing of the Polish Resistance inside the country and in exile has nothing to do with restorationism, because it bases itself on the economic and social transformation of Poland. To confuse political problems does not help to solve them.

It's Stalin's Turn - -

(Continued from page 1)

We do not deny that the present trend may continue. That is, there may be more sweet talk; many old Stalinist hacks and perhaps even some of the genuine old Bolsheviks may be resurrected from their political graves and rehabilitated. The purges may be denounced.

All that is quite conceivable and proper in an attempt to convince the bureaucracy that they will never have to go through that nightmare again. Collective leadership of sorts may continue for some time . . . that is, until that leader appears who dares to disagree publicly, not with Molotov, but with Khrushchev or his equivalent.

We might even raise a word of caution at the moment. In a Stalinist movement, when everyone at the top starts shouting about how a collective leadership has been established, about the abolition of the old one-man rule and how terrible things were when it prevailed, there are at least two possibilities on what is going on:

(1) It is possible that a faction fight is raging in which men like Mikoyan, Malenkov and others are warning the man who has shown a tendency to become more-equal-than-others in the equality of the collective leadership.

(2) Khrushchev has actually emerged as the undisputed single leader who has defeated all opponents for the scepter. It is quite in character for such a development to be hailed with paeans of praise to collective leadership.

There is an old Bulgarian proverb: "the hasty bitch bears blind litters." In attempting to assess what is new in the Russian situation, it is best to proceed with the deliberation the subject warrants. And above all, it is essential not

to exchange all that is known about the Stalinist system, its social foundations and political nature, for airy speculations about what might be going on.

For instance: While Mikoyan denounces the old historiography of the Russian Revolution, civil war, and the party, and specifically attacks the tendency to attribute complicated historical processes to the evil machinations of individual spies and traitors, Khrushchev tells the congress that Beria was a paid imperialist agent who had managed to worm his way into the leadership of the party.

Old habits, it seems, find it hard to die. And hardest where the present relations of forces in the dictatorial regime are at issue.

Ever since the death of Stalin and the removal of his capricious personal iron grip on the party and state machine, his heirs and continuators have been engaged in the process of sloughing off the excesses of his regime, especially of the last few years—excesses in terms of the needs and interests of the totalitarian bureaucratic system itself.

Long before Stalin died, it had been perfectly clear to knowledgeable observers that the system itself, and most particularly the ruling bureaucracy itself, was being torn and weakened not only by the terror inherent in the system but also by the irrational and unnecessary excesses imposed by the unchecked sway of a man like Stalin. With his death, at a faster or slower pace, the bureaucracy set out to clear the despotic system of the adventitious debris accumulated during that rule.

The twentieth congress marks another stage in that process—prior to the commencement of that very same process under the one-man domination of another Vozhd.

Humanitarianism Marches On— Hoffa Becomes a Labor Statesman

By JACK WILSON

Detroit, Feb. 19

The inimitable James Hoffa, czar of the Teamsters Union in the Midwest, is never a man to let the grass grow under his feet.

Forced to accept a compromise settlement of the dispute at Packard with Walter Reuther's United Auto Workers, and stymied at least momentarily in his effort to capture control of the New York City Teamsters Joint Council, Hoffa has come up with another one.

This one is difficult to criticize, unless one happens to think that the union movement is something other than a business institution. Even in this case, Hoffa has done a neat job of making himself immune from ordinary criticism.

What's the angle? It was announced this week in Detroit that April 20 will see a \$100-a-plate dinner honoring James R. Hoffa by admiring friends from management and labor.

He isn't going to take the profit. The plan is far more grandiose than that.

The money will go toward building a children's home in Jerusalem; and for an Irish labor leader, you have to admit that is a new and splendid example of social-consciousness.

With the cooperation of all of these eminent people, Hoffa will now become a Labor Statesman, a Humanitarian, an Internationalist, and a Friend of Suffering Children—all at no cost to himself.

It is only fitting that the main table will include Abba Eban, Israeli ambassador to the United States, Dave Beck, and many governors and senators. Toastmaster will be Nathan Feisinger, dean of the University of Wisconsin Law School. Eban will deliver the main address.

This is not going to be a small dinner. A nation-wide committee representing AFL unions and the trucking industry is handling the affair. It is going to be held at the state fair coliseum, and about 2,500 people are expected. The profit will be over \$200,000!

Credit for this brilliant idea (and

surely nobody can be critical of efforts to make labor leaders more socially conscious) is Harold Gibbons, Teamsters union official from St. Louis, who was once a fairly well-known CIO figure.

Said the trucking industry spokesman here about this event: "In spite of all the stories, the trucking industry thinks a great deal of Jimmy Hoffa. He's tough but we respect him. We think he's one of the most forward-looking labor leaders in the country."

Perhaps even the vanguard of the future?

RUDE NEWS

Chairman of the affair is Joel Goldblatt, a Chicago department store mogul. Mr. Goldblatt volunteered the statement that neither he nor representatives had been subjected to pressure by the Teamsters:

"Gibbons took a trip to Israel last year and was tremendously impressed by what he saw. He's an old friend of mine and when I saw him last fall he suggested a dinner for Hoffa with the proceeds going to the Israel children's home."

"I think the main idea of this thing is an example of joint labor-management humanitarianism," Goldblatt declared.

At this point it would be rude, of course, to bring up the other stories, but news is news, so here goes.

In the contest between Martin Lacey, incumbent, and John J. O'Rourke, president of Local 282, for control of the Teamsters Joint Council, the votes of five

locals are being challenged. They happen to be recently chartered and were previously controlled by the racketeer John Dio as representative of the old AGL auto workers union. Although Lacey won by a small margin of votes, inclusion of the votes of these locals would defeat him, and give Hoffa control of the New York Teamsters Joint Council, for he is backing O'Rourke.

This control is necessary for Hoffa's plan to aid the racket-ridden longshoremen's union in its coming struggle against the AFL.

Subjects like this will not be discussed at the dinner—only Mr. Hoffa's humanitarianism, as blessed officially by the state of Israel, undoubtedly under the theory that a buck is a buck no matter who gives it.

As for the Packard dispute, that old pro George Meany showed he had lost none of the ability he used for years in the labyrinths of jurisdictional disputes in the New York labor movement from which he arose. He worked out a compromise that everybody had to accept.

The UAW will keep 66 of its skilled workers on the job at Packard on renovating the plant for aircraft work, and the AFL will replace the UAW people now working on jobs that the AFL walked off from. All this to take place in the next couple of weeks.

Coming back to the Hoffa dinner, there are two interesting questions that deserve mention. Just a week ago, Hoffa and many AFL leaders here gave Governor Knight of California a fancy dinner at the Cadillac-Sheraton Hotel, and were proud to emphasize that in California at least they support the Republican Party. Will Governor Williams of Michigan attend the Hoffa dinner? Will Senator Pat MacNamara, whom Hoffa opposed to support Senator Joe Ferguson, be there? And will the UAW and Walter Reuther give their blessings to this dinner by buying a block of tickets?

It ought to be worth watching.

The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ISL FUND DRIVE

First Returns In on Fund Drive

By ALBERT GATES
Fund Drive Director

Although full returns on the opening week of the 1956 Fund Drive have not yet been calculated for the purposes of a box score, the first contributions have sent the drive off to a good start.

Among the first contributors—picking up where it left off in last year's campaign—is Chicago, with a \$700 contribution. We know, of course, that remittances vary considerably from week to week as the various cities all gear their campaigns somewhat differently. But this showing by the Windy

City is, indeed, a good omen.

The need for a good start toward a successful drive has never been more important than this year. We have come through a rough time last year which was highlighted by the persistent fight made in the Shachtman passport case and the efforts to force a hearing from the attorney general on the ISL listing.

The maintenance of our excellent press, LABOR ACTION and the *New Internationalist*, is a rough job enough in these days. And yet we managed this together with our legal fight by sheer effort. It has been, as all our readers must surely know, an unceasing fight. And this year, we face the continuation of our efforts to complete our hearing from the attorney general, who is none too eager to go ahead.

Without our press, it would be like fighting without weapons. LABOR ACTION is the key to our efforts, as it is the means by which we express our views and our program in the total world situation.

We feel no hesitation in calling upon all our friends, sympathizers and readers to join in the 1956 Fund Drive by making their contributions and making them as rapidly as possible.

Already, several cities have responded and made a dent in their quotas. Chicago has, of course,

taken a big jump in the campaign with its initial contribution.

From the West Coast, the Bay Area branch has sent in \$100 or 25 per cent of its quota. New York has made an initial payment of \$146. The National Office has recorded a \$25 payment, while Philadelphia has started off with \$35 and Newark with a sizable sum.

A friend in Seattle came through with a \$20 contribution. We thank him for his support particularly, because he has done this more than once before. Cleveland too has made a first-week contribution.

Next week the box score will carry the percentage figures and the standings of the cities. We trust that by that time every city listed will be represented by some figure in the contribution column.

CONTRIBUTE!

We need every dollar that LABOR ACTION readers can send in. Checks for the ISL Fund Drive should be made out to Albert Gates.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, New York City

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

Send for our free book list.

Get Acquainted!

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

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

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, New York

Please enter my subscription:

- 1 year at \$2. New
- 6 months at \$1. Renewal
- Payment enclosed. Bill me.

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

Revise Schedule In Shachtman Tour

As a result of several circumstances, a revision has been made in the tour schedule of Max Shachtman, national chairman of the Independent Socialist League.

The tour is now divided into two parts, the first to the West Coast being made within the next weeks and the second to cities in the Midwest and East to take place later in the course of the Fund Drive.

As it stands now, Shachtman will speak on the West Coast on the following dates:

- Los Angeles March 16-19
- Bay Area March 20-22
- Seattle March 23-25

A rescheduling of the tour as mentioned above will take place for St. Louis, Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, Pittsburgh, Reading and Philadelphia. This will be announced shortly in LABOR ACTION.