

LABOR ACTION

Joe Clark's Resignation Points to New Crisis in CP

... page 7

Senate Hearings and the Unions

... page 2

Union Pressure Mounting on Hoffa

... page 4

National Student Assn. Meeting

... page 5

September 23, 1957

TEN CENTS

New York City Mayor Retreats Shamefully On Housing Bias Law

By SAM BOTTONE

While national attention for the past several months has been focused on the civil rights bill in Congress and more recently on Little Rock and Nashville school integration, New York City is in the midst of an attempt to enact a law banning racial and religious discrimination in private housing.

There already is a New York State law prohibiting such discrimination in housing constructed with financial assistance from the federal, state or local governments. However this is the first proposed law anywhere in the country to extend the ban to existing privately constructed and owned apartments.

SORE SPOT

Discrimination in housing has long been a sore spot in New York City with its tremendous population consisting largely of racial and ethnic minority groups. While discrimination against Negroes and Puerto Ricans is obvious and widespread, it is also used against Jews. Despite the fact that there are no laws enforcing segregation and the Supreme Court ruling of several years ago prohibiting court enforcement of restrictive covenants, private covenants are enforced by "gentlemen's agreement."

But the immediate pressure to break the back of residential home and apartment discrimination came by way of the school integration issue. For well over a year there has been mounting pressure by the Negro people and their organizations to break up the all-Negro schools in the ghetto areas of Manhattan and Brooklyn.

The backbone of this *de facto* school segregation is segregated housing. It is possible and necessary to work out a plan of pupil transfer to integrate schools on the fringes of the ghetto-slums, although the superintendent of schools has been resisting the transfer plans through stalling tactics. But a more fundamental approach had to be the elimination of segregated housing. The proposed law would not eliminate slums for the low-paid Negroes and Puerto Ricans. It would, however make it possible for a minority of professional and better-paid workers to escape from the ghetto.

An anti-bias housing bill was introduced to the City Council on May 21 of this year. Support for the bill appeared to be almost unanimous. Mayor Robert Wagner was for it, labor and liberal organizations were pushing for early enactment and the entire City Council with the exception of one Republican had indicated their support. Only the real estate lobby was in open opposition.

And yet almost four months later the bill is still bottled up in the General Welfare Committee. The Democratic administration was thrown into retreat and confusion when confronted with the opposition of the New York City Real

(Continued on page 3)

Eisenhower Do-Nothing Policy Spurs Racists to Flout Law

By MAX MARTIN

An important battle in the struggle to integrate schools—the current major campaign in the war for equality for the Negro people in the United States—is presently taking place in the state of Arkansas. This battle, which began two weeks ago and whose end has not yet been sighted, should have quickly resulted in victory for the Negroes and other anti-Jim Crow forces in America, considering the various factors present in the situation.

That it has not done so, that the segregationists have to date been allowed to flout the law of the land enunciated by the Supreme Court three years ago, can be attributed entirely to the incredible inaction of the United States government, and of President Eisenhower in the first place. Arkansas' Governor Faubus has gotten away with his open defiance of the various court rulings ordering desegregation of the schools of Little Rock up to the present time because the federal government has not utilized the various means available to it for coping with his defiance, and because of the attitude of indifference and quiescence displayed by the president.

This behavior by the president in the face of the Arkansas events in turn constitutes a part of the bipartisan pattern of evasion and inaction on the pressing issue of civil rights for which both major political parties bear responsibility. Under the impact of the world situation and the growing tide of struggle by the Ne-

groes here at home, Jim Crow went on the defensive, and gains for democracy became inevitable. Both the Republicans and the Democrats reacted to this new situation by doing as little as possible to aid the anti-Jim Crow developments. Thus, in the context of present circumstances a civil rights bill of some kind was inevitable in the last session of Congress. The bill that was enacted, however, was an extraordinarily weak one as liberal Democrats bowed to the pressure of the Southern reactionaries in the name of party unity. Flushed with their unexpected semi-victory in Congress, the Jim Crow forces were emboldened to give battle on the school integration front on the disputed territory of the border states.

Arkansas, it must be remembered, is not Deep South; it is a border state on the Western fringes of the South and combines the "Southern tradition" with that of the frontier West, as represented by Oklahoma and Texas. Politically, the state has in recent years contained a "liberal, New Deal" strain, both in the state government and in its delegations

to Congress. Compliance with the Supreme Court decision on school integration by the state authorities, albeit with reluctance, was therefore to be expected.

The actual implementation plans drawn up were such that all "gradualists" and "moderates" should have been satisfied. Indeed, the plan of the Little Rock Board of Education for integration involved a long, drawn-out operation. Its program, adopted in 1955, called for integration of the senior high schools this year, the admission of Negroes to junior high schools in 1960, and the desegregation of elementary schools in 1963. The Little Rock National Association of Colored People had filed suit against this extremely "moderate" proposal, charging it with being too slow. The Circuit Court of Appeals ruled early this year that the program met the Supreme Court's requirement of "all deliberate speed" and ordered the Board to proceed with the program.

SMOOTH BUT SLOW

During the two years between the adoption of this "go-slow" program and the projected first stage of its enactment via the admission of seventeen Negroes to Central High School this year, the Little Rock press and various community leaders prepared the city for the coming integration program, as did most leading civic personalities. Thus it appeared that the first stage of desegregation of edu-

(Turn to last page)

SYRIA: Another Guatemala in the Making?

By BRIJEN K. GUPTA

The hit and miss American foreign policy went through the whirlwind motions of a warm-up for a real battle at the doorstep of Syria last week. Result after the first round: one more miss.

The State Department's moves were familiar. Syria was first accused of receiving economic loans and military supplies from the Soviet bloc at a favored price. To this was added the accusation that the ruling cabinet (which is left-of-center) and the top military hierarchy were infested with card-carrying Communists and fellow travellers. The State Department argued, therefore, that in the paramount interest of preserving "democracy" in the Middle East it was necessary to strengthen the allies of the Atlantic Camp—Jordan, Iraq, Lebanon and Turkey—by making more weapons available to them.

Syria seems to have survived the first round, largely because Jordanians and the Lebanese have lost nerve. But the game is still far from being over.

This is because the paramount American goal in the Middle East since the nationalization of the Suez Canal has been to liquidate the neutralist bloc of Arab nations led by Egypt. The first victim was the democratic, mildly socialist, largely Third Camp-inclined, government of Suleiman Nabulsi in Jordan, against which King Hussein with the support of his tribal bedouin troops, and American blessings, staged a counter-revolutionary coup earlier this year. As will be recalled, both the Eisenhower administration and the king had equated the democratic trend in Jordanian politics with "pro-Soviet" lean-

ings to warrant the counter-revolutionary coup.

Since then Syria has been the next on the list. The participation of the Ba'ath Arab Socialist Party in the Syrian Cabinet (where it controls the ministries of Foreign and Economic Affairs) has been totally unpalatable to the Eisenhower Administration. The Ba'ath stands in the Middle East for all those things that the Eisenhower administration opposes. In recent months in Syria the Ba'ath has been increasing its popularity and support. Not primarily by slogans, but by several concrete policies. For example in domestic affairs, under the leadership of the Ba'ath, the accent has been on economic and political development, rather on the hysteria for the extermination of Israel.

The International Bank and United Nations sources privately admit that during the last few years the pace of economic development in Syria has been

(Turn to last page)

Socialist Analysis, or Sectarian Agitation on:

The Senate Hearings And the Labor Movement

By GORDON HASKELL

The Senate investigation into labor racketeering has evoked what at first sight might seem a peculiar reaction in a section of what is generally called "the left" in this country. Organizations and periodicals who for years have been denouncing the leadership of the Teamsters' union, and others, for their corruption and racketeering, turn their fire from these leaders just when they are really on the run for the first time, and concentrate it instead on their exposers in the Senate, and on the Meany-Reuther forces who are seeking to utilize these exposures to drive racketeering out of the labor movement.

The reaction is peculiar only at first sight. A little knowledge of the approach of the groups in question to the American labor movement, as well as to politics in general, quickly clears up what might otherwise appear incomprehensible. Since time has been lacking in which to trace the reaction of all radical publications to the hearings, we have concentrated on two, one of which at least represents the extreme version of a mood which is widespread among radicals and socialists on this matter.

BASIC PROPOSITIONS

The basic proposition from which these periodicals (*The Militant* and *The Daily Worker*) start is that the Senate investigation is not led by well-wishers of the labor movement, but rather by people who will seek to utilize their exposures of corruption in the movement as a pretext to shackle it with all kinds of damaging and restrictive legislation. This is a proposition which is recognized and accepted so widely inside and outside the labor movement that to draw attention to it requires no great insight and merits no special recognition. Yet the *Militant*, specially, is so insistent and even strident on this point that one might think there were some danger it

might be overlooked by the rank and file as well as the leaders of the labor movement.

Actually, of course, the stridency is not accidental, but relates to the central theme of the analysis. That is: the labor leadership is betraying the labor movement by not meeting the Senate committee "head on," and by "cooperating" with it. *The Daily Worker*, which pursues the line with a diffidence which may reflect a certain lack of conviction, carries two quotes from the recent deliberations of the United Electrical Workers' convention in San Francisco. Russell Nixon, UE's Washington representative told the convention that, "the established labor movement is not meeting the challenge. . . Why are the leaders of the AFL-CIO immobilized in the face of this committee? We're going to pay a terrible price!"

"We have to fight it everywhere in the labor movement before it gets too late, and it's already getting awfully late!"

The quotation appears ambiguous. Exactly what is "it" that must be fought in the labor movement? We gather that "it" is "an atmosphere among the people favorable to the passage of restrictive labor legislation," from the context of the article. We are left to form our own ideas of exactly what the leaders of the AFL-CIO should do with regard to the committee's activities.

The same radical tone combined with the same vagueness as to program is apparent in the UE's resolution:

"The failure thus far of the leadership of the labor movement to give effective direction on these issues must be

overcome by the development of an aggressive mass movement of the rank and file.

"This must and will happen because in the past it has always been the common people who saved this country from disaster. The present lack of leadership leads only to disaster, economically and politically."

(Both quotes from *The Worker*, Sept. 3).

Again, we do not have the whole text of the UE's resolution before us. But presumably the *Worker* is seeking to educate and inform its readers on the program of this union as well as on a generally correct approach to the Senate hearings. The context of the quotes seems to indicate that it relates to the hearings. Again we are left to guess exactly what "effective direction on these issues" means, and what the UE would have the union leaders, or the rank and file do about it: throw all the crooks out of the labor movement? Refuse to throw any out who are questioned by the Senate Committee? Advise all unionists to refuse to appear before the Committee? Start a big public propaganda campaign against the possible recommendations of the Committee, even before they are known? Your guess is as good as ours.

While the *Daily Worker* has tended to handle this perplexing question tangentially, and mainly in its news columns, the *Militant* has been campaigning on it in the fiercest fashion imaginable. The tocsin is rung weekly. The labor bureaucracy is denounced for its many betrayals. There is all the sound and fury of a genuine campaign. But when we seek carefully for exactly what the leadership, or the rank and file are being called on to do about the investigations . . . the matter seems to slip between our fingers.

THROW RASCALS OUT

That is not completely accurate. So let us make it more so. The *Militant* calls on the Senate to "keep hands off" the labor movement. They also call on the workers to throw the bureaucrats out of office. An article by Joseph Keller, who appears to be about the fiercest and most uncompromising of them all, in the *Militant* for September 9 concludes:

"The fight for union democracy and a class-struggle program, which is a fight to oust the whole bureaucratic class-collaborationist leadership, would also bring with its victory the elimination of the outright crooks and racketeers. That is a solution to corruption in the unions that neither the Senators and corporations nor Meany, Dubinsky and Reuther would welcome."

We, for our part, would not be the last to welcome such a fight. Its victory would not only solve corruption in the labor movement, but would also go a long way to settling the hash of the capitalist system itself. For a successful fight for union democracy and a class-struggle program would mean that a majority of the organized workers in this country have, more or less, the convictions and opinions of socialists. But since we are for it whether there be a Senate investigation or not; since we have been for it for decades, and will continue to be for it for further decades, we cannot regard this as a precise program for the particular problem faced by the labor movement as it is today.

The truth of the matter, as we see it, is that the *Militant* is not really interested in the problem of just what the labor movement should do now to further the fight against the racketeers on the one hand, and to fend off the very real possibility that reactionary elements in the Senate and in the country at large will seek to use the revelations of corruption in the labor movement for the purpose of shackling its power to advance the interests of the workers. What they appear to be interested in, instead, is a bit of good old-fashioned agitation against the lead-

ership of the labor movement which is based on and pretty much limited to a repetition of the following propositions, however much that repetition may be disguised by verbiage.

1) The union bureaucracy are labor lieutenants of the capitalist class. 2. As such, they always "capitulate" or "sell out" the interests of the workers and the labor movement. 3) Therefore, they are doing it now by aiding and supporting the Senate investigation instead of opposing it.

NOT QUITE ACCURATE

It is regrettable that to "prove" this simplistic analysis the *Militant* and the *Daily Worker* find themselves compelled to step beyond the bounds of reportorial accuracy. Brother Keller writes in the same article quoted above:

"To begin with, Meany, David Dubinsky, Walter Reuther and their like have given aid and comfort to this inquiry. Instead of opposing this disguised anti-union attack, they issued an edict providing for expulsion from AFL-CIO office of union officials who avail themselves of their constitutional right to refuse to cooperate with congressional committees out to knife labor."

"At the behest of 'public investigatory bodies,' Meany would even expel from the AFL-CIO 1,500,000 guiltless members of the teamsters along with a few corrupt officials."

The first statement is repeated so often in the *Militant* and the *Daily Worker* that by this time it is quite likely their writers really believe it. It happens to be demonstrably contrary to fact. That does not mean that the writers who repeat it are necessarily liars. It is probably more accurate to say that they have been taken in by their own over-simplified view of what is going on in the labor movement. Since to assert that the AFL-CIO leadership has issued an "edict" providing for the expulsion from AFL-CIO office of union officials who take the Fifth Amendment before a congressional committee fits that view, they continue to assert it despite the fact that it never was true, the additional fact that taking the Fifth was not included in the charges against Beck, and the facts about the fate of UAW officers who took the Fifth carried in an adjoining article in this issue of *Labor Action*.

PROOF OF PERFDY

Another line of "proof" of the spineless cooperation of the Meany-Reuther leadership with the Committee is that they had never before taken serious steps against the corrupt elements in the labor movement, although the facts about their corruption had long been public knowledge.

There is no excuse for the failure of the "clean" elements in the labor leadership not to have taken action against the racketeers long ago. It is absolutely true that in large part their failure to do anything about this disgraceful and dangerous situation stems from a general attitude of bureaucratic solidarity against the ranks. All that is true, but is it not also irrelevant to the actual question of what the labor movement, ranks as well as leaders, can and should do now, that the Senate investigation is on?

Let us agree, even insist, that the workers in the unions should "clean their own house," without any outside assistance of any kind, specially that which may appear to come from enemies of the labor movement. They should. One day they no doubt will. As a matter of fact, one of the things which has made the Senate investigation possible at this particular time is the general revulsion inside the labor movement against corruption, which has isolated the Becks and Hoffas from union support and protection. It is precisely this atmosphere which has compelled Senators who have always regarded the Becks and Hoffas as a necessary bulwark in the labor movement against the "radicalism" of the Reuthers to deal reluctant blows to these "businesslike" leaders.

Further, is it not true that Reuther and Meany and Dubinsky had started the war against the racketeers before the Senate investigation was planned, with the ouster of the International Longshoremen's Association? To be sure, they did this in their own bureaucratic way, not by helping the ranks to throw their racketeer leaders out. Further, they

(Continued on page 3)

The UAW and the Fifth Amendment

During the Spring and Summer of this year, twelve local officers and staff members of the United Automobile Workers were subpoenaed by the Senate Internal Security subcommittee (the Eastland committee) and questioned about past or present membership or association with the Communist Party.

Seven out of eight of the local officers called invoked the Fifth Amendment at some point in their testimony. Two of the four UAW staff representatives invoked the First Amendment in refusing to testify on their past associations.

By the end of August, all nine who had balked at giving certain types of testimony to the Senate had had their "cases" reviewed either by their local unions or by the UAW International Executive Board. In every single case, the appropriate union body voted to retain the person involved in office, after reviewing his testimony and getting his statement on it. In a couple of cases in which the IEB thought the individual's testimony had been ambiguous, supplemental affidavits were filed with the Senate committee clarifying the testimony.

On August 26, the UAW International Executive Board sent the cases of all union and International officers whose cases had been concluded to the UAW Public Review Board for final review. The question the Public Review Board is supposed to find on is whether the action of the locals involved, or respectively of the UAW top officers, in retaining all these individuals in office was "consistent in spirit as well as in letter, with the AFL-CIO Ethical Practice Code."

In referring the cases to the Public Review Board, Walter Reuther made it clear that this action was taken as a reply to an attempt by Senator Barry Goldwater to smear the UAW.

The administrative letter sent out by UAW President Reuther to the locals in connection with the appearance of UAW officers before the Eastland subcommittee pointed out that a UAW member "who might exercise his personal right to invoke the Fifth Amendment will not be judged by that fact alone."

"It is equally clear that when a member of the UAW holding either elective or appointive office chooses to use the Fifth Amendment, the matter is no longer purely personal, for such member's holding of a union office immediately and inescapably involves the union as an organization in the matter."

"Under these circumstances, the union as an organization must take prompt steps to protect itself by determining beyond a doubt whether the member is eligible to hold a position of leadership in the Union as a result of his personal decision to use the Fifth Amendment."

It may be that the UAW Executive Board is bending a little too far backward in its public relations program in sending these cases up to the Public Review Board. But one thing should be clear: in the UAW "taking the Fifth" does not lead to automatic disqualification from office. In fact, so far it has not lead to disqualification at all for those who have felt themselves compelled to take this course in front of a congressional committee.

New York Mayor Retreats — —

(Continued from page 1)

Estate Boards and banking interests in the city.

The proposed bill would not cover all private housing. In a concession to minimize opposition it exempted one and two-family houses as well as small homes in developments of fewer than 10 units. On the other hand, it did make racial and religious discrimination a misdemeanor punishable by a fine of \$500, and permitted the State Committee Against Discrimination to initiate court actions.

The shameful retreat by the Wagner administration in face of the real estate and racist pressures is a pure and simple case of Eisenhowerism. When the sun was shining bright Mayor Wagner made militant speeches about making New York an "open city" free from racial bias. But when the clouds of opposition gathered he began to equivocate, stumble and now has refused to even issue a statement as to where he stands on the bill. What makes this performance even more scandalous is that during the past two months he was virtually unanimously endorsed for re-election by the Liberal Party as well as most liberal and labor organizations.

REAL ESTATE LOBBY

When hearings began before the General Welfare Committee of the City Council, it was freely predicted that the bill would romp through the Council once it emerged from the committee. Then the

real estate lobby swung into action. Within a few days several thousand letters flooded the office of the Mayor and Democratic majority leader, Joseph Sharkey.

It was obvious that this represented a concerted drive by a small but well-heeled minority. Ranged on the other side were organizations representing hundreds of thousands of New Yorkers—the NAACP, the Liberal Party, the AFL-CIO, the Urban League, American Jewish Congress and many others.

Almost immediately the Wagner administration began to wilt under the pressure of the real estate lobby. The New York Post reported on June 17 that "Wagner was being urged by most of his advisers to delay action until after the mayoral election in the fall." However the next day Wagner told the Post that he always has been aware of the opposition but was still in favor of the bill.

The chairman of the General Welfare Committee announced that he thought the bill would be passed and that he would vote for it. But he added that it would not be "a horrible thing" if the bill were held up for further study.

Then the panic was on. On June 19, Wagner announced that "there is no time table on the bill" and that he is "not trying to ram this bill down anybody's throat." At a press conference Wagner said that he still favored the bill "in

principle" but felt that "certain changes will have to be made so that it will become more acceptable." What these changes were he never indicated but a series of weakening amendments flooded in.

AMENDMENTS

The two amendments which are probably now in the bill would eliminate the \$500 fine on landlords who discriminate against tenants on racial or religious grounds, and prevent aggrieved persons or SCAD from going directly to court. Instead they would go through a special committee which would separate out the "legitimate" from "illegitimate" grievances.

More serious is the attempt to exempt cooperative apartments. The effect would be to create a huge gap in coverage, since "co-ops" could be formed as a means of continuing the present practices. Today luxury co-ops form the hard core of residential anti-Semitism in N. Y. C.

Once the stampede began it was only a question of how some of the fair-weather liberals would retreat. Democratic majority leader Sharkey went so far as to try to disassociate himself from the bill. He claimed that he was unacquainted with its provisions and only agreed to sponsor it as a favor to the mayor.

At the Liberal Party's 13th annual dinner, Mayor Wagner was one the fea-

ture speakers preparatory to receiving the party's endorsement. The N. Y. Post reported on June 20 that in the original draft of his speech, Wagner reiterated his support of the bill. But when he delivered it, the reference was dropped. The voice of the Democratic Party became inaudible. Eisenhower at least had a few copybook maxims to utter from somewhere on a golf green.

On July 1, the NAACP organized a rally in support of the bill. Mayor Wagner did not attend but he sent word to the chairman of the rally that he had to take one of his sons to camp. And when Manhattan Borough President Hulan Jack defended the mayor's stand on the bill, he was booed.

Later in the month further hearings were held on the proposed amendments but once again the Wagner administration refused to lift a finger to bring the bill to a vote in the committee. Since that time, it has been impossible to even get a meeting of the General Welfare Committee.

EXPLANATIONS

Various reasons have been put forth explaining this attempt to make like Dixiecrats. First it was suggested that the Democratic Party wanted to postpone a vote till after the primary on Sept. 10. Now that the primaries are over it is questionable whether it will be passed before the November election.

Although the civil rights forces in the city have suffered a set-back in their failure to have a bill enacted, nothing short of a Republican victory in the mayoralty election will block this bill. The only doubt which remains is the extent to which it will be emasculated. Once the anti-bias housing bill comes up before the City Council, it would be tantamount to political suicide for a majority of the Councilmen to vote against it, whatever their private sentiments may be. The pressure of civil rights organizations has already made a complete capitulation impossible.

But the experience of the weak-kneed retreat of the Democratic administration in face of real estate and racist pressure ought to give the labor movement and the liberal organizations in New York City something to think about. At the very least they ought to examine the double standards they have erected. Toward the Eisenhower administration's vacillations they offer the severest criticism, but toward the same kind of policy by a liberal Democratic administration only, a gentle slap on the wrist.

These past four months have once again demonstrated the dead end into which the Liberal Party works itself in its support of Democratic Party candidates. If the Liberal Party ran an independent mayoralty candidate, they would be able to take the lead in pushing for a strong bill. But instead they are forced to keep silent on the Wagner administration's shameful retreat.

YOU'RE INVITED

to speak your mind in the letter column of Labor Action. Our policy is to publish letters of general political interest, regardless of views. Keep them to 500 words.

Senate Probe and Labor — —

(Continued from page 2)

tried to do it in league with other union leaders whose own hands were far from clean, and that is one of the chief reasons for the failure of their attempt to replace the ILA with a decent union. But the unity of the labor movement has greatly strengthened the position of the anti-racist and anti-racketeer elements, and that is one reason they are able to take on the Hoffas today.

But quite aside from the evolution within the labor movement which has put the racketeers on the defensive with regard to the rest of the union bureaucracy, is it not perfectly clear that the Senate investigation, as it has proceeded up to the present, has greatly facilitated the rank and file in doing the job of throwing the racketeers out of their movement?

GRUDGING RECOGNITION

Even the *Militant* (Sept. 2) has to give grudging recognition to this fact when it writes: "Although publicity given to these exposures may be made use of here and there by rank-and-file workers in their struggles against the boss-racketeer alliance, this should not allow militant unionists to blind themselves to the crimes of the committee, or to the threat to the union movement involved in the committee's methods and aims."

The fact, hard as it may be for all of us to take, is that until this committee started to work the hands of the workers in most of the racketeer-dominated unions were pretty well tied. Dozens and hundreds had paid with broken bones, lost jobs and with their very lives for daring to oppose the Becks, Hoffas and others. The teamsters and other unions are still far from being out of the woods with regard to racketeering leaders. But there can be little doubt that things are more favorable right now to a real struggle against these elements than they have been for a long time.

Is it not amazing, then, to find groups who should be encouraging and helping the workers to utilize the Senate revelations to the full to run the racketeers out of the movement, engaged, instead, in a campaign of denunciation against the Reuther-Meany forces? How demagogic this really is can be derived only by once again referring to the need to distort the relationship of these union leaders to the Senate committee so as to make it appear that they are somehow responsible for the reactionaries on the committee, or that they are lending themselves to the latter's long-term anti-union objectives.

ONLY CROOKS

To date, the Senate Committee has hauled no one on the carpet except people charged with crimes and abuses of office which are detestable to every good unionist. It is clear that within the committee there are elements pressing for an extension of the investigation to include the legitimate union activities of the UAW and others. So far, they have not chosen, or dared to do so.

The top AFL-CIO leadership recognizes just as well as you and I what some members of the committee have as their ultimate objective. But since it is a distressing but obvious fact that do date the labor movement has failed to clean its own house of racketeers and crooks, for them to put up a hue and cry against the committee at this point would make it appear to the general public (including a large section of the union membership) that they are defending their old pals and colleagues, the racketeers and crooks.

In any event, such a stand would play right into the hands of the most conservative workers, and the most reactionary elements in the country. Is that not as clear as day? If it is not, why do both the Communists and the writers in the *Militant* find it so hard to propose an actual line, a concrete course of action

for the union leadership to follow in this situation, rather than contenting themselves with vague super-radical agitation?

The moment the Senate committee starts questioning unionists with a clean record from the labor movement's own point of view about their legitimate union activities, it will be possible to start a real campaign against the anti-labor character of the committee, not before. As a matter of fact, the unions which start it now (and they have been mostly the racketeer-controlled unions) compromise their position for the time when such a struggle becomes realistic and possible.

So, in our book, the leadership of the AFL-CIO is doing about what they can do in this situation. They are seeking to make a real dent in the racketeering section of the movement. They do it in their own bureaucratic way, to be sure. But nothing they are doing prevents the rank and file in this or that union from cleaning its own house: quite the contrary. We would venture the suggestion that such rank and file revolts against racketeers in the past as have been met with a solid front of bureaucratic indifference or opposition stand a much better chance of getting a friendly reception and even some aid today than they ever did before.

The *Militant*, and the *Daily Worker* in a lower key, keep talking about the "full retreat before the developing anti-labor drive" of the AFL-CIO leadership. Their "analysis" is made of the kind of stuff we have talked about above. The inability to distinguish retreats from advances of the actual labor movement, as it is, one of the hallmarks of the sectarian.

New Edition

Three Volumes in One

History of the Russian Revolution

By LEON TROTSKY

Trotsky's great classic, now available again for the first time in years.

List \$12.50 our price \$10.00

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

NEW BOOK OFFERS

The New Class
"An Analysis of the Communist System"
By Milovan Djilas
List \$3.95 our price \$3.50

The Roots of American Communism
By Theodore Draper
List \$6.75 our price \$5.75

Orders must be accompanied by check to
Labor Action Book Service
114 West 14th Street, NYC 11, N.Y.

Union Pressure Mounting Against Hoffa

By JACK WILSON

Detroit, Mich.

The pressure keeps mounting against Jimmy Hoffa and his notorious clique as the Teamsters Union convention draws near. It will be held in Miami, Florida beginning on Sept. 30. Hoffa's isolation from the main stream of the labor movement continues to place him on the defensive.

It was quite a blow to Hoffa's bandwagon when the Western Conference of Teamsters failed to come through with an expected endorsement. Of course, his three opponents, Tom Haggerty of Chicago, Tom Hickey of New York, and John Shelly of San Francisco likewise didn't get an OK for the presidency, but no one expected that.

Hoffa is bound to become more tarnished as president if the Senate rackets committee goes through with the announced plan of holding another public hearing with Hoffa as a witness before the teamsters organization has its elections.

The Senate committee chief counsel spent eight days in Detroit checking upon the Hoffa story in Michigan. If the committee brings out the Pontiac Local story, the way Hoffa destroyed all opposition to his racketeer friends whom he kept in offices after their convictions, his badly punctured reputation as a union leader will go deeper down the drain. The committee may bring before nation-wide TV a series of rank and file witnesses who can testify how they were beaten up and run out of the local union for trying to go on the ballot against Hoffa's convicted friends.

Perhaps the committee may also touch on the close association of Hoffa and his lieutenants with racketeers in Michigan whose records make Johnny Dio look like a secondary truant.

KID GLOVES

It remains to be seen if the Senators will again try to handle Hoffa with kid gloves, or do him the favor of postponing the hearings until after his election as president of the teamsters. In any event, Hoffa still has to appear in federal court on charges of illegal use of wiretapping. Incidentally, it was rather amusing to read in a so-called labor paper a vigorous denunciation of the Senate committee for using wire-tap recording against Hoffa. These apologists for Hoffa forgot to mention that he is on trial for using wire-taps against his own union cronies.

But even more difficult for Hoffa than his public comedown is the fact that the AFL-CIO shows no indication of turning soft and compromising with the corruption and racketeering which Hoffa symbolizes.

George Meany and other AFL-CIO leaders are not only aware of the mortal damage that would be done to the union movement if they made a deal with Hoffa—it would tar them in the eyes of public opinion with the same brush—but the AFL-CIO leaders are encouraged to keep going after Hoffa by the huge stacks of mail they keep receiving from rank and file teamsters throughout the country urging them to get rid of Hoffa.

Top union officials aren't fooled one bit by the so-called endorsements Hoffa claims to be getting from the teamsters' "ranks." In no single case, including Hoffa's home Local in Detroit, was there a vote of the rank and file on his endorsement. A meeting of stewards and business agents, with a hand vote, was the method Hoffa used to get an OK from his Local.

If the teamsters bureaucracy goes

through with the plan for making Hoffa its official spokesman as newly elected president, then the expulsion of the teamsters union from the AFL-CIO is a foregone conclusion at the December convention of the united labor movement.

This is something Hoffa and company fear far more than do the AFL-CIO leaders. For without the guise and protection of bona-fide union movement, the teamsters will be isolated, exposed and wracked with a split, since many local unions already have privately asked about direct charters from the AFL-CIO.

Placed in a position of being a split-off and dual union, the teamsters organization doesn't face a prospect of growth and improvement. Rather its defensive character, the corruption of its leaders, and the moral approbrium it faces will make its future existence a stormy one.

For each trouble that the Hoffa clique can give the AFL-CIO, they will get at least two in return, for the pressures of

the vast bulk of the union movement will be felt directly by them. It is a far different thing for the teamsters to be out of the main stream of the union movement than it is for a powerful and naturally isolated union like the coal miners. In coal mining towns, coal miners automatically are the majority of the union movement. In any urban area, no matter how strategic the truck drivers are, the fact remains that they are a small minority of the labor movement, and minorities have a hard time muscling any majority, as the history of the union movement shows.

As for the effect on the labor movement of expulsion of the teamsters for failing to get rid of the racketeers and corrupt leaders, it will boost the moral authority of the union movement. Of course, the anti-labor press will predict the end of unionism, etc. when this happens, but that is the same kind of nonsense that has been written every time

a major organizational division took place. The AFL-CIO split was supposed to end the effectiveness of labor. The departure of the ILGWU from the CIO was supposed to weaken and collapse the CIO. Ditto when the coal miners under John L. Lewis walked out of the CIO. Ditto when the CIO expelled Stalinist-controlled unions.

In all cases of such analyses, what is lacking is an understanding of the basic strength and inevitable drawing power of unionism to the working class. That is why, no matter what mistakes or false policies, or poor leaders have influenced the union movement, it has developed into a gigantic force of over 16,000,000 people.

Expulsion of the teamsters may well bring forth another wave of organization, since the single strongest argument against unionism now that tends to influence backward workers is that "it's all a racket," or "they're all alike." To see how pernicious and widespread this reactionary argument really is, we recommend reading some of the contemporary press of the "left." Not even third period Stalinists ever wrote such utter nonsense.

PRO & CON DISCUSSION

Intellectuals in Labor Unions

The exchange of opinions printed here deals with a subject which we think will interest many of our readers. We will be glad to print additional comment on it. Unless you have something exceptionally illuminating to say, please keep your comments within our 500 word limit.—ED.

Hired Trade Union Employees Can Do Socialistically Relevant Work

Ben Hall's recent review of Harold Wilensky's book, *Intellectuals in Labor Unions* (LA July 15), though most informative, neglects to consider an important aspect of this problem that should be of particular interest to many of LABOR ACTION's readers. I refer to the question of whether or not socialistically relevant work can be performed by hired employees of the trade union officialdom.

Speaking from my own personal experience, as one who took such a path after seeking a means of livelihood that jibed in some meaningful way with my socialist convictions in this most un-socialist society of ours, I must say that such pursuits are quite possible.

I have found, as have many of my colleagues, that despite the bureaucratic malformations and practices so rampant in the trade unions, and the lamentable lack of influence that the decimated socialist movement has upon them, union staffers are still far from limited to the routine performance of basically minor, non-essential work, as Hall and Wilensky seem to imply.

Perhaps a brief mention of some of my experiences as a union organizer will be of some interest, and offer at least a personal substantiation of my point of view.

First of all, let me make clear to Comrade Hall that Wilensky's observations to the contrary, the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union Training Institute, in its approach to prospective applicants, has not been able to dispense with the idealistic appeal that used to draw much larger numbers of young men and women onto union staffs with so much enthusiasm and ridiculously low pay.

To buttress this point, I can reveal to Comrade Hall some facts about the working conditions of Training Institute members and graduates, most particularly of organizers in the field, that make the professional, academic, white collar, and other petty-bourgeois existence (and aspirations) of many ISLers and YSLers look quite a bit more secure, comfortable, and financially rewarding in comparison.

As for myself, I have had the opportunity, as an organizer, to take part in a Southern organizational drive that successfully brought a scab plant into the union fold. I am currently engaged in another such drive somewhat further north of the Mason and Dixon line.

The union contract that is in effect in the former shop, and the one we are fighting to establish in the latter, most likely leave much to be desired from a socialist standpoint, and from the standpoints of everyone in the entire union.

Be that as it may, I am secure in the knowledge that I have had an important part in bringing the working conditions and job security of many workers to an appreciably higher and more equitable plane. Also, when contract renegotiation time comes around, in shops where we have already won union recognition, many workers will be in a somewhat firmer position to get a little more of the same.

Now this elementary type of union activity may be far removed from the immediate academic interests of sociologist-Wilensky, and far below the highest revolutionary standards of comrade Hall. But I submit once again that this work is precisely the sort of "labor action" that in this or any other day is most relevant and meaningful from any non-sectarian socialist point of view.

All of which should not be taken as a clarion call for the ranks of the ISL and YSL to do as I have done. The myriad personal factors that enter into such considerations positively preclude any intelligent discussion about the possibilities for socialists in this field on a programmatic level.

The same, I might add, goes for any discussion or agitation about the entrance into the trade union movement on an industrial (shop) level.

September 6, 1957

P. W.

Union Officialdom Tends to Turn Paid Staff into "Hired Hands"

I am glad to learn that comrade and brother P. W. has been able to do valuable work as an organizer to advance the cause of unionism. Certainly socialists can do it; in fact, thousands have done so before and hundreds do so right now. That should surprise no one. "Socialistically relevant" work covers a lot of territory and includes the efforts, not only of union organizers, but of men and women in many callings, depending upon their capacities, their preferences, and just plain luck. It covers the arts, the professions and mere jobs. Why not, then, union staff men and labor intellectuals? Of course!

But that is not what I considered to the point in my review. It is not at all a matter of down-to-earth unionism versus "tighter revolutionary standards." The question relates not to socialists in particular but to thinking people in general. Does the union movement, as it is now constituted, permit "intellectuals," broadly defined, to work in the labor movement in full intellectual freedom and to the limit of their abilities? The answer is clearly, "No." The tendency is to turn them into mere hired hands whose efforts are circumscribed by the immediate needs of the union officialdom which hires them.

By and large, this is only one facet of a general cold bureaucratic atmosphere in the American labor movement. It affects socialists just as it affects liberals and consistent democrats. It is true, that each individual finds some compensation and gratification in the fact that he serves the cause of building a strong labor movement. But in general, the lack of a living democratic atmosphere in the unions makes it impossible for them to fulfill their potential for making the world a better place to live in, whether this is conceived in terms of a new social order or as a flowering of democracy and decency under our present system. There is no reason why we, as socialists, should not underscore this fact.

By the way, this affects not only "intellectuals" whom you might consider a special extreme case, but ordinary union organizers even more. For example: the AFL-CIO is now confronted by a move of its own staff organizers to form a union of their own for security and protection on the job. Say what you want about it, this remains: once the bulk of union organizers was composed of men inspired by the goal of social justice; they hardly looked upon themselves as "employees," rather as crusaders for the underdog.

But now, they have been reduced to mere salary earners, hired and fired at the whim of their employers (union officers) and compelled to come trotting when the whistle is blown. Their demand for a union is open recognition of their reduced status. George Meany recognizes it too: in order to discourage their attempt he offers a wage increase, without a union. Its humiliating. Yet, each organizer, in turn, can do fine work in advancing the cause of labor.

All this rankles if you look upon the labor movement as a liberating, democratic social force. Socialists keep stressing that fact and so do others. Naturally, it will do no good if people just throw up their hands and deplore, "count me out." The labor movement will only be reformed by those who participate within it. It takes a good unionist to make the unions better, but a unionist.

Ben Hall

LABOR ACTION • 18th YEAR

September 23, 1957

Vol. 21 No. 33

Published every other week by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone WAtkins 4-4222—Re-entered as second-class matter July 26, 1957, under the act of March 3, 1879.—Subscription: \$2 a year; \$1 for 6 months.—Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

Editor: GORDON HASKELL
Assoc. Editor: HERMAN BENSON
Business Manager: Mel Stack

Editorial Board:

GORDON HASKELL
HERMAN BENSONMAX MARTIN
SAM BOTTONE

10th Congress of the National Student Association

Visible Stirrings in the Generation of Conformists

By HAROLD KAMM and GEORGE RAWICK

The Tenth Congress of the United States National Student Association (USNSA) held at the University of Michigan, August 20-30 was a meeting of the Generation of Conformists. Of this, there can be no doubt. The USNSA, founded in the immediate post World War Two campus intellectual ferment, was at its outset decidedly liberal in tone. The liberal bloc of those years was dominant and considerably to the left of present-day American liberalism. But now USNSA has reached middle-aged respectability. One of the speakers at the Congress, John Cogley, former editor of the liberal Catholic journal, *Commonweal*, who had been invited to speak in order to counteract the conservatising influence of the large delegations from the Catholic schools, caught the feeling of the assembly. He observed that while in the past an "elder worthy" would be called in to address a body of students in order to act as a restraining influence, he would have to stir up his audience, rather than calming them down.

But Cogley's efforts were not successful. The drift towards the dulling conformity of dead center was evident throughout despite the pleas to the contrary of Cogley, Senator Hubert Humphrey, and President Buell Gallagher, of CCNY. (It is interesting to note that Senator Humphrey and President Gallagher have themselves not been reknowned of late for their courageous defense of principle and liberalism.)

CENTER OF CONGRESS

Faced with the defeat of federal aid to education, the struggle for integration of the schools and recurring attacks on academic freedom; with radioactive poisoning of the air; with the struggles of the students of the colonial world for national freedom, the great majority of the nine-hundred students attending the parley as representatives of 800,000 college youths in 355 colleges reacted with a compound of conservatism, complacency, and often cynicism.

The great bulk of those present were clearly not politically oriented, being

concerned primarily with the local tasks of student governments. They provided the center of the Congress, the group most representative of the temperature of those present. There were, however, a number of consciously political delegates. First were the Campus-Politicians who tried to combine a liberal rhetoric with a comparatively conservative set of positions. They gave the leadership to the relatively docile majority. They defended their chopping away at more liberal stands not on the basis of arguments over principles and the issues involved but on the basis of the "correct parliamentary procedure" and their narrow interpretations of the USNSA Constitution. To their right were a small group of very able and intelligent representatives of the more reactionary Catholic schools. They followed the William Buckley-National Review line, applying it with considerable sophistication, and were able to arrange favorable compromises with the campus-politicians.

Slightly to the left of the campus-politicians were the staff and elected leadership of the NSA. While unwilling to offer any forceful leadership to the Congress, and at times playing their roles as the Official American Student Leaders with all the fast footwork required, they were concerned about the drive to the right in NSA. To their left was a small group of delegates who managed to interject whatever controversy and dissent were apparent at the Congress. While a few of them were experienced politicals, the rest were relatively non-ideologized students without an overall point of view but with a genuine concern for civil rights, civil liberties, and the responsibility of the student as a citizen in society.

A resolution calling upon USNSA to conduct a national educational program on the effects of atomic fallout proposed by the University of Chicago delegation proved one of the touchiest of topics and sent conservatives and liberal respectables scurrying for a "constitutional cover." Narrowly interpreting a clause in the body's constitution which states that USNSA can take stands only on issues which "affect students in their role as students," they vigorously argued that the Congress would be stepping beyond its proper bounds in such a program.

STUDENTS AS STUDENTS

Continued citing of the "students as students" principle in order to scotch controversial issues and squelch serious debate noticeably antagonized several foreign student observers.

Nonetheless, following a sizzling blast by a Japanese student leader that its fetishistic use was "a pretext for disguising the weakness of USNSA's leadership," delegates proceeded to gut the H-Bomb resolution by overwhelmingly defeating the mandate section which directed the national staff to plan an edu-

cational program. As finally passed, the resolution merely notes that "the production and testing of nuclear weapons is . . . an issue of prime importance to humanity."

The "students as students" provision was twisted again to repeal a traditional USNSA stand urging recognition of conscientious objection on humanitarian as well as religious grounds, and to bloc any consideration of the 18-year-old vote.

Realizing towards the tail end of the Congress that the "students as students" gimmick could be used to stifle any support for foreign students' fights for their academic freedom, so often bound up in "larger issues" (i.e., colonial struggles for independence) the national leadership, which at first seemed to be aiding the cynical maneuvering, finally came out strongly for "considering each resolution on its own merits." They were apparently motivated by the need to keep USNSA's prestige from sinking abysmally in the eyes of the international student community.

Their intervention successfully paved the way for passage by a dwindling number of weary and docile delegates of resolutions on the suppression of academic freedom in Hungary, Algeria, Cuba, Guatemala and South Africa—few of which skirted the "larger issues" involved in these struggles.

The Congress also criticized the U.S. Civil Administration on Okinawa for suppressing Ryukyuu student demonstrations against violations of their academic freedom.

FOR EXCHANGES

The Congress passed a resolution condemning the Moscow Youth Festival as a "weapon of Communist propaganda," but refused to pass a motion suggesting the "possibility of holding an international youth festival in the free world." In one of the most hotly debated moments of the plenary session, the NSA voted, 129 to 96, to censure the current visit of forty-one American youths to China, thus echoing the U.S. State Department line. An amendment to leave open the possibility of student exchange with China failed.

On the other hand, the Congress looked favorably upon "the possibility of negotiating a long-term exchange with the Polish national union of students" and for the third year in a row went on record in favor of exchange with the Soviet Union.

An issue which had always aroused fiery debate in past years—desegregation—fell victim to the politics of truce and compromise. Originally drafted at the 1955 Congress, the desegregation resolution was watered down in a bitter floor fight at last year's Congress and was further weakened this year—but more quietly—as a sop to a handful of militant Southern segregationists in order to ensure unity.

The major point of contention was a sentence in the resolution which described segregation in education as "unethical and unwise." A motion "to soften the harshness" by substituting the phrase "incompatible with human equality" was made by an avowed racist—who did not believe in human equality!—and carried the Congress. The 1955 resolution urged immedi-

ate steps toward desegregation on all levels of education. It now reserves that demand only for higher education.

On the positive side, the document mandates USNSA to hold a desegregation conference this coming year in the South.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM

In contrast to the emasculation of the desegregation resolution was the improvement over past years in the USNSA stand on academic freedom. Though by no means a consistent libertarian document, a nine-point basic policy declaration—the first policy stand taken by USNSA in this field—was adopted at this year's Congress. It unambiguously affirms that college students have the right to hear any viewpoints they want to, that they have the right to organize and join partisan political groups on campus, that loyalty oaths are destructive to academic freedom and an individual's constitutional rights, and condemns the use of membership lists for other than purely administrative purposes.

The declaration falls down on the question of criteria in judging an individual's fitness to teach however, by adding an otherwise strong statement on the "incontrovertible logic" of Sydney Hook liberals that "membership in an organization which advocates the violent overthrow of our constitutional process would require an investigation of the individual's integrity and professional competence."

Compared with Congresses at the height of the Witch Hunt this NSA convocation was marked by an increase of intellectual exploration and boldness, at least on the part of a vocal minority. The improved position on academic freedom, despite its inadequacies, marks a step forward. While the bulk of the students remain conformist, there is visible a stirring among the rest. And this is encouraging.

Today the USNSA is marked by a docile conservatism. Yesterday it was worse. Before that it reflected the outpouring of an independent liberalism, even radicalism. Tomorrow—it will be affected by the changes that will take place in American student life and in American society. Thus, despite the disappointing conservatism of this Congress, the NSA remains an important center of American student life. The task of those students who take their responsibilities as citizens seriously is to work to broaden the scope of NSA, and to do so these students must work for a more progressive and militant program and policies for the United States National Student Association.

THE AIM OF THE YSL

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

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

—From the Constitution of the YSL

Successful YSL Camp

The YSL National Camp at Mountain Spring Camp, New Jersey, was held during the week following Labor Day. Members and friends of the YSL from various units (Chicago, Los Angeles, New York, Philadelphia, and New Haven were among the units and organizing committees represented) joined together in a week of socialist education and recreation. There were discussions of socialist organization, the history of liberalism during the two world wars, the socialist position on war, the farmer-labor alliance in America, youth revolt against Stalinism and Communist China. One of the high-spots of the week was the party on Saturday night which featured excerpts from skits which had been produced on May Day in New York, an impromptu song fest presided over by Bob Bone and a camp fire.

Plans are currently underway for a Fall Camp under the sponsorship of the New York unit of the YSL.

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

POLAND

Split Grows Between People And Gomulka Government

By A. RUDZIENSKI

The Polish government's press acknowledges that a wave of discontent is sweeping over Poland because the people have expected much more from the October revolution and from the Gomulka government than the latter can give.

The situation in the country is very difficult. The standard of living is extremely low and the poverty horrible, not only because Poland is poor and was devastated by war, but because the economic policy of the regime, imposed by the Kremlin, was directed to the increase of heavy industry and armaments. This policy ruined the old, historic economy of Poland without building up a new economic organism capable of satisfying the needs of the country. Poland is now suffering the consequences of Russian colonial, imperialist policy.

AGRICULTURE RUINED

Polish agriculture was ruined by the annihilation of the small peasant farm. In addition, the great state farms (Sovhose) run a constant deficit of five billion zlotys annually, or about 100 zlotys for every member of the population. Over and above all this, however, the most completely ruined link in the Polish economy is the small town, destroyed by bureaucratic centralization.

Before the war, the small town was the center of the peasant economy where small trade, the handicrafts and the free professions performed indispensable tasks for the peasants. In the Polish towns, commerce and trade was carried on mainly by the Jewish population, because the Polish middle class was very weak.

Now, after the extermination of the Jewish population by the Germans, and after the desolation of small trade and the handicrafts by totalitarian bureaucratic centralization, the Polish provinces represent a picture of ruin and desolation with semi-deserted small towns, with houses falling into ruin, without any trace of life or independent activity, destroyed by the bureaucracy. Because of the monopoly of building materials in the hands of the government, no peasant could restore his old house or build a new one without bureaucratic permission and delivery of materials. So, today Poland is a land of devastated small towns, of villages falling into ruins, and of a terrible housing situation in such cities as Warsaw, Cracow, Poznan, Lodz, Gdansk, etc.

WORKERS SUFFER

The weight of this terrible economic situation falls primarily on the working class and the lower middle class (the lower bureaucracy), because the peasants have their own houses, even if primitive, old and ruined, and the upper layers of the bureaucracy are living very well at the cost of the working people. The average wage of unskilled workers is between 800-1200 zlotys, while a pair of shoes costs 600 zlotys, and a suite of clothes 3000 zlotys. There are in Poland today some millions of working people who earn less than 600 zlotys. To be sure, the mine workers earn between 2000-4000 zlotys (a university professor earns 3000 zlotys).

Thus the working class is the worst damaged by the "socialist" policy of the Stalinist bureaucracy and is the most discontented. While the peasants are quiet as a result of the dividing-up of the kolхозes, and the Catholics with the winning of religious freedom, the working class is more and more discontented with Gomulka's administration, because it cannot live off beautiful phrases about socialist democracy and workers' councils. They must eat, and give food to their children. That is why the wave of strikes is spreading over Poland, from Poznan to the mines of Silesia, from Warsaw and Lodz to maritime Pomerania. The workers are demanding wage increases, and Gomulka's answer is always that this is impossible as it means

a further hike in the inflation and the break-up of the Polish economy.

Many thousands of workers have won wage increases despite Gomulka's opposition. Among them are the workers of Poznan, Warsaw and the Silesian miners. But a majority of the working class is stuck at the old wage level, and hence is disillusioned with the government and Gomulka's promises. The government should permit strikes to take place, for in the October days Gomulka promised to guarantee the right to strike. But now the government opposes strikes with the old argument that strikes in a socialist state are an absurdity.

Nevertheless, the streetcar workers of Lodz, the industrial center of Poland and the traditional center of workers' radicalism, went on strike after exhausting all other means of struggle. This time the government used not only pressure by the party and the unions, it called out the police and the army against the striking workers. The strike was broken by the combined pressure of the Party, unions, police and army. Many workers were arrested. The government promised to raise wages and to change

the hated bureaucrats in the streetcar "enterprise." The official organ *Tribuna Ludu* (directed by my old prison comrade Leon Kasman) explained to the workers that to strike was wrong, and would harm their own interests.

In this way, Gomulka, who promised the right to strike to the working class as one of the conquests of the revolution, now assumes the role of a strike breaker. This is a dangerous road for him to follow, because without the support of the workers the Gomulka regime is destined to fall.

After the Lodz strike, Gomulka declared to the workers at Nowa Huta, near Cracow, that he can "calm" the "brawlers," but the impression this speech made appears to have been so bad that he corrected it, and appealed to the "common sense" and the "responsibility" of the workers, and to their understanding of the difficult international situation of the country. The discontent of the workers is reflected in the internal struggle in the Party. But it is curious that the Stalinist opposition brings up the problem of the workers' wages as a point against Gomulka. In a recent meeting of the Warsaw organization, Gomulka just barely won by a majority of nine votes over the Stalinists.

While the working class is fighting actively for an increase in its wages, the middle class and the "intelligentsia" are delivering themselves over to disappointment with the results of October, to political indifference or to desperation.

The ardent young writers from the

October days have been either fired or corrupted. The Polish press has lost its critical edge. The organs of the October left are now controlled by the censorship. From day to day the breach between Gomulka and the October left, represented by the youth, the workers of Zeran and Poznan, the intellectuals and the Party left, is growing. If the split is not yet open, this can be attributed to the growing attack of the Stalinists on Gomulka. The spontaneous political left, like the workers, are vacillating in their fight because they think that the fall of Gomulka could mean the return of the Stalinists or civil war in Poland, menaced by Russian intervention.

DANGER OF INTERVENTION

The danger of Russian intervention delays the growth of the opposition of the working class to Gomulka and the crystallization of a new Polish left and its development of an independent political role in the country. But in spite of the international situation this is the historical tendency of the Polish workers and of the Polish revolutionary left: to break up Stalinism, overcoming Gomulka's transitional administration in the process.

For the moment, it is not only the Polish economy which is sick. The mind of the people is also sick and desperate. In addition to the strikes, the resistance to the bureaucracy is taking other forms. Thirty per cent of the workers are regularly absent from their jobs, which do not assure them of the minimum they need to exist. Government functionaries steal to the tune of two million dollars daily, a sign of low salaries and demoralization. And the whole people is seeking consolation in vodka which is consumed at the rate of about one million dollars per day.

The Polish people understand that due to the present division in the world their situation is desperate and their fate tragic. But in spite of this, the general tendency of the healthy part of the nation is to seek to overcome the present stage and to win a victory over Stalinism.

Independence Struggle Grows in Okinawa

Readers of LABOR ACTION will remember (or can look up) the article "The Crime of Okinawa" which appeared in our issue for March 26, 1956. That article described the American military's land-grab in Okinawa which has disrupted the island's economic and social structure, and has led to a mounting opposition to the American occupation and a mounting demand to have Okinawa returned to Japanese administration.

CRISIS GROWS

Right after that report was published in *Labor Action*, the political situation in Okinawa reached a crisis as a result of the publication of the findings and recommendations of a House Armed Services Sub-committee on Okinawa, headed by Representative Price. Instead of backing the Okinawans' demand for curtailment of land seizures by the American military, and for compensation to the Okinawan farmers on a rental rather than a lump-sum basis, the Price Report backed the military's basic position, while recommending that lump-sum payments be based on a higher rate than that which the armed services have been willing to pay in the past.

The Price Report was greeted by protest demonstrations in which the police estimated about 100,000 persons participated at 55 different areas on the island in one day. For months anti-American sentiment ran so high that a large area in the south-central part of the island had to be declared off-limits to service personnel.

At the end of December, 1956, elections were held for mayor of Naha, capital of Okinawa. Of the three candidates, two were "pro-American" conservatives. The other was Kamajiro Senaga, secretary general of the Peoples' Party. Senaga polled 16,592 votes, or 40 per cent of the total, and won easily.

In his campaign, Senaga concentrated on three issues: reversion of the island

to Japan; the land question; and low wages. (The average wage in Okinawa is \$3.00 per hour for Americans, and 18 cents for Okinawans!) It is hardly surprising that Senaga drew his heaviest support from the laboring communities of Shurt and Oroku.

The warning signs were so pointed that the American administration tried to put its best foot forward to placate the Okinawans. The day before Senaga took office, General Lemnitzer, U.S. Far Eastern commander and governor of the Ryukyu Islands, announced that: "I have directed a comprehensive review of all military requirements for land in the Ryukyus with a view to reducing our existing requirements wherever possible and of limiting new acquisitions to an absolute minimum."

On January 20, 1957, it was announced that rents paid Okinawans for their land by the armed forces had been tripled "over what the Army concedes was an unfair valuation in earlier surveys." It was further announced that there were current plans to "release 12,500 acres now held by different arms of the service," and that \$5.7 million had been appropriated for resettlement of displaced farmers.

The same report, however, also made it clear that lump-sum payments were going into effect (with the Price Report recommendations for a higher sum; but this is still the major grievance of Okinawans). (2) The Marines still need 46,000 acres of land, of which 25,000 will have to be requisitioned by lump-sum payment. (3) That the U.S. must have, at the lowest minimum, 16 per cent of Okinawa's arable land for its military purposes.

"CONCESSIONS"

Thus, the "concessions" were hardly enough to conceal the basic fact that American military needs have priority over the needs of the people of Okinawa. Popular support for Senaga's program was not lessened by the "concessions." Last June, the 24 man conservative "pro-American" majority on the Naha Municipal Council passed a no-confidence

vote, and thus overthrew the Senaga administration. New elections were called in the hope that Senaga could be beaten.

But once again, he won easily, receiving 16,818 votes, or 226 more than he got in the previous election. This despite the fact that when his first administration took office the Bank of the Ryukyus, in which the U.S. government is majority stockholder, refused to lend the Naha city government money for reconstruction, causing city contractors to terminate their contracts and thus throwing 4000 people out of work.

In brief, the blind policy of placing American military needs above the needs of the Okinawan people creates a continuing and continually growing opposition in the island to American occupation. From a land where "there are no restrictions imposed by a foreign government on our rights to store or to employ atomic weapons," (Price's Report) Okinawa is turning into a land where a whole people is united in its hatred of the imperialist invader and occupier.

Labor Action FORUM New York

Thursday, September 26
8:30 P.M.

FERMENT IN MAO'S CHINA

speaker

MICHAEL HARRINGTON

Chairman, Young Socialist League

LABOR ACTION HALL
Third Floor, 114 West 14th Street

Joe Clark's Resignation Points to New Crisis in CP

By H. W. BENSON

As the Communist Party national convention was winding up in February, a rumor buzzed through the little anteroom that served as a press room; Joe Clark, foreign editor of the *Daily Worker*, it was hinted, would demand the floor and in a dramatic last minute declaration resign from the party. It never happened but the rumor was, at worst, premature. On September 9, in a letter printed in the *Daily Worker*, he finally left the party.

His resignation comes as another shattering blow to the dwindling morale and tattered prestige of the CP. There have been others, notably Howard Fast and John Steuben. But this time, unlike the others, it seems that Clark's move will set off the internal party faction fires that had been banked and smouldering for seven months. John Gates, DW editor and spokesman for the only formal tendency in the party that has aroused any interest in the broad socialist public, felt impelled to restate the need for a struggle inside the party for his views. And, simultaneously, perhaps by coincidence, Gates was attacked by name for the first time in the Russian press, in an article in *Kommunist*, political organ of the Russian CP. It is difficult to see how a revival of the wide-open fight can be avoided.

Clarke served on the *Daily Worker* staff for 12 years; he had been a Communist for 28 years. He joined in his teens during the so-called "Third Period" when he became a leader of CP student work, organizing mass student demonstrations and helping to set up the National Student League, which later entered as the Communist wing into the American Student Union. Ever since, for a political lifetime, he has served as a loyal and prominent party leader and spokesman. What he says now becomes political evidence of the first order. As Gates commented in the DW, "The resignation of Clark is another sign of the continued decline of the Communist Party." And so it is. But more, it will undoubtedly upset the relations of the various groups and tendencies within it.

Like others who supported Gates, Clark was encouraged by the recent CP convention and waited for a full-scale turn. But in vain. "The hope and promise of that convention," he writes, "have not [been] fulfilled." Apparently, the downfall of Molotov and Malenkov was a last straw. Clark says, "To support Khrushchev against Molotov and Malenkov as the party and *Daily Worker* have done, is no service to socialism or the Soviet Union. Wrong though Molotov has been, the Soviet people face the perspective, and I think will succeed, in producing a new leadership, one which is not responsible for the crimes of Stalin as both Molotov and Khrushchev are. American socialists should be partisans of socialism everywhere. But one cannot have an independent stance or a scrupulous regard for truth, and support the 'unity' of the Soviet Communist Party behind Khrushchev, as the *Daily Worker* did editorially."

For Socialist Democracy

He calls for "independence" of American Marxists, as have others of all shades of opinion in the party. The word is a euphemism, carried along from his past. Socialists require more than "independence" from a dictatorial, repressive regime headed by men who worked hand-in-glove with Stalin; they are hostile to it and look toward and support every genuine movement for democracy. But Clark obviously inclines beyond mere "independence"; he speaks now of a "new leadership" in Russia. Elsewhere, he says, "my view is that socialism can be served only by a complete break with Stalinism. The latter perverted socialism by substituting autocracy for democracy. But Marxists have always advocated socialist democracy, which they uphold as more libertarian than any yet attained."

One question comes to mind instantly because it is so fundamental: does Clark maintain that Russia was "socialist" under Stalin and is it socialism-without-democracy today? We note, that even a man who broke so sharply with Stalinism, like Howard Fast, was unable to throw off his old misconceptions on this score. But Clark does not say!

"Communism on a world scale," he still maintains, "has been the major current in our time through which socialist transformations have taken place." That appears clear enough. But do the Communist regimes here and now represent socialism? At this point, Clark becomes cloudy. He speaks of "the successful revolutions in Russia, China, and Yugoslavia" and in the same breath of the "socialist transformation in Poland." This apparently subtle differentiation between Poland and the other nations is underlined when he writes:

"Marxism realized its greatest triumph in the Russian and Chinese revolutions. It also reached its most serious crisis as a result of Stalinist perversion of the Communist movement. Within the Communist countries there is great hope for socialism in the complete elimination of Stalinism which deprived socialism of its humanism and high moral principles and which replaced scientific method with a religious type dogma."

We ask again—are they socialist now? Clark neglects to mention even once that holy of holies, "the socialist world," referred to with reverence even by the most professedly anti-Stalinist Communist. We refer to this "oversight" not in order to ridicule an "inconsistency" which we have gleefully discovered or to chide Clark for missing the crucial point. (We leave to his Stalinist enemies the task of berating him for his "anti-Sovietism" as they have already begun.) Quite the contrary. We take great pains to note Clark's "omission" because in that "defect" lies perhaps his most important contribution to the reorientation of Communists.

Key Political Questions

On another plane, however, Clark is just beginning to raise the key political questions, even for himself. He calls generally for socialist democracy; and for a "new leadership" in Russia. But a lot can fit under those headings. Concretely, the issue is posed thus: are you for real and tangible democratic rights now in the nations dominated by Communists: free speech, free press, the right to strike, the right to form free trade unions? the right to form legal and peaceful opposition parties, free to change the regime by peaceful, constitutional methods? We are for all that here. Are we for it there?

In the answer to this question lies the future of socialism, in America as elsewhere. It is this, at bottom, which finally ruined the Communist Party when it served as the political apologist for a totalitarian power. Like many others, Clark doesn't yet feel it in his bones.

"Fundamentally the demise of the party is related to that of every other socialist movement in our country since the days of the first Marxists here," he writes. Not content with growing directly out of the struggles of the American people, and basing themselves on the specific conditions of American life, these movements have unwittingly tried to impose their dogmas on the struggles. But at one time, with the same dogmas, the CP could enroll a hundred thousand members and influence a million others. What has changed is not the party but the world of labor, liberalism and socialism. Yesterday, Russia could win their sympathies and the CP, which rested upon it, grew. Today, the dictatorship in Russia arouses the detestation of all; the CP which continues to apologize for it, even if less blatantly, falls to pieces.

Clark repudiates the advice of Jaques Duclos, French CP leader, who put pro-Russian apologetics in their most arrant form. Duclos maintained that "internationalism" meant "solidarity with the foreign policy of the Soviet Union." This Clark rejects and he criticizes the American party for not explicitly repudiating this thesis.

Supports Hungarian Revolt

He writes: "In 1939, internationalism required support for the anti-Hitler war, not the shameful neutrality of both the French and American Communist parties." Entirely apart from any judgment on the validity of Clark's own new conclusion, there is no doubt that it represents a thrust at Stalinism at one of its weakest points. More important is Clark's outright support of the Hungarian revolution: "And in 1956, proletarian internationalism required solidarity with the Hungarian workers opposing Soviet intervention. It demanded support for the Hungarian workers who formed a solid phalanx of workers' councils and for their 100 per cent general strike."

Finally, in a letter to the *New York Times*, in which he appealed for an amnesty for Gilbert Green and Henry Winston, Clark reminded himself of the Moscow Trials, "Nothing made me more ashamed than learning that the trials of Trotsky, Zinoviev, Bukharin and other Bolshevik leaders were dastardly frame-ups as were the Rajk, Kostov and Slansky trials."

In sum, Clark does not pretend to offer any platform or special program, except to reiterate his faith in socialism; he certainly essays no theoretical analysis. What he does is sufficient for his purposes of the moment: it is a stinging criticism of the Communist Party and a renunciation of Stalinism. He is convinced that "the party has become a hindrance rather than a means for advancing socialism."

To appreciate the impact of Clark's resignation upon the inner party situation we need only examine two quite different reactions to it: 1. a statement by

the National Administrative Committee of the CP, and 2. a statement by John Gates, ostensibly written as a "reply" to Clark.

The party is naturally not in a position to exert its full talents of vituperation in these difficult days, but its official statement makes the best of it. Its NAC, reject Clark's contention that the Party is in any way as is only natural, announces that all its members "will an obstacle to the achievement of socialism." The Committee is entitled to its vain hopes but it will not rest content with that. It goes on, "but Clark goes beyond mere loss of faith. He asserts that the Communist Party has become a hindrance to the advancement of socialism. This is more than dissatisfaction. It places him as an opponent of the Party—as one who believes that the cause of socialism can best be served by its liquidation."

Thus the edge is directed not only against Clark but against those Gatesites who proposed the transformation of the party into a political action association. And then the inevitable: "Clark has lost all conception of a sound workingclass attitude toward the Soviet Union." And, "Clark's statement . . . gives grist to the mills of those who plan to exploit the 'foreign agent' lie." In this rather mild muck-dropping this stands out: the Committee considers Clark an enemy.

But John Gates still considers Clark a friend and future collaborator. In his "reply," Gates ends, "In the farewell *Daily Worker* staff gave Clark a few days ago, I expressed the thought that in saying farewell to Joe we were not bidding farewell to his and our mutual fight for socialism. Clark replied in kind. We parted in sorrow and not in anger, as friends not enemies. I hope we will be able to discuss our disagreements in such a way as to be able to march to socialism, each in our own way, at the present time, but unitedly some time in the future." Gates, is careful to distinguish his views from those of Clark. He thinks the party is moving in the right direction; he believes that Duclos was repudiated; "we supported the recent changes in leadership in the Soviet Union," he writes, "because we were for the policies enunciated by the 20th Congress of the CPSU."

One Step Backward

Here, we might recall, that as far back as July 24 in a discussion of Clark's views on Russia, Gates took a big step backward when he wrote in the *Daily Worker*, ". . . a multi-party system will probably continue for a considerable period after the American people attain socialism. In the Soviet Union however, there is no material base for a multi-party system." Not even under Stalin? Not even now under Khrushchev who was linked with Stalin? Why not? Perhaps he will soon be compelled to give other answers. Let us hope so. But at any rate, his discussions with Clark remain on the plane of political affinity.

But how different his handling of the Foster wing in his own party! Gates, in effect, denounces the Fosterites for forcing Clark out of the party; it is a difficult if not untenable position; he has more in common with Clark who calls for the end of the CP than with the Foster wing with which he remains united! At a meeting of the CP National Committee July 27-28 (before Clark resigned), Gates spoke out against Foster, "If you want to exclude from the pages of the *Daily Worker* columns like Joe Clark's, let's talk about excluding articles by Foster and anyone else that also contradicts the line of the Party. I say that this is a vital question, because it has to do with the direction our Party is going. He struck back at his critics, "There was a remark made to the effect that comrades who advocate a political action association were putting forward the position of imperialism—that's the way you talk to enemies, not to comrades!"

Foster answered, "Comrade Gates said that I also had written anti-Party articles, which were printed in the *Daily Worker*. That is not correct. Every article I submitted to the *Daily Worker* was first submitted to, and passed upon by the Party. I wrote some articles, that were against the line of the *Daily Worker*, which is quite a different line from that of the Party, in many respects."

A Reply to Foster

With this as a background, we can understand that Gates' "reply" to Clark is actually a reply to Foster. ". . . we have not yet succeeded in creating the kind of atmosphere in the Communist movement where new ideas can freely be advanced and explored without name-calling, invective and abuse." That, explains, Gates, is why Clark was forced out of the Party. And Gates goes on: "there are those who opposed these new policies before the convention and who resist, obstruct and seek to reverse them now. This is a real struggle and has not yet come to a definitive conclusion."

As everything seems poised for a new eruption inside the Communist Party, two problems which will affect the immediate future of socialism in the United States press forward again:

1. Will those still inside the Communist movement who want a real break with Stalinism move toward democratic socialism? That is, will they affirm their adherence to democracy, not only for the United States, but for all the nations now under Communist control.

2. Can democratic socialists present an active, positive militant anti-Stalinist and anti-capitalist program capable of attracting those who have already broken with Stalinism; those who are breaking from it today under our very eyes; and those who will inevitably do so tomorrow?

Racists Block Integration — —

(Continued from page 1)

cation would proceed fairly smoothly—though very slowly—and that a situation similar to the one in Louisville, Kentucky last year would prevail. At this point, Governor Arval Faubus, a reputed Southern liberal, entered the picture.

On August 29, the State Chancellor granted an injunction, asked by a white woman, to prevent the school board from proceeding with the planned admission of Negroes to the high school on September 3. The principle witness at the Chancellor's hearing was Governor Faubus who argued for the injunction on the grounds that attempted integration would lead to mob violence and bloodshed. On the following day, Federal District Judge Ronald N. Davies overruled the injunction and enjoined all persons from interfering with the plan for integration. In response to this ruling, the Little Rock Board of Education announced the next day that the high school would be open to all qualified students on September 3 regardless of race.

The day before the scheduled opening of the schools, Faubus announced over television that he had ordered the National Guard to surround the school so as to prevent disorder. Disorder was to be warded off by the Guardsmen keeping the Negroes out of school, and not by giving them protection against any possible segregationist mobs that might have gathered to prevent integration, it goes without saying. The following day the school was ringed by some 270 armed Guardsmen, who have been preventing the Negro students from entering the school until this hour.

NO EVIDENCE

Neither Faubus nor anyone else has produced the slightest scintilla of evidence to back up the claim of threatening violence. Faubus has talked about armed caravans descending upon the city, rioting mobs and the like of that, but all this is clearly the most transparent fabrication. The Mayor of Little Rock, as well as other city officials have denied that violence impended and so have the community's newspapers. The Jim Crow crowds that have gathered before the school clearly did so in response to Faubus' efforts to prevent integration, rather than being the cause of these efforts.

What Faubus' motivation has been cannot be discerned. He has been charged with acting in collusion with various political leaders from the deep South to create a situation that would strengthen them in their campaign to keep desegregation from occurring at all in such states as Alabama and Georgia. Whether this is actually the case, or whether Faubus on his own initiative decided to become the hero of the racists, the fact is that his actions have strengthened the most reactionary Southern forces everywhere; they have emboldened all those who intend to meet change in the Jim Crow pattern with fierce, all-out resistance. The events in Arkansas undoubtedly played an important role in inflaming the Jim Crow hoodlums in Nashville, including those who carried their resistance to integration so far as to dynamite and destroy a school in that city.

EISENHOWER CALM

President Eisenhower's reaction to Faubus' defiance of the law has been to maintain a calm, passionless stance, complete with "understanding" of the "complexities" of the situation. The Justice Department and the FBI have conducted a leisurely study of the situation while the President confined himself to platitudinous statements about upholding the Constitution. At the request of Federal Judge Davies, the Justice Department has finally ordered Faubus' appearance in Court on September 20 for a hearing on the plea by the federal government that the Court order Faubus to cease interfering with integration. The litigation involved can conceivably drag on for months and months.

Meanwhile, a meeting between Faubus and Eisenhower was arranged. When the press reported that the Arkansas governor was going to capitulate to the federal government at this meeting, Eis-

enhower let it be known that he was extremely angry over such speculation. The meeting itself produced statements by both Eisenhower and Faubus filled with doubletalk on both sides. The president stated that Faubus had informed him that he intended to respect the decisions of the Court, and added that the governor had displayed a "constructive and cooperative" attitude. Faubus stated that he intended to obey the law, but that at the same time he had to prevent violence and that the President had recognized this.

Would the troops be withdrawn and the Negro students permitted to enter the school? Neither statement answered this question, but the events of the following Monday did. The troops remained and the Negroes were no nearer entering Central High School than they were before the meeting. Rumors have it that Faubus will remove the troops before the court hearing scheduled for the 20th but whether or not this is so remains to be seen. Also, and most important, will the removal of the troops result in integration of the school this semester or will it be accompanied by a deal which puts integration off for another year? At this point nobody knows the answer to this one either.

Eisenhower refrained from doing any of the things he might have done to force Faubus to back down, including the simple gesture of publicly condemning the Arkansas governor's action explicitly by name and calling upon him to at once enforce the integration ordered by the court and planned by the school board. The President could have gone to

Little Rock in person and made a speech there calling for an end to Faubus' rebellion, or perhaps even personally led the Negro children into the school. He could have placed the Arkansas National Guard under federal direction and ordered them to admit the Negro students.

HELPED REACTION

It is not a question of deciding which of these steps he should have taken first, or whether he should have utilized these avenues or others in combination to secure compliance with the Supreme Court decision. What is involved is that he could have created a forceful atmosphere of insistence upon integration in response to the Little Rock situation, but instead produced an aura of inaction and indecision. In so doing he helped the most reactionary forces in the South. Their influence over the numerous "neutral" white elements who regardless of their own opposition to integration are willing to comply with the law was measurably strengthened.

If the responsibility for the current victory for racism in Arkansas rests with Eisenhower, and hence with the Republican Party, it is only by virtue of the fact that the Democrats are out of power. The reaction of leading liberal Democrats to Faubus' action showed that their concern was mainly with retaining the unity of the Democratic Party. During the first two weeks after the initial events such leading Democratic Party personalities as Harry Truman and Adlai Stevenson could only get themselves to utter a few weasleworded remarks about the actions of their Democratic colleague. Finally, on Septem-

ber 15, the party's Advisory Council issued a statement charging President Eisenhower with having "failed in his duty" to exercise leadership in the Little Rock events.

The Democratic statement also took a gingerly slap at Faubus' wrist and asserted that his action "does not represent the position or policy of the Democratic party." This statement represents the least that could have been said about Faubus' action, given the responsibility that rests upon the shoulders of the Democratic leaders in view of the fact that they and Faubus are united in the same political party.

IMPORTANT LESSON

The integration struggle in Arkansas points up an important lesson. Namely, that the difference between victory and defeat for the Negro people may often depend upon whether public authority is forcefully utilized for integration, or against it. In Tennessee, integration is proceeding because the state and local authorities acted in favor of carrying out the law despite the actions of racist extremists like Kasper. There, the police acted to break up the mobs which aimed to prevent desegregation. In Arkansas, despite a climate favorable to achieving the first steps of integration planned by the Little Rock school board, Faubus used the public authority to halt the integration program. Had the federal government used its authority to counteract the state government, integration would have by now quite likely been achieved. Because it did not the courageous Negro youngsters of Little Rock have yet to enter school.

Syria: Another Guatemala? — —

(Continued from page 1)

much more rapid than in any other Arab country. This is all the more creditable because Syria does not have any oil fields and her only share of oil royalties, which comes as pipeline fees, is only about 6 million dollars annually.

The balance of trade which has been for years against Syria has been converted into a favorable balance during the last two years. A person who works closely with the Zionist groups in New York and who has just returned from a trip to the Middle East has stated that the Israelis could learn from the Syrians in the field of swamp reclamation! Doreen Warriner, in her new study of the land and economic development in the Middle East, finds herself amazed at the developmental drive of the Syrians, the rise in their real wages and the rapid growth in the country's national income.

To the State Department such conditions in Syria have caused a profound shock, specially because the Syrians have been able to build a modern army and a semi-modern economy without any financial assistance from Uncle Sam.

SMEAR CAMPAIGN

A smear campaign against Syria has thus been the Eisenhower administration's most typical weapon. The Ba'ath has been accused of being pro-Russian in its outlook, which is hardly true. It is conveniently forgotten that the Socialist foreign minister of Syria, Salah el-Bitar, while attacking the Eisenhower Doctrine, had declared that if the Soviet

Union had offered Syria its version of the Eisenhower Doctrine, Syria would have rejected it equally. The Ba'ath for years has been in the forefront in Asia for advocating a third camp in international affairs, and though it has approved buying arms from the Soviet bloc, it still remains deeply committed to the policy of non-alignment.

In the last few weeks attempts have also been made to drive a wedge between Syria and Egypt by playing upon the anti-communist sentiment of Colonel Nasser. Nasser who for some years now has been accused of being out on a limb with the Russians was all of a sudden praised by the American press for maintaining an intelligent distance from the Soviet Union. But this strategy did not work. Syrian and Egyptian governments have reaffirmed their alliance.

American interference in the Syrian affairs is hardly likely to cease after this first round. If the Syrian government does not topple, the American position in Jordan, which is totally insecure, will not be maintainable in spite of the loyalty of the crack tribal troops. The Eisenhower administration is therefore likely to continue to encourage a policy of pressure on Syria whereby Jordan, Turkey and Iraq will maintain their troops on the Syrian frontier to keep alive and promote border tensions, while at the same time the anti-democratic forces will be encouraged to subvert the Syrian regime. Visitors from Lebanon have confirmed the Syrian charge that

the outlawed fascist Syrian National Socialist Party (which has a formidable record of political assassinations both in Lebanon and Syria) is training paramilitary bands on the Lebanese side of the Syrian frontier with the clandestine support of "foreign" groups. What foreign groups? The same that supported Colonel Aramas in the Guatemalan coup in 1954?

HENDERSON APPEARS

Loy W. Henderson's involvement in the Middle Eastern politics is a bad omen in itself. Henderson is one of those activists in the State Department who should logically belong to the Central Intelligence Agency. While in India as American ambassador he did all he could to encourage the rightist anti-Nehru factions. In Iran he never concealed his hostility towards the nationalization of the Iranian Oil Company. It was his report that hastened the delivery of arms to Syria's neighbors in a totally unwarranted situation.

Syria thus shows all the signs of another "Guatemalan liberation." But an attempt to replace the present neutralist regime with a thoroughly pro-Western one would take place this time in the Middle East, remote focal point of imperialist rivalries, not in Central America. While the Guatemalan overturn could be accomplished with complete safety from any kind of Russian intervention, the same cannot be said for the Middle East.

And pressures against the tough, all-out policy adopted by the State Department have already built up in the Middle East itself. Governments noted for their friendliness to and dependence on the United States appear to have warned Dulles that a brutal intervention into the domestic affairs of Syria could have the most serious consequences, and would receive no backing in that area.

For the moment, at least, the State Department appears to have drawn back. If this is not simply an attempt to divert public attention from the area while a coup is prepared, it may give time for the democratic forces in Syria to gather additional strength, and for the mobilization of public opinion in this country against any attempt to repeat in Syria the disaster of Guatemala under conditions far more dangerous to world peace.

Politics and the Novel

A Symposium

Irving Howe Editor *Dissent*

Norman Mailer Author, *Naked and the Dead*

Harvey Swados Novelist and Critic

Auspices

Lower Manhattan Branch, SP-SDF

Friday, October 4

8:00 P.M.

Machinists Auditorium, 7 East 15th St., N. Y. C.

Admission 90¢