

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

**A Road for Israel in the Mid-East Crisis:  
How to Break the Vicious Spiral**  
... page 6

**Dostoyevsky and 'Cultural Freedom':  
Arthur Miller and the Posse**  
... page 3

**Background for New Orleans:  
The Catholic Attack on Jim Crow**  
... page 4

**Westinghouse's Co. Union and McDonald**  
... page 2

MARCH 5, 1956

FIVE CENTS

**NOT ONLY STEVENSON AND THE POLITICIANS—**

## **Labor Movement Too Is Put on the Spot By the Historic Negro Fight in the South**

### **Westinghouse Unveils the T-H Time Bomb**

By JOHN WILLIAMS

One of the most sinister elements in the strikebusting strategy being unleashed by the Westinghouse Corporation is the use of the company-union weapon at the giant Pittsburgh plant. The company is aiming to get the striking union (IUE) decertified by the NLRB.

Under the Taft-Hartley Act, it is possible during a strike for a company union to petition the labor board for an election in which only the scabs will have the right to vote. This anti-labor instrument in the law, which hangs over the head of even the most powerful union, is not the least reason for the infamy of the name Taft-Hartley.

At the Perfect Circle plant, the United Auto Workers suffered some grievous losses when Taft-Hartley was used in this way. Yet despite all the speeches against Taft-Hartley in general, and against the scab-voting provision in particular, nothing has been changed in the basic T-H setup. And this is true even though from 1947 to 1952 it was that great liberal New Deal president Harry Truman who was sitting in the White House.

Since none of the union-busting gimmicks in the Taft-Hartley Law was used on any "massive" scale, there was a tendency on the part of the labor movement to get reconciled to this law's continued existence. Along with T-H apologists, the labor movement began to think of it as a law for "union control" but not for union-busting. The whole period of "labor peace" and War Economy prosperity has helped to nourish all kinds of illusions on this score.

But the labor theoreticians of the "American Way" and American "classlessness" must be disconcerted by the fury and the class vindictiveness of the Westinghouse assault on unionism.

#### **ANOTHER 'FIRST'**

To all the other "firsts" of the Westinghouse strike should be added this: that it is the first attempt in a mass-production industry to smash a union the size of the IUE, via the Taft-Hartley and company-union route.

It is unthinkable that the labor movement can allow Westinghouse to break through on this. Unquestionably such a catastrophe would point the way for all employers who are also looking for a way to hogtie the union movement.

In spite of all the Rotarian talk about jointly building the Great American System, as a Reuther keeps repeating, the country's employers have never reconciled themselves to the business of constantly handing out concessions to the unions. Many employers must be

(Continued on page 4)

By GORDON HASKELL

The struggle of the Negro people in America to break the back of the Jim Crow system once and for all is driving this country to a political crisis of prime magnitude. If the struggle continues at its present rate of intensity it may well determine the outcome of the next presidential election.

Make no mistake about it: This is the kind of struggle which can separate the men from the boys in the American labor and liberal movements; can split the Democratic Party wide open; can force a realignment in our politics which becomes much more far-reaching than the issue of the struggle for racial equality which gave it its original impetus.

The politically explosive nature of the mighty conflict which is now breaking to the surface everywhere was illustrated by at least two things which happened last week.

(1) The proposal which was made by the mercurial New York Congressman Adam Clayton Powell that all Negroes stage a one-hour strike on March 28, un-

der the guise of an hour of prayer, in support of the people arrested and indicted in the Montgomery bus strike.

(2) The fact that Adlai Stevenson has been forced to endanger his alliance with the Southern Democratic leaders by at least (and at last) stating categorically and forcefully that he is for enforcement of the Supreme Court decision on integration of the schools.

The second of these is by far the less important symptom, so let us dispose of it briefly and at once.

Stevenson made his deal with the Southern leadership during the past four years. When pressed on the issue of the Negro struggle for equality, he first attempted to take a completely noncommit-

tal stand and to decry the introduction of this "divisive" issue into the election campaign.

During the past week, however, he has been forced to change his tune somewhat by the rising panic of his liberal and labor supporters who have been pleading with him—not so much to propose any action on behalf of the embattled Negroes, but at least to utter a word of moral indignation at the open law-breaking and law-evasion by their enemies.

He has finally screwed up the political courage to do so—in about as inoffensive (to the Southern leaders) a manner as humanly possible. He has asked President Eisenhower to call a conference of Negro and white leaders from the South to improve race relations! That is exactly the suggestion made by Alabama's Governor Big Jim Folsom. And it is made for the same political purpose: an attempt to tread warily between those who are fighting for their rights and those who seek to continue to trample on them, as a "friend" of both.

While such a proposal may be consid-  
(Turn to last page)

### **Now It's Republic—After Westinghouse, Perfect Circle, Kohler Strikebreaking Violence Is Spreading**

By BEN HALL

By 7 a.m. on Monday morning, February 20, more than 700 pickets were gathered outside the main gate of the Republic Aviation Corporation's factory in Farmingdale, New York. Seventy local policemen were standing by. The company had decided to try to break the strike of 12,000 members of International Association of Machinists, Lodge 1987.

Within a few minutes, more than 20 pickets were injured; 58 union men were arrested, including Justin Ostro, local union president. Automobiles carrying strikebreakers, escorted by police, plowed through picket lines, running strikers to the ground. One man suffered a broken leg. Edward Serback, a 33-year-old striking machinist, was run down, rushed to a hospital with a possible spinal fracture. Ostro dispatched a telegram to Governor Harriman accusing the town and county police of attempting to break the strike by illegal interference with picketing.

But the strike was hardly a few hours old. In the next days more of the same was to come.

The IAM, which represents 12,000 of 19,000 workers at four Republic plants in Long Island, had decided to stop work on Saturday at midnight, but Monday morning was the first working day and the company had already made immediate plans to continue production with strikebreakers. In answer to the union, which demands wage increases and benefits equivalent to 19½ cents, the company has offered 5 cents. A position from which it has not budged since negotiations began on January 27.

By Friday night, when the week ended, 139 arrests had been made and more than 30 were injured, virtually all strikers. The company reported that 2700 employees had entered the plant, most of them before picket lines had formed. Plans had been made to feed and house company officials and police inside the factory. Beds were set up in the plant hospital and meals served in the cafeteria.

#### **COURT GRANTS A BLACKJACK**

That afternoon, Supreme Court Justice Edgar J. Nathan issued an injunction against the IAM forbidding mass picketing, which, he argued, tended to provoke "disorderly conduct on the part of members of the contending factions." The union had already offered to supply passes to 4000 office and engineering employees who are not involved in the strike—they make up the bulk of those who went to work—but the company, which is eager to provoke a violent showdown, rejected the offer.

The injunction restricts the total number of pickets at all four company plants to 105 in all. There are 16 entrances to the four plants. The union, then, is re-

duced to an average of less than 7 at each gate, a number that can hardly make much of an impression on the minds of those who are wavering between scabbing or staying out.

The county sheriff had deputized 50 men for strike duty and had been authorized by the County Board of Supervisors to employ as many men as he wanted at \$2 an hour. Yet, on Friday, Judge Nathan, in issuing his injunction, announced that local authorities could not furnish adequate police protection because of lack of manpower. It is a question now whether Governor Harriman will be pressed to send state troops to the scene.

#### **WIDENING PATTERN**

By its decision to slug it out with the IAM, Republic takes its place with Kohler, Perfect Circle, Miami hotel owners, and Westinghouse in a slowly spreading pattern of violent strikebreaking. The labor movement in New York City has already pledged a million dollars to help the Westinghouse strikers. Now, on the outskirts of the city, the labor movement hits up against a new campaign of anti-unionism.

IAM Local President Justin Ostro has felt impelled to announce: "As a law-abiding and responsible organization we shall abide by this decision [the injunction] of the court. The onus is on Republic for provoking 90 per cent of these incidents at the gates." But there is no law that prohibits a mass demonstration of New York labor against strikebreaking, from whatever source.

# Westinghouse's Co. Union Praises Dave McDonald

By EMIL MODIC

Pittsburgh, Feb. 21

Dave McDonald, president of the United Steelworkers, certainly must have a red face these days. If he doesn't, he ought to.

Because the strike-breaking, back-to-work company union which has appeared in the Westinghouse strike is reprinting his speeches with approval!

This company union, the so-called "Westinghouse Electric Workers," is the same union which is trying to get people to cross the picket lines in East Pittsburgh and trying to get the striking IUE decertified.

Headlines of the newspaper published by this "independent union" hail McDonald as "A True Union Leader" and declare "We Agree, Mr. McDonald." We reprint below some excerpts from this article:

"David J. McDonald, President, Steelworkers union, recently made a speech in which he outlined the proper goal of a responsible labor union. Mr. McDonald urged cooperation between labor and management. He said the managers of industry and the labor unions 'must join in a common effort to achieve a profitable production of goods.'

"What is needed, the union leader added, is not a Marxist concept of the class struggle, nor 'bread-and-butter unionism' but a mutual trusteeship of union leaders and business executives.

"This program of 'mutual trusteeship' he added, will be attacked by some, who will 'go about their business as always—calling names, seeking mastery, jubilant over each victory against the enemy—but their system won't work.'

"The people—workers and owners alike," he declared, 'have an over-riding interest that will not forever TOLERATE THE FUTILITY OF UNNECESSARY STRIKES caused by failure at the bargaining table when there is a better way—a way that pays off for everyone.'

"The Westinghouse Electric Workers are attempting to bring to East Pittsburgh Westinghouse employees the same responsible union leadership that Mr. McDonald provides for the steel workers. Frequent walkouts and strikes are evidence of incompetent and bungling union leadership. We, too, want a union that works in the interests of the majority, rather than for the sake of a FEW LOAFERS AND TROUBLEMAKERS."

It should be said in all fairness that McDonald has supported the IUE with cash and with a statement that their strike was entirely justified. But McDonald's policy of playing the "safe and sane" union leader in contradiction to Reuther is here coming home to roost.

If you stand on the George Westinghouse Bridge over the Turtle Creek Valley on U. S. Route 30 and look north, you see the roofs of acres and acres of buildings of the East Pittsburgh works of Westinghouse. If you walk to the other side of the bridge and look south, you see the rows of smoke stacks and plumes of multi-colored smoke of the great Edgar Thompson Works of the United States Steel Corporation.

If the Westinghouse strike is broken, there will be nothing between the United Steelworkers of America and the open shop but a bridge.

We hope Dave McDonald thinks about that before he makes his next speech.

DISPATCH FROM DUBLIN

## Irish Labor Left Is Pushing For Break with Gov't Coalition

By M. M.

Dublin, Feb. 23

The political situation here is pregnant with possibilities for the Labor left.

Hard on the heels of the setting up of the provisional united trade-union center, Larkin and Conroy, leaders of the country's two largest general unions, have come out sharply against the know-nothing policies of the government coalition (which includes the Irish Labor Party) in the face of the economic crisis.

Conroy and Larkin, both obviously under pressure, from their members, have demanded increased public control of banking and credit and, in turn, at union gatherings and Labor Party membership meetings, flayed the government for the shift to economic chaos, inherent in the moth-eaten capitalist device of deflation.

Growing unemployment and soaring prices at the same time underscore the absolute dependence of the Irish economy. Full employment in Britain and West Europe inflates the cost of materials and services with devastating effect on the Irish price structure. The Tory credit squeeze in Britain is calculated to depress consumption and investment in an effort to sustain the balance of foreign payments and to boost exports at competitive prices, in the cut-throat climate of the world market.

The automatic application by the Irish government (including its Labor ministers) of the British Tory chancellor's deflationary measures to a situation (underinvestment and chronic underemployment) that is basically different from Britain is deepening the crisis of Irish capitalist society.

Even that diffident apologist for capitalism, De Valera, was prompted to remark, in a by-election speech at Kerry last week, that the incompetence of this capitalist coalition administration was imperiling the existence and social solidarity of bourgeois interests, by the irrevocable attitude of the government to the needs of the economy.

He said that two currents of political thought found solace in the growing crisis: the "back-to-Britain" school who denigrated the independence movement, and the revolutionary socialists, who would exploit the economic breakdown. He hardly had in mind the Labor Party or the Stalinists in his reference to revolutionary socialism.

### NORTON FACES REVOLT

Against this background a minor revolt is scheduled for the Labor Party conference in April, a revolt against continuing Labor support to the coalition. Several motions submitted demand an action program that the party would use to highlight a break with the capitalist parties in the government: measures like nationalization of the banks, of the flour-mills, soak-the-rich taxes, import-export control, and state purchasing abroad to cut out the agents who chisel up the costs.

Labor Minister Norton can be expected to blow his top, because he is the minister responsible for the economic well-being of the country, as well as being the senior Labor minister in the cabinet.

It is believed that union leaders will play a major role in this debate, because of the militant mood and pressure of the ranks against the attempt to lay off the crisis on them. A new critical mood is apparent in those sections of the party that in the past faithfully reflected Norton's craven collaboration with the most reactionary capitalist elements in the government.

One Sunday newspaper columnist, who is usually on the inside of Labor developments, hints at the possibility that Norton may be a McDonald act and break organizationally with the party. His ideological break has not been in doubt for years.

Lemass, who is De Valera's economic expert and Norton's predecessor in the Ministry of Industry, discarded Norton's current economic theories 20 years ago. Such is the measure of Norton's thinking—even in a capitalist sense.

### LARKIN'S STAR UP

Larkin is being touted as the leader of the Labor left in certain Labor Party circles. However, Larkin's behavior is enigmatic. He has done some dirty chores in recent times for the right-wing leaders, while continuing to mouth left-wing phrases, together with an occasional genuflection to the Stalinist elements in the party.

It is agreed that he speaks from strength now, because of his influential position in the united trade-union center, and that he is becoming more outspoken and critical of the crassly ignorant and opportunist line of the Labor ministers.

Local Stalinists here, with the agility of mental Houdinis, are lapping up the popular-front line emanating from the 20th Communist Party circus in Moscow and are endeavoring—wryly, of course—to justify Milkoyan's debunking of Stalin after collaborating with it all for a lifetime. Now that the divinity of the Father of All the Russians has been exploded and the Great Father himself is no more, we have denunciation all around.

### SHACHTMAN TOUR

SAN FRANCISCO &amp; EAST BAY

Max Shachtman

will speak in Berkeley

on

The Russian Congress  
And the Cold War

WED., MARCH 21 at 8 p.m.

FINNISH BROTHERHOOD HALL  
1970 Chestnut Street  
Berkeley

### LONDON LETTER

## TUC Chides; Unions Prepare Strikes

By OWEN ROBERTS

London, Feb. 22

A warning that the government's financial policy may lead to an economic pile-up came today from representatives of more than eight million British trade-unionists. The warning was contained in a 2000-word document on the economic situation sent by the General Council of the Trades Union Congress to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Harold Macmillan.

The TUC was prompted to make this move after Macmillan's emergency measures announced last week and to give him an indication of the TUC's attitude before he sits down to draw up the plans for the annual government budget in April.

The document criticized the government's policy in using arbitrary financial measures in an endeavor to solve the balance-of-payments crisis and protested against the deliberate discrimination against social expenditure and investment in the nationalized industries.

"In rejecting the use of direct controls, whether on investment or on imports, and relying heavily on monetary policy, the government is taking a risk on the employment situation," said the TUC.

The statement also welcomed Chancellor Macmillan's recent statement that he would not deliberately create unemployment in order to ease the present economic situation—a policy that has been frequently advanced in recent months by sections of the Tory Party and capitalist press. But the TUC pointed out that, whatever the government's intentions, it was folly to pursue a policy which might precipitate the very dangers that it was designed to avoid.

Saying that "any fresh upsurge of incomes above the increase in output" would undermine any measures which the chancellor may be planning for his April budget, the TUC gently chastised those who allege that the responsibility for inflation rests with the trade unions for demanding wage increases and the employers for granting the increases.

"The policy pursued by the Conservative government of deliberately dismantling the machinery of control and planning in order to return to a freer economy, coupled with the measures which have resulted in the redistribution of income, has given rise to fears in the minds of many work-people that their

living standards are in danger," said the TUC's statement. "Moreover, the initial motivation of the great bulk of wage demands in recent years has been the justifiable need, as workers see it, to maintain a level of consumption (of which food and other essential commodities form a large proportion) threatened by price increases some of which have resulted from deliberate budget policy."

### WEAK CRITICISM

The TUC has also expressed concern at possible reductions in expenditure on public services. It said that while those criticizing government expenditure never specified the particular sections which should be cut there was little doubt that the social services were the intended target.

After saying that the need for proper economies in government expenditure must not be made the excuse for delaying necessary improvements in the social services or for making arbitrary cuts in other directions the TUC's statement concluded by drawing attention to a particular item of government spending.

"Defense expenditure," it said, "is still absorbing a third of all revenue from taxes, and, while we recognize the impor-

ance of avoiding any action which weaken the defense effort, we consider it essential that the government should keep the defense program under constant scrutiny with a view to effecting economies where possible."

In spite of its criticisms of the Tory government the TUC's statement is filled with academic waffling and is unlikely to give satisfaction to the rank-and-file trade-unionists, many of whom are in the thick of struggles for pay-increases. The engineering industry, in particular, may prove a Number One trouble spot in the next few weeks.

Some months ago three million workers in the engineering industry filed a claim for a 15 per cent pay raise. After innumerable meetings and humming and hawing the employers' organization eventually offered an increase of less than half this amount, and it was promptly rejected by the engineering unions.

### DEMONSTRATION STRIKES

In two days time the leaders of the 39 unions in the engineering industry are meeting in London to discuss the next step. A number of them are now known to favor lifting the demand to a 20 per cent raise in view of the government's recent battering down on workers' living standards.

Meanwhile local organizations of the engineering workers are opening up with small-arms fire against the employers. On Friday, the day of the union leaders' meeting in London, engineering enterprises in the giant steel center of Sheffield will come to a halt for twenty-four hours as the workers stage a token strike. Three days later the 40,000 engineering and shipbuilding workers in Belfast will down tools for a day in support of their wage claim.

These actions are typical of the mood which now prevails among the workers in Britain's largest industry and where by tradition the unions are among the most militant at rank-and-file level. And these actions are causing the government much more worry than all the faintly voiced protests originating from the Transport House headquarters of the TUC.

More and more the Tories are casting anxious glances at the workshops in the knowledge that within them lies the latent power that can send this government toppling in the dust.

### SUBSCRIBERS — ATTENTION!

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

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

20-10

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

RENEW NOW!

**DOSTOYEVSKY GETS IN THE MIDDLE—**

# Arthur Miller and the 'Cultural Freedom' Posse

By MAX MARTIN

The American Committee for Cultural Freedom, which is militantly in favor of cultural freedom for Russia and other Iron Curtain countries, has once again and in its usual fashion come to the defense of liberty in the cultural field.

This time its passionate commitment to cultural freedom in other countries came up against no less a threat to culture and the free practice thereof than playwright Arthur Miller, author of "Death of a Salesman" and other works.

February 9 was the seventy-fifth anniversary of the death of Dostoyevsky. As could be predicted, publicists and propagandists on both sides of the Iron Curtain tried to make some political hay out of the event.

In Russia, where the Stalinist regime until recently suppressed many of Dostoyevsky's novels, various celebrations were held, during the course of which the Stalinists got in a few cultural-propaganda licks. And in this country, likewise, it was a rare public notice of the anniversary which failed to attack Russian totalitarianism. Thus the New York Times editorial hailed the writer as a heroic fighter against authoritarianism, an appreciation which is less than accurate but which did score a point against Moscow.

On February 13 it was announced that Arthur Miller had issued a statement on Dostoyevsky denouncing both Russia and the United States for their treatment of art.

In his statement Miller asserted that three organizations, one Russian Stalinist group and two American anti-Stalinist ones, had asked him to comment publicly on the significance of Dostoyevsky. He identified the three as the Union of Soviet Writers, the American Committee for Liberation from Bolshevism (a right-wing group composed mainly of East European refugees) and the ACCF.

**NEITHER CAN CLAIM HIM**

Asserting that true art is above politics, Miller called upon both Russia and the United States to recognize that "to interfere with its freedom is to commit an act against mankind itself." He also denounced the propagandistic exploitation of Dostoyevsky's anniversary by stating: "... to attempt to draw the memory of this great and terrible man onto any political platform extant in the world today is vanity."

"I must confess to a very particular feeling of Dostoyevskian comedy in the arrival of these three invitations," he said. "Here I am, a writer who has only recently been deprived of his right to create a screen play in America; a writer who only a few years ago had his plays removed from the Soviet stages on the basis of his 'cosmopolitanism' being asked to speak in celebration of an author who was exiled in his own time in Czarist Russia, whose works were forever being censored, and who until recently was suppressed by the Soviet government."

The reference to Miller's being prevented from writing a screen play concerns an incident which occurred in New York City last December. The New York City Youth Board had planned to sponsor the production of a movie on juvenile delinquency, with Miller as scenarist. When attacked by the American Legion, the Catholic War Veterans and other groups for so employing a "subversive," the Youth Board decided to drop Miller and then to drop entirely its plans for the picture.

"I have always felt," wrote Miller, "that the Soviet suppression of some of his [Dostoyevsky's] works and the outright banning of others was a particularly indefensible act of cultural barbarism."

"The facts, I believe, make it absolutely impossible for either the American or Soviet civilizations to honestly 'claim' Dostoyevsky," he added. "Were he alive today I believe he would be in trouble in America for certain of his views, and in Russia for others."

**ON ART AND TRUTH**

Miller's statement is unusual enough to deserve further quotation:

"If I could, I would say to the world that Dostoyevsky was exiled and his works censored in his own time; that un-

der the Soviets they were suppressed at times and at times held to be so injurious that people were warned away from reading them; that in neither the Soviet Union nor in the United States today could a man with his views have long survived without punitive condemnation, which in the Soviet Union could mean outright suppression if not worse and in the United States an unofficial but, nevertheless, powerful process of social and economic ostracism.

"I would want to say that the survival of Dostoyevsky's work is a testament to the futility of censorship either overt or covert; that the political man's claim to know that an artist or a work of art is injurious to the public mind or the national interest is an expression, always and everywhere, not of his love of country but his fear for the loss of his power when the truth is told.

"That as a consequence, to attempt to draw the memory of this great and terrible man onto any political platform extant in the world today is vanity. That what all of us might do everywhere in the world is to understand that through the works of their artists the nations of the world have at hand a communion of spirit unapproachable for its sincerity and depth by any other means. That whatever the views of its author, a genuine work of art is an expression of love, especially is this true of Dostoyevsky, and that to break off this communion or to interfere with its freedom is to commit an act against mankind itself."

**VIGILANTES AT WORK**

The ACCF entered the act immediately after the publication of Miller's statement. It declared in the first place that it had not invited Miller to issue such a comment, and that he had erred in thinking otherwise. (On this point, in fact, Miller had indicated that he may have confused the ACCF with ACLB, because of overlapping personnel.)

But the intrepid custodians of cultural freedom did not stop there. Recognizing Miller as a grave danger to that species of freedom which the ACCF holds so dear, it swung into action, blackjack in hand.

Grudgingly stating that it welcomed his criticism of suppression of artistic freedom, the ACCF declared that it wanted to know why he had not taken this position in 1949. Miller, the committee pointed out, had that year been one of the sponsors of a Stalinist "peace" rally at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York.

The sentinels of cultural freedom were obviously worried by the idea that some people would regard Miller's progress politically during the past six years with enthusiasm, so they quickly stepped in to squelch the cheers.

"So what if he's criticizing Stalinist totalitarianism today—he didn't do so in 1949" The indictment is not only crushing and irrefutable but permanent.

Having gotten this out of the way, the ACCF went on to the heart of the matter. It sharply rebuked Miller for having dared to do what it called comparing cultural interference in Russia with such phenomena in the United States.

"We wish," it said, "to take sharp issue with Mr. Miller's near equation of these episodic violations of the tradition of political and cultural freedom in the United States with the official government policy of the Soviet Union in imposing a 'party line' in all fields of art, culture and science, and enforcing such a line with sanctions ranging from imprisonment to exile to loss of job." (Emphasis added.)

**SPOTTING THE ENEMY**

To be sure, there are some who will not recognize that Miller made a "near equation" of Russia and the United States in regard to cultural freedom. Such people will think that his statement

—"which in the Soviet Union could mean outright suppression if not worse, and in the United States an unofficial but, nevertheless, powerful process of social and economic ostracism"—recognized the great difference between totalitarianism in Russia and the witchhunt in the United States. They might think that Miller's use of the phrase "cultural barbarism" in application to the Moscow regime's policies, and his failure to utilize the same expression in regard to this country showed that he distinguished. Still others might think: All right, if Miller constructed a near-equation in his comparison of the two countries this is wrong, but the important thing is that he's against cultural suppression everywhere, which apparently was not the case in 1949.

The curators of cultural freedom, however, were not to be mollified. They knew at once that anybody who regards the events in the civil liberties field which have occurred in this country during the last ten years or so as more than "episodic violations"—there is its enemy. It knows that anyone who thinks that one should speak out sharply about the dangers to freedom in the United States instead of just shaking his head sadly once in a while over the "episodic violations"—he is the real threat. Since he thinks that Russia and America are both evil.

And against him, the ACCF is ever ready to swing into action, even if in so doing it may have to keep quiet about a few of those "episodic violations." After all, there's only so much that one organization can do.

**SHIFTY POLITICS**

Moreover, the ACCF understands the real political significance of Miller's act of criticism of both Russia and the United States. It's neutralism, that's what it is.

As it boldly stated, Miller's views are "typical of neutralist sentiment once it moves from the position of open Communist sympathy." And the only greater threat to cultural freedom than neutralism is Stalinism itself; indeed they are practically speaking the only threats. Therefore, mincing no words, the ACCF spoke out on that too.

Now neutralism is a dirty word in respectable American circles, but it is a bit ambiguous at best. Insofar as neutralism is associated with Nehru, for example, it connotes cuddling up to both war camps. What Miller had done was just the reverse: he had attacked both rival systems. In fact, to tell the horrible truth, it smacked of a distinctly Third-Campish approach, if only by implication.

And even if Miller is to be condemned for committing some sin called neutralism, there are those who might think that he deserves a kind word for moving away from the position of "open Communist sympathizer" to a position of attacking Moscow in the name of cultural freedom.

Still others might wonder how an organization like the ACCF, which is supposed to be a cultural-freedom group and not a political organization with a party line, gets the nerve to condemn neutralism, considering that it refused to speak out against the "general principles" of the McCarran Immigration Act on the ground that this fell outside its jurisdiction as a cultural-freedom organization. One learns that obviously there are those political matters which are closely related to cultural freedom, like neutralism and world politics, for instance, and those which are not, like the racist McCarran Act.

**THE MEAT-CLEAVER**

As a matter of fact, the ACCF is worried that there may even be people, who despite their recognition of Miller's unclarity on the question of Stalinism, will greet his statement with some sympathy, thinking in the first place, that his latest position is a welcome political development for him, and that, secondly, inadequate as some of his formulations may be, he is correct about the essential matter: the necessity for all democrats to fight for cultural and political freedom everywhere.

Such people may even believe that the reaction of the ACCF resembles that of the CP in cultural affairs to this extent: that both demand conformity to their

party lines, or else the meat-cleaver will descend.

As if to reassure cavers and refute any "ritualistic" protests to the effect that the ACCF has utilized this incident for purposes of propagandizing for the American Party Line and hatcheting any artists and intellectuals who fail to conform to it totally, a letter from ACCF Chairman James T. Farrell appeared in the New York Times for February 21. Farrell refrains from criticizing Miller for his heresy and even praises his defense of artistic freedom a bit.

He does wish to straighten out Miller's confusion on the question of who invited him to issue a statement on Dostoyevsky's anniversary. The ACCF had nothing to do with it, he says, but some of its members, including Farrell, did cooperate with the American Committee for the Liberation from Bolshevism in the Dostoyevsky anniversary project.

One thing Farrell does take exception to, namely, Miller's implication that the ACCF "is attempting to draw the memory of Dostoyevsky, onto a political platform." No sir, says Farrell; "This is not so as far as the committee is concerned." Moreover, he adds, "Especially because of the phenomena of totalitarianism in our time, there has been an increase in the efforts to politicize art and literature. These efforts the American Committee for Cultural Freedom has consistently opposed."

**HOLDING THE BAG**

Let's say that's so, for the sake of argument. But there can be no doubt that the other organization with which Farrell cooperated, the American Committee for the Liberation from Bolshevism, was deliberately using the Dostoyevsky anniversary as a propaganda instrument against the Moscow regime. Farrell (not we) seems to object to this sort of thing; he even compares it, by implication, with totalitarian habits.

There was a sequel. The "Liberation" committee runs a propaganda transmitter in Europe called "Radio Liberation." Having solicited Miller's statement, Radio Liberation proceeded to beam it out to the Eastern European masses. The committee did not attack it at all.

Some people might think that this kind of left the American Committee for Cultural Freedom holding the bag. Even the rightist anti-Bolshevik crusaders, who do not have overweening ambitions to be considered "liberal," failed to be moved when the Cerberus of Cultural Freedom raised the alarm on behalf of humanity against the Miller Menace.

Whither are we drifting, O concierges of cultural freedom? Maybe it is time to write a letter to the Times exposing the anti-anti-neutralists of the "Liberation" gang. Who knows what some of its people may have been doing in 1949....

**'POTEMKIN VILLAGE' IN AFRICA**

It seems they have "Potemkin villages" for British royalty too.

Tagging along with Queen Elizabeth on her current tour among Her Loyal Subjects is a Daily Herald (Labor) reporter, Pat Tyler, who wired back from the capital of Nigeria, Lagos, for the January 26 issue:

"The things they do here. The Big Clean-Up is on for the Queen's visit. The huge rubbish dump has been covered with ashes. The roads along which the Queen will travel have been resurfaced and shanty town has got a new look.

"Ah, the irony of shanty town! You see, a 6 foot wall was built to hide the railway yard from the Queen's view when she arrives to start her Nigerian tour on Saturday.

"But Nigerians pointed out that it was not much good hiding the ugliness of one side of the road when the shanty hovels lined the other.

"So a row of nice clean huts has been put up in front of the others. They will be kept brand new, with nobody living in them, while the Queen is here.

"This solution has delighted everybody....

"The Big Clean-Up went on politically, too. The Minister of Social Services, Adegoke Adelabu, who was due to greet the Queen, resigned dramatically in the Federal House of Representatives today.

"He had been found guilty of bribery and corruption as chairman of a district council.

"At Enugu, the Eastern Region Ministers of Land and Finance quit too. The resignations were demanded by Premier Nnamdi Azikiwe—he once called himself the George Washington of Nigeria—who was determined that there should be no scandal around politicians meeting the Queen."

## BACKGROUND FOR NEW ORLEANS

# The Catholic Attack On Jim Crow

By EDWARD HILL

The recent anti-Jim-Crow stand taken by the Archbishop of New Orleans, and indeed, the whole role of the Catholic Church in the South, requires a considerable amount of background information for analysis. Put in such a context, the explanation which emerges is complex and anything but a case of simple self-serving.

The American Catholic Church entered the period of the thirties with a high-level social ideology but without any kind of social movement. The work of Monsignor John Ryan was in a liberal tradition, and it had resulted in documents such as the Bishop's Statement of 1919. Ryan was, of course, anti-socialist; in fact, he had debates with Socialist Party leaders from time to time. The general point of this line of thought was pro-union, anti-racist, and so on.

But the ideology remained pretty much on the level of ceremonial statements of the church's devotion to the common man. The priests were not taught these ideas in their seminaries, and their general attitudes were those of a new petty-bourgeois, larded over with the tradition of Irish Jansenism which had become dominant in the American church.

Indeed, American Catholicism was (and still, to a certain extent, is) the most unimaginative, untheoretical section of the world church. To this day, it has failed to produce a heretic of substance—Father Feeny being more of a crackpot than anything else—and the one papal denunciation of a deviation, that of Americanism, was actually aimed at some French thinkers.

With the thirties and the advent of a period of social movement in the United States all this began to change. When movements arose which attempted to give substance to the ritual phrases of the 1919 Declaration and Ryan's ideas they met with tremendous resistance. And yet one fact guaranteed a certain base for this new development: the American church of the thirties was primarily composed of working-class members. This meant that the church had to make a turn toward the needs of its own people.

## IN THE '30s

One of the first signs of this change was the appearance of Father Coughlin. Initially he was not fascist, at least not publicly so. His avowed intention was to popularize the papal encyclicals on the social question (*Rerum Novarum* of Leo XII, written in 1891 as an anti-Marxist attempt to win back the European working class to the church; and *Quadragesimo Anno*, Pius XI's analysis on the same subject.) His interpretation of these highly ambiguous documents was in general liberal. This was during the period when he was supporting Roosevelt.

As the thirties progressed, Coughlin went over to an outright fascist ideology. But other groups developed within the church taking the line of liberal interpretation of the encyclicals.

In the early thirties, the *Catholic Worker* came into existence. In its early period, this group attracted almost all of the young priests and laymen who were to form the liberal wing of American Catholicism. Its ideology was, from the very beginning, anti-racist.

In the mid-thirties, the *Worker* group split in many directions. Its opposition to Mussolini's attack on Ethiopia lost it many Italian supporters; its hostility to Franco and its pacifism cost it still more. Yet at the same time new groups developed from within the *Catholic Worker*.

One of these, Friendship House, had inter-racialism as its primary concern. It was initially under the direction of a Russian émigré, Catherine de Hueck, and the stand it took was one of religious absolutism. It defended, for example, inter-racial marriage.

## ST. LOUIS REHEARSAL

Then in the mid-thirties again, during the Spanish Civil War, an internal struggle in the magazine *Commonweal* over the issue of support to Franco put a liberal group in control. Part of their ideology was also inter-racialist.

They formed part of a new, and broad front which had developed in a period of half a decade: the *Catholic Worker*, Friendship House, *Commonweal*, the Asso-

ciation of Catholic Trade Unionists, and so on. The general line of these groups was "liberal," i.e., pro-union, anti-Jim-Crow, etc., with a certain amount of anti-capitalist radicalism (the *Catholic Worker*) thrown in.

Indeed, one of the strange and important aspects of this entire development was how easily the liberal and left-wing Catholic took to outright anti-capitalism. This followed from the ideology of the papal documents which became the basis for both fascist and democratic interpretations of an anti-capitalist stand. And almost all of the left-wing interpreters propagandized against segregation.

In the early forties, an event of considerable significance for the anti-racist Catholics took place. A group of priests at St. Louis University—Father George Dunne, S.J., author of a famous article called "The Sin of Segregation," Father Claude Heithaus, and a few others—fought a strong campaign for the integration of that Jesuit university.

Their struggle resulted in the leaders being transferred to other parts of the country, but it had its impact. In 1945-6, St. Louis University was integrated.

## RITTER WINS

By this time, it had become apparent that the long educational campaign of the liberal Catholics was bearing fruit. As a matter of fact, this was probably their most successful single agitation.

A group of "liberal" bishops began to form in the late forties—Shiel of Chicago, Lucey of San Antonio, Ritter of St. Louis, Rummel in New Orleans, Waters in Carolina, and so on—and almost all of them had a hard line on the question of Jim Crow and began to integrate the institutions under their control.

One of the most dramatic instances of this trend occurred in St. Louis in the late forties.

Upon the death of Cardinal Glennon, Ritter was appointed to the bishopric. The manner of his coming should have been a hint of what was to follow. He said his first mass in his new diocese in a Negro church. Arriving in the summer, he made it a point of appearing in public with various Negro leaders. Then in the fall he tossed his bombshell into the city (a border town city, at that): all parochial schools were to be integrated.

An opposition quickly formed among the Catholics: A parents' group threatened a law suit to maintain Jim Crow. Ritter moved swiftly, had every pastor in St. Louis read the code of canon law on excommunication to their parishioners, and let it be known that all of the leaders of the movement were to be excommunicated forthwith unless they complied with his order.

The movement collapsed, and the integration was successfully carried out.

## WHY THE STRONG LINE?

This case is particularly instructive in view of Archbishop Rummel's stand in New Orleans. For Rummel is apparently following the Ritter tactic, relying heavily upon his spiritual authority over his communicants to push his policy. He has already threatened the excommunication of Catholic legislators who move to keep Jim Crow in the church's schools in that state.

His line is, in this sense, quite absolutistic, but it is the way which the bishops (Ritter, Waters, and others) have moved in similar cases. If the past is any guide, it means that integration will be successfully carried out.

Why this strong policy? Is it simply the result of the educational efforts of the liberal wing of the church?

This answer clearly doesn't explain everything, although it is a considerable factor in the present situation, especially in accounting for the hardness of the line which the bishops are taking. But other elements must be included.

One of these is the position of the international church vis-à-vis the colonial peoples. Since World War II, Rome has been following a fairly clear policy of appealing to the world's underdeveloped areas. There is evidently an intention that the experience of the 19th century, when the church (as Pius XI put it) lost the working class, shall not be repeated.

This line has worked itself out in appointments to high positions in the hierarchy. India now has a cardinal. Native

(Turn to last page)

## Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

### 'Down on the Farm'

To the Editor:

Item 1: You mention a national headquarters set up by the new Indian SP. I'd greatly appreciate it if you could send me the address or publish same.

[The address is: Socialist Party, Central Office — 3-16-19, Himayatnagar Hyderabad (Dn), India.—Ed.]

Item 2: In the final installment of your reprints from *Down On the Farm* there appear the legislative recommendations that the secretary of Labor should be authorized to (1) determine whether foreign workers are needed; (2) see that they get the prevailing wage; and (3) provide that the jobs have first been offered to domestic workers.

Even the most "altruistic" looking of these proposals (the second) is but a backhanded form of discrimination as long as domestic workers do not get the same "protection" when they bid for jobs. And as to the third proposal, what would we say if anyone proposed a law that the jobs in some area should first be offered to white, blue-eyed Protestants? The intent of all three proposals is the same: to keep the foreigner out.

This is not my idea of international working-class solidarity. Is it any worse for one-half of the working class to shut the other half, than for one-twentieth of the working class to shut the other 95 per cent out? Here we stand, 150 million strong, monopolizing over a third of the world's contemporary economic opportunities. And in the name of the labor movement!

The right to move is as fundamental to democracy as the right to speak. To move is to communicate; there can never be a truly international proletariat while workers are penned up in separate corals and poisoned with nationality-consciousness, nor can there ever be a truly international market in ideas in the absence of widespread personal contact. To move is also to level. If economic equality has anything to do with democracy, then the fight for international freedom of movement is one of the most significant and concrete of all the tasks with which we could concern ourselves, in a day and age when the Indian government charges that the land-hogging exclusionist practices of the United States and Australia contribute in no small measure to the poverty of Asia.

I will never forget a trial I witnessed two years ago. I was attending the trial of a conscientious objector, and I happened to get there early. They brought in a poor, humble wetback, who stood there mute through the whole five minutes of his "trial." Said the lawyer (for the defense or for the prosecution was never quite clear) in a familiar, deprecating tone, "Your Honor, here's a man who likes the United States too well." (Oh yes, you can get punished for that, too!)

Hizzoner looked over a transcript of the prisoner's record. "I see you've been here several times before. Last time we gave you six months. You don't learn very well, do you?" says he, with the sanctimonious air of a Sunday School teacher who has just caught Johnny with a copy of *God's Little Acre* for the third time. "Well, what shall we do with you this time? Hmmm." Nerve-racking pause; hizzoner twiddles his fat thumbs. Cat and Mouse. A little amusement with a defenseless being who can't get back at you. "Well, I'll give you two years this time, at the end of which you'll be transported back to Mexico. Maybe this will make you think twice before you come again." And so the well-heeled judge, who had probably never known hunger in his life because his ancestors had fought their way into a bounteous land by force and violence, toyed with two years of another man's life, punishing him for no greater crime than having slipped unobtrusively over the border and offered his services where they would turn out the greatest product and fetch the greatest reward. That night the judge went home and slept serene in the knowledge that he was a Pillar of the Community, Upholding the Majesty of the Law. For my part, I have never felt more sympathy for anarchism.

The conscientious objector who was tried that day got his support in the socialist press. When Max Shachtman was denied that right to travel on political grounds, he got his proper support. But never in any socialist periodical did I see one word about that poor Wetback. Nor about any of the hundreds, maybe thousands of other cases like him every month.

How could any socialist who is worth his salt fail to feel a burning rage at

this treatment of fellow workers? Is there, perhaps, a guilty silence, somewhat analogous to that of certain liberal Democrats, who are in favor of democratic rights except when they happen to embarrass certain people whose support they solicit? Are we pandering to the nationalistic narrowness of the bulk of the present-day labor movement in the United States? Why are we silent?

Even the most conservative of the political philosophies kicking around these days assert the right of revolutionary action against laws not agreed to by the majority of those affected. Well, here's a type of law that in the very nature of the case never has been and never will be submitted to the majority of those affected. By rights we should be running an underground railroad. But we don't even peep.

DICK FREDERICKSEN

Comrade, Frederickson misapprehends the provision to which he objects. In the pamphlet by the LID and the National Sharecroppers Fund, as reprinted here Jan. 30, this passage read, "provided that all the benefits given foreign workers must have been offered to domestic workers prior to approval of the importation of foreign workers." (Italics added.)

It is not the jobs which have to be offered to domestic workers first, according to this legislative program.

We're told over the phone by the LID office that this legislative proposal probably seeks to stop the practice of offering special initial inducements and lures to Mexican workers, after which they are at the mercy of the labor importers.—Ed.

## T-H Bomb — —

(Continued from page 1)

itching to get in their licks against the labor unions and to quit "knuckling down" to organized labor (as they would put it). For the likes of these, Westinghouse is a vanguard of the capitalist class in its thought-out and unremitting battle against the union.

Our great American labor statesmen, however, continue to be the captives of their own slogans. They are still playing it sweet with Stevenson even though he has spoken out only for some changes in the T-H Law, not for its repeal; after all they are tied to him and to the Democratic Party.

But the Westinghouse strike illuminates the need for labor political action to destroy Taft-Hartley. It needs mass protests against the use of T-H to smash a strike. In this situation labor is seeing that its own previous (and semi-forgotten) predictions about the strikebreaking potentials of Taft-Hartley are coming true.

How long will they be afraid to embarrass their political allies and so tone down their real opposition to that legal atrocity.

By now, as the Westinghouse situation is revealed in all its ugliness, with the guttering out of the settlement hopes aroused recently, surely there must be an "agonizing reappraisal" by the heads of the labor movement of any idea that this strike can go under without vitally impairing all of labor's struggle.

The united labor movement has the power to put the fear of the lord into the union-smashers by organizing giant demonstrations against the use of Taft-Hartley to smash labor.



# LABOR ACTION

March 5, 1956 Vol. 20, No. 10

Published weekly by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone: WATKINS 4-4222—Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1874.—Subscriptions: \$2 a year; \$1 for 6 months (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canadian and Foreign).—Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

Editor: HAL DRAPER

Associate Editors:

GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL  
Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

## 'Dissent' Holds a Conference

By MICHAEL HARRINGTON and GEORGE RAWLINGS

With *Dissent* entering its third year of publication, we feel that some comment is due from us on the course which that magazine (and the broad tendency it represents) is taking. This is especially true given the fact that the YSL responded favorably to the appearance of *Dissent*, regarding it as an organ which would prove to be of some (if limited) value to the cause of socialism. Also there is the fact that various YSLers have been contributors to the magazine.

At the *Dissent* Conference in New York City on February 18, the speeches of two of the leading members of the *Dissent* editorial board, Irving Howe and Lewis Coser, gave an interesting indication of the thinking of at least part of the supporters of the magazine, thinking which has been reflected in its pages. In general, one could summarize their presentations as showing a movement from political involvement to cultural non-conformism, from socialism to undifferentiated radicalism.

It was more present as a matter of mood than of program, and yet it was there and palpably so. And given *Dissent's* avowed anti-programmatic bias, the mood of its leading figures becomes, for all practical purposes, its program.

Howe's talk on "Culture and Politics" was based on the assumption that culture, in our period, reflects the crisis of our society more directly than any other area, and is more directly susceptible to radical influence; therefore, that cultural discussion and activity have become more important for socialists. Politics, he argued, are still meaningful, indeed they are the heart of the problem, but they have become "tight," i.e., allowing for little real movement and, in particular, excluding the radical from any possibility of disposing of political power. Political analysis, political positions, political programs, he maintained, are not significant for socialists at the present time.

There is, of course, much in Howe's analysis which cannot be disputed. American politics are tight; radicals are, in practical terms, excluded from real relevance to them. But this recognition of fact hardly justifies the conclusion which Howe draws from it: that therefore it is no longer necessary for radicals to put in so much time analyzing politics. Indeed, a much stronger argument could be drawn from Howe's fact: that now is precisely the time for socialists to begin raising basic questions of political analysis.

### GENERAL MOOD

But this is to phrase the question in the abstract. The real significance of Howe's point can only be seen in the context of the general mood of the conference, one which Coser, more than Howe, articulated.

Coser's general analysis was almost an echo of the position put forth by Albert Camus in *The Rebel*. And it is reminiscent of the attitudes of people like Dwight Macdonald and Ignazio Silone when they were on their way out of the left socialist movement.

The main imperative which Coser recognizes for socialists today is one of "personal dissent." This is placed within a context of questioning some basic socialist assumptions: the social power of the working class to create a new society; the class struggle as the mechanism of the growth of socialist consciousness.

In turning from the traditional socialist position, Coser moved in the direction of lumping the trade-union bureaucrats, the "socially backward" working class and the capitalist class into one mass which must be fought, and he did so without differentiating among them.

As a corollary of this he also suggested that "radicalism" might be a more inclusive and better word than "socialism," i.e., all anti-conformism is

more or less equally good. This, of course, is an element in the anti-organizational position which he expressed at the conference and previously in *Dissent*.

Ultimately, he came close to asserting that socialist politics as we have known them are no longer historically relevant. Such a theoretical revision is clearly of the first magnitude, and Coser shied away from being definite about it. It was there as a mood.

Some of the *Dissent* supporters present clearly realized how politically significant the Howe-Coser turn is, and one speaker attacked the absence of basic theoretical articles in the magazine while major changes are announced *ad hoc*.

### REACTION TO CRITICS

Howe took the floor and in rejoinder to the criticisms of Coser's talk which several YSLers present at the Conference had made, angrily demanded to know why they did not identify themselves as YSLers, state their program, and defend it, rather than criticize Coser's remarks on organization, his pessimism, etc. He stated that what separated "us" from "you" are the differing political views held (which he did not specify), rather than the questions discussed. Coser, in his summary, also claimed that political ideas, and not organizational ones, were the axis around which the differences revolve.

What was interesting about this tack was not so much its implication that the YSLers present were hiding their affiliations as its clear and straightforward assertion that "politics" and not "organization" was at the bottom of the disagreement. The YSL's politics are known, stated in resolutions, articles, documents, etc., in terms of that kind of political analysis which Howe had previously rejected. But *Dissent* according to its avowals has no political "line." What then did Howe mean? The critical support to American imperialism which he announced on leaving the Independent Socialist League? Is this another *ad hoc* revision of *Dissent's* untheoretical theory and unpolitical politics? Moreover, YSLers who write for *Dissent* have not been asked to identify their organization when their articles were accepted for the magazine—this became a question only when the YSLers were critical of the Howe-Coser line.

### THE ROAD IT'S TRAVELING

In its pages and at this conference, there is being made clear the road along which *Dissent* is traveling. From political involvement to an amorphous cultural radicalism, from socialism to an undifferentiated "radicalism," from an "open forum" to a tendency counterposing itself to organized socialist politics—these seem to be the directions. The effect is the liquidation of socialist politics into a mood of pessimistic "radical" uneasiness and dissent, and the blurring of the distinctions between socialism and that "sophisticated and advanced" culturism which passes for radicalism among many students and intellectuals.

With the effort to reach this new generation and such sections of the population with the socialist message we are sympathetic; we felt that *Dissent* could play such a role. But if it will reach them with the moods of despair being displayed, if it will reflect back to intellectuals all of the unhealthy tendencies to be found among them, if it will convert college sophomores into exhausted old men overnight, it will play its role badly, to put it both charitably and mildly.

## UC and Miss Lucy: Waiting for a 'Sane Voice'

By CHARLES WALKER

Berkeley, Feb. 17

After waiting an additional week for further developments, the Associated Students of the University of California Executive Committee declined to send a telegram to the University of Alabama student body supporting Autherine Lucy's right to attend school. There were only two dissents.

The issue was touched off when a Westminster Presbyterian Student Fellowship representative reported to the Executive Committee session of February 7 on a telegram his group had sent to the Alabama students and Bay Area papers. "Ex Com was asked to take similar action," said the *Daily Californian*, Feb. 8.

Westminster's telegram read: "We are concerned by accounts in today's newspapers that more than 2000 students have marched in protest against the admission of Autherine Lucy to the University of Alabama. We hope that your responsible leadership deploras this demonstration.

"Our prayers are with your group and all others who recognize Miss Lucy as a child of God and are working to make this truth manifest in Tuscaloosa. We stand with you as you struggle to find ways to make this ideal of Christianity and Democracy a reality in your situation. We watch and wait with the whole world for a sane, courageous voice out of your midst which will speak for man's humanity to man. What can we do to help?"

The non-student members of Ex Committee once more showed their reactionary role by offering cheap rationalizations for inactivity. The Director of ASUC activities said it was a political problem and would have to be cleared through President Sproul's office. (Why not do so?)

Dean Stone—famed for the faculty loyalty-oath and anti-Shachtman ban—said such a "proclamation" might just "stir up feeling," advising an inquiry by the student president of Cal to the U. of Alabama student president. (This typical bureaucratic stalling device was ridiculous in the light of thorough national coverage on the issue.)

Three pro-Lucy editorials marked the week between Ex Committee meetings, plus two letters (Editorial Page is also concerned with dramatics and book reviews)—all of which were pro-Lucy.

The YSL's letter asked: "Isn't it crystal-clear—even to a college-educated person—that moral support from one of the nation's largest universities is vital at this time in encouraging Miss Lucy's fight for her legal and moral rights in this matter? Can we be so shortsighted and callous as to believe that her fight for an education does not concern us?"

The editorials were labeled: "The 'I Hate Lucy' Show," "Southern Discomfort," and (after Ex Com's decision) "The Silent Treatment."

The last editorial began: "Silence isn't always golden. ASUC Executive Committee decided last night to withhold its voice from those rallying to the support of Autherine Lucy. If Miss Lucy is successful in her fight for education and equality as a student at the University of Alabama, there will be one less thank-you-card to write. . . . The united voice of a great student body has been hushed, with a call for action passed to the organizations represented on Ex Com. In contrast to the supreme reign of silence in the committee room, mutterings of repentance have been heard down Alabama way. . . ."

Additional comment on the issue and condemnation of Ex Com's apathy came from an off-campus noon meeting addressed by an NAACP speaker. Franklin Williams, regional director of the NAACP, spoke to about 70 students at the University YWCA, under YMCA and YWCA sponsorship.

Williams felt that the White Citizens Council in Tuscaloosa deliberately stirred up the riots, and he recommended that arrest of a few of the council's known leaders would discourage future riots. Williams called the councils a "new Ku Klux Klan" using "economic oppression" but creating the atmosphere for more violent tactics.

## The 'Greeks' Defend Racist Constitutions

By CHARLES WALKER

Berkeley, Feb. 17

Thirty sororities and thirty-six fraternities have withdrawn from the UCLA student government rather than submit copies of their constitutions for the purpose of detecting racial restriction clauses.

After Panhellenic Council representing the sororities) had withdrawn rather than comply, last week, the Interfraternity Council withdrew in support of the sororities and to withhold their own constitutions.

While it is obvious that racial discrimination need not be proclaimed in a fraternity's constitution in order to be enforced, it is important that blatant formal defense of this policy must be stricken down as a prelude to eliminating the actual practices themselves. It is ques-

(Turn to last page)

## YOUNG REPUBLICANS DEMAND FREE SPEECH

Over 400 Young Republicans, meeting at a state convention in Palo Alto, unanimously adopted a resolution on February 12 opposing Rule 17 at UC. "Reasoning behind the bill is that neither of the two major parties should fear debate with leftist groups [the major reason for supporting Rule 17 till now], but rather, should seek it because they are able to demonstrate how wrong the ideas of these groups are." (*Daily Californian*, Feb. 16.)

The YRs also approved the Supreme Court's decision and Interstate Commerce decisions regarding segregation. The UC chapter president put this resolution forward.

With the Young Democrats and the Stu-

dent Civil Liberties Union also previously attacking Rule 17, this hot potato is again tossed into the lap of Chancellor Kerr, who is the "court liberal" in the administration. Kerr had intimated that some revisions of Rule 17 might be possible now, but he will probably choose some new formula of prudence rather than abolish this authoritarian tradition.

The Berkeley YSL would be glad to see even the Young Republicans and/or Young Democrats alone get on campus this year, as a wedge in restoring more democracy to the campus. But this is what the administration is really afraid of—that unorthodox politics might be able to compete freely in its famed marketplace of ideas.

## A Road for Israel Out of the Middle East Impasse

# TO BREAK THE VICIOUS SPIRAL . . .

By HAL DRAPER

In discussing the crisis in the Middle East, we are dealing with one of the most difficult problems in a torn world. There are no very easy or ready-made solutions. As someone has said, it is "a conflict of rights"—it is not a simple matter of right on one side and wrong on the other. By the same token, it is a conflict of wrongs too.

Although this article will try to present a very concrete and immediate program—one which is even brashly numbered from 1 to 12—I want to emphasize right at the start that this will be done mainly in order to illustrate the *type* of approach which is pointed to. The intent is to be suggestive, certainly not "definitive," and not to cover all aspects of the dispute.

The question is how to break out of a vicious circle.

One of the poles of the situation is the threat by the surrounding governments to wipe out Israel as a state. As I tried to stress at a recent symposium on the subject, on which this article is based, this discussion is within the framework of the question of *how* to defend Israel—against this threat.

**"How to Defend Israel" in this sense is also the question we addressed ourselves to in the Palestine war of 1948.<sup>1</sup> At that time we supported Israel in the war against the invasion of the Arab states; but we predicted that if the war were carried through as a war against the Arab people, rather than as a revolutionary war of defense appealing to the Arab people against their own rulers, only grief would come of it. And we were indubitably right, as events have shown.**

It was also from this point of view that a year and a half ago we engaged in a polemic against the anti-Israel position of Arab socialists on this question, as represented by Clovis Maksoud.<sup>2</sup>

But we have always stressed that we expect more from the Israeli working-class movement, precisely because of its relatively more advanced social and political character. This is why we have addressed ourselves in the first place to a program for Israel—how to break out of the vicious circle.

### In the Name of Survival

What is at stake is the survival of Israeli Jewry, and also all of its considerable accomplishments in many fields, all of the many sacrifices that were made by or exacted from so large a part of its population since the exodus from Nazism.

*We fear that what is happening may be a new act in the tragedy of the Jewish people. Yesterday it was played out in Europe; now it has been shifted to the Palestine arena, which according to the Zionist ideology was supposed to be the scene of the final solution of the Jewish question.*

Last November, Israel army head Yaakov Dori, at a rally in Haifa, said: "If war breaks out here our enemies will be fighting to kill every Jew, and for us it will mean a fight against extermination . . ."

**Yesterday Jews were faced with Hitlerite exterminationism. Now, today—again—there is**

**talk of extermination. This is an appalling fact. It cannot be explained away by a devil theory, not even by a theory about Arab devils.**

In 1953 when Foreign Minister Sharett reported to his Knesset on world reaction against the Kibya massacre, he said: "It is . . . false to assume that Israel cannot survive without peace. We exist and can continue to exist indefinitely without it."

*Exist? Perhaps. But how?*

As a state ghetto in the Middle East?

As a fear-palled fortress?

As a militarized garrison?

As a satellite of Washington?

Even before this present alarm of war, two years ago, two leaders of the *Ichud* of Israel regretfully put a spotlight on the following fact, which speaks volumes: "The State of Israel . . . is today almost the only country in the world where the life of Jews is in danger—now, and even more so in the future."

Think of it!

If the outcome of the "Zionist fulfillment" is not to be simply another act of Jewish tragedy, then some way of breaking out of the vicious circle must be found.

### The Spiral Moves Down

**In fact it is not a vicious circle but a vicious spiral, a spiral down. The present situation is not some entirely unforeseen result of unpredictable factors. From the beginning of Zionism, the opponents of Jewish chauvinism insistently pointed to the fatal results that would flow from trying to displace a people from their land by colonization under the aegis of an imperialist power. The Zionists always underestimated the "Arab question," though usually giving it lip-service. Reactionary Arab leaders utilized the justified resentment of their people, against the interlopers who came under the protection of the imperialist's flag, and turned it into fuel for their own dynastic and feudal power-politics. So reaction on both sides has jacked up mutual antagonism first on one side and then on the other.**

This jacking-up process has been especially virulent in the last few years. It has even been systematized with the adoption by the Israeli authorities, under Ben-Gurion's inspiration, of the policy of "massive retaliation" (as against Kibya, Gaza and Syria) in response to Arab attacks; which in turn were exacerbated by Israeli injustices to its refugees; which in turn took place on the background of the Arab states' aggressive assault on the sovereignty of the new State of Israel in 1948; which in turn had been prepared for by over three decades of Zionist transgressions in Jewish-Arab relations in this land which they were infiltrating with the hope of taking it away from its inhabitants . . .

This vicious spiral is still moving down. The program proposed below aims to break it from the Israeli side.

### Four Principles

There are four guiding principles on which any such program has to be based, in our opinion. These are four things to realize about the position of Israel. Or four ways of looking at it.

**(1) First and foremost, Israel must be looked on as a Middle East state.**

Not as the "fulfillment" of the Bible or Theodor Herzl. Not as a ghetto (a very large ghetto with national boundaries) in the midst of an Arab world. Not as a regional beachhead for NATO or American imperialism.

This article is mainly a slightly expanded write-up of a talk given as part of a three-way symposium in New York, on January 13, on the Israel-Arab conflict. The two other participants in that symposium were Dr. Arie Plotkin, representing the Israel government, and Max Alexandrovich, representing the Jewish Labor Bund.—H. D.

Israel will either accept its being as a Middle East state, *as against* any of the other concepts, or it will remain an alien splinter-state festering in the body of this region where three continents meet.

**(2) Israel must be a state of two peoples, Jews and Arabs—a binational state in this sense, even though the Jewish majority will inevitably be the dominant element.**

The policy and orientation signified by the Zionist concept of "Jewish State" is a danger to the Jews and a provocation to the Arabs at home and around it.

In this country the question of Israel's relation to its own Arab population is not separate and apart from its relation to the Arab people outside. The close tie makes it one question, not two. Its situation is not like that of the U.S. where people can better afford the error of thinking of domestic and foreign policy as being in two compartments. Here internal Arab policy and external Arab policy are intertwined like the fingers of two hands—hence the one question of survival.

### The Revolutionary Key

**(3) The problem of breaking out of the vicious spiral is not how to appease the Arab rulers, nor how to tickle them under the chin with concessions.**

Even when and where the Israeli leaders have thought to make concessions, it has been with this false perspective.

The aim is how to appeal to the mass of Arab people *against* these rulers, how to mobilize them against their own government cliques.

In this sense, it is a revolutionary approach, and the very opposite of appeasement.

The question of concessions to the Arab population, or a new approach in Arab-Jewish relations, takes on an entirely different coloration from the standpoint of this objective.

In contrast, Israeli policy has lurched between appeasement on the one hand and provocation on the other, always with the eye fixed on the Arab *tops*. The way out of the vicious spiral is: *from below*.

**(4) The Arab countries, it must be recognized, are not simply backward and zombie-like societies, with passive but bloodthirsty Arab hordes firmly in the grip of feudal devils. This is a chauvinist caricature.**

The Arab countries today are rent through and through with revolutionary ferment. They are filled with anti-government and anti-status-quo dissent—more so than Israel. Their masses are stirring.

There is no paradox in the following statement: The same hatred of the Arab regimes by its people which today even takes the form of *anti-Israel* extremism could, given a revolutionized Israeli policy, be channelized in a progressive direction—to blow up from within the dictators and feudal powers who are today the *joint enemies of both their own people and the Israeli Jews*.

### New Direction

There's the direction to look! Certainly not to the Big Brothers in the imperialist camps; not to cynical manipulators like Dulles and his colleagues in Washington, who are ready to sell out the so-called "bastion of democracy" at the drop of an oil barrel. Not to the totalitarians in Moscow.

A "security pact" with the U. S., which the Israelis and Zionists are demanding, would afford Israel no security in making this little country the local branch office of the Atlantic Pact in a hostile environment.

An Israel which is "guaranteed" by U. S. armed "police action," as is demanded, is more likely to make Israel a Korea than to integrate it into the Middle East where it exists.

When the Israeli regime faces in this direction, it is of course in response to immediate dangers from its threatening neighbors; but to face this way is to ensure disaster. There is no safety in becoming the satellite, satrapy or stooge of the imperialists.

**So Israel must about-face. It has to go in the other direction, to integrate with the peoples of the Middle**

1. "How to Defend Israel" was the title of my article in the *New Internationalist* of July 1948, discussing our position on the war in Palestine, which had been presented in LABOR ACTION editorials of May 24 and 31.

2. Maksoud presented "The Position of the Arab Socialists" in LA for Aug. 9 and 16, 1954. Our reply was published Aug. 23 and 30.

# Looking Toward a Program for Israel-Arab Peace . . .

East as a force for political freedom in friendship and peace.

What these "four principles" add up to, we admit, is a revolutionary transformation in the Zionist policy-basis of the state—no slight change. The question is whether the realities of life in the Middle East will batter this into the Zionist-stuffed heads of the political people of the country before the last act of tragedy is played out.

But in any case it is a change in direction that is vital, not an overnight transmogrification. The direction would have to be toward winning the support and friendship of the Arab masses, away from and against the reactionary rulers of the Arab states—instead of the present policy which pushes them together.

## The Arab Question at Home

This program begins at home for Israel.

In Israel the Arab question is first of all internal, not external.

Israel can show the world how to make peace with the Arab people without waiting on the power-politics or whims of neighboring kings or colonels.

**Israel will never achieve real peace with the surrounding Arab world, even after a settlement with the Massers, as long as it is at war with its own Arab minority.**

This is the first place to start, to reach the Arab people.

This is precisely the opposite of the prevailing Israeli line—prevailing since 1949 at least. It early became the government practice and the Zionist norm to treat all Israeli Arabs as if they were enemies as long as the neighboring states breathed war clouds.<sup>3</sup>

Spoilation of Israeli Arabs has been excused on the ground that they are fifth-columnists, potential or otherwise. Discrimination against Arabs at home has been condoned and officially fostered in vital economic fields—even Arabs who were never hostile to the state; even Arabs who fought with the Israeli Jews against the Arab armies.

**For seven years, with zigs and zags, Israeli policy has pushed itself into the pattern of making bitter enemies out of even friendly Arabs, in spite of sectors (like health and education) where real benefits were bestowed.**

Arabs were juridically turned into second-class citizens by a Law of Nationality which discriminated racially and put obstacles to citizenship in the path of Arab families whose ancestors had lived in the land for a thousand years.

It was this Law of Nationality which caused Norman Thomas to write that "An Arab, without too much exaggeration, could complain that the Jews were practicing Hitlerism in reverse. . . ." If the comparison seems shockingly extreme, it is an index to Thomas's sense of shock.

The overwhelming majority of Israel's Arabs are confined to areas under military rule as if they were a conquered people under occupation by an enemy. To all intents and purposes the military commanders over them are dictators with wide powers over their lives. They cannot even travel out of their areas without military permits, whether to look for a job or to sell their produce on the market or to visit a doctor outside.

The barbarous system of collective punishments (of a village, for example, for an individual's offense) is flourishing from the colonialist code of the British, but as an anti-Arab weapon of the Israeli government. It has been applied even to a village that fought on the side of the Jews in 1948.

## Turning Arabs Into Enemies

**The system is justified as a security measure. Is it wise security which seeks to turn every Arab into an enemy even if he was not an enemy to begin with?**

Is it a security measure that Arabs from the border zones are not allowed to move away from the border,

3. The following section of this article, on discrimination against the Arab minority in Israel, deals with a subject largely blacked out of notice in the general press. The usual Zionist reflex is to stoutly deny any deviation from equal status for the minority, vaguely qualified with references to security precautions. The subject therefore calls for documentation. A comprehensive survey of the truth about this situation will appear in our press in the near future.

In the meantime, a couple of references may be useful. The most informative survey is in the middle half of an unpublished Ph.D. thesis (Columbia University) on *Israel and the Arab Refugees*, by Dr. Don Peretz, available at the university and also (I think) for sale in mimeo form. The same scholar has also published a number of magazine articles on the subject in recent years, particularly "The Arab Minority in Israel" in the *Middle East Journal*, Spring 1954. Another outstanding article is by Harold Fey in the *Christian Century* for Jan. 13, 1954—see also his preceding articles in a series of reports from his Middle East trip.

### A basic pamphlet—

## "SOCIALISM: THE HOPE OF HUMANITY"

by Max Shachtman

Read it!

10 cents

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

so that presumably their ethnic sympathies will not be so dangerous?

Is it entirely for security reasons that Jewish citizens (by state definition, "racially" loyal) are not allowed into Arab zones?

Is it entirely for security reasons that an Arab cannot leave one of these military areas and come to Tel-Aviv without a military permit?

**Nor is it in the interests of security that the Arab population (including some who never moved from their villages during the war) have been systematically robbed of land, by a series of laws.**

The large majority of the Arabs who remained in Israel territory during the war were peasants—people who, uprooted from their land, were uprooted in life.

From 1948 to a culmination in 1953 a systematic land-grab went on—"legally." By an Absentee Properties Law of 1950, Arabs who fled from their village to a neighboring village, to get out of the way of the bullets, or some even because they were ousted by Israeli troops, were declared technical "absentees" even though they were in the country, not to speak of those who were caught on the other side of borders as refugees. The government took away their land.

By another set of laws, the government stripped Arabs of land by declaring an area a "security zone," then making it *Araber-rein*, ousting all Arabs, taking over the land and handing it over to Jewish settlement.

By the Land Acquisition Law of 1953, even land-grabs that had been perfectly illegal up to then were sanctioned ex-post-facto, and Israeli Arabs were despoiled of land which was added to Jewish settlements.

Aside from the inadequacy and trickiness of the government's compensation provisions, no money compensation could keep these Arabs' lives together.

It is little justification for these gross acts when pro-Zionist apologists, in extenuation, point to the U. S. crime against the Japanese-Americans who were stripped of their property and herded behind barbed wire for the duration of the war.

**These are the two main grievances which work to turn Israel's Arabs into "security risks" against their own will: military rule and the land-grab.**

## Making Fiends or Friends

To this, add the problem of the Arab refugees from Palestine who were caught on the other side of the truce lines at the end of the war, after a mass flight from the war-torn land which was caused by three pressures working in close harmony: the threats of the Arab military forces; fear of the Israeli forces especially after the atrocious Deir Yassin massacre, and ejection from villages even by the regular Israeli troops; and evacuation by the British forces when they left Palestine.

The refugees too have been turned, unnecessarily, into a festering pool of hatred and hostility—incidentally, not only against the Israelis but also against the Arab leaders, and almost anyone else.

Insistently, the Israeli government and Zionist parties have taken the position that they can do nothing to change the lot of these Arab masses until the Arab war lords become willing to make a peace settlement.

They keep their eyes fixed on the tops.

They were willing to think in terms of a deal with Abdullah of Jordan, till he was assassinated. They are willing to think in terms of a peace deal with Nasser, if he will change his tune.

**But they have shown no capacity to think in terms of a "deal" with the discontented masses, that is, of a revolutionary approach to them—from below.**

They too look on the Arab people as pawns of their leaders, doomed to be somebody's victims—victims of oppression by an Israeli overlord or an Arab overlord.

If this is true, then Israel is probably doomed as a free and independent state and a decent home for its people.

The conditions that have been sketched point to another way. This road leads from unity with the Arab population at home to the implementation of a binational approach to drive a class wedge inside the encircling Arab states.

It is a road that can turn the socialist and democratic currents of Arab life from enemies of Israel's existence to friends of a revolutionary Israel which fights for two peoples.

## For a Sweeping Change

**It is a program which starts with proposals that are demanded by elementary feelings of justice, to remedy political sins which today lie heavy on the conscience of every decent man in Israel.**

(1) An end to the land-grab from the Arabs of Israel. Repeal of the discriminatory laws. Rent from occupied land and possessions to go to the Arab owners immediately. Return of a maximum of such land and real property to Arab owners. Compensation at full current value in all other cases.

(2) Full and equal citizenship rights for Arabs.

(3) Abolition of the segregation system, restrictions, permits, etc., in Arab zones, and turning over of a maximum of functions to civilian self-government.

(4) Abolition of military rule over Arab areas.

(5) Extension of the right to all members of an Arab family to rejoin parents in Israel.

(6) Encouragement—not just toleration, but encouragement—to Arabs to enter into every field of life and work on a plane of complete equality. Extension to Arab workers of the right to vote in the Histadrut elections.

The above six proposals give examples of the type of change that involve the present Arab minority in the country.

(7) The Israel government should return to the proposal it made once before, albeit grudgingly under U. S. pressure: admission of 100,000 of the refugees.

(8) Acceptance of the principle of repatriation or compensation for other legitimate refugees—not conditioned on a prior peace agreement with the kings and colonels but as part of an Israeli political offensive. Few observers expect an overwhelming number to insist on repatriation.

(9) The Jewish fund-raising network in the United States and elsewhere has raised millions of dollars a year for Israel. Let the American Jewish fund-raisers announce a campaign to raise such millions to *resettle the Arab refugees*, and the whole world would be electrified!

(10) The abandonment of the theory and practice of Israel as a "Jewish State," as explained above.

(11) Border changes to straighten out the frontier so as to reunite Arab villages with their own land where the truce lines ran through them: one of the biggest single contributions possible to stopping "infiltration" and border incidents.

**(12) And lastly, on the basis of such a deep revolutionary transformation of Israeli policy, which ranges the Jewish people of Israel with the Arab people: launching of a massive initiative and political offensive inside the whole Arab world to rally support for the new Israel and against any and all of the provocateurs and fanatics and dynasts who want war.**

It is in such a context that an enormous initiative could be taken to do, within such a transformed framework, what Nahum Goldmann of the Jewish Agency proposed the other week: a program of Israeli-Jewish economic development and investment for the whole Middle East.<sup>4</sup>

This idea, with all of its huge potential, was suggested in a speech by Goldmann, who was speaking as a top leader in the World Zionist movement, but he did it in the traditional Zionist way: as a dangled piece of bait to reward some "good" Arab leader who would accede to Israel's demands.

But the idea itself, in the framework of our own program, is dynamite. Not as a reward for capitulation, but as the spearhead of a political offensive. Propose it now. Of course, the Arab states are busy pretending that Israel does not even exist, or at least refusing to recognize its existence—except to implement their economic boycott against this non-existent state. Let them reject such an economic offensive, on the basis of a transformed Israel policy. . . .

Instead of hedging in Arab students at Hebrew University with restrictions and red tape and suspicion, let Israel make efforts to bring Arab students there, and press for cultural exchanges of all sorts.

## A Program for Democracy

Above all, and this applies to the program as a whole, it is meaningless to act along these lines in a half-hearted fashion; or (as the Israeli government has typically done) suggest that one is willing to make a couple of concessions along these lines only provided the other side (meaning the kings and colonels and feudals) reciprocate.

**The whole point of such a program is its sweep. A policy of half-hearted appeasement, alternating with sporadic retaliation and provocation, is a combination of sure poisons, bringing together everything that is self-defeating.**

What unites and inspires such a revolutionary program is its aim: the eventual integration of Israel into a Federation of the Middle East to unite the region for development and independence from outside pressures and imperialism. This may be a more or less distant aim: that is not the point. Every step in the direction of Arab-Jewish unity is a step in its direction.

This is not only the road of survival for Israel's Jewry; it is more. It means the end of the state's ghetto existence. It means the liberation of its none-too-plentiful resources from the crushing burden of armaments. It means the normalization of its economy, which can make sense not by indefinite dependence on international charity but by corollation with the complementary economies of its Arab neighbors. It means the end of its process of satellization by the American dollar—both the dollar of charity and the dollar of imperialism.

And still more: it means that for the first time Israel can really play the role it deserves where the superior cultural and technical resources of much of its population can legitimately give it the position of a beneficent leader and guide in Middle Eastern development, as a part of a whole.

**Today its boast of being the "bastion of democracy" and progress in its part of the world is only a boast. Tomorrow it could really play that role—not over the Arab peoples but as a partner with them, as one Middle Eastern people among others.**

Such a program as this is not put forth as advice to Ben-Gurion and his like in the Zionist leadership of Israel. I expect little from the Ben-Gurions except their practiced role as the glorious leaders of Israel leading the country, with screaming life and throbbing drum, down a self-sacrificing road to suicide and tragedy.

What we have described is, rather, a program for a genuine socialist movement in Israel—one which has not dissolved its socialism in Zionism. Such an organized movement has not yet matured, but numerous elements for it do exist. Its development would be the first step in changing the fate of Israel.

4. Goldmann's proposal, of course, came after the Jan. 13 symposium on which this article is based. I include it here as important proof of the feasibility of the general idea of an economic initiative which I had already put under point 12 (leaving aside the basic difference that for the Zionists such an economic proposal is dangled as a reward, rather than part of a political offensive).

# Labor Put on the Spot by Negro Fight—

(Continued from page 11)

ered an act of political courage for the governor of Alabama, it is a transparent act of political trickery by the leading Democratic candidate for president. And even though it has been greeted with sighs of relief by some of his liberal supporters, one can rest assured that in the present situation neither Stevenson nor his Northern idolators will be permitted to get away with this as their reaction to the struggle for equality.

The more important symptomatic event has been the call by Congressman Powell for a one-hour work stoppage by all Negroes and their supporters for the purpose of praying for the men and women indicted in connection with the Negro boycott of the busses in Montgomery, Alabama.

## CHALLENGE

(Continued from page 51)

tionable whether more than a few national sororities and fraternities at UCLA would have such formal clauses in the constitution.

At the University of California (Berkeley), however, where administration recognition of "the Greeks" takes place rather than student government recognition, there are no changes contemplated. Only a day after he had urged the ASUC Executive Committee not to support Autherine Lucy's fight for an education at Alabama University, Dean Stone admitted that Cal's administration "does not demand that copies of the constitutions and by-laws of existing national student organizations be approved by it, nor does it require these organizations to affirm that they do not have restrictive clauses. . . ." (Daily Californian, Feb. 10.)

Stone limits the administration's concern in these matters to new student organizations, which represent only a tiny minority of students in fraternities or sororities. Stone admits that national "Greek" groups submit their constitutions to administrations—although generally not to student government groups—but the administration of a state-supported university, in a state with FEP laws just isn't interested in such things. In the meantime Interfraternity Council and Panhellenic Council have one seat on the Men's Executive Board and Women's Executive Board of the Associated Students, respectively.

No one can accuse the Cal administration of deviations from a rigidly reactionary policy.

## ISL FUND DRIVE

# First Lap Makes It 15%

By ALBERT GATES  
Fund Drive Director

We now have all the returns for the first two weeks of the fund drive. A total of \$1533 has been received, making a total of 15.3 per cent of the total quota in the 1956 campaign. This is not too bad for a start, but not nearly high enough considering the duration of the drive.

Anyway, the reason we are up this high is because of the big lead Chicago has taken in the first two weeks. We have received from the Windy City a total of \$835 out of a quota of \$2,000, making 41 per cent of its goal. It looks like Chicago is out to repeat its campaign of a year ago when it increased its quota and then went above the increase. Good luck to you!

Little Streater is in second place at this point. Although its quota is small, the effort is a big one. It now has 40 per cent with a \$10 payment on a quota of \$25.

Now, however, we take a big jump down to Newark and the Bay Area, which are running neck and neck with 27.7 per cent and 25 per cent respectively. That is a good average, since a one-fourth achievement of their goals after two weeks places these areas in an excellent position to complete their quotas within the time set.

Philadelphia, Cleveland, Seattle and Los Angeles are grouped next with a fair showing. They have each reached 10 or more per cent in the first two weeks. If they keep that pace up, they too, should be able to finish on top.

From there on, however, things look a little rough. Although New York has

For the moment, the Montgomery bus boycott has replaced the struggle at Tuscaloosa as the most dramatic battlefield in the struggle for equal rights in the South. Over 90 Negroes, many of them preachers, have been indicted for organizing the boycott. The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the American Civil Liberties Union have announced that they will give full legal support to the indicted boycotters.

The mass character of the indictment, the cynicism of this attempt to break the boycott by means of legal terror, the respectable character of the leaders involved, and the steadfastness with which virtually the whole Negro population of Montgomery have met the situation—all this tends to make this a powerful issue around which to rally the Negroes of the nation and all whites who stand with them in the struggle for equality.

Adam Clayton Powell and a group of New York Negro ministers met and issued a call for a one-hour stop-work prayer session on March 28. As so often happens with anything in which Powell is involved as a leader, he quickly drew back from his radical proposal. This time it turns out that the leading Negro Baptist bishops in the South were against it. In these circumstances he could also hardly have gotten the support of the NAACP or the bulk of the leadership of the labor movement.

## LABOR'S CROSSROADS

This brings us up against one of the crucial aspects of the whole situation: the attitude and relationship of the labor movement to the Negro struggle for equality.

An article in the New York Times for February 26 on the reaction of the Southern labor movement to the Autherine Lucy case and the Montgomery bus boycott states that Southern labor leaders feel their ranks are, in the main, opposed to an end to segregation, and have been heavily infiltrated by White Citizens Council sentiment. Surveys conducted by the labor movement itself seem to bear out the Times article.

In some sections of the labor movement in the South the cry has been raised for secession from the national movement on the ground that its influence and funds are being used to back the integration fight. Many local leaders who are themselves more enlightened hesitate to seek to assert the authority of the national movement on this issue for fear that it would lead to their being ousted from office.

Thus some of the less appetizing chickens of the American labor movement are coming home to roost.

Many of the American Federation of Labor unions were themselves Jim Crow till after World War II, and some still are, in one degree or another. It is clear why such unions could not educate their Southern membership on this question.

## EXPLOSIVE

Even in the CIO only the best of the unions put forth a real and sustained effort on this score in the South. It is significant that it happened to be a group of steel workers who wrote their union threatening secession if the AFL-CIO continues to back school integration.

Now the union leadership is confronted with a terrible dilemma. To continue to back the fight of the Negroes for integration may risk a serious split in its own movement. To abandon that fight is not only to give any pretense to the role of being the vanguard of America in the struggle for human rights, but to see strengthened, in the South and hence nationally, precisely those forces which even conservative labor leaders understand to be their worst enemies.

It is precisely for this reason that the struggle for Negro equality is so explosive politically at this time. Ever since the early New Deal labor legislation, Congress has been controlled by the Dixie-GOP anti-labor coalition. As long as the disfranchisement of the Negroes in the South continues, the labor-liberal wing of the Democratic party can hardly hope to win a national victory.

The White Citizens Councils are dominated, in the main, by the most reactionary elements of the South. If they should actually succeed in whipping the Negroes in their fight for full citizenship at this stage, they would further strengthen the anti-labor character of the politics of the region.

It would thus be an act of political self-mutilation for the labor movement to bow to the reactionary sentiments of some of its Southern members, even should the Jim Crow element prove to be in a majority in the South.

## TO TAKE THE LEAD

A posture of firm resolution in support of the Negro struggle is the only intelligent (let alone moral) course. If defections should result now, the defectors will soon think better of it after they have been exposed to the tender mercies of their buddies of the WCCs—the Southern employers.

An attitude of timidity and indecision is even less feasible for the labor movement than for a presidential candidate like Stevenson in this matter. Such a posture would not appease the racists, would not win over the Negroes, and would do nothing to defeat the political enemies of the labor movement.

On the contrary. What the labor movement should clearly do is to take the lead in the struggle for equal rights, to become the staunch and militant ally of the Negroes in the fight.

A one-hour stop-work demonstration by Negroes alone is obviously fraught with grave disadvantages to those who participate in it in the North as well as the South. A one-hour sympathy strike

backed by decisive sections of the labor movement could make the most profound political impression on the country as a whole.

Or, if it is not feasible, a mass March on Washington, organized by the Negro and labor movements for the purpose of putting the maximum pressure on the administration and Congress to enforce the Supreme Court decision and defend the civil rights and liberties of the Negroes in the South could be most effective.

At the point at which any such proposals for the labor movement's participation in the fight are considered seriously, the explosive political consequences of this struggle become apparent.

The Negro bus boycott in Montgomery is a combined economic-political action. The local government moves in to crush it by political means. A one-hour demonstration would be a fundamentally political action, as would a March on Washington. But any political action over this issue endangers the integrity of the Democratic Party.

There is little doubt that this fact, as well as general timidity and conservatism at high levels, inhibits the labor movement in its support of the struggle for equality.

But the timidity of leaders can be overcome by pressure from below. One of the striking things about the struggle in Montgomery is that it is led in large part by preachers—a group who in the recent history of the struggle for equality have often been at the conservative wing of the movement. But now that the masses are really in motion, now that they press forward and are willing to fight and sacrifice, preachers become leaders, and even heroes and martyrs.

For the labor movement, this is a challenge and opportunity. It is especially so for the militants who have been so long swimming against a tide of lassitude and apathy. Proposals such as Powell's, or for a mass March on Washington, could be carefully discussed and considered in union meetings and put forward on a local level as proposals to the labor movement as a whole.

The year 1956 may yet turn out to be a year of decision, not only in the struggle to break Jim Crow's back in the South, but in the traditional alignments of American politics in general.

## Catholics —

(Continued from page 4)

bishops are appearing in greater and greater numbers. The point is being made over and over that the church is on the side of the non-white millions in their struggle for emancipation.

This policy has a corollary in the United States which is certainly an element in the hard position taken by the bishops.

Still another factor is the church's concern for its authority over marriage. Traditionally, Rome has resisted any state attempt to restrict marriage. This has come into conflict with various laws on miscegenation.

As a result, the orthodox Catholic position in these situations has come to be one of civil disobedience, i.e., to marry inter-racial couples. This has already taken place in the United States and in other parts of the world. It is a function of Catholic absolutism on the subject of marriage.

But still, the educational efforts of the liberal Catholics cannot be underestimated. In some cases, one liberal Catholic would find himself as head of a seminary and a whole generation of priests would be trained in terms of an anti-Jim-Crow ideology. This took place during the late thirties and forties in Chicago. Its impact will not be really felt for another decade or so, when the men from these seminaries will assume pastoral authority in that city. When this happens, the agitation may assume a mass character.

Clearly there are questionable elements in this development. The heavy reliance upon authoritarian power cannot be welcomed wholeheartedly even if it is used in a good cause. (However, since the church is, in this society, a voluntary association, the problem of excommunication is nothing like it would be in a country like Spain.) Nevertheless, it is important to realize that the church will probably play an important anti-Jim-Crow role in the struggles now taking place in the South.

sent in a sizable contribution, it has done so on the largest quota in the campaign. It will have to push a good deal harder so that its percentage of contributions compares more closely to the weekly average.

The others are also rans. Those who have made no contributions so far have fixed it so that they must accomplish their quotas in 8 weeks time rather than 10. This only makes the burden on them a little tougher. There are too many zero columns in the standings to date.

Our next goal is to get every city in the show column with some kind of contribution, so we can wipe out the ciphers which appear in the box score.

## FUND DRIVE BOX SCORE

City	Quota	Contribution	Per Cent
	\$10,000	\$1,533	15.3
Chicago	2,000	835	41
Streater	25	10	40
Newark	400	111	27.7
Bay Area	400	100	25
Philadelphia	200	35	17.3
Cleveland	150	25	16.6
Seattle	150	20	13.3
New York	3,800	294	7.7
Pittsburgh	200	13	6.5
Natl. Office	1,250	25	2
Detroit	350	0	0
Buffalo	150	0	0
Indiana	100	0	0
Akron	25	0	0
Reading	50	0	0
Oregon	50	0	0
St. Louis	25	0	0

## From India

Within 90 days of its foundation, the new Socialist Party of India (left wing) won all three seats up in by-elections in the state of Uttar Pradesh. This is Nehru's own state, but the prime minister's ruling Congress Party was routed.

The right-wing Praja Socialist Party has suffered a mournful loss. Its chairman, Acharya Narendra Deva, died last week.

Deva, one of the founders of the Socialist Party in 1934, suffered chronically from asthma. A leading scholar in Buddhist literature, he was at one time president of Lucknow University and later of Benares Hindu University.

## LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, New York City

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

Send for our free book list.