

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

INSIDE SECTION

An Appeal to the Nation's Conscience

## THE CRIME OF OKINAWA

American Bulldozers at Work  
On the 'Cyprus' of the Pacific

See pages 6-7-8

MARCH 26, 1956

FIVE CENTS

# STALINISM WITHOUT STALIN:

## The Meaning and Limits of the Khrushchev Reforms

By HAL DRAPER

The past week saw two disclosures about the 20th Russian Party Congress and its aftermath which are of major historical importance both in understanding the post-Stalin regime in Moscow and in foreseeing the pattern of its doom.

The demonstrations already officially admitted to have taken place in Tiflis (and perhaps in Azerbaidjan and Soviet Armenia) can now be mentioned in the same breath with the anti-Stalinist struggles of the June days in East Germany or the famous Vorkuta concentration-camp strike; and we say this advisedly in spite of the "pro-Stalin" character ascribed to these demonstrations, as we shall explain, and in spite of the many uncertainties about the origins of this event.

The other of the two revelations is, however, even clearer in its main points and tremendously informative to anyone who is willing to approach it without overweening illusions about Stalinism. This is the news of the secret and closed-session Khrushchev report to the 20th Congress in which he deflated the image of Stalin.

In this report Khrushchev also, in effect, defined the aims and limits of the post-Stalin reformation in the Stalinist system.

In our opinion, many things which we have formerly had to debate and argue in our columns, against all those who suffered from illusions about Stalinist "democratization," are no longer susceptible to easy dispute.

Let us first recapitulate how much is known and reported or rumored about this speech which marks an epoch in the course of the Stalinist system.

On the evening of February 24 (it is reported), at a session of the congress closed to foreign Stalinists—for reasons not yet really explained, incidentally,—Khrushchev gave a report for over three hours, in a highly tense and "emotional" atmosphere, explaining that Stalin was not the all-wise, all-good, all-knowing genius of the myth, but rather a cruel, capricious, cowardly "criminal."

He was, indicated Khrushchev, the victim of a "phobia" in his "later years"—he was "not himself"—suffered from "delusions and derangements"—in other words, we are led to understand, mentally unbalanced, off his rocker, clinically psychopathic. He suspected his closest coworkers and colleagues (and we add, his most compliant sycophants and agents) of treachery. None could be sure of coming out alive when called to see him. The terrible atmosphere was such that no one knew whose head would be next to go.

The frame-up and execution of Mar-

shal Tukhachevsky and the army men in 1937 was a "terrible mistake." Equally a "mistake were other cases mentioned by Khrushchev—the liquidation of Voznesensky, former head of the State Planning Commission; which may be linked with still another "mistake," namely, the liquidation of a whole group of alleged Zhdanov lieutenants in the so-called "Leningrad case."

One version of the Khrushchev speech has him charging that Stalin was also behind the Kremlin "doctors' plot," allegedly directed against Khrushchev et al. at the time.

Stalin, charged the new boss, was pathologically convinced that the pact with Hitler was a lasting masterpiece and refused to listen to any warnings that the Nazis would attack even as they were doing so. Khrushchev even charged that army units were ordered not to return the German invaders' fire till Stalin was belatedly convinced that Hitler had really declared war. Furthermore he was cowardly, fled Moscow under fire. He was not the great general who saved Russia; he even found it difficult to read a military map.

### BLOW TO FAITH

Without standing too firmly on every detail in Khrushchev's reported indictment, some of which are admittedly uncertain or contradicted by other versions, it is yet quite clear already that the main drift, at least, is accurate enough. This is confirmed by what is passed by the Moscow censor, what is hinted at in the Russian press, and what is obviously being assumed as true by the foreign Stalinist parties, which have not been thrown into such a panic since the overnight announcement of the Hitler-Stalin Pact. [See article on the American CP on page 3.]

It means that both the Russian people and the international working class will be given a new image of Stalin which largely resembles that hitherto presented by the enemies of Stalinism and heatedly denied as lies and slander not only by outright Stalinists but by scads of well-or ill-intentioned fellow-travelers, dupes, innocents and apologists—all of whom, Russian and non-Russian, thereby expose themselves as having been uncritical sycophants and janissaries of a lunatic Genghis Khan.

Nothing about Khrushchev's revelations (as so far reported) is new—except one thing, and that is enough. That is, that they came straight from the horses' mouth—not from Orlov's once-sensational book *The Secret History of*

Stalin's Crimes, not from the Trotskyist press, not from any other opponents of the Byzantine despot in the Kremlin, but from his closest tools, the very accomplices who carried out his crimes for him.

The impact of this one fact can hardly be over-estimated. Who will believe these people again? A blow of permanent and ineradicable effect has been struck against the underpinnings of Stalinism as a semi-religious faith.

### THE SANE LACKEYS

Who will put faith in these people who admit that they stood by and cheered, to a man, while all these things were going on; not only cheered, but lent their daggers and talons to the service of this "psychopath"; jumped with alacrity when he called for bloodbaths; made their speeches and wrote their articles and reports in which the myth of the Great Stalin was first created and then enforced on the mind of a generation; took the initiative themselves in anticipating, ahead of the next ambitious rival, the slightest whim or bloody whimsy of this tyrant; acted in their own bailiwicks as "little Stalins" on their own (sane variety); channeled the terror from the top down into the ranks and into the population, arriving at their present exalted station as Stalin's heirs only by their extra zeal and agility and assiduousness in aping and obeying the boss of the system. . . . Who will give them faith again?

In point of fact, many, we're afraid.

To be sure, in the long run, the fact we are stressing will be a permanent source of everregenerating doubts, which will merge into dissent and rebellion; but in the present short run, in cold fact, the spotlight even of Stalinism's enemies has been focused on the alleged "liberalizing" meaning of Khrushchev's revelations.

In virtually every newspaper one can read the standard journalistic summary of the present development: the Khrushchev leadership is "breaking with Stalinism." And that's good, isn't it?

An attack on Stalin is an attack on Stalinism, isn't it?

It stands to reason.

These phrases are not the result of any particular political thought in the heads of the *Times* pundits who use them (Salisbury), or *N. Y. Post* rewrite men (Lash) who echo them, or other newspaper commentators who repeat the phrases. They do not really represent a viewpoint to be defended or refuted. They represent the lack of thought.



On the contrary, the great truth about Khrushchev's attack on Stalin is that it throws a stark light precisely on the nature of the Stalinist system which they are maintaining—in particular, the limits of reform.

### BREAKING WITH—LUNACY?

Let us begin with the significance of Khrushchev's apparently most harrowing charge: that Stalin was "not himself in his later years." The phrase is from the *Times*' version of the Khrushchev speech and may or may not be textual, but that is not vital.

If the anti-Stalin reforms and revisions that are being introduced are directed against the consequences of Stalin's late lunacy, what then is this "Stalinism" with which they are allegedly "breaking"?

Does "Stalinism" = Stalin's lunacy?

If Stalin was "not himself" by the time of the runaway mass purges, when heads rolled indiscriminately, isn't it a fact that the system of terror was instituted and built when Stalin was quite "himself"?

Stalinism did not come into existence when Tukhachevsky's head hit the floor of the Lubyanka. That was when it reached its apogee.

Now look at it again from a related but different angle:

If the execution of (say) Tukhachevsky was a "terrible mistake," does this not mean necessarily: a "terrible mistake" even within the framework of the Stalinist system?

If the liquidation of Voznesensky (or Bela Kun, or Antonov-Ovseyenko, or whoever) was due to and was an indication of Stalin's phobia or unbalanced mentality, does it not mean that, when these men are rehabilitated and the in-

(Continued on page 2)



### LEFT OUT

of this issue are a number of events we'd like to have commented on. The Westinghouse strike was settled toward press time and will be discussed next week. Then there's the Kefauver vs. Stevenson fight, with Kefauver upsetting the favorite in Minnesota, about which we'd like to raise an embarrassing question for liberals. In France a so-called socialist named Guy Mollet is brandishing bayonets at the Algerian liberation fighters. William Faulkner's offer to fight for his "blood and kin" against the Negroes leads us to raise some questions about the role of the intellectuals in that fight. We'll see what we can do about it all next week. —Ed.

# Without Stalin — —

(Continued from page 1)

sane mistake corrected, it is not anything about the Stalinist system that is at stake?

If it was insane of Stalin to have cooked up the "doctors' plot," then how is it the slightest indication of "democratization" or "liberalization" when these insane doings are repudiated in the name of sane totalitarianism?

Take it another step:

Even if we elect to believe Khrushchev that it was a question of Stalin's phobia, what kind of system is this which made it possible for a madman to rule unchallenged—nay, servilely obeyed—for decades?

What kind of system was it that the Stalin group built when he was "himself"?

The "phobia" theory presented by Khrushchev still leads right about back to the nature of the system behind the man.

## 'MISTAKES' AND THE SYSTEM

But it is not necessary to accept the clinical explanation of Stalin's crimes or mental state, in probing the meaning of Khrushchev's admissions.

I do not mean to imply that I am arguing that Stalin was mentally normal (what ever that is) "in his later years." It is quite possible to assume, if only for the sake of argument if anyone insists, that this isolated all-powerful dictator had become in some sense mentally warped. Even if a psychiatrist could give him a posthumous once-over right now, it would be difficult to draw the line between ordinary clinical phenomena and the inevitable personal effects of Stalin's position as all-mighty arbiter of life and death. Other characters in history have displayed the characteristic traits of seemingly pathological suspicion and arbitrary bloodthirstiness in similar situations, even without Stalin's personal predilections as recorded by honest biographers.

The point is that his mental state, with all the dubious speculations attached thereto and which it would be preferable to avoid, is plainly a possible consequence but not a basic cause.

It does not take the hypothesis of lunacy to explain "terrible mistakes" in a system which is based on the unchecked and uncheckable, uncontrolled and uncontrollable rule of a totalitarian bureaucracy.

In order to by-pass the "lunacy" theory and still stick to the letter and spirit of Khrushchev's report and the known facts, the word to substitute is—*excesses*.

What the new leadership has set out to root out and reform are the *excesses* which accumulated like barnacles around the system as Stalin's one-man rule hardened and institutionalized itself.

As LABOR ACTION said right after the 20th Congress, and before this news of Khrushchev's speech—

"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."

## "EXCESSES"

This is the real key to Khrushchev's talk of Stalin's derangement.

It is necessary only to add that such "excesses" and "terrible mistakes" are not accidental and isolated personal deviations in such a system but inevitable, inherent and in the long run inescapable built-in features of such a totalitarianism.

For example, the United States, Lord knows, is a long distance from being totalitarian; but even here, with the onset of McCarthyite complications on the already existent witchhunt, one of the most portentous results was the outcropping of seemingly irrational and lunatic "excesses" in the assault on civil liberties, "excesses" which tore apart whole government departments and agencies, wrecked cadres of the State Department, liquidated the jobs of perfectly conservative and even reactionaries officeholders. But we do not really mean to compare even the witchhunts of a degenerating capitalist democracy with the totalitarianism of Russia; yet the role of "excesses" is analogous.

This is what determines the limits of the Khrushchev regime's reforms.

Without exception, everyone of the individuals who have been mentioned for

rehabilitation in Russia or in the satellites is a man who was a loyal Stalinist who was liquidated by "terrible mistake,"—that is, by the purge turning in on itself, in the irrational way which is built into the totalitarian rationale.

We have already pointed this out with respect to Bela Kun, Antonov-Ovseyenko, and some others whose names had been made known before this. Exactly the same is true of Voznesensky.

**These were all men who had marched together with Stalin in the destruction of the old Bolshevik party and the physical annihilation of the old Bolsheviks themselves.**

That is why it is only the ignorant "Russian experts" of the press, or the more sophisticated and conscious apologists for Stalinism like Isaac Deutscher, who thoughtlessly jumped from the rehabilitation of Stalinists to predictions about the rehabilitation of men like Trotsky. It is precisely in the mind of Stalinists that there is an unbridgeable gulf between these two types.

*The limits of the Khrushchev reforms are the limits of the Stalinist system, as a system.*

## VICTIMS

The revelations of Khrushchev also show their power by their efficacy in shattering the artificial constructions of all kinds of theorists who have tried to claim the 20th Congress as confirmation of their notions.

One prominent victim has been John Foster Dulles, with his boasts that the new lines of the Stalinists are due to the great strength of the "free world" achieved under Washington's guiding policies. It is not likely that Stalin went crazy because of the State Department's great triumphs in world diplomacy.

A second victim has been Isaac Deutscher, who (as we shall take pains to detail next week, when more space is available) now stands exposed—we mean it literally—as a charlatan who prostituted his undoubted talents to inventing fables and forgeries for the purpose of rose-coloring Stalinism. By an evil stroke of foul luck (for him), the *Reporter* magazine came out on the stands this past week at the same time as the first stories on the Khrushchev report were appearing, with Deutscher's definitive analysis of "Communist Party Congress: The Break with Stalinism."

The whole article revolves around Deutscher's explanation presented as the real low-down in his usual authoritative style, of how there was a concealed debate at the congress between the anti-Stalinists represented by Mikoyan and the "Stalinist die-hards" led by Khrushchev and (for some reason) Kaganovich. This theme is not simply developed but elaborated and rigged out for pages with circumstantial explanations of practically everything you might want to know about this muted "struggle" at the congress, the very existence of which sent Deutscher back to Lenin's time for comparisons.

**The merest babe now knows that Deutscher invented and fabricated this whole article and its analysis out of a mendacious imagination, purely and simply for the purpose of lending seeming authority to the pro-Stalinist theories of his which lie in back of his discreditable falsification.**

Not only that, but in this article Deutscher did not merely dabble with predictions about Stalinist liberalization: he boldly asserted, just as blandly as if it had just appeared in all the papers, that the whole concentration-camp system in Russia has been virtually abolished! He is in an awful hurry to speed along the Stalinist democratization-from-above that he has been plugging....

It is no doubt inevitable that, as soon as it is decent, Deutscher will manufacture another analysis, equally "authoritative," which will utilize the Khrushchev attack on Stalin as the proof-post-positive that everything he said before was gospel!

## CONTINUED NEXT WEEK:

*More on the limits of reform; the collective leadership and one-man rule; the relation between "Khrushchevism" and Titoism; the role of the party machine vs. the army; motives of the Stalin-deflation; Stalinism as an unfinished system; the strength of the illusions; the portent of the Tiflis demonstration.*

**Subscribe to LABOR ACTION—  
\$1 a year for Student Subs**

# SILONE SCANDAL

## AN EX-MORALIST THREATENS TO RUN TO THE MAGISTRATES

By H. D.

In a shocking move which has justifiably caused something of a scandal in Italian socialist circles, Ignazio Silone has announced in Rome that he is running to the courts to settle a political argument with a socialist opponent.

He is going to bring suit, he threatened, against Lucio Libertini and his independent socialist weekly *Risorgimento Socialista*—for reprinting an article which originally appeared in LABOR ACTION back in last November. The ground, he said, is one sentence in the article which is "slandering."

He had, however, not complained about this "slander" before its republication in Italy, he admits. It has been noted in Italy that he suddenly discovered his duty to call the bailiff into the debate when the political questions were getting embarrassing.

**As a matter of fact, the whole story actually started in LABOR ACTION's columns last year, in an "exclusive" which attracted wide political interest here.**

Libertini, a leader of Italy's Independent Socialist Union who acts as our Italian correspondent, had mentioned Silone in passing in the course of an article last September 26 on the crisis in the Italian CP. We asked him to explain his remark about Silone's devolution. He did so in "The Case of Ignazio Silone" in our November 28 issue, in which he regretfully traced Silone's development, since quitting the CP, from left socialism to support of the Atlantic war block.

We immediately sent this criticism to Silone and urged him to reply in our columns, with no limitations space-wise or otherwise. This procedure, of course, is unusual in the political world, though standard for LABOR ACTION.

A cordial note from Silone (which we printed Dec. 12) promised a reply soon, and at the end added: "leaving aside insults to which I never reply, I feel the duty to explain my objective position." (We had written him that we were particularly interested in his reply to the political questions raised.)

His reply came and was published in LA January 30, "My Political Faith." The following week, February 6, we continued the discussion with "An Open Letter to Ignazio Silone," and again invited him to take a rejoinder.

## WE GET REPAID . . .

**At this time *Risorgimento Socialista* of Rome, of which Libertini is editor, announced that it would reprint the whole exchange with and by Silone, and started with the article "The Case of Ignazio Silone."**

Silone answered—with his threat of a slander suit, announced in the right-wing social-democratic *Giustizia* on Feb. 25.

The sentence on which he hung this was one saying that Silone has been accused widely of working for the State Department and has defended himself against such charges weakly; but Libertini added for himself that he refused to associate himself with those "who sling glib accusations."

As noted, the article containing the offending sentence was published in LA last November. Silone replied to it, moreover. Besides, he sent us his reply with a note which conveyed "cordial greet-

## Fake

An AP dispatch from Mexico City on Wednesday evoked news items headed "Soviet May Honor Trotsky," and "Says Russia Plans Homage to Trotsky." It quoted one Felipe Alvahuante, who claims to have been Trotsky's "private secretary" for his three years in Mexico, as saying that the Moscow government plans to "pay homage" to the memory of Trotsky, who has assassinated in 1940 by Stalinist agents; and that he (Alvahuante) and other "Trotsky admirers" have been invited to the November celebration in Moscow of the Russian Revolution anniversary.

**But no such person was Trotsky's "private secretary" or any other kind of secretary.**

**A check with people then living in Trotsky's household also shows that no one ever heard of any such person in any capacity.**

Inquiry is being made into the identity of this Alvahuante and into the origins of this report.

ings" and which was of course quite devoid of any complaints about "slander." On the contrary we assumed that he was duly appreciative of our procedure in insisting on publishing both sides with free rein.

It is understandable, therefore, that from our vantage point on this side of the ocean, Silone's new move seems especially inglorious and, to tell the truth, shabby.

## SECOND ACT

But discreditable as this was, it was not the end. Two days later, in the same right-wing organ of Feb. 27, Silone was quoted as saying that he had not wanted to bring suit also against LABOR ACTION (which, after all, had insisted on publishing his side as well as Libertini!) but that he had been forced to change his mind—apparently under the urging of two Americans whom he refers to but does not name.

One reason why he had not wanted to sue LA, even though the "slander" was first printed there—explained this moralist who once wrote *Bread and Wine*—is that "The editor of LABOR ACTION had written [me] very courteously about not giving importance to the slanderous passages and answering the political questions."

Why then—may we modestly ask—did the honorable man after all decide to sue this most unusually fair publication? The answer is none too clear from this news item but it seems that "the editors of *Risorgimento Socialista* were thereby encouraged to republish in Italy" the offending article.

We hasten to add at this point that we have heard no more about this disgraceful threat of suit against us—except from a correspondent who apparently undertook to communicate with us on Silone's behalf, an editor of the social-democratic paper *Unità Socialista* with which Silone has been associated.

**Two weeks ago, on first learning of the sordid story summarized above, we wrote directly to Silone, demanding to know whether the published threats ascribed to him were true or not, and cogently calling to his attention the obvious discrediting and shame that could be the only result for the perpetrators of such a scandal.**

Apparently in reply, we heard not from Silone, who may be too busy with the magistrates, but from this person from *Unità Socialista*, one Vittorio Libera.

## ANOTHER EXCHANGE

Libera informed us that Silone had indeed written a reply to our Open Letter, but that he could not send it to us—the court suit, you know—but he enclosed proofs which were scheduled to be published in his own paper. This Libera also apparently undertook to be Silone's spokesman in explaining why he had been convinced to sue us.

Silone had to sue us too, he explained, because Libertini had announced that his only defense was going to be the previous publication of the article in LABOR ACTION, which he was simply reprinting.

This, however, is a very stupid falsehood. Libertini and his independent socialist comrades are already prepared to blow up the Silone maneuver (if Silone ever actually does bring it to an Italian court) by providing (1) that the questions at issue are political, not personal; and (2) that the charges, with which he did not associate himself, were plentifully made by others, as stated.

**The foregoing is about as much as we know about this dirty mess which Silone seems to be cooking up in Italy with the help of certain dubious social-democratic friends. We can speak with more confidence about something else: namely, that all we're really interested in is, if possible, spotlighting the nature of Silone's political VIEWS, and the degeneration they have gone through.**

To this end, we will publish next week, in full, Silone's latest rejoinder, together with a comment.

The comment will also be sent for publication to *Unità Socialista*, with the request that it adopt our habit of publishing dissenting views. It will be interesting to see whether Silone's passion for justice—in the courts—extends also to his press.

# The Debate in the 'Daily Worker' —

# The U.S. Communist Party Rocks-and-Rolls in the Crisis

By GEORGE POST

The American Communist Party, past victim of countless shocks to its nervous system caused by sudden right-angle or swivel turns in the Stalinist road, is entering—shuddering—into another period of trauma, perhaps its worst, in reaction to the news of the Russian bureaucracy's attacks on Stalin.

In the past three weeks the *Daily Worker* has started on what amounts to an open discussion, with something of the very note of "panic and disarray" against which Stalin's heirs warned on his bier in 1953.

Talk of a "split" in the party is certainly premature, if at all realistic, but there have been two quite distinct approaches set down, reflecting two obvious and distinct tendencies.

One has been represented by articles of William Z. Foster, the national chairman of the CP, and Joseph Clark, the *Daily Worker's* foreign editor. The other has so far been articulated by the paper's managing editor, Alan Max, and in a letter by Ring Lardner Jr., one of the "Hollywood Ten."

Alan Max's tendency is to openly admit the disorienting and mind-upsetting effect of the recent anti-Stalin revelations and to raise, various questions about the validity of past and present CP lines.

The Foster-Clark tendency seems to be: let us go along with the Moscow line as far as we must, echoing whatever the Russian leaders lay down so flatly and unequivocally that we are left no choice; but let us drag out feet on this—don't be in a hurry to get ahead of the parade fit-jumping on Stalin—go slow!

## NEW NOTES

For some weeks after the 20th Party Congress the *Daily Worker* tried to act as if nothing had happened. James Allen, writing in the *Sunday Worker* on March 4, for example, declared that there was nothing in the Congress to cause concern or embarrassment; rather, the congress displayed the "great confidence, the élan, the inner strength, the new advance and upsurge" of Stalinist society.

A similar tone was maintained by Joseph Clark in the *Daily Worker* for March 12.

But as the weight of evidence began to pile up and the attack on Stalin went from a critique of Stalin's *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR* to Khrushchev's accusations on claiming Stalin's "phobia," new notes were sounded:

Alan Max gave tongue to this new confusion in the *Daily Worker* on March 13, admitting: "Any Marxist who says he has not been jolted is either not being honest with himself, in my opinion, or minimizes the extent of the developments now in progress in the Soviet Union."

Editor Max raised many questions which he said he could not answer: "where were the present leaders during the period when they say that collective leadership was lacking?—what about their own mistakes in the period of capitalist encirclement? are they giving proper weight to the achievements of Stalin?" etc. And he admitted that "for the answers to such questions, one must either speculate or await further developments."

But while he could not answer these questions, still the fact that the Russian Party had attacked Stalin, and Max has obviously little doubt that at least in part the Khrushchev line is correct, made him aware that the complete adoration of Stalin and every aspect of Stalinist society was questionable.

Max concluded: "... we went overboard in defending things like the idea of Stalin as infallible, in opposing any suggestion that civil liberties were not being fully respected in the Soviet Union, in discouraging serious discussion and criticism of Soviet movies, books, etc. As a matter of fact, while the defense of the Soviet policy as a policy of peace was proper and necessary for the welfare of the American people, going overboard on these

## Go Slow, He Says



WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

other matters was wrong, and hence, self-defeating. It made it unnecessarily more difficult to win the ear of our fellow-Americans on the more basic questions. It made it easier for the reactionaries to persecute and isolate us."

And, of course, in saying this, Max says a mouthful for a Stalinist editor, for he has attacked the Russian art cult (something certainly which many Stalinists, faced with some of the cultural monstrosities of "socialist realism," have wanted to do for a long while), and he has admitted that civil liberties in Russia were "not being fully respected." This moderate bit of jargon for a Stalinist is tantamount to admitting that Russian society also knows witchhunts.

Taking his cue from the 20th Party Congress' declaration that "socialism" would be achieved in different ways according to specific national traditions and conditions, Max muses that all these errors could have been avoided if American Stalinists "had stood more firmly on our own feet on these matters." Max here verbally challenges the monolithic structure of Stalinism.

## FOSTER INTERPRETS

Max's line was taken up by Ring Lardner Jr. in a "Letter to the Editor" which appeared in the *Worker* for March 18. He too attacks the "near deification of Stalin" and "the cloying panegyrics" which appeared in the *Worker* on Stalin's 70th birthday celebration. But he carries this lesson further, applying it to the United States. He observes:

"And in that connection, recalling the damage done in this country through leadership by personality [an attack on Browder?], I wonder if some of the rather maudlin testaments to William Z. Foster on his recent birthday are really the most mature and effective way of acknowledging the respect due America's outstanding working-class leader."

There is also an Aesopian bit in Lardner's letter which suggests "that distortions of revolutionary history had unfortunate effects in relation to old requirements as well" as future needs; but he does not carry this any further. Lardner, as well as Max, admits that "any expression of doubt regarding Soviet judicial procedure" might not be "an unforgivable sin."

Foster's contribution put on the brakes, in the face of this invitation to free-wheeling re-examination and soul-searching. Not daring to challenge the dictates

of the Russian party, Foster accepts as fact that Stalin made a mistake in reference to Yugoslavia and that he had a tendency toward "one-man leadership with the negation of criticism and self-criticism."

However, he softens the blow by interpreting the Khrushchev line as a "review" of Stalin's work. The wholesale political attack almost becomes in Foster's hand a tentative essay at a "theoretical reevaluation." This "reevaluation" is considered as being in process rather than a *fait accompli*.

Foster asks to what extent the negative effects of the "failure to develop a real collective leadership" prevail; "what if any, decisive political mistakes were made by Stalin? What alternative policies to Stalin's were suggested by others and rejected? What resistance was made in top official circles to Stalin's trend toward super-centralization and denial of collective leadership? Were injustices committed during the purges?"

And while this review proceeds, Foster goes on to suggest, the task of the CP "is neither to rush indignantly to the defense of Stalin nor to tear him to political shreds, as some in our ranks seem inclined to do."

## DEFENDS STALIN

But Foster in effect makes his evaluation of Stalin.

He defends Stalin, declaring that the "excessive stress upon individual leadership" arose out of the "objective" conditions: "the prolonged struggle against the inner and outer party opposition, the long-continued, monumental effort to industrialize the country; the formulation and application of several five-year plans; the carrying through of the bitter world war against Hitlerism; the vital test of Soviet strength during the cold war in recent years, the struggle for the policy of peaceful coexistence, and many others."

And with all this, and even given the errors of overstressing individual leadership, one should not "fall into the bourgeois trap of making a negative and destructive sum-up of this whole situation." For after all, one must remember "the elementary fact that during the past generation, throughout the period of Stalin's leadership, the USSR made stupendous progress in nearly every direction in the building of socialism."

Foster then proceeds to a list of the "achievements" of Stalin from "the great ideological and political victory over the Trotskyites and other opportunists" through "the drastic raising of the living standards and cultural levels of the Soviet people." Foster is willing to concede that without the failure to develop a genuine collective leadership "in all probability, Socialism would have made still more rapid progress than it has done," but nothing more.

Foster's reference to "the victory over the Trotskyites" is thrown in as a reminder that there is nothing to the loose talk about rehabilitating Trotsky. Even more pertinent is his reaching-out to drag in the name of Browder: "In the past, we had to learn at great cost, in the affair of the renegade Browder, the danger attendant upon allowing too much power to concentrate in the hands of one individual."

## Not Interested



EARL BROWDER

For Browder's name inevitably springs to mind in this whole upset. The trend of the present line is that of which Browder was accused, in his time. And like Bela Kun and others being rehabilitated in Moscow, Browder was a thorough Stalinist who lost out in an intra-Stalinist purge, not an opponent Stalinism. Politically, therefore, there is no doubt that logic would demand his revival, just as it demands that in France the CP make up with Pierre Hervé.

But this type of logic is not too relevant to the power-politics of the Stalinist movement. Foster, Browder's factional enemy in the American movement, will never permit Browder's return; and Browder, today a sad hulk of his former self in every way, has indicated only the barest interest in anything that is happening.

Then, in a front-page editorial on March 19, the editors of the *Daily Worker* attempted to discuss the unusual situation created by these differences. They explain that of course differences of opinion exist in the CP and these differences are permitted to be expressed—

"... it would be peculiar indeed if any two articles or letters in our paper were to express themselves in exactly the same on such a vast event—not to mention an event on which all facts have not yet been made public. . . ."

Ah, different times, different arguments! Time was when Stalinist editors used to explain, without any trouble at all, how there could be universal and instantaneous unanimity in the CP press—expressed in the same words—with the same brand-new political lines—on the same day in every CP organ from Labrador to *Tierra del Fuego*; namely, because "Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism" is a "science," and it's just as if two physicists, one in Moscow and one in New York, performed the same experiments and got the same results, down to the third decimal point or punctuation mark. . . .

Now Alan Max, and also the foot-dragger Joseph Clark, call on their readers to discuss, the columns are open, etc. Joseph Clark, ended up a Fosterite-type article on March 18 with: "this is only one man's views, who would appreciate it if our readers wrote us and told us theirs."

## ALL MIXED UP

For the former it is at least partly a way of saying: *Please tell me what to believe about all this, I'm all mixed up, aren't you?* For the latter, representing the hard bureaucratic core whose main concern is living through it all, it is a way of postponing that which is impossible anyway at the moment: the putting forward of an authoritative "line."

As the *Daily Worker* editorial mentioned, "all the facts have not yet been made public"; new revelations may yet come from Moscow; the pot there is still bubbling; the secret Central Committee document being circulated in Russia has not yet traveled the ocean; anything may still happen. . . . Wouldn't it be risky to take a hard-and-fast position now while everything is still in flux? Hang on, hold fast, tread water, wait it out till the mists clear, and then we'll lay down the line . . . if we're still around.

Meanwhile there is considerable confusion in CP ranks. The CP's New York school, Jefferson School, has been offering a Wednesday evening series of lecture-discussions on the 20th Congress, and a second one is scheduled right away.

It must be remembered, however, that the American CP is pretty much down to a hard core of members. It can be conjectured that those who have been able to stick out the CP's switches and vicissitudes up to now are less likely to be shaken out of their faith than (say) the mass membership of parties like the French or Italian CP. Short of anything as dramatic as a "split," there is more likelihood of defections in ones or twos by those who cannot emerge from their mental and spiritual tailspins.

On the other hand, though there seems no prospect of a rapprochement with the politically defunct Browder, the new Stalinist line and the present talk of party reorientation would seem to call for friendlier relations with the various independent-Stalinist grouplets and elements who have been loyally complaining about the CP in the past: the "Sweezyites" around the *Monthly Review* and their friends, the "Cochranites" and other Stalinoids.

Read the  
**NEW INTERNATIONAL**  
America's leading Marxist review

## THE SEGREGATIONIST MANIFESTO:

**The Negro's Enemies Are Labor's Enemies**

By H. W. BENSON

Southern reaction and racism are taking their stand. Ninety-six congressmen, all from the South, have declared resistance to integration in schools.

Segregation is their proclaimed fighting front. But behind segregation lies the right of Negroes to freedom: their right to vote, to speak, to meet, to influence state governments that rule them.

And behind the rights of Negroes lies democracy for all: the right of unions, liberals and genuine democrats to organize.

In striking at the Negro, Southern reaction strains to perpetuate the power of classes that have stalled social progress in the whole nation for decades.

In fighting for their own rights, Negroes are in effect fighting for a new political realignment in the South that would open a new road for labor and progressive action everywhere.

An epochal struggle to extend democracy has begun; its full significance is hidden in a mist of embarrassed vaporizing steaming forth from the lips of official politicians from all wings of both parties. Here is a fight touched off by a Supreme Court decision that literally wells up from below against the instincts and desires of those in both parties who alternated in the control of our country.

"The labor movement and the liberal movement in 1956," declared UAW Vice-President Leonard Woodcock, "cannot allow a sort of Korean truce on this vital issue by the two political parties. This is not a matter now to be put on the back burner while the Constitution is mocked and set aside. We must insist that this is a major issue of 1956 and that no one shall stand for high office and receive our support who does not face up to this central fact of our times."

Labor and liberalism, North and South, have within their power to make the stand of Southern reaction its last futile stand; but they would have to fight in reality and in action in the spirit of Woodcock's words without bending before the demands and admonitions of conservatives in their own Democratic Party. Who, we ask, among the politicians supported by labor in recent times has faced up to this struggle?

In Montgomery, Negroes organize a mass bus boycott and are imprisoned. One of their organizers is a working-class leader, president of a local of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters.

In Houston, Texas, 200 Negroes plan a mass picket line to protest the appearance of Gov. Allan Shivers at the all-Negro Texas Southern University; Shivers, the Dixiecrat and enemy of organized labor.

All over the South, the NAACP initiates test cases in the courts, and courageous Negroes risk their lives, to break barriers of segregation.

Meanwhile, a quickie trial in Sumner, Mississippi, frees the murderers of a Negro in the same courtroom which acquitted the killers of Emmett Till.

Such times, such struggles test all political leaders. Where are our great liberal politicians? With few exceptions, absent!

The "friends of labor" are never around when the fight begins. Where were they, for example, when labor walked off all War Boards in 1942. Absent!

How many loud voices are raised on behalf of the Westinghouse strikers?

And now, in what Woodcock calls "this central fact of our times," official liberalism mumbles and mutters, straining not to lead a struggle but merely to save face.

**LABOR'S REWARD**

The spokesmen in Congress for Southern reaction are now ranged out in the open for all to see. Their manifesto is nothing less than an even-tempered call to resist the expansion of democracy. Who signs it?

Affixed to this document which unites all supporters of racism are the names not only of such open enemies of labor as Eastland of Mississippi and Barden of North Carolina but men touted as "liberals" like Lister Hill and John Sparkman, senators from Alabama.

Hill is chairman of the Senate Labor Committee.

In Sparkman, labor gets its full reward. The man whom it supported for the vice-presidency in 1952 turns up in the ranks of reaction, arm and arm with those whose rule rests upon the suppression of democracy.

Whether they sign with an enthusias-

tic John Hancock flourish or reluctantly go along with notorious racists is an interesting problem in political and sociological psychology; but it changes nothing fundamental. They have taken their public stand in the camp of reaction and anti-democracy.

Sparkman's 1952 running mate, Adlai Stevenson, still searches for the felicitous phrase or comical quip that will extricate him from the annoying but imperative necessity of taking a clear stand. Continuing the farce or fraud... Stevenson was "misquoted" or "misunderstood" . . . and the New York Post reprints the full text of one of his speeches to prove that he really favors integration and opposes Jim Crow. But that is not at issue.

He is not a private citizen baring his private conscious to the world. He is a political leader of liberalism. He must take a stand not merely for civil rights in general but for one side or the other in an actual fight.

Is he for those who fight for equal rights or is he for those who resist it? Will he denounce, by name, those like Eastland who lead the struggle against democracy? Thus far he continues to act as a candidate for the support of Southern reaction.

Yes, a momentous struggle for democracy is erupting in the South, stimulated by the Supreme Court decision. Those who would stifle the reach for freedom stand up in Congress to lead and to encourage reaction. The elected representatives of American democracy listen politely; they mull it over . . . there is much to be said on both sides . . . eminent gentlemen on my right . . . distinguished citizens from the South. . . . Talk drifts into an abstract discussion of "gradualism," of the Southern "tradition," of "government by law," of "outside interference." One imagines that he has stumbled inadvertently into a friendly club of responsible citizens agreed on promoting the welfare of the nation but disagreeing amicably on methodology.

But outside, the real fight has begun. The enemies of democracy get moral encouragement and leadership from the halls of Congress. The fighters for democracy get . . . ?

**ANTI-DEMOCRATIC CAMP**

Dwight D. Eisenhower, who by the way is president of the United States and is therefore compelled to comment on such things, told reporters: "Now, the first thing about the manifesto is this: that they say they are going to use every legal means. No one in any responsible position anywhere has talked nullification. . . ."

No one? Only in Virginia, Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina, Mississippi, and North Carolina has there been a movement for nullification or "interposition"; but we leave this point of simple fact to get right to the question of "law."

"The people who have this deep emotional reaction on the other side," added our understanding president, "were not acting over these past three generations in defiance of law. They were acting in compliance with the law as interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States under the decision of 1896."

Here, then, is a difference of opinion between distinguished gentlemen, all of whom believe in "law." Stevenson, too, pays homage to that section of "law-abiding" Southern rulers, reserving a gingerly criticism, only for those who defy law.

But the conflict which has begun is not basically between those who defy the law and those who obey it. Senator Eastland organizes White Councils in his state of Mississippi, supports nullification in practice, and is therefore, we presume, against "law." But he stands side by side with Hill and Sparkman who, we will presume, are for "law." In fact, the manifesto was deliberately phrased to facilitate joint action between the "law-abiding" and "law-resisting" sections of anti-democracy.

The fight is between democracy and anti-democracy: whether to resist the Supreme Court decision by "legal" or ille-

gal methods—that is a question of tactics which faces the camp of anti-democracy, but still within the framework of anti-democracy.

Taft-Hartley is "law." But the fight between its supporters and its antagonists is no less significant. Until the Supreme Court decision, segregation in the South was "law." But that made it no less hateful and its supporters no less enemies of democracy.

But, let us ask, how did segregation and anti-democracy become law?

Basic constitutional legality was established after the Civil War. The 14th Amendment adopted in 1868 states clearly, "No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States." By common consent of all parties and factions of the ruling classes, a stamp of legality was placed on the unconstitutional trampling of the rights of Negroes and workers in the South.

Now that the Supreme Court, under the impact of world events and the rise of a modern labor movement and the increased militancy of Negroes, has established a new legality, it is perhaps time to call attention of all law-abiding elements to two other sections of the Constitution. The 15th Amendment adopted in 1870 declares: "The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude."

But the law-abiding manifesto signers have trodden all over the right to vote. Southern representatives in Congress represent a thin segment of their own population. By transparent "legal" evasions and by open terror, whole sections of the population have been deprived of the right to vote.

**WHO IS FOR LAW?**

Where were the staunch upholders of law and order? In the South, they were part of the ruling Democratic Party, where they cohabited and collaborated nationally with Northern liberals.

And, too, we call attention to Section 2 of the 14th Amendment, which states clearly: "But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice-President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the Executive and Judicial officers of a State or the members of the Legislature thereof is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being twenty-one years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such state."

It is simple democracy! You cannot get representation for those whose vote is stolen.

If the Constitution were enforced, if genuine democracy prevailed, the Democratic Party would fall to pieces!

What law-abiding congressman, North or South, will insist that the Constitution be enforced? Let the gentlemen whose seats in Congress derive from terror, fraud, intimidation and murder return home and sign future manifestos merely as private citizens under the law and Constitution of the United States.

"We of the labor movement," said UAW Vice-President Woodcock, cannot afford for political expediency to climb cosily in bed with the unspeakable Eastland of Mississippi, who had said: "You are not required to obey any court which passes out such a ruling. In fact you are obliged to defy it." This is subversion. It hacks away at the very tap-roots of our free system."

Now, politicians whom the UAW has supported join with Eastland.

On March 15, Adam Clayton Powell, according to the New York Times, "asserted that many Negroes were dissatisfied both with the general Democratic record on civil rights and with what he called a lack of leadership by President Eisenhower himself. If the President continued to decline to summon a White House conference and if Adlai Stevenson and other Democrats continued in their middle-road stand on segregation, Mr. Powell said, he and other Negroes would meet to discuss a third-party movement."

A new party? There is no other way. There are many who profess democracy; there is no political party to lead this fight. But it begins nevertheless.

**Hoffa on Pan In AFL-CIO**

By JACK WILSON

Detroit, March 18

In the next two weeks, a major turning-point in the career of James R. Hoffa, Teamsters Union boss of the Midwest, will take place, and the outcome has much significance in the campaign of the AFL-CIO to eliminate raiding and racketeering as detriments to the growth of a healthy and dynamic labor movement.

In Honolulu, the executive board of the Teamsters Union has an ultimatum before it from the policy committee of the AFL-CIO. Either it renounces the proposed \$400,000 loan by Hoffa to the racket-ridden independent Longshoremen's union (ILA), or else the Teamsters Union faces expulsion from the AFL-CIO.

In Detroit, Hoffa is making an all-out bid for control of the powerful Wayne County Federation of Labor, in the elections taking place this coming week. His slate is taking on the incumbents backed by George Meany and other top AFL-CIO leaders.

Hoffa's welcome at a special conference of the ILA, and his pledge to loan them \$400,000, met with swift reaction in top labor circles, especially after he informed the world of his other raiding intentions. A top policy committee meeting informed Dave Beck, president of the Teamsters Union, of the consequences of Hoffa's plan, and brushed aside arguments that the Midwest Teamsters conference had autonomy in that field. Pertinent constitutional and policy statements of the founding convention of the AFL-CIO were read to Beck to remind him of the serious nature of Hoffa's proposed violation.

**MAY CURB HIM**

In Chicago, William Snitzler, secretary-treasurer of the AFL-CIO, issued a public warning to the Teamsters Union on this issue.

In Washington a meeting of the Industrial Union Department of the AFL-CIO, headed by Walter P. Reuther, pointedly rejected applications of two unions considered pro-Hoffa. They are the Jewelry Workers Union and the old AFL-UAW, from which Hoffa recently obtained seven local unions in an effort to win the election of the Teamsters Joint Council of New York, to which these locals were secretly chartered.

It would be too much to expect an open split in the Teamsters leadership at this point, but the pressure of the vast AFL-CIO may be strong enough to curb Hoffa somewhat, for he understands the value of remaining within the mainstream of the labor movement.

Undoubtedly Hoffa will offer the AFL-CIO some kind of compromise formula by which he hopes to reintroduce the ILA into the official union movement. Both George Meany and Walter Reuther, among others, are certain to be opposed to any compromise on this score.

The importance of the Wayne County Federation of Labor to Hoffa is decisive: Unless his slate wins, he loses much bargaining power in forthcoming unity meetings between the former CIO unions here and the AFL—more precisely, in his feud with Walter P. Reuther for influence in and control of the Michigan labor movement.

**LABOR ACTION**

March 26, 1956 Vol. 20, No. 13

Published weekly by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York 23, 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

## What Students Can Do on the Lucy Case

By its outrageous expulsion of Autherine Lucy the Board of Trustees of the University of Alabama has proved to the hilt that it stands shoulder to shoulder with those racist elements in the South which are prepared to go to any lengths to perpetuate the Jim Crow system.

Unlike colleges in Texas, Louisiana and North Carolina, which fought the admission of Negroes in the courts but finally admitted Negro applicants when so ordered, the University of Alabama has made clear its intention of circumventing anti-segregation decisions by any pretext it can lay hold of.

Its actions in the case of Miss Lucy, culminating in her expulsion two weeks ago, prove this.

After many years of litigation in which the university bitterly opposed her entrance into its lily-white classrooms, it was directed to admit her at the beginning of the current semester. She would be the first and only Negro there.

As clear a case of gradualism and moderation as even those timid souls Eisenhower and Stevenson could wish for.

On the second day of her attendance at classes, a minority of the pro-segregationist students, led by a sophomore named Leonard R. Wilson who later was to organize a White Citizens Council in Tuscaloosa, and some outsiders from the town, began to organize riots aimed at driving her off the campus. Needless to say, the Tuscaloosa police stood by.

And the university administration—which, one can be certain, would have known how to deal with a student demonstration protesting higher tuition fees, let us say—likewise did nothing.

But not exactly nothing. It suspended Miss Lucy "for her own safety."

Naturally it did not attempt to break up the rioting mobs "for her safety." It did not attempt to defend her against them "for her safety." It did not suspend the student leaders of the white-chauvinist hoodlums "for her safety." It suspended her "for her safety."

One cannot be certain that the university officials were counting on the development of riots to achieve what they failed to achieve in the courts. What is sure, however, though it may not be legally provable, is that they utilized the rioting to get her off the campus. A university administration determined to obey the law, no matter how reluctantly, would have found ways to protect her against the violence which developed.

### PROVING THE CHARGE

When ordered by a federal judge to readmit her, the University of Alabama responded by expelling her, using as a pretext this time the fact that in her legal efforts to secure lifting of the suspension she had charged university officers with complicity with the mob, a charge which had later been withdrawn. The blatant phoniness of this pretext, which incidentally involves a denial of academic freedom if one is to take it at its face value, since in essence the Board of Trustees declared that she was being expelled for bringing charges against it, should be evident to all.

Indeed, there seems to be some evidence that the university officials had planned to expel her on this ground even before the judicial ruling that she be readmitted, but waited until after the judge had rendered his decision in the hope that it might be unfavorable to Miss Lucy and that they would therefore not be required to throw her out of school on such a flimsy pretext. Faced with an adverse ruling on its suspension, it used this last weapon.

One might even say that by expelling her on the grounds that she had charged them with complicity with the mob, it thereby morally, if not legally, lent credence to those very charges. Why should one believe that a Board of Trustees which would throw her out of school on the pretext that it did, in order to uphold Jim Crow, would balk at conniving with a racist mob for the same purpose?

Adlai Stevenson may go out of his way to whitewash the officials of the University of Alabama, as he again did after they expelled Miss Lucy, but that's no reason for all those, the Negroes, work-

ers, students, and the liberals, who have no interest in making a deal with the racist leaders of the Democratic Party in the South, to close their eyes to the outrageous enormity of its Jim Crow policies and actions.

### COMPOUNDING THE CRIME

On March 12 the University of Alabama expelled Leonard Wilson, announced the suspension of four others and the meting out of discipline less severe than suspension to another twenty. Its decision to do so can only be regarded as an attempt to make its expulsion of Miss Lucy appear legitimate.

When viewed in context, no other explanation of its action is possible. For while it threw her out of the university immediately after the last court decision, it delayed in taking any action against Wilson even though his offenses were obviously more severe than her alleged offenses. By not taking any action against Wilson the university was making the phoniness of its grounds for expelling Miss Lucy obvious. Indeed, some pro-segregationist Southerners were even pointing this out.

Its motivation for expelling Wilson was clearly reactionary and needless to say, so were the reasons which it gave for its action. Had the university disciplined Wilson, including, if necessary, expelling him, during the course of the racist riots, then it would not have been involved in a denial of academic freedom. Indeed, a university administration determined to comply with the law and defend Autherine Lucy might have had to take such action against Wilson; nobody has any right to perpetrate violence against another student.

But the Board of Trustees gave as its major reason for moving against Wilson was not his overt acts but the fact that this advocate of "white supremacy" had expressed opinions in criticism of university officials—in his eyes they were not Jim-Crow enough.

Its step therefore represents a violation of academic freedom, and as such cannot be defended by opponents of Jim Crow, all the more so as it is not an action which is designed to accept integration but one designed to try to legitimize the Jim Crow expulsion of Miss Lucy.

Indeed, it has defined Wilson's crime as "public attack . . . upon the integrity of the president and faculty and officers of the university. . . ." In its view, this, and not the organization of violence against a Negro student, is what is bad.

By so doing, it has almost condoned the violence, or at least done nothing to discourage future violence the next time Miss Lucy or some other Negro wins admission by court action.

Won't some future Wilson think: "So long as I don't attack President Carmichael I can organize a mob to drive the Negro student out"? In pointing to his attacks on the university officials as the reason for expelling him, the Trustees revealed their reactionary hand.

Now Miss Lucy and her legal counsel are considering whether to make further efforts for her admission to that college. Whatever the decision is, the attempt to end segregation at the University of Alabama, as everywhere else, will again be made in the future.

The question which arises is what must be done the next time Miss Lucy or another Negro student arrives on that campus, to ensure an outcome different from the one which ended this chapter in the struggle of the Negroes for their elementary democratic rights. And what should be done in the interim to make that outcome more likely?

The first and most obvious point to be made consists of the necessity for continued and increased struggle by the Negro people and their organizations, and by their progressive white allies, for an end to the Jim Crow system, a struggle which is being carried on and must continue to be carried on, along all fronts.

### BRING UP SUPPORT

The fight of the Negroes in Montgomery against transportation segregation, the efforts of Negroes throughout the South to obtain the right to vote, the struggle to end segregation in education, elementary and secondary, as well as on the college level—these must go on.

These efforts must receive the support of the labor movement and of all democratic-minded people throughout the country. Unfortunately, the trade unions to date have contented themselves with not very much more than verbal and platonic support to the efforts of the Negroes; and much more in the way of material and moral support is needed.

Such support from the North is all the more urgent because the Negroes and those white forces in the South, including students at the University of Alabama, who are opposed to Jim Crow, or who, if not militantly against segregation, at least wish to comply with the law, feel helpless in the face of the monopoly of political power held by the racists. Support from the outside can help them to take up the offensive against the forces of Jim Crow.

Were there a government in Washington interested in doing something about Jim Crow in education, as well as Jim Crow generally, it could do much.

It could cut off all financial aid to the University of Alabama, whether such aid is granted in the form of research projects or in other ways. (Private foundations, for that matter, should do exactly this.)

It could, whether legislatively or administratively, put the proposal of the Powell amendment into effect.

It could prosecute the people who attempted to perpetrate violence against Miss Lucy.

It could prepare to protect the next Negro admitted by court order through having Department of Justice agents on hand, and by mobilizing those white students and the Negroes of Tuscaloosa who wished to defend her.

And in the event that all other methods failed, federal troops could be utilized to defend her against racist violence and threatened lynching.

The unions and liberals must demand that the government take such actions as are sketched above, and many others. And at the same time as the Eisenhower administration is asked to carry out a program of struggle for Negro rights, the opposition Democratic Party, and its leading candidate Stevenson, supported by the unions and liberals, must also be asked to commit themselves to it.

### FOR STUDENT ACTION

But in the columns of Challenge we are mainly concerned with what the students of America, and the academic communities as a whole, can and should do. We must unhappily note that to date, on the whole, the voice of the students has not been heard on this shameful disgrace, one with which students are directly concerned.

What can students do?

(1) They must let the students of the University of Alabama know that they stand for an end to segregation and that they regard the treatment of Miss Lucy as an outrage.

(2) They must let those students at the University of Alabama who favored Miss Lucy's admission—five hundred of them signed petitions to this effect—know that they have the support of the student bodies throughout the country.

(3) They must let Miss Lucy and Negroes throughout the country know that they sympathize with and support efforts to secure Negroes full equality.

(4) They must raise their voices in

the demand that the University of Alabama not yield to the Alabama state legislature, which has requested the names of those students who signed petitions demanding that Miss Lucy be admitted.

The exact forms in which these proposals are carried out will vary from school to school. It can be a petition campaign, (as was the case at the University of California recently) a declaration by the student government and organizations, an open letter to the students in Alabama, or other methods. Meetings and demonstrations of solidarity can be held.

The forms of making the student voice heard are not too important; what does matter is that it should be heard.

A good date for students to conduct such activities in behalf of civil rights would be March 28. Congressman Adam Clayton Powell (Dem., N. Y.) and other Negro leaders had declared that day as a day of prayer for Negro deliverance, originally coupling the idea with a proposal for a one-hour work stoppage from 2 to 3 p.m. The latter proposal has since been junked by Powell, but March 28 will receive some observance as a day of protest against Jim Crow. Students should support the various meetings and rallies which are held that day.

In schools where it is possible to realize mass student support for such a proposal, students might absent themselves from class during that hour, utilizing it for the holding of meetings and other activities directed against Jim Crow.

While small groups of students who stay away from class on their own would probably not be effective propaganda-wise and lay themselves open to administration reprisal, it may be possible in some schools to achieve mass support for such a project, perhaps even to get the student government to sponsor it. An effort to do so should certainly be made.

### TEACHERS CAN HELP

What can teachers do?

(1) They, too, can speak out.  
(2) They can institute a boycott of the University of Alabama, refuse to accept appointments to it, refuse to speak at meetings there, or accept honorary degrees from it (so should all other intellectuals to whom these are offered). Such forms of boycott were utilized by teachers a year ago at the University of Washington when it denied Robert Oppenheimer academic freedom, and at the University of California during the "year of the oath."

(3) The American Association of University Professors and other professional and trade-union organizations of educators should urge their members to participate in such boycotts and should urge those of its members who currently teach at the University of Alabama to withdraw from that institution or in other ways to make clear their opposition to its barbaric race policies.

Such protest and pressure by students and teachers can be effective. It can let the white-chauvinists know what the rest of the country thinks of them and it can bring important material-pressure to bear against them.

Above all it can give a great lift to the Negroes of the South who almost single-handedly are waging such a courageous struggle for equality for themselves and democracy for the nation.

It can provide the same kind of encouragement to those white Southerners who also are against Jim Crow but today are afraid to speak out. The progressive forces of the South, both Negro and white, need every bit of aid that can possibly be mustered.

### Get the Challenge

every week — by subscribing to  
Labor Action. A student sub is  
only \$1 a year!

## AN APPEAL TO THE NATION'S CONSCIENCE

**THE CRIME OF OKINAWA****A STUDY OF AMERICAN BULLDOZERS AT WORK ON THE 'CYPRUS' OF THE PACIFIC**

By MEL BECKER and PHILIP COBEN

As this study of the U. S. crime of Okinawa was being prepared Secretary of State Dulles reached Tokyo on March 18 in the course of his world perambulation and was greeted, among other ways, by a demonstration demanding the liberation of Okinawa. That made one sentence in an inside-page N. Y. Times dispatch which was headlined "Dulles Broadcasts to North Korea That Liberation Is Firm U. S. Goal."

It is no doubt the firm goal of U. S. power to "liberate" the possessions of all of its enemies. This is equally the firm goal of the world Stalinist power, which thereby achieves an "anti-imperialist" reputation among some.

**But the test of a genuine democrat is that he fights for the freedom of peoples oppressed by his OWN government, without compromising his denunciation of oppression anywhere.**

By this standard, U. S. democracy is cankered. There are few spots on earth where the toll of imperialist domination has been as heavy on a people as it has been in Okinawa under American occupation. Yet who is even aware of it in this country?

In the same issue of the Times above-mentioned, the resistance in Cyprus to British military terror was on the front page. Yet, leaving aside the obvious difference that the people of Cyprus are now fighting militantly, while the people of Okinawa are still protesting peacefully—there is a striking similarity between the cases of the two islands.

Both are held by foreign powers who insist on hanging on to their rule on the plea of military "security"—their own military security, of course, not that of the islanders.

In both cases the overwhelming majority of the islanders demand union with another country (Okinawa with Japan).

If there is a difference, it is that the Okinawans have far more immediate reason to wish freedom from the U. S.'s grasp, even apart from nationalist considerations.

Yet hundreds of thousands of words of justified sympathy are being poured out in this country on behalf of the Cypriots, but the case of the Okinawans is blacked out.

Is it because there are only a handful of people involved?—No, there are a million subjugated people in the Ryukyu Islands; and the 600,000 on Okinawa alone number far more than the whole population of Cyprus.

Is it that "we" are entitled to rule Okinawa because "we" liberated her in the war against Japan? Didn't our GIs give their lives on its shores? etc.—Then Russia is entitled to rule Eastern Europe. Indeed, Russian troops did help to liberate its present satellites from a Nazi occupation that the people hated, whereas U. S. troops did not "liberate" the Okinawan people when they seized it as a military objective.

Or is the freedom of the Okinawans of such lesser interest to our great democrats because its people are not members of the white race?

In any case, here is the truth about what the United States has done in the only land which is today directly under its own military occupation.

"So savage were the bombardments that Okinawa was altered almost beyond recognition . . . all the large towns and villages had to be rebuilt from scratch. At least 50,000 Okinawan civilians were killed or seriously wounded. . . ."

Another source speaks of the "Complete destruction of the two cities of Shuri and Naha [the capital] and of about 90 per cent of the rest of the island. . . ." And "almost anyone visiting Okinawa today, five years after the end of the war in Asia, would get the impression that some terrible scourge had descended upon and remained with both islands and people. Certainly it must seem so to the Okinawans themselves. . . ."

But what the war itself did to Okinawa is not our theme.\* Other lands suffered as battlefields too, in the fury of the world-wide slaughter, though few in as concentrated a fashion. It is simply the background of what has happened since.

**GRABBED FROM JAPAN**

In the first place, the islands were detached from Japan without the victorious powers even bothering to invent a moral-sounding reason. The official rationale would seem to be the Cairo declaration of December 1943: "Japan will also be expelled from all other territories she has taken by violence and greed," which certainly does not apply to Okinawa as long as the people themselves demand return. The Potsdam declaration of 1945 reaffirmed the statement but nowhere are the Ryukyus mentioned by name. The peace treaty stated explicitly that the U. S. would exercise immediate complete control over the islands but gives no reason.<sup>7</sup>

The reason, of course, is simply that the Truman government wanted it so, to build the islands into its own fortress. This was why they were not even formally turned over to UN trusteeship.

Japan even remains the "technical" owner of the islands, though this fact is, mainly a juridical curiosity. It underlines, however, the enormity of what the U. S. is doing with utter callousness to a land which it does not even "own" in the imperialist sense.

There is not the slightest doubt that, as we have reported, the mass of Okinawans desire return to Japan, as well as that the Japanese demand this reunification. The latest to confirm this is the American Civil Liberties Union, in its statement last year to the Defense Department on civil rights in Okinawa: "the major agitation in Okinawa, the Union said, is for reversion of the island to its former status as part of Japan, which practically all of the natives desire."<sup>8</sup>

In the 1954 legislative elections on the island, "The Socialist Party, favoring the return of Okinawa to Japan, won the largest single vote . . . the U. S. army said today," reported the Times.<sup>9</sup>

There is also a relatively weak tendency that wants independence, and another that favors UN trusteeship under the U. S. It can be imagined what sort of native quislings could possibly favor the status quo under the U. S. army as today; we shall mention them later on.

(Japan, of course, is officially on record as demanding the return of Okinawa. In July 1953 a unanimous resolution of the Japanese lower house, supported by all political parties, called on the government to take prompt action for its restoration.)

**But Washington has made it perfectly clear that, whoever is supposed to own Okinawa, it will never give it up, either**

\* But one should not ignore the following incident: "The physician who is in charge of the Airakuen leper colony told . . . that the colony has few badly crippled lepers because all such died in 1945-6. Mistaking it for a Japanese army installation, our planes blasted and strafed the leper colony and burned it to the ground. The lepers took to their caves and only one was wounded. But 300 of them died of starvation." (Christian Century, Jan. 23, 1952.)

to Japan or to the Okinawans. This is taken for granted by everyone, however official or unofficial, who has ever mentioned the subject. It was made virtually official by a Dulles statement, made as a 1953 Christmas Day present to the Okinawans, asserting that "the U. S. intends to remain as custodian of these islands for the foreseeable future."<sup>10</sup>

On this occasion the U. S. returned the Amamis Islands but Dulles said it was holding on to Okinawa "until conditions of genuine stability and confidence are created"—i.e., until the cows come home.

One hundred years after Commodore Perry had proposed, in his own italics, that the strategic islands be put under "surveillance of the American Flag upon the ground of reclamation for insults and injuries committed upon American Citizens" (the best excuse the pious chap could think of so early in the day of U. S. imperialism); one hundred years after Perry called for their occupation in accordance with the "strictest rules of moral law" and the "laws of stern necessity,"<sup>11</sup> the Ryukyus were indeed and at long last put into the hands of the occidental imperialists by the Japanese peace treaty.

**BASE FOR EMPIRE**

The century-old reason why Okinawa has been tempting an American land-grab is its strategic position in the Pacific—not in some special sense for defense of the U. S. but for domination of the Far East.

Said General Stearley, commander of the 20th Air Force: "Okinawa is the key to the whole thing out there. The nation which controls that island will control the Far East, and that is one part of the world which can be controlled by a single nation. . . . Okinawa is a bastion of defense and a base from which we can strike."<sup>12</sup>

That's rare frank talk. Behind it is the fact that from Okinawa "U. S. bombers can dominate every Asiatic port, from Vladivostok and Port Arthur to Singapore"<sup>13</sup>; that it is "only 500 miles from Red China,"<sup>14</sup> as the Times preferred to put it a little while ago.

And so this home of an ancient people is being turned into a bristling fortress for H-bomb warfare against any part of Asia.

"The island . . . has gone through one of the amazing transformations in the history of Pacific defenses. A 500 square mile patch of once desolate [sic!] subtropics, smaller than the Shetlands and less than half the size of Rhode Island, it has quietly mushroomed into a first-class island bastion, barbed with batteries of long-muzzled 120s cannonading in watchful practice across the emerald waters of the China Sea. Whole complexes of airports pack the sun-baked flatlands, forming a sprawling airdrome for the B-29s that take off each day to pound North Korea . . . and—if war comes—for the gargantuan eight-engine heavies that can carry atom bombs against any target on the surface of our planet."<sup>15</sup>

Less than a year ago, the Times also announced that "The 633rd Field Artillery, equipped with the 280-mm atomic cannon, will be sent from Fort Bragg, N. C., to Okinawa."<sup>16</sup>

**OKINAWA UNDERGROUND**

"The U. S. has spent \$500,000,000 to transform Okinawa into an American Malta," wrote Demaree Bess; its American community now numbers 40,000.<sup>17</sup> The "U. S. aim now is to convert the former [sic] Japanese island into a stationary 'aircraft carrier,'" is how the U. S. News & World Report enthusiastically described the plan to "re-do" the Okinawans' home.<sup>18</sup>

No wonder the U. S. has no intention of ever releasing its talons on the invest-

**The Air-Conditioned Nightmare**

SAKINI: . . . History of Okinawa reveal distinguished record of conquerors. We have honor to be subjugated in 14th century by Chinese pirates. In 16th century by English missionaries. In 18th centuries by Japanese war lords. And in 20th century by American marines. Okinawa very fortunate. . . .

—"TEAHOUSE OF THE AUGUST MOON," ACT I, SCENE 1

The people of Okinawa are not Japanese and do not consider themselves Japanese. They are Okinawans.

They are a people with their own proud history, culture and way of life, which the U. S. is now engaged in destroying with brutal methods. If they wish union with Japan, it is because for several centuries now Japanese influence has been dominant and effective in determining the orientation of the people.

From the 14th into the 17th century Chinese influence was uppermost, under the Ming dynasty, but never achieved real governmental domination of the Ryukyu island group. Japanese influence began in the first years of the 17th century. By 1879 it was incorporated into the Japanese empire, the native king becoming a Japanese peer. The process did not differ much from the transformation, within Japan proper, of other feudal states into the centralized government under the restored Meiji emperor. It was not the kind of colonial conquest that characterized the formation of the European empires.

Today, the Okinawans almost universally speak Japanese as fluently as their native Ryukyuan language, and "many of their characteristics are Japanese."<sup>1</sup>

The Okinawans are not the savages who generally, in the American popular mind, populate the Pacific islands. We point this out somewhat apologetically, since we certainly do not wish to imply that it would be all right to oppress savages. It is still important to note that this people whose home has been taken away from them are, and long have been, a highly cultured people.

The Ryukyu Islanders have a higher literacy rate than the great United States of America.<sup>2</sup>

The editors of the Christian Century, who pointed this out in one editorial, said in another: "Okinawans are not primitive South-Sea islanders. They had achieved a high degree of civilization when Scotsmen were still eating each other. Their poets, dramatists and composers antedate those of the British Isles. Their musical dramas, some of them of operatic caliber, are a highly developed art form."<sup>3</sup>

**WAR-TORN**

This is the people who were caught up in the Second World War, and today the name Okinawa mainly denotes to Americans the scene of a great Pacific battle. What was merely a battlefield to the contending U. S. and Japanese forces was—their home.

1. Numbered notes, which give reference sources only, will be found at the end of the article. Footnotes are denoted by asterisks.

# Spotlight on the Only Area Under Direct U.S. Military Occupation . . .

ment. Here's another bird's-eye view, from the *Times*:

"Certainly the sprawling, ultra-modern base looks permanent.

"The heart of the fortress is shielded in great, underground bunkers. From the air, well traveled roads that suddenly disappear—apparently into deep concrete caves—can be spotted all over the 67-mile-long outcropping.

"It is taken for granted here that some of the giant caves house an atomic weapons stockpile. The 280-mm atomic cannon are here. . . .

"A \$400,000,000 construction program . . . is taking shape. . . .

"Bulldozers are busy everywhere, scraping and leveling land and extending the air-conditioned underground caverns that house the island's vitals."<sup>19</sup>

There is the picture of the air-conditioned nightmare in the midst of which the Okinawans live. Now let us take a closer look at those bulldozers that are "busy everywhere, scraping and leveling the land"—and at the land which they are scraping away.

## II

### Dictatorship of the Bulldozer

CAPT. FISBY: *Make sure they understand that I come as a friend of the people. That we intend to lift the yoke of oppression from their shoulders.*

SAKINI: *Oh, they like that, boss. This their favorite speech.*

FISBY: *What do you mean, their favorite speech.*

SAKINI: *Oh, Japanese say same things when they come, boss. Then take everything.*

FISBY: *Well, we're not here to take anything.*

SAKINI: *They got nothing left to take away, boss.*

FISBY: *Well, if they did have, we wouldn't take it. We're here to give them something.*

SAKINI: *Oh, not get angry, boss. We not mind. After eight centuries we get used to it. When friends come now, we hid things quick as the dickens.*

—"TEAHOUSE OF THE AUGUST MOON," ACT I, SCENE 3

The benevolent Americans are not taking away the sort of thing that the Japanese overlords or Chinese traders were after, that the Okinawans could hide. In fact, they don't want to take anything away at all—except the islands themselves. They have only love and kindness, for Okinawans Who Know Their Place.

And if they are taking something material away from the people, it is nothing that they can hide. In many cases it is the land—no, the soil itself on the land, which is being scraped away.

All this requires suppression of the people. The military plan for the islands requires a heavy-handed dictatorship. Here is an unusually frank statement:

"However sympathetic one may be to Ryukyuan problems, a simple, unpopular truth must be faced: our primary mission in the islands is strategic. Accordingly, military necessity must often trample over Ryukyuan interests. . . . Indeed our very presence in the islands is in violation of the wishes of the Ryukyans. So long as our mission remains that of Pacific security, the character of our administration must reflect the ascendancy of military considerations. It is possible that civilian control [this means: even U. S. gaudier civilian control] might be too sympathetic to native interests and would thereby jeopardize the internal military strength of the islands."<sup>20</sup>

A Russian could not be clearer in explaining why Moscow control over the satellites cannot be relinquished.

#### THE KIND MASTERS

In addition to its geographic advantages, the strategic value of Okinawa to the American military was (they thought) that they would not have to deal with a refractory native government that would continually harass them with tiresome things like rights and local interests. "Top military men, moreover, believe that Okinawa has decided advantages over Japan and the Philippines as a site for American air bases. They point out that in Japan and the Philippines the U. S. must deal with independent governments which may not always be so favorably inclined to the idea of playing host to U. S. military forces."<sup>21</sup>

Here (they thought), the army will be the government. What could be better? It's not that they have any special animus against Okinawans. It's just that the one million people are . . . in the way.

*Haven't we been good to these unfortunates? Haven't we built (or rebuilt) them schools and hospitals and such? Haven't we improved their health and sanitation facilities? Haven't we cut down typhoon damage with a better warning system? What are they complaining about?*

"U. S. military and congressional lead-

ers, anxious at the possibility of U. S. forces having to fight from an island base where the civilian population is hostile, have made many studies of the problem. But no solution has been found."<sup>22</sup>

Okinawans suggest a solution, of course, a simple one: "Please get off our backs." But the army, it seems, searching high and low for the "solution," rejects proposals far less drastic: some elementary civil rights, for example.

"Citizens of neither Japan nor the U. S., nor even a Ryukyuan nation, Ryukyans are subject to stringent travel restrictions."<sup>23</sup>

The point is not simply this single restriction; they are citizens of nothing, and have no rights at all—only the sufferance that the U. S. army decides to give them.

"Non-fraternization has been more strictly enforced on Okinawa than in any other occupied territory. . . . No free election of civil officials has been permitted," reported the *Christian Century* in 1950.<sup>24</sup> That last point must be brought up to date.

#### ARMY DICTATORSHIP

The first military government for the island was under the U. S. navy, then transferred to the army July 1, 1946. Four and a half years later, affairs were taken over by an army-controlled civilian administration (U.S.C.A.R.).<sup>25</sup> In 1954 the administration organized free elections to a native legislature, with the results reported earlier in this article. But—

"While the U. S. general in command exercises all the ultimate powers of government, the native legislature is freely elected. Its laws, however, are subject to the commander's veto. The chief executive, a native, is appointed by the general in command without the consent of the legislature, and he in turn appoints all the administrative officials of Okinawa. The [American Civil Liberties] Union urged that the chief executive be appointed by the legislature, as has been U. S. practice in other occupied areas. This proposal, which is the key problem in assuring native rights, has been opposed by the Bureau of the Budget. Proponents of the idea have pointed out that the veto in matters affecting military security would remain. The Administration maintains that the change can only be made by Congress."<sup>26</sup>

Moreover, U. S. law does not apply to Okinawa. The army is the law. It alone decides which U. S. laws apply in this bailiwick, if any, in any situation.<sup>26</sup>

The real situation was indicated when, in answer to a suggestion that, with several parties in the field and some of them opposed to the status quo, the situation might become unstable, the army-appointed Chief Executive replied: "The situation cannot become unstable because U.S.C.A.R. holds absolute power."<sup>27</sup>

Incidentally, the present "civil administrator" is a brigadier general!

#### CIVIL LIBERTIES

It can be imagined in this context that all civil liberties are contingent on "discreet" use. The army in Okinawa is freer than McCarthy with the cry of communism against any dissenting voice. Theoretically there is no press censorship over Naha's four daily papers, but "occasionally a paper may be reminded by the American administration that something said has been out of line."<sup>28</sup>

<sup>20</sup> During this period, in fact up to the outbreak of the Korean war, Okinawa was a stepchild of the armed forces. *Time* magazine (Nov. 28, 1948) has an interesting contribution to the background of the Okinawan situation today.

<sup>21</sup> For the past four years, poor, typhoon-swept Okinawa has dangled at what better Army men call "the logistical end of the line" . . . Okinawa had become a dumping ground for army misfits and rejects from more comfortable posts. In the six months ending last September, U. S. soldiers committed an appalling number of crimes—29 murders, 18 rape cases, 16 robberies, 93 assaults.

In 1954 the head of the People's Party, which is for union with Japan, was prosecuted for "perjury and hiding an underground leftist," said an uninformative *Times* item. Another party leader "was arrested along with 26 party members on charges of 'printing and circulating inflammatory literature.' The statement did not elaborate . . . U. S. officials said one of the party's main platforms was a demand that Okinawa . . . be returned to Japan."<sup>29</sup>

This People's Party was charged with being over-friendly with "Communism," and we do not know how much truth if any is in this description, but it does not sound highly relevant to the real motives of this crackdown.

Early this year, it seems, a new law was promulgated obviously for restricting both the press and political action. A news item said in February: "Newspaper editor Takeo Sakumoto was jailed yesterday on a charge of publishing criticism of a candidate for public office. . . . Such criticism in newspapers or magazines is forbidden under a law passed last month."<sup>30</sup>

#### QUOTING SCRIPTURE

A gag on the people has to follow the flouting of their rights, lest the victims cry out. The cry of Communism is the pattern, as on Cyprus or anywhere else where imperialists face unrest. A Methodist missionary wrote in 1954, for example:

"On December 5, 1954, troops of the U. S. army on Okinawa were called out to suppress what the army termed a Communist uprising on the island. The 'trouble-makers' were an unarmed group of Okinawans who were protesting the use of their land by the occupation forces without agreement and without payment."<sup>31</sup>

A special commission of missionaries charged, the same year, that "where they have given voice to what they consider just grievances, they have been accused of being Communists."<sup>32</sup>

This is especially true whenever Okinawans protest the heinous military land-grab which has gone on. Remember the bulldozers "busy everywhere, scraping and leveling the land."

#### LAND-GRAB

"Forty per cent of the arable land is said to have been requisitioned by the army," reported the ACLU last October.<sup>33</sup> Two years ago a missionary wrote: "How much land is the army using? The figure given is 40,000 acres. . . . At present Okinawa has 1300 people to the square mile. Subtract the land on which Okinawans are not allowed to live and the number is 1700 per square mile."<sup>34</sup>

The 40 per cent figure may, and should, astound the reader, even for a land-grab. Here is another figure, from the *Christian Century*, whose articles reflect missionaries' reports: "The American bulldozers scraped away approximately one-third of the top soil of the island, often for no better purpose than to level a campsite."<sup>35</sup>

And even for purposes not as "good" as that:

"While most of the land taken over is used for actual military purposes, a substantial portion is used to provide large lawns and gardens or American style residences, for golf courses and, for other such purposes. While this is a normal use of land in a country such as the United States, where there is plenty of land, it seems an abnormal and unnecessary use of good farming land to the Okinawans."<sup>36</sup>

So thousands of Okinawans are forced off their land and out of their whole social fabric as tillers of the soil, so that the occupying Americans might not be denied the little velleities that their way of life demands.

#### BAYONETS ON IE-SHIMA

But this aspect may be considered an "excess." The core of the problem is not the use of land for golf courses but the wholesale allocation of land to military installations and firing ranges. Village after village disappears under the bulldozers—

"Gushi-ko [a village], stated the [*Ryukyu Shimpō*] newspaper December

<sup>32</sup> Incidentally, it is true that one of the few liberal voices raised to protest the Okinawans' plight has been that of the Christian missionaries, channeling through their church institutions and the *Christian Century*. As they themselves have stressed, it has been very difficult for the missionaries to explain to the unsophisticated Okinawans what their very Christian brethren have been doing to them, and this has been a serious deterrent to the work of the Lord. Missionaries, like the Dr. Darley Downs mentioned later in this article, have been laudably active in advocating improvements in the natives' lot. But it must be regretfully noted, too, that at no time and in no way as far as we know, have the church institutions involved come out for the simple justice of self-determination for Okinawa.

*Ryukyu Shimpō* [newspaper] December 6, 1953, had 320,000 tsubo of land before the war. Expansion of American airfields reduced this to the present 60,000 tsubo. The villagers maintain that construction of the new airfield will reduce their land holdings to 4000 tsubo.<sup>37</sup> (One tsubo equals only 36 square feet.)

For a more vivid picture of the army in the process of executing the death sentence on a village, here is a report from the *Okinawa Times*, which in turn is quoting the native newspaper *Hokubei Shimpō*, March 16, 1954.

The report told of the eviction of 13 peasant families (over 80 people), on the morning of March 15, on Ie-shima Island. A special land committee of the Okinawa legislature rushed to the place when they heard of it, and listened to the families.

The eviction had taken place within the bounds of a "newly proposed bombing and firing range of the U. S. armed forces." Work on the range had been started at 7 in the morning on March 14 and was completely finished on March 15. The evictees were assembled in tents outside the area. "The peasants were seen crouching expressionless in the tents in their misery after the sudden destruction of their former homes."

The legislative committee came and saw: "There were housewives carrying their babies in their arms. Some aged people put up mosquito nets in the tents. Others were preparing some food on open fires which were hastily constructed out of fieldstones. . . . There was a group of old people who refused to eat since noon of March 14."

The villagers told the committee how surprised they had been by the speed of the eviction:

"About 7 o'clock on the morning of March 14, heavily armed American soldiers appeared and operational forces started to tear down the roofs, sidewalls, and floors, one house after the other. Especially tragic was the destruction of one house which was just smashed and run over by the bulldozers. In this area, the supply of drinking water is insufficient. Therefore the people collect the rain-water in a wooden tank. However, even this water tank was mowed down by the bulldozer, complained an old peasant in tears about this outrage. One of the families had a child sick with measles who had to be carried from his bed during the sudden commotion of eviction. They also said: 'Everything happened so suddenly that we just had to watch in speechless surprise what the operational forces were doing to our homes.'"

The army, candidly stated this Okinawa newspaper, falsely announced that the villagers themselves had helped to dismantle their homes; it gave the lie to this bureaucratic falsehood.

#### BARBARISM IN BRASS

Anticipating for a moment the question of compensation, we can add that, the same article reported, representatives from Ie-shima went on a hunger strike in front of the door of the government office in protest against the unsatisfactory offer of compensation made for the land thus brutally taken away.

That was in March. In October a committee of the legislature was making another investigation of the land problem on Ie-shima. One hundred fifty-two families had been told to evacuate by October 15, but they were determined to stay. The *Ryukyu Shimpō* said in the course of its report: "It is said the aerial firing training is carried out only every Saturday and Sunday, from dawn till after sunset. Subjected to the firing practice, the villagers take refuge in shelters and can cultivate at best only about 10 tsubo per day."

A villager told the legislative committee about how they were informed that they had to give up their land and their lives:

"Before we knew it, trucks had driven up and scattered sand on our land, and a plane flew over our land and suddenly a bomb was dropped. Without knowing anything, we took refuge in a cave for the sake of securing our lives, but when we were informed that we must evacuate we were thrown into confusion. This is the land we have received from our ancestors, and we would rather die than lose it."

If the barbarous scenes that were enacted on Ie-shima were acted out by NKVD troops or Nazi SS corps, they would fit. But they were not perpetrated by totalitarians—not in this case. This was the United States, busy at work defending Democracy and Civilization.

It was after these events that army troops on Okinawa were called out to suppress a peaceful demonstration of

(Turn to last page)

# THE CRIME OF OKINAWA

(Continued from page 1)

peasants which was labeled a "Communist uprising," as noted earlier in this article.

## FOOD PROBLEM

One—only one—of the consequences of this land-grab policy is simply a shortage of food raised on the islands. "Even before the war . . . Okinawan agriculture, though largely devoted to the production of food crops, did not supply all of the island's needs. More than two-thirds of the rice consumed, about one-half of the soy beans, and about a quarter of the wheat and barley consumed had to be imported from abroad."<sup>39</sup>

But after the war, as a result of the U. S. military landgrab, only 60 per cent of the pre-war crop of rice was being produced, only 68 per cent of the sweet potatoes, only 40 per cent of the soy beans (the foregoing being the dietary staples), plus only 7.8 per cent of the sugar, 53 per cent of the livestock, and 78 per cent of the bean products.<sup>40</sup>

## STALL ON COMPENSATION

As we have already indicated, not only is the army callous in its expropriation of the people's land, but it is also niggardly in offering compensation. In a real sense, no amount of money can compensate for destroying a peasant family's whole life, even if a sum of money is handed over, but, in point of fact—

"Since April 28, 1952," stated a missionary's article in 1954, "the army has been using land without agreement or payment. . . . There are 76,000 landowners and 200,000 parcels of land involved in army use. Less than 2 per cent of the owners have agreed to the rent offered by the army. . . . On being asked why only Americans do the work of appraisal, the district engineer's office gave two reasons: the land was taken by the army and therefore does not concern the Ryukyans, and the Ryukyans demand an unreasonable price. . . . I asked the district engineer's office why most of the people object to the army's appraisal figure. The answer was that the people were made recalcitrant by communist agitation . . . in a country that has been occupied by the United States army for eight years one would not expect to find 98 per cent of the landowners communists or sympathetic to communism."<sup>41</sup>

The same writer notes that Okinawan government leaders have repeatedly requested that islanders be put on the appraisal committee, but this has been rejected.

Even this stall on compensation was an advance over the situation which had existed only two years previously, when the *Christian Century* reported on "the lack of indemnification to Okinawans who suffer misfortune as a result of the occupation. People whose land has been taken so far receive only indefinite promises of payment at a rate which is also indefinite. When an American plane drops a gas tank which falls on a house, killing several people, the relatives are told that the military have no policy or authorization to make reparation. These things are widely known, and they help nobody."<sup>42</sup>

## CHEATING THE PEASANTS

Last year, the Japanese Federation of Bar Associations, in a report on Okinawa, charged "that the rent paid was only one-ninth that asked by the Okinawa owners. . . . The report noted that more than 38,000 of the 44,000 landowners whose property had been expropriated had filed appeals but that 'only four cases have been settled.'" (N. Y. Times, June 17, 1955.)

The army dictatorship in Okinawa was caught redhanded in a mathematical demonstration of its willful cheating and spoliation of the natives, when Dr. Downs, a representative of the National Council of Churches (Division of Foreign Missions), testified before a congressional committee visiting Okinawa at the end of 1955. He showed that the army is compensating for land it takes at one price, and renting similar land at prices nearly eight times greater, and that going prices in land sales were as much as forty-five times larger than its compensation-rate!

Here is part of his testimony:

"Is it true that while the army is paying an average of 8 yen per tsubo for

land around Gorku [a township], it is renting land held as former (Japanese) government property at 60 yen; and that privately held plots there are being rented at between 240 and 520 yen? Is it true that while the army pays 16,000 yen for the former site of the Gorku elementary school, the township is paying from taxes 720,000 yen for the substitute site? If this is correct, does it not suggest that the army rates are too low? . . ."

## "NO FUNDS..."

The same Dr. Downs, who is the field secretary of the Inter-Board Commission for Christian Work in Japan, made a number of suggestions for relief, showing that there was much to be done even as palliatives which the army dictatorship was not doing. He pointed to 16,500 acres of arable land that could be made available for cultivation if the government took sufficiently strenuous action. On some islands "large tracts" could be made arable "with modern engineering techniques and earth-moving machines," such as were being used to turn the islands into an A-bomb fortress. And in addition, he asked, "what are the possibilities of emigration, of development of household industries, of nut and fruit trees, of development of grazing of cattle, sheep and goats, of expansion of fishing and canning, and of the culture-pearl industry? Probably these have not been seriously explored owing to the feeling that funds were not available to execute any such plans. . . ."

Some of these suggestions would not cost more than the price of one shell used for target practice, which falls on a peasant's land and blows it to bits. But funds are not available even for such dubious substitutes for the right of the people to live in their homes as free men.

## EXPLOITED LABOR

Okinawan society is based on the peasant, but, especially with the new works projects of the "American Malta," there is a new working class—the "native labor" on which the construction depends. They are no less exploited.

"The second major problem, the report [of the Japanese Federation of Bar Associations] said, was the payment of what it called unreasonable wages to Okinawan laborers. It said local workers were unprotected by labor laws and had no right of collective bargaining, and that wages were discriminatory. The survey added that wages paid to American workers ranged from approximately \$1 to \$6 an hour, to Filipinos from 40 cents to \$1.60, to Japanese workers 20 to 40 cents, but only 8 to 21 cents to Okinawans."<sup>43</sup>

This scandalous situation was suffi-

ciently crass to attract the attention of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, at its world congress in Vienna in May 1955. The ICFTU noted that the army dictatorship had refused permission to a Japanese trade-union delegation which sought to investigate the complaints. It called on its Executive Board to investigate and act because "reports have been received that basic human rights, and in particular workers rights, have been violated in the island of Okinawa."<sup>44</sup>

## A KIND OF GENOCIDE

But the crime against the Okinawan people cannot be measured simply in terms of how much soil has been scraped away by the bulldozers, how many people have been evicted by bayonets, how much land has been stolen for how little compensation, how few civil rights the people have . . . or even how many thousands of Okinawans will be killed in a World War III when this atom-bomb fortress is itself blasted by atom bombs.

It is Okinawan society itself that is gradually being destroyed under the bulldozers. It is not a question of idealizing that society, no matter how preferable it may be to the garrison-dictatorship that is destroying it—especially to the Okinawan people. It is not a question of whether preservation of their own society is preferable to its replacement by the "American Way of Life," because the A.W. of L. (whatever that is considered to be) is not replacing it and cannot replace it. When such a society is destroyed, its people are on the way to disintegration.

This was clearly seen in the National Council of Churches statement already quoted:

"(1) Since arable land in Okinawa is limited, when it is taken for military purposes the owner of the land cannot secure other farming land or continue his occupation as a farmer. In many cases, land has been in possession of the family for uncounted generations and the whole tradition and history of the family has been that of farming. In many cases, no financial compensation, no matter how just or adequate, can compensate for the loss of such land.

"(2) The Okinawans are often criticized by members of the armed forces as parasitical, but when a family's land is taken, they have little choice but to depend in some way on the military economy for their livelihood."<sup>45</sup>

Since the war, writes a Methodist missionary, "Okinawans who had been professional men, tradesmen, teachers, and the like, were reduced to the status of peasants dependent upon the soil for a meager livelihood. The discarded military clothing made available by the American armed forces reduced everybody to the drab uniformity of dependence upon foreign charity."<sup>46</sup>

The philanthropists, of course, cannot understand why the recipients of their charity are so ungrateful and unappreciative of the rags that they hand out so lavishly.

## "NO COMFORT"

The future narrows for the whole people as for the individual. *Time* magazine caught a vignette:

"In the windowless teachers' room of the Nadke High School, old bushy-haired Principal Matsugoro Shimabukuro sighed: 'The students here are too puzzled to have any fixed hopes. Why bother to graduate from high school if the only job you can get is working on a labor gang for the American air force?'"<sup>47</sup>

Americans look around from their garden lawns and states-style residences and say: "Think of the dollars being spent here; these Okinawans must be getting rich off of us." The aforementioned Dr. Downs answered before the congressional committee:

"Note has been taken of evidences of general prosperity in Naha and at the various military installations. Thousands of Okinawans are getting rich—at least by local standards—out of expenditures by military agencies and soldiers. Obviously this is no comfort to impoverished evacuees but rather only an infuriating aggravation."

Thus some aspects of the American Way of Life are imported—deepening class differentiations, for example. How else, in fact, without the creation of a compradore class, will the quislings be found to man the official posts which the army dictators have at their disposal?

## TELL THE WORLD

This crime against a people, which we have sketched here, is not being committed by a foreign government in which we

## ISL FUND DRIVE

# 15 Areas Lag Behind 50%

By ALBERT GATES  
Fund Drive Director

The slight improvement in contributions this week did not jump high enough to make up for the lag of the past two weeks. \$862 was received, lifting the total amount to \$3,637.75 or 36.3 per cent of our goal.

This week payments were received from the National Office, the largest payment for the week (and from Chicago, New York, Los Angeles, Detroit, Pittsburgh, St. Louis and Streator. That left eleven areas still to be heard of.

It is the lack of weekly payments on all quotas that has pushed the rate of the drive down and puts a heavy burden on all cities in the coming weeks.

We know that the pending reopening of the hearing of the ISL on the Attorney General's list will produce results on our appeal and that there hasn't been enough time for that to occur as yet, but we are certain that the response will be there.

St. Louis has already jumped to the top of the list, however, A \$50 single contribution plus \$10 gives St. Louis a total of \$60 or 240 per cent of its quota. That is going to be hard to top by anyone, and St. Louis is merely repeating what it did a year ago.

Only Oregon in addition has reached 100 per cent of its quota. The only area within striking point of its goal is Chicago, with 56.7 per cent. Yet, at this stage of the drive, every area should have reached at least 50 per cent of its quota. Fifteen quota holders are still under that figure.

We know from experience that those areas now below the 50 per cent mark have to pull much stronger in the coming weeks if we are to finish a successful drive. This is warning number one.

## FUND DRIVE BOX SCORE

City	Quota	Paid	%
St. Louis	\$10,000	\$3,637.75	36.3
Oregon	25	60	240
Streator	50	50	100
Chicago	25	15	60
Newark	2,000	1,135	56.7
Natl. Office	400	181	45.2
Los Angeles	1,250	625	42
New York	650	212	32.6
Bay Area	3,800	1,151	30.2
Pittsburgh	400	100	25
Philadelphia	200	48	24
Detroit	200	45	22.5
Cleveland	350	70.75	20.2
Seattle	150	25	16.8
Buffalo	150	20	13.3
Indiana	150	0	0
Akron	100	0	0
Reading	25	0	0
	50	0	0

have nothing to say. It is being committed by our own government.

It is not a black page in past history, such as makes us wonder how man could ever have shown such inhumanity to man. It is being committed right now, while you read this.

It is not being committed by a government which is frankly a dictatorship or despotism. It is being committed by a government which tells the world that it is defending the Free World against barbarism.

In fact, it is being committed in the very name of defending the Free World against barbarism. Slavery is freedom and barbarism is civilization, in this Newspeak.

It is an American duty to make it known, to make it stink in the nostrils of the world like the imperialist brutalities which have gained wider notoriety, like those in North Africa and Cyprus.

We ourselves do not have to decide whether the Okinawans want to return to Japan or favor any other disposition. The democratic demand is simply that they must have the right to determine their own fate—the right to self-determination. It is perhaps conceivable that a completely free Okinawa, now or in the future, might be willing to continue some form of association with the United States. That is up to them.

In any case, if freedom in the world can be defended only with the help of the strategic island, then it can be defended only if that help is given freely.

This indeed is the test of whether it is really freedom that is being defended or merely the interests of one imperialist war camp among the two rival colossi that are struggling for the right to bulldoze the world.

## REFERENCE NOTES

1. T. T. Brumbaugh, "God-Forsaken Okinawa," *Christian Century*, June 7, 1950.
2. "Okinawa—Five Years After," *Christian Century*, Jan. 23, 1952.
3. "If Okinawa Is Not to Be God-Forsaken," *Christian Century*, Aug. 16, 1950.
4. Demaree Bess, "Okinawa—American Island," *Sat. Eve. Post*, July 11, 1953.
5. Same as note 3.
6. Same as n. 1.
7. Ralph Braibanti, "The Ryukyu Islands: Pawn of the Pacific," *Amer. Political Science Review*, Dec. 1954.
8. ACLU Weekly Bulletin, Oct. 31, 1955, summarizing ACLU proposals to Defense Dept., drawn up by Roger Baldwin, based on a review of material submitted by Japanese Federation of Bar Associations, Japan Civil Liberties Union, and Okinawan Residents Association.
9. N. Y. Times, April 1, 1954.
10. N. Y. Times, Dec. 25, 1953.
11. In his dispatch from Okinawa on Jan. 25, 1954.
12. Same as n. 4.
13. "Okinawa: Base to Dominate Asia," *U. S. News & World Report*, June 22, 1951.
14. N. Y. Times, Dec. 25, 1955.
15. George Barrett, "Report on Okinawa," *N. Y. Times* magazine, Sept. 21, 1952.
16. N. Y. Times, July 29, 1955.
17. Same as n. 4.
18. Same as n. 13.
19. N. Y. Times, Dec. 25, 1955.
20. Same as n. 7.
21. Same as n. 13.
22. N. Y. Times, Dec. 25, 1955.
23. Same as n. 7.
24. Same as n. 3.
25. Same as n. 8.
26. Ibid.
27. Reported by A. J. Muste, quoted in *Labor Action*, Nov. 15, 1954.
28. Same as n. 2.
29. N. Y. Times, Oct. 12, 1954.
30. N. Y. Post, Feb. 8, 1956.
31. Otis W. Bell, "Play Fair with Okinawans," *Christian Century*, Jan. 20, 1954.
32. National Council of Churches of Christ in the U. S. A., Division of Foreign Missions, Statement on Okinawan Land Problems, by a special commission.
33. Same as n. 8.
34. Same as n. 31.
35. Same as n. 3.
36. Same as n. 32.
37. Same as n. 7.
38. From Daily Okinawan Press Summary, Civil Information and Educational Dept., U.S.C.A.R.
39. U. S. Naval Military Government, Okinawa, "The Agricultural Program for Okinawa," January 15, 1946.
40. Same as n. 2.
41. Same as n. 31.
42. Same as n. 2.
43. N. Y. Times, June 7, 1955.
44. Text of resolution quoted in *Labor Action*, July 11, 1955, from ICFTU Bulletin.
45. Same as n. 32.
46. Same as n. 1.
47. "Okinawa—Forgotten Island," *Time*, Nov. 28, 1949.

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