

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

FEBRUARY 20, 1956

FIVE CENTS

Demoralization of the Adlai Cult

... page 6

Stevenson and the Civil War

... page 7

THE WESTINGHOUSE STRIKE GOES ON

... page 2

HOFFA PICKS A FIGHT WITH THE UAW

... page 3

Stevenson Goes Down the Line for South In Rejecting Any Action on Negro Rights

'Nation' Editors Flirt with Eisenhower!

By HAL DRAPER

The *Nation*, the joint organ of liberals and Stalinoids, has announced that it is flirting with the idea of supporting Eisenhower or another "liberal" Republican in the presidential contest.

The development is by no means as incredible as it may seem at first blush.

It does sound next to incredible even at second blush, however, when you stop to think of the enormities implied. What, liberals support the re-election of the man whose administration has given us Dulles' brink-of-war policy, McKay's give-aways, the tideland-oil steal, Benson's foot-in-mouth japes from Ladejinsky to the farms, Charles Wilson's tributes to GM, Nixon's smear-campaigning, a cabinet of millionaires . . . ?

But still the *Nation's* new lurch in the direction of the GOP makes sense. Not liberal sense, of course. It makes sense in terms of the rampaging demoralization of liberalism which is so obvious right now, and whose manifestations are discussed in other articles in this issue.

It also makes sense in terms of the Stalinoid politics which is the *Nation's* distinguishing characteristic. And this is decisive.

The *Nation's* editorial—"Should Liberals Climb Aboard Stevenson's Bandwagon? of Jan. 28—does not quite come out for Eisenhower. Nor, sad to say, does it have the courage of its convictions, or perhaps consciousness of its convictions, enough to present its motivations in plain language. It is a very muddy business. But it had a predecessor.

STRANGE CONVERSION

The real thinking behind the *Nation's* line was expressed far more frankly, or at any rate more plainly, when I. F. Stone came out flatly for Eisenhower and the Republicans in 1954.

Stone is a distinctive Stalinoid-liberal type who today puts out his own *I. F. Stone's Weekly* and used to be the *Nation's* Washington correspondent before going to *PM* and the *Compass*, the erstwhile New York Stalinoid dailies.

It will help to take a look back at Stone's conversion ("The Strange Case of I. F. Stone," *LA* for Nov. 8, 1954) since the *Nation* has gone about three-quarters of the way in his direction.

Stone in 1954 argued that "the overriding issue is that of peace," and the Democrats are "the war party." That was it.

Stone's Stalinoid foreign politics, of

(Turn to last page)

The Program That Isn't

A new children's book entitled *The Possum That Didn't* has been published by the author of *The Bear That Wasn't*.

Sounds like a good beginning for a quip by Adlai Stevenson, the Candidate That Wouldn't.



"Goodness me, election time is here again . . ."

By GORDON HASKELL

Adlai Stevenson, the leading Democratic candidate for the presidency and the special darling of the labor-liberal-egghead forces in this country, has succeeded during the past week in making one thing so clear that no misunderstanding about it is possible. He is prepared to stand like a rock, firm and unshaken by the beating of the political waves, in his determination not to do or say anything which might alienate the support of the leading racist politicians in the South.

He will not yield to whatever temptation there may be inside him, or whatever pressure may bear on him from without, to side with the Negroes and the white supporters of equality who are locked in a great struggle to break the barriers to full and equal citizenship of the Negroes in the South.

Of course, Stevenson is not personally for segregation or discrimination. He has said repeatedly that he is against it and hopes that the day will come when it will no longer exist. To make it clear that his hopes are not vaguely attached to infinity, he has set a date (1963) at which he aims them.

But again and again, under the relentless prodding of an issue which simply will not lie still in these United States in 1956, he has made it clear that he is



willing to leave the issue of equal rights for Negroes in the South to the tender mercies of the Southern white leadership who are so important a section of the Democratic Party.

He has done this indirectly, by refusing to condemn them for their resistance to and outright defiance of the Supreme Court decision on desegregation in the schools, and directly by openly praising the officials of the University of Alabama who barred Autherine Lucy from the school rather than proceed against the leaders of the mob who threatened her.

At first Stevenson appears to have thought that he could simply ignore the struggle which is going on in the South over the discrimination issue. When pushed on the problem in his tour of California he showed hostility to the Negroes and others who were trying to get a clear statement from him.

OKAYS U. OF ALABAMA!

By the time he got to Portland, Oregon, the events at the University of Alabama were on the front pages of the papers, and though he ignored the issue in his major speech there, he appears to have finally realized that the press would not leave him alone with regard to these matters.

So he read them a prepared statement, in which he found that the "temporary denial of the right of a Negro student to

(Turn to last page)

Fight for Negro Rights Is Ripping the South

By MAX MARTIN

Despite Adlai Stevenson's plea to take Negro rights out of politics, civil rights will remain a major issue, above all because the Negro people themselves will not be wheedled into deserting the fight.

In the North the conviction has grown since the war that the Jim Crow status quo cannot be maintained; hence the Supreme Court's historic desegregation decision. Among the Negroes there is awareness

of the favorableness of the present juncture of events; they are determined to translate promises into reality. Among the Southern racists there is fear that a real break-through may spell big changes in the whole Jim Crow system; hence the savage fury of their resistance.

Signs of these forces and this atmosphere are found daily, in big incidents and little ones.

In New Orleans several months ago Negro college students were arrested for removing the "colored" and "white" posters marking the segregation line on a bus and throwing them out of the window. An incident, to be sure, but an indication of the new winds blowing.

Of greater importance is the bus boycott by the Negroes of Montgomery, Alabama. A mass rally of 5,000 Negroes last December 5, protesting the fining of a Negro woman who had refused to give up her seat to a white passenger, voted to boycott the bus line until it ended segregation, required its drivers to treat Negro passengers more courteously and

employed Negro drivers. For over 70 days, 90 per cent or more of Montgomery's Negro population has carried on a solid boycott of the bus company.

They have organized car pools, and some have walked up to 3-4 miles to get to work. Negro domestic workers have insisted that white employers provide transportation for them as a condition of employment.

Result: a 75 per cent drop in passengers for the line, and the impending bankruptcy of the company. The white-supremacists have tried advertising campaigns to increase use of the bus line by whites, economic coercion of Negroes, the bombing of the homes of two leaders of the boycott, and currently, a grand-jury investigation on whether the boycott is a "conspiracy."

The county grand jury, consisting of 17 whites plus one Negro for window-dressing, met on February 14. It can send the boycott leaders to jail, but cannot compel the Negroes to ride the buses. The white-supremacists may hope that

(Continued on page 6)

Test for a Demagogue

With transparent demagoguery, Gov. Harriman of New York, who had been hedging on the explosive civil-rights issue even more agilely than Stevenson, came out with a splash on the issue as soon as he saw which tack his leading rival had taken.

Since Stevenson stuck with the South, Harriman dropped off the fence with statements in the other direction. After all, a man has to make promises in order to get votes.

But the other week-end the Protestant Council of New York City made a survey which gives Harriman a chance to show some civil-rights fervor in his own state. It was found that 22 out of the city's 27 major real-estate operators discriminated against Negroes.

Does Governor Harriman listen to Candidate Harriman?

The Westinghouse Strike Goes On In a Crucial Fight to Control Speedup

By BEN HALL

On February 13 the Westinghouse strike was 120 days old—the longest major strike since the end of World War II.

News reports are shunted away to little corner columns in the daily press. The union press highlights it as a significant, crucial—but more or less usual—fight. Yet events at Westinghouse raise issues as fundamental to the labor movement as the GM strike of 1945-6, and also hold in the balance the fate of a major union, the International Union of Electrical Workers (IUE).

The latest effort to settle the long stoppage foundered on two critical issues: five-year contracts and time-study.

The company's objective is not unusual: if it is forced to raise wages, it intends to wring the costs out of the workers' muscle and nerves. It insists upon the right to time-study workers and to set production standards at whim. It wants five years of uninterrupted production to squeeze to the limit without union interference.

Company Torpedoes Proposed Agreement To End Strike

By GERRY McDERMOTT

Pittsburgh, Feb. 14

The agreement of last week between the IUE and Westinghouse blew up when the company made it clear that it was still insisting on "unconditional surrender." The union had interpreted it as a sign that Westinghouse was ready to make concessions. This turned out to be a miscalculation.

The union made other concessions in the hope of meeting the company halfway, but it was no soap. In the past week, in fact, the company has stepped up the back-to-work movement and fired many more strikers.

Two new propositions have been put forward.

(1) Westinghouse will agree to fact-finding on the single issue of whether their offer meets the GE offer or not. However, this would be a trap for the union because it would tie them to a 5-year contract, and what is more important, they would have no protection against their raise being taken away by rate-cutting.

(2) The union in collaboration with five governors, has started fact-finding procedures before two highly esteemed arbitrators: David L. Cole, who settled the steel pension dispute, and Dr. George W. Taylor, former chairman of the War Labor Board. Westinghouse has not agreed to this plan.

The hatred on the part of the company is really shocking. It is apparent how vicious they are about this business. So the need for help from the rest of the labor movement is more pressing than ever.

By JOHN WILLIAMS

Newark, Feb. 13

The breakdown of the latest "truce" between Westinghouse and IUE in the 5 months' old strike points up the adamancy of the company.

It didn't take the union long to discover that Westinghouse had interpreted the "putting aside of time-study" deal, offered by the federal mediators, as a victory for itself. The company continued to demand a 5-year agreement, even though the old contract had a year to go, and held up and down the line to every position it had previously held. Any "reasonableness" on the part of the union is only a signal for a renewed attack by Westinghouse.

If the official labor movement had any illusion that something less than an all-out mobilization of labor's forces could win, they were rudely disillusioned.

Reports have it that Westinghouse itself is sub-contracting work out. If this is true, these sources must be prevented from bailing Westinghouse out.

Only labor's own great protests and demonstrations will call a halt to this first real attempt in these times to smash a mass industrial union. Time is rapidly running out.

In negotiations with the independent United Electrical Workers (UE), which carries on separate talks, a company spokesman put it this way: "The value of the company's offer for five years is \$369,000,000. We don't have that kind of money. We've got to get that money out of the productivity clause." Its negotiators proclaim an "unconditional right to manage."

With the advance of unionism, the poor old banner inscribed "Right to Manage" has become tattered and torn. Labor has wrested rights which had been jealously guarded by employers. But not everywhere equally.

Among the rights which management preserves almost inviolate, in mass production industries, is the right to set the pace of production, leaving the union, at best, the right to protest or to strike. Not even the powerful United Auto Workers has won basic rights here. It may try to force changes but short of a strike it has no right to alter a company decision.

AFTER 20 YEARS

For the first time in mass production industry the IUE demands equal rights on production standards. That is the sum and substance of its position; it is fighting to curb the "unconditional rights of management," to win a new position for labor.

The fight against speed-up has at last been raised to the level of a demand for an extension of the rights of the working class, for an expansion of democracy in the factory. In 20 years of the CIO, no other union has faced the issue behind so pointed a demand.

In the great GM strike of 1945-6, Walter Reuther dramatized the union position by far-reaching slogans: "Open the Books" and "Wage Increases Without Price Increases." The moral standing of the UAW rose; the strikers and their friends were moved; the "public" was impressed.

But the slogans were never translated into an actual demand and did not enter into the final settlement. The UAW neither demanded nor won control over prices or over company's records.

This is not to minimize the political impact of the Reuther program; but it puts the slogans in perspective so that we may understand the IUE Westinghouse program in its full significance.

Unlike the Reuther leadership which dramatized its program, the IUE leaders turn theirs into run-of-the-mill routine. Yet the IUE demand is as far-reaching as anything the UAW has actually sought in contract negotiations.

DEMAND FROM BELOW

For 17 weeks Westinghouse workers have fought to bridle the authoritarian rights of their bosses over the pace of work. But neither the labor movement as a whole, nor even the strikers themselves, are aroused to the full implications of the fight. This might be an ordinary strike that simply meets extraordinary employer resistance.

If the IUE leaders are aware of the implications of their own fight, they perhaps hesitate to talk about it. Their union, compared to other mass production unions is comparatively weak. This is its first big test. The leadership may be reluctant to demand what more powerful unions have never attained.

Yet the Westinghouse workers have decided to fight; it was the ranks and secondary leaders who began the battle over time-study as early as last September, when a short national strike erupted

in advance of the current negotiations. In other words, the crucial demand comes from below and not from the leaders on top.

A responsible and progressive labor leadership has the duty of defending and explaining the demand to all; that the Westinghouse workers are not fighting for some private, technically complex concessions but for democracy in the factory—an issue posed in every mass industry under the name "speed-up."

How is the issue posed concretely? To put it in short, the IUE rejects the final authority of the company over production standards.

On October 10 the IUE News explained the union's position as follows: "The union's proposed 'ground rules' for handling company studies of day-workers, while providing for surveys and general measurements necessary for the company's production improvements and general budget determinations, would prevent studies of day-worker operations for the purpose of establishing individual production standards where no incentive payments are permitted."

The company gags. For it could not hold the disciplinary whip over its employees while it made up for wage increases by an intensification of human labor and sweat. Yet this is what employers have done in other industries.

PIE-IN-THE-SKY

The collective capitalist class is raising speed-up to the level of a lofty principle. Reporting on employers' reaction to the auto settlements in its issue of April 27, 1955, the *Wall Street Journal* summarized a speech by Robert C. Hendon, vice-president of Railway Express Agency:

"Organized labor must increasingly surrender many of its privileges as the current trend toward job security progresses, said Mr. Hendon. . . . Discipline must be tightened up, chronic absenteeism and tardiness corrected. In return for these

concessions, he predicted, the manufacturing employee in the next 10 years or so will be put on a straight year-round salary, will seldom work overtime, and will no longer be subject to layoffs."

Summary: speed-up for pie-in-the-sky. It is easy to understand why the speed-up problem becomes more acute as wages, pensions and insurance rises. Manufacturers try to keep profits high by forcing a faster work pace. In Westinghouse, the IUE says no.

Consider what happens in a typical UAW plant in the Big Three. The GM contract reads: "The right to hire, promote, discharge or discipline for cause, and to maintain discipline and efficiency of employees is the sole responsibility of the Corporation except that union members shall not be discriminated against as such. In addition, the products to be manufactured, the location of plants, the schedule of production, the methods, processes and means of manufacturing are solely and exclusively the responsibility of the Corporation."

WHAT'S THE TROUBLE?

In actual practice, many of the rights which seem so unqualifiedly in the hands of the company have been curbed. But least of all on the matter of setting production standards.

The company decides unilaterally that each worker must produce a given number of pieces per day. If he fails, his boss can suspend or discharge him. If the union objects to any standard, it may call a strike to force the company to reconsider. But it takes time to authorize a "legal" strike. Meanwhile, the workers are compelled to try to meet the standard imposed by management; they are subject to penalty if they refuse to try; they are subject to penalty if they fail after trying.

The official procedure is unwieldy and cumbersome; while it creaks on its way, men are disciplined; stewards are fired;

(Continued on next page)

Philly's 107 Has Its Own Fight

By FRANK HARPER

Philadelphia, Feb. 7

Six thousand employees at the Westinghouse South Philadelphia Works in Essington have been out in the streets since October 16. Most of these are members of Local 107 of the independent United Electrical Workers (UE).

The nature of the local dispute is such that perhaps 107 will remain outside the gates even if their national organization and the larger International Union of Electrical Workers (IUE—of the AFL-CIO) are able to reach an agreement.

The Essington dispute started with the expiration of the "Local Supplement" to the national Westinghouse contract. The company refused to renew the supplement or to extend it at union request on a 90-day basis while negotiations continued. Instead they offered extensions on only a day-to-day basis and proposed reductions in the rates of both piece and hourly workers which would have cut the average rate from approx. \$2.50 to about \$2.10.

This was not satisfactory to the union. The men absented themselves on a Friday; by Monday the company had locked the gates to all but the supervisors. The local dispute merged into the national one.

Local negotiations have made less progress than national; the company will not bargain until the union gives them "access to their property," i.e., ceases to picket.

Almost overshadowing the contract negotiations on both levels is a decision from the Democratic regime in the capital at Harrisburg on unemployment compensation for the Local 107 workers. The union maintains that the men were locked out. There is bitter feeling about the delay of the decision. There is talk in the local that if the Democrats don't come through "we will start a labor party."

Governor Leader has so far rejected requests by the company (and by the sheriff of Republican Delaware County) to send state troops to preserve "peace and order" at the plant gates.

Strangely enough, the Department of Public Assistance in Democratic Phila-

delphia has resisted the pleas of the needy families more than the Republicans in Delaware and Chester Counties.

The strikers' morale is good, but the local is in bad financial circumstances. The union entered the strike without a strike fund. The hard-pressed national UE has been sending \$1000 weekly. For the last month members have been circularizing and soliciting funds from the neighboring communities, and from other unions, also at other plant gates.

The local was able to give its traditional Christmas party to the children of the members. Most of the members have found some part or full-time employment but at lesser pay. They picket their two-hour assignment in the evening.

It is estimated that the strike is costing the local over \$5000 a week.

Enough of the officers and other activists remain near the plant to prevent the company from moving goods in and out of the plant. On January 27 the local was fined \$2000 by Delaware County Judge Sweeney for blocking five railway cars in violation of the mass-picketing injunction of December 2. It has also been alleged that two cars of supervisors were overturned.

While the union has been successful in blocking the company the leadership is somewhat under fire for carrying out the struggle without sufficient attempt to interest the bulk of the membership in the action. The company is apparently aware of the fact that these shortcomings have not seriously weakened the local for there has been no serious back-to-work movement. No batteries of lights, cameras, and recorders have been placed at the closed gates.

Westinghouse has told national negotiators of the UE that a general settlement could be made which would not cover 107. This may be an idle threat, or even a tempting offer, to the UE.

It is more likely, however, that it is an expression of Westinghouse's wish to break or very seriously weaken Local 107, which is by far the largest and most militant local in the Westinghouse UE organization. Without them the UE will be truly impotent.

YOU'RE INVITED

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

Hoffa and Teamsters Launch Jurisdictional Assault on UAW

By JACK WILSON

Detroit, Feb. 12

One week of negotiations in the jurisdictional dispute between the United Auto Workers and the Building Trades unions at the Packard motor company here failed to break the deadlock, and now George Meany, AFL-CIO president, personally has intervened.

It remains to be seen how much he accomplishes, in view of all the power-politics factors involved in this fight. This arena was chosen deliberately as a battleground by James (Jimmy) Hoffa, Teamsters boss in Michigan, who is backing the Building Trades completely.

During the week, Walter Reuther made a four-point proposal to settle the issue. It was:

- (1) The Building Trades unions remove picket lines.
 - (2) Unions involved in the dispute work out a settlement in Detroit based on the understanding and practices by which similar disputes were settled in the last 10 to 12 years before the AFL-CIO merger.
 - (3) As an alternative, all unions in the dispute agree to have Dave Cole, the arbitrator under the AFL-CIO "no-raiding" agreement, schedule a hearing immediately so all unions may present their viewpoint. Cole would be authorized to make a final and binding decision.
 - (4) Immediate meetings of the Building Trades Department and the Industrial Union Department committees would be rescheduled to work out rules and procedures solving disputes between craft and industrial unions.
- This proposal was rejected by the special craft-union committee of which Hoffa is a leader and spokesman.

COMPLICATIONS

A later compromise plan was also rejected by the Hoffa forces. This one is important because it shows how complicated the situation is.

The second plan called for the following:

- All of the 239 UAW members working to make the East Grand Boulevard plant of the Studebaker-Packard Corporation ready for production of air corps parts

Westinghouse Strike — —

(Continued from page 2)

"wildcat" stoppages occur in local bursts of resentment; these stoppages, unauthorized, lead to more discipline. In sum, the fight against speed-up is disorganized and fragmented by department and plant.

The UAW leadership is accustomed to reply to those who demand leadership in the fight against speed-up: "Wherever workers ask for the right to strike against speed-up, we authorize it." This reply silences the critics. But the fact remains that the fight against speed-up is undercut by the very system that puts the basic power to set standards in the hands of the company.

Production standards, unlike other shop conditions, are not subject to arbitration. The company word is final unless the union strikes. But disputes over standards occur a thousand times a year; slowly the workers, who cannot strike every day, are forced backward.

The IUE would cut through all this. The union would take away the right of the company to set individual production standards on the basis of its own time-study.

It may not win its full demand but it has faced up to the issue and points the way to all unions in manufacturing.

contract would stay there until February 20.

• If Packard on February 20 recalls 5500 automotive workers laid off in other Packard plants 11 days ago, the UAW work force at the East Grand plant would drop to 66. (That was about the UAW total when the 350 Building Trades workers walked off the job after charging that UAW members were taking their work.)

The Building Trades workers were employed by contractors who had bid on the Packard job.

The second compromise plan worked out by Reuther was also rejected by the committee representing the Building Trades.

It also came to light that the reason the UAW was able to place its men on the contract work was because of special contract provisions, which UAW vice-president Norman Mathews said was negotiated last year, and which also obtained in the Ford contract. Under those contract provisions, if there have been no previous layoffs the "outside" workers are called in. If there have been layoffs, the laid-off UAW workers get preference.

SOURCES OF FRICTION

Coming at a time of declining housing starts, and cutbacks in auto production, any issue of job jurisdiction takes a very acute form. In the past, any time the UAW shops had cutbacks and some outside contract work was ordered, the UAW did respect the AFL jurisdiction in an effort to keep peace, but the UAW was always under pressure from its ranks to fight for those jobs. That kind of pressure is very powerful now, and taking into consideration the general dissatisfaction of the skilled workers too, it can easily be seen what an important issue it is for Walter Reuther and the UAW.

How strongly other CIO unions feel about this issue was illustrated by the firm statements for complete industrial-union practices by Dave McDonald of the Steelworkers' union, which faces similar issues in relation to AFL building-trades unions.

For the Building Trades, the knowledge that some UAW contracts now give UAW skilled and maintenance workers preference in that field of rebuilding, reworking or otherwise carrying out changes comes as a shock and arouses grave fears over the future of the Building Trades work around industrial plants. As we said before, in a period of prosperity, the issue was largely theoretical. Everybody was working. Now it is different.

Another source of friction is the wage scales involved. As a rule, the Building Trades men get much higher wages in each classification than the UAW workers. A case in point: A UAW welder will make \$2.25 an hour; an AFL man working for an outside contractor on the same job will get \$3.20 an hour. The hard feelings all around on this subject should be easy to understand.

The strategic importance of the Teamsters Union and Hoffa in this area is obvious. The Teamsters Union delivers the materials for the work to be done in the plants. It's an old story in Detroit that the Teamsters Union could shut down the auto plants as easy as the UAW. Nor are the Teamsters officials bashful of reminding people of that point.

Following is Jack Wilson's background story received late last week.—ED.

Detroit, Feb. 6

The first important clash between the dominant George Meany-Walter Reuther leadership and the rambunctious Teamsters Union since the AFL-CIO merger will take place at the meeting of the newly constituted Executive Council in Miami.

The pressure for a showdown came from a decision of the Teamsters Union, as approved at a recent meeting at St.

Louis of 900 union officials, under the determined drive of James (Jimmy) Hoffa, the single most powerful leader in the Teamsters Union.

On two major fronts Hoffa had announced, with the approval of the Teamsters Union, that he was challenging the combined AFL-CIO leadership and its stated policies.

Hoffa bluntly told AFL-CIO leaders that the Teamsters Union is going all the way down the line in aiding the expelled International Longshoremen's Union against the AFL-CIO Maritime Department. A first indication of this is the projected \$500,000 loan to the racketeer-ridden ILA.

Secondly, Hoffa squarely challenged the UAW in the Detroit area in a jurisdictional fight of national significance.

GAUNTLET IS FLUNG

In both cases, Hoffa has, as this writer knows from first-hand reports, bluntly told UAW leaders he is ready to take everybody on, and any time, unless all jurisdictional rights of the Teamsters Union are approved by the Executive Council.

Two weeks ago 100 AFL workers from its craft-union departments, aided by Teamsters Union officials, picketed the

Packard motor car company in a jurisdictional dispute over maintenance work on a new plant project. In the past, this kind of issue was solved by a working agreement between Hoffa and the UAW. In this case Hoffa told UAW officials he would not settle the issue until the AFL-CIO council settled it on the basis of guaranteeing the Teamsters their full jurisdictional rights as the old AFL had allowed them.

He even hinted that as far as he is concerned, the old AFL unions had more jurisdictional claim over skilled workers in the auto industry than the UAW, and implied that maybe he'd help them in this direction. The temptation to play around with the Independent Society of Skilled Trades is present for Hoffa.

Deliberately (and he has told UAW leaders this) Hoffa has slowed down the process of achieving labor unity on an area-wide basis here, again until the Teamsters Union gets full jurisdiction over many workers, some of whom are in the UAW now.

Unless every sign is wrong, it is clear that Hoffa has replaced Dave Beck as the top leader of the Teamsters Union. Furthermore, it is also very obvious that he is far rougher than Beck ever figured to be. Hoffa's contempt for the "softies" of the CIO and "that politician George" (meaning Meany) is typical.

Since Hoffa told the top AFL-CIO leaders in the plainest possible, brutal and cold-blooded language exactly what he intends, it remains to be seen how the Meany-Reuther leadership proposes to meet this dangerous challenge.

DISPATCH FROM DUBLIN

Merger of Trade-Union Centers Will Give Irish Labor a Lift

By M. M.

Dublin, Jan. 22

On January 5 the two trade union centers—the Trade Union Congress and the Congress of Irish Unions—held special conferences to discuss and decide on the unity document drawn up by their respective teams of negotiations. The negotiators had met some two dozen times within two years, under the chairmanship of Prof. Busted (University College, Cork).

The special conferences voted for the unity proposals contained in the document, by substantial majorities.

In the case of the CIU, it is reported that the decision was unanimous. This is a far cry from the CIU's anti-unity intransigence of even four years ago.

The anti-unity forces at the TUC meeting rolled up one-third of the votes cast. This was surprising, since the initiative on unity had been taken by the TUC.

The anti-unity vote at the TUC meeting was drawn from the Woodworkers, the Engineers, and the bureaucratized Irish offspring of the Transport & General Workers Union, together with a sprinkling of native timeservers whose independent and factional activities would be eclipsed in a united movement. The three unions mentioned above are what are colloquially known as "English unions" by virtue of the fact that their headquarters are in Britain, and they represent at worst the Unionist mentality on the trade union level. ("Unionist" means favoring political union with Britain.)

MERGER BY '62

Actions such as these lay bare the basic political division on the national question and the constitutional character of the two states in Ireland: one existing by integration proper in the United Kingdom, and the other born of the independent struggle and its political attitudes subjectively conditioned by that struggle, though economically and objectively dependent on Britain's patronage.

The unity document itself provides for the setting up of a provisional united organization of a federal character with a 16-man steering committee drawn from each center charged with the task of providing a constitution and the consummation of the merger by 1962. The congresses in a formal sense will continue their separate existences, but the emphasis will be on joint activity at every level and at every juncture.

Quite probably the first major task will be on future wage policy and movements, costs and prices. Just now the credit squeeze attendant on the 1 per cent increase in the bank rate must immediately affect costs and prices. Unemployment is mounting and the official

index stands at 60,000 at the moment. This must be further amplified as manufacturers cut back stockpiling and plant expansion on bank overdrafts, in the face of the jacked-up bank rates. Building, municipal and speculative, for working-class and middle-class housing will take a nosedive by putting rents and mortgage repayments out of income reach.

The background of the economic facts of life in Ireland today conditions the latest activity of Minister Norton, the Labor Party's leader. Norton's attempt to sell Ireland to U. S. capitalism on his American junket is either an extended hayride or the prelude to a deal on NATO. It is not mere coincidence that Premier Costello is to lecture on constitutional law at Yale later this year.

It should be remembered that a major policy decision on Ireland's external relations was announced at an international gathering of lawyers in Canada in 1949 by the same Mr. Costello who was the premier in the first coalition government. It is well known that Norton is the government's "fixer." Sincere apologies to bona-fide stage-managers.

CP ANTICS

Getting back to the TUC conference, it was remarkable if only for the bizarre antics of the Stalinists. Betty Sinclair, a leading Stalinist militant representing the Belfast Trades Council, lashed the anti-unity leaders of the Woodworkers and the Transport Workers for their capitulation to the sectarian and opportunist Tory politics of Unionism (political union with Britain). Holmes, a former faithful Stalinist hack in the Transport Workers' Belfast sector, moved the reference back of the unity document. In the voting line-up, Sinclair and the uninhibited Stalinists in the Electrical Trade Union voted solidly for unity, while the Stalinists in the various levels of the bureaucracy of the Woodworkers, Transport Workers and Engineers jumped into line when their union top brass sounded the rally.

A feeling of optimism has pervaded the ranks of the movement again on the morrow of the unity moves. The industrial weaknesses attendant on the existence of a formal organizational break, particularly in industries where there is a multiplicity of unions, are within reach of correction.

Long overdue steps to rationalize and assess jurisdiction on the basis of industries and functions can now be taken. The educational work of the movement can be given an enormous push forward and the most important element is the reintegration of the Labor Party as a potentially powerful vehicle of the political aspirations of the Irish working class.

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.

2 0 - 8

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

RENEW NOW!

LONDON LETTER

Bevan Goes on the Offensive

By OWEN ROBERTS

London, Feb. 9

Last week the newly elected leader of the Labor Party, Hugh Gaitskell, gave an interview to the political correspondent of the Sunday *Observer* during which he was asked what he thought was the mood of the party and how was he going to heal the split. Gaitskell replied that the mood of the party was in favor of putting an end to the "disputes and squabbles" of the past few years and that "anybody who starts up a further row will be highly unpopular."

By the time this interview had appeared in print Aneurin Bevan had made himself a candidate for Gaitskell's "unpopularity" by making a stinging attack on the right wing and its endeavors to further dilute the socialist characteristics of the party. His speech, as readers can judge for themselves by the report below, was couched in terms that make it quite clear that he has no intention of accepting the present line-up in the party with its right-wing dominance.

Whether or not the right wing will use this latest speech as an opportunity to "discipline" Bevan is not yet clear, but the reaction of the press was immediate. Labor's *Daily Herald*, in an editorial, sneered that Bevan "thinks that a party which rejects him, rejects also its fundamental faith in Socialism!" It said that Bevan's vanity is becoming a national joke and "a very good joke for the Tories."

The right-wing Laborite *Daily Mirror*, with a daily sale of four and a quarter million copies, let lose its pet hater—William Connor, alias "Cassandra." Connor vented his spleen on Bevan and the Bevanites by attempting to hold them up to ridicule and, by a queer feat of mathematics, discovering that only Ian Mikardo and Bevan remained as Bevanites in Parliament.

The *Liberal News Chronicle* pinpointed the situation now facing Gaitskell when it said: "Within a few weeks of taking office, Mr. Gaitskell faces a stern test. His political stature will be measured by his skill in blunting the Bevanite campaign while maintaining the party's unity."

Gaitskell himself is treading very warily. At a press conference held two days after Bevan's speech he flatly refused to be drawn into discussion on the subject by newspapermen. His position is made difficult because Bevan was careful in his speech not to refer to any particular right-wing leader and to confine his general criticism to tendencies within the party. In this way he has made it difficult for the right wing to take action against him on the grounds that he infringed the resolution of the National Executive which restrains party members from making what are termed "personal attacks" on other party members in public.

The general feeling is that Gaitskell and the right wing will bide their time while laying plans to attempt Bevan's execution—politically—at some later date. What this date will be depends on the success which the right wing will have in extending its hold on the party—particularly among the rank and file of the constituencies.

BEVAN'S SPEECH

The speech by Bevan which precipitated much of the to-do was made in Manchester on February 4. Following is a summary.

Bevan began his speech by directing what he called "a personal word" to the leader-writer of the *Manchester Guardian* who had recently written that if it had not been for his follies and failures Bevan would probably be the leader of the Labor Party today. Commented Bevan:

"I am not interested in being the leader of any party, but merely in being a leader. If the Labor Party is not going to be a socialist party, I don't want to lead it. I don't believe you can measure the progress of society by individual careers."

"When you join a team in the expectation that you are going to be asked to play rigger you can't be expected to be enthusiastic if you are asked to play tidily-winks."

Bevan said that he didn't join the Labor Party; he grew up in it. Most of his audience were in the same position: they belonged to the Labor Party because they worked in mines, factories or fields. When the leadership of the party ceased in the main to be drawn

from such people, then the movement would languish.

"In the various contests that have taken place inside the Labor movement over the last four or five years, the aim we have had has not been to obtain this or that position, but to provide an opportunity for the rank and file of the movement to register the strength of socialist feeling in the movement."

He was not such a fool, or so naive, innocent and simple, as not to know that he would get a "black eye" in some of these contests. In spite of this unpleasantness it was necessary to submit to the franchise of the movement in order that socialist opinion have a chance to register itself.

WHERE ARE WE GOING?

Leaving these personal things, as he called them, Bevan said that the party was engaged in revising its machinery. That might be a good thing. But if there were a number of buttons on a desk which did not ring when pressed, the problem was not solved by increasing the number of buttons.

That was what had happened in the last election. The buttons were pressed but the bells did not ring; so now the party is looking for more buttons. It was no good streamlining machinery if the car was going toward a precipice. "I want," he said, "a more precise idea of where we are going."

The National Executive was going into conference to find out what it was all about. In other words, they were in a team and were now going to find out what game they were going to play. "You would have thought that some of those men had only just arrived in the socialist movement. You would have thought that the history of the socialist movement began when they came into it. The history of the socialist movement looks as though it is beginning to end when they came into it."

It has always been understood that one of the major premises of the movement was to change society from one based upon private property and exploitation into one based upon public service.

"If it is not about that I am not interested in it. It has no longer any appeal when some people go about saying we are going to investigate industries, one by one, to see whether they qualify for nationalization. I regard that as a retrograde step. I would force private enterprise to justify itself."

Socialism was not only an economic theory but a way of life. The economists came into the matter when a means was being sought to carry out the central purpose; and this central purpose must first of all be based upon a moral decision. It was not done by considering the situation and deciding what was possible. Any politician who concerned himself only with what was possible never did anything.

When he went around various parts of the country he found no uncertainties or lack of vigor at the bottom of the Labor movement. All the uncertainties were at the top. It was quite true that the rank and file did not know as much about what was happening as those at the top, for those at the top knew the facts which were concealed from the rank and file. And those at the top had been bogged down by those facts.

"You elect a Labor member of Parliament to represent you. In the secrecy of a party meeting he plays in the team, keeps a straight bat and a stiff upper lip, and then reaches decisions. You don't know about them and he is not allowed to say. That is a travesty of democracy. A representative of the people has no right to secrecy."

PARLIAMENTARY CONSPIRACY

Meetings were held "upstairs" in the House of Commons in secret and then Labor MPs had to go onto the floor of the House and make speeches. "If those speeches do not accord with what has been decided 'upstairs' we are threatened

Two Liberals & Democracy

Maybe our liberals are not devoted unto the death to civil liberties for all; but surely when it is only a question of the abstract notion of democracy, they should still be found in the cheering stands?

Not exactly. Not if you look at two prominent liberal periodicals.

An editorial discussion in the *Reporter* for January 26 dealt with the mess made by the recent French election, and smugly compared that hapless situation with our own hapful days of joy under the American Constitution:

"There is no reason why we should pat ourselves on the back for our superior wisdom," says the editor as he reminds himself not to sprain his arm. "Rather, we should be grateful to the Founding Fathers and our politicians—dead or alive. Thanks to our Constitution and our politics, the popular will in our country goes through so many filters and processings that its end product becomes somewhat homogenized and sterilized. We living Americans cannot claim much credit for this system we have inherited, and cannot blame the French for not having one like ours."

You see how broadminded and understanding our liberals are about the foibles of other peoples—downright forgiving. It's not the fault of the French that their system reflects the popular mind even when said mind is confused. Serves 'em right to be a democracy when, as Westbrook Pegler has been telling us right along, we're not a democracy but a republic.

DEFENESTRATION

But lest this sneer at unfiltered democracy be haply considered a hapax legomenon, which roughly means a swallow that doesn't make a summer, we hereby pull out of our files the *New Republic* for last November 7, which had one Henry M. Magid reviewing the two recent books put out by Columbia on academic freedom (one by MacIver and one by Hofstadter and Metzger). MacIver's book was the one which set Sidney Hook's canine teeth on edge, and which he has been denouncing as formal-liberalism because it's for academic freedom.

The *New Republic's* reviewer was driven to equally sad thoughts, but not against MacIver. The whole thing set him wondering whether liberals nowadays really have a right to "take their stand on the most obvious interpretation of the maxim 'Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free.'"

"But is this position as philosophically and sociologically sound as it is emotionally appealing?" he asks, as he grapples with Fundamentals. And "Is the communication of truth under all circumstances bound to be of benefit to society?" It's time we "faced it squarely." (In such jargon, by the way, "face squarely" or "re-examine" always means "defenestrate," which is our scholarly way of saying "throw out of the window.")

In pursuit of the square facing, Magid reasons:

"Human personality is often a fragile thing in the presence of which the truth is often a corrosive agent. Too strong a

with expulsion. Although you do not know how your representative voted upstairs."

"Is that democracy? It is conspiracy. If it goes on it is the end of parliamentary institutions."

Bevan said there was nothing wrong in MPs consulting together in private. But to enforce on MPs policies, votes and conduct decided behind locked doors was antagonistic to democratic principles of any sort. The same thing was happening at local levels and the council chamber was being reduced to a farce. The caucus was getting more powerful than the electors.

"I know these words are going to get me into trouble, but I am not a Communist, I am a democratic socialist." The only way that democratic institutions could be used to transform society was to keep them healthy and active.

"The trouble with the movement is that decisions are being reached on the top and imposed on the bottom."

Replying to a woman in the audience who asked why he did not leave the Labor Party and join another, Bevan said that to do so would be the gospel of despair. He was not going to agree that the vast masses of socialists inside the Labor Party should leave and abandon its traditions and its heritage in the hands of the most reactionary members. "I think we should still fight and transform it."

dose of truth will destroy any personality except one which has a supreme and single dedication to the truth itself. Or to put this point in another way: For most people truth is one value among others, inferior in status probably to security or power or pleasure. Thus making truth absolute would involve an inversion of existing values if not of society itself."

HOMOGENIZED PRODUCT

Far be it from us to make truth absolute, but you will notice that our liberal reviewer is not saying that truth is subversive; it's *inversive*. Probably *reversive* and *perversive*, too, you would find if the FBI ever got after it good, but let's get back to Magid:

"The inquirer in a democratic society cannot claim special privilege. He too must be accountable to society for his actions, and his publishing and his teaching are his actions...."

"Does this mean that the claim to academic freedom has no adequate rationale? Not at all. It means that the liberal rationale of academic freedom is superficial and optimistic and needs to be replaced by one which does not fall into the delusions of automatic social progress through the increase of knowledge."

Or as the *Reporter* would say, academic freedom must first be "filtered" and "processed" until "its end product becomes somewhat homogenized and sterilized." That way, instead of the delusion of automatic social progress, we get by collusion the reality of handmade social regress.

Magid's final conclusion from all this is that maybe the only way to get freedom of inquiry is "Socratic withdrawal from social action and political life." That is, you can have all the academic freedom you can use if you keep your unfiltered end-products confined to your study and don't go around subverting—sorry, *inverting*—society with them.

World History—Year by Year

The bound volumes of LABOR ACTION

are an invaluable record of the social and political issues of our day, and a socialist education in themselves. Completely indexed from 1949 on.

1950-53.....\$3 per vol.

Bound volumes of LA are also available back to, and including, 1942, at somewhat higher prices depending on the year. Prices on request. A complete set of bound volumes for the 11 years from 1942 to 1952 is available for \$40.

Independent Socialist Press
114 West 14 Street, New York City



LABOR ACTION

February 20, 1956 Vol. 20, No. 8

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

Editor: MAL DRAPER

Associate Editors:

GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL

Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

Spanish Students Battle Franco Fascists

By MAX MARTIN

The growing open disaffection and hostility of the Spanish students to the Franco regime exploded during the past week, confronting the dictatorial and tyrannical regime with a serious political crisis.

Realizing that the clashes between the students and the Falange (the fascist government party) is a barometer to the precariousness of his position, Franco called a cabinet meeting to discuss the dangers confronting the regime, at the conclusion of which new repressive measures were announced.

These were the developments:

- At the beginning of February a group of Madrid students sent an open letter to the government demanding an end to Falangist control of the universities. Specifically, they concentrated their fire on the Falangist student organization, Sindicato Español Universitario, to which all students must belong, and which is supposed to "represent" them in dealings with the government. They pointed out that the SEU had done nothing about their demands for lower tuition, textbook and lodging fees, and for better education.
- The students circulated a petition demanding the right to form their own student organizations, and on February 4 the students of the Law faculty at the University of Madrid voted down the Falangist delegates whom they were supposed to "elect" and elected a group of their own delegates to present their views to the regime. The Falangists responded to this by invading the law school, beating up anti-Falange students and declaring the elections illegal.
- On February 8 several columns of students prepared to march to the Ministry of Education to voice their protests. They were attacked by groups of militarized Falangists, and scuffles between students and pro-Franco hoodlums took place all day in and around the university and in

The New York unit of the Young Socialist League is planning a demonstration of solidarity with the Spanish students in front of a Spanish Government office on February 22. Challenge readers are urged to participate. Phone WA 4-4222 for information on time and place.

the main streets of Madrid. Approximately 4000 students were reported to have taken part in these events.

- The struggles continued during the following day, this time with guns. Over twenty casualties occurred with a Falangist critically wounded. Hundreds of students gathered in various places around the school, shouting, "Falange — No! SEU—No!" Hundreds of policemen were rushed to the scenes of the clashes in trucks and jeeps. They blocked off the streets, dispersed the demonstrators with water sprayed from a tank-car, and arrested dozens of students.
- The regime shut down the university on the 9th and continued to make arrests of students that day and the following two days. The exact number seized is not known, some reports indicating sixty.
- On the 11th, the cabinet announced its new decrees. The police were given unlimited powers to make arrests for a three-month period, and were told to use these powers against any who "attempted or may in the future attempt to break the peace." The right to change residences without police permission was withdrawn.

At the same time the regime began efforts to make the wounded Falangist, who is close to death, a martyr-symbol of its despotic rule. Leading officials of the regime have visited him in the hospital and the Franco newspapers have all contained long articles and editorials extolling him. Simultaneously, the government began a campaign to convince the people that "Communism" was responsible for stirring up the clashes.

• On the 13th, Seville University students organized a mass march and rally as a demonstration of solidarity with the Madrid University students. This is the last news as this is written. The movement of protest is spreading geographically.

It is much too early to say how far further developments may go. Their significance, however, should not be underestimated.

In the first place, the students in Spain, like in all industrially undeveloped countries, have a heavier social weight than is true in the United States or in most of Western Europe. But even more important are two other factors.

For one, the attitudes of the students mirror the attitudes of all sections of the population, particularly of strata on whose support Franco relies. The stu-

dents in Franco Spain do not come from the working class; they are the sons and daughters of the big and little bourgeoisie and of the governmental bureaucracy. It is an open secret that in these circles too, dissatisfaction with Franco and his regime has grown.

Thus the fact that among the anti-Falange students were to be found the sons of several government officials and former government officials is an indication of how unpopular Franco is.

Secondly, any open expression of defiance in a totalitarian country creates the gravest dangers for the regime. On the one hand, the ability of the students to openly stage their demonstrations is an indication of the weakness of the ruling power. And on the other, it intensifies that weakness, for open defiance of the totalitarian regime makes clear to all that it can be defied, indeed, that it can be overthrown.

Hence the regime had to react with a crack-down. To allow the students to get away with their defiance would spell the death-knell for the Spanish dictator. The various propaganda efforts which Franco is making ("It's a Communist plot"

propaganda coupled with belated promises by the SEU to start fighting for the students' interests) are auxiliary to its major weapon—the knout.

It is the task of all students in the world to speak out now in defense of their Spanish comrades. Student organizations in the United States—the National Student Association, for example—should raise their voices in the demand: "Hands off the Madrid students."

The American labor movement should add its voice to that of the students. The probability is that Franco will take strong measures of reprisal against those who dared to protest. A world outcry of all democrats is required to help stay his hand.

The tragedy in the whole situation lies in the fact that just now, when the overthrow of Franco becomes a real possibility in the coming period, the United States intensifies its efforts to prop up the Spanish dictator. And so Franco is admitted into the United Nations, receives aid from the U. S., etc. Students in this country must let the government know how they feel about this, also.

Peanut Politicos in Oregon

This report was received from a student at Reed College, in Portland, Oregon. Challenge readers will find it an interesting commentary on two-party-system politics.—Ed.

By REUEL S. AMDUR

Portland, Feb. 5

Recent occurrences in connection with the Oregon primary provide an interesting light on the part that factors other than the will of the people play on the American political scene.

The Oregon primaries are to be held on May 18, but already petitions have been taken out for Eisenhower and Stevenson. In Oregon, the candidate may get on the primary ballot either by petition or by payment of a filing fee. The person put on the ballot by petition does not, in the presidential primary, have the right to withdraw his name.

The movement to put Eisenhower on the ballot is led by Paul Kerrigan, a figure of importance in Reed College student politics and former president of the Reed College student body, as well as a figure in Oregon state Young Republican politics. Kerrigan represents the liberal wing of Republicanism.

He hopes that the campaign to get Ike's name on the ballot will aid him in his attempt to be elected delegate to the Republican National Convention. Thus, the petitions for Ike bear at the bottom in bold-face type the legend, "Please return to Paul Kerrigan, Reed College, Portland."

Kerrigan is playing his political advantage in being the first to take out an Eisenhower petition and put it in circulation. He approached Republican State Senator Mark Hatfield about being the first to sign the petition; he did not need to point to the magic in the name Ike as something that could benefit both.

They then called in the local press, which carried publicity about the campaign, including a shot of Hatfield signing a petition while Kerrigan was standing by. The Executive Council of the Oregon Young Republican Federation, largely a paper organization, also came out in favor of the petition.

The fashion in which the petition for Stevenson was taken out is more interesting. In fact we must go into greater detail on the Eisenhower petition to find the full story of the Stevenson one:

Another Reed student, John Ramsay-Hill, decided to beat out Kerrigan in getting up a petition for Ike. He went with another student to Salem to get the form for the petition. Arriving an hour before Kerrigan, he immediately put the copy in order and took it to a non-union print

shop. Ramsay-Hill then made rapid tracks for Portland and called the papers to inform them that he had taken out a petition for Ike.

However, since he had no big political names backing him, the papers were not particularly interested. When Kerrigan returned, he and Ramsay-Hill made a bargain: they would unite their campaigns under the condition that, though Kerrigan's name would remain in the most prominent sponsorship position on the petitions, Ramsay-Hill and others would be listed as members of an executive committee.

Ramsay-Hill, however, being apparently without political ambitions and rather playing politics for dilettantish reasons, decided to take out a different petition—one for Stevenson. He joined forces with a liberal on the Reed campus, one Sheldon Lynn, who hopes to be a page or a sergeant-at-arms at the Democratic National Convention.

The two of them went down to Salem, and a week after he had taken out the petition for Eisenhower, Ramsay-Hill had one printed up for Stevenson—in the same non-union print-shop.

Returning to Portland, Ramsay-Hill and Lynn contacted Monroe Sweetland, state senator and Oregon Democratic national committeeman, and Maurine Neuberger, wife of the senator and herself a member of the Oregon state legislature. Ramsay-Hill and Lynn were more successful than Kerrigan in gaining publicity. They received local coverage, including a picture of Maurine Neuberger and Sweetland signing a Stevenson petition while Ramsay-Hill and Lynn stood in the background; they also received national coverage over the AP.

At this point, events moved rapidly. Ramsay-Hill left early for the Christmas vacation, leaving Lynn with the petitions. Kerrigan told Sweetland of the previous activities of Ramsay-Hill for Ike and Sweetland shifted the ball to Students for Stevenson, a Reed student group. Students for Stevenson managed to take the campaign for Stevenson into their own hands by making Lynn a member of the executive.

The old Stevenson petitions printed in the non-union shop were destroyed, and Sweetland printed others with a union label on them and put the new ones into circulation.

However, in Chicago Lynn found out that Stevenson is hesitant about entering the Oregon primaries. At this writing, that question is still up in the air.

Such is the story of the Oregon grassroots movements for Eisenhower and Stevenson in the '56 primary race.

Racist Football

By BOB STEVENS

New Orleans, Feb. 5

Louisiana State University has entered the ranks of those upholding the despicable banner of Jim Crow. The LSU Board of Supervisors announced yesterday that it was taking steps to prevent its athletic teams from playing racially mixed teams.

In arranging its games in the future, it will insist that a "color" clause be written into its contracts with Northern universities, with the latter promising that no Negro players will play in games with LSU.

At the same time it was announced that a program was adopted to prevent undergraduate Negro enrollment at LSU and to cut down on the present graduate Negro students. (There are several of the latter at LSU at the present time.)

The following requirements for admission have been added:

- (1) Each applicant must furnish letters of recommendation by two alumni.
- (2) A photograph must accompany the application.
- (3) A statement from a juvenile judge or other county official, testifying to the applicant's good character, is required.
- (4) A medical certificate from the county coronor, or other medical authority, is also required.
- (5) A new written entrance examination will be given to all applicants.

An LSU official is quoted in the local press as saying: "If administered properly we will meet approval from the courts. We have to crack down now at the sign of the first crack in the dike. Any opening is dangerous."

It is reported that white students who fail to meet these requirements will also not be admitted. If true, this proves how destructive to all are the frenzied efforts of Southern racists to circumvent the Supreme Court decision.

For the background development of youth and student disaffection in Spain, see Challenge for Jan. 23; also see 1955 articles in June 20 and August 8 issues of both Challenge and LABOR ACTION for the internal fights among the Franco forces as well as youth and student opposition sentiment.

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

The Demoralization Of the Adlai Cult

By PHILIP COHEN

Demoralization is beginning to run high among this country's lib-labs as more get a glimmering of the hollow, tinselled rhetoric that is behind the Stevenson image which they hold. The Negro fight is showing up the Adlai cult.

NAACP leaders have been most outspoken. Executive Secretary Roy Wilkins publicly attacked Stevenson's stand against "coercive federal action." Stevenson replied that he was amazed that Wilkins "misunderstood" him.

George Meany, AFL-CIO president, made the headlines with his criticism of Stevenson on Tuesday: "I am in complete disagreement with Mr. Stevenson on this question. I am also in disagreement with Mr. Stevenson that the way to handle this question is to run away from it."

Meany also made pointed remarks about the kind of courage that Stevenson lacked. He specifically took issue with the candidate also on keeping federal education funds from Jim Crow states by presidential action, although unfortunately he came out against the Powell amendment as "unnecessary."

Stevenson replied that he was amazed that Meany "misunderstood" him.

Mrs. Roosevelt issued a statement through a pro-Stevenson group. She was amazed that everybody was misunderstanding her man: "the confusion and misunderstanding that have arisen concerning Adlai Stevenson's position on civil rights seem to be difficult to understand."

The news item didn't say what she thought his "real" position is. Or what hers is.

Thurgood Marshall, NAACP chief counsel, expressed "shock" that Stevenson would "espouse the cause of the South." He also said: "For his information, he won't get as many white votes in the South as he thinks he's going to by saying these things."

"CHIEF MICROBE"

Clarence Mitchell, Washington Bureau director for the NAACP, had some pointed things to say about Adlai Stevenson and the liberals in a speech in Berkeley Feb. 11.

If Stevenson threw his weight behind civil-rights legislation, Mitchell said, he could put it through Congress. But "the chief roadblock is the abject surrender of some liberals in Congress, most of whom support the Stevenson candidacy."

"In its present state," added Mitchell, "the Democratic Party represents a serious threat to national security. Democrats suffer from a native disease, with Senator James O. Eastland as the 'chief microbe' poisoning the bloodstream of the nation."

Rep. Powell, Democrat from Harlem (he of the Powell amendment), announced that he would support... Eisenhower. Since Eisenhower is not only against the Powell amendment, and not only has kept silent on the whole issue, but is also the man who actually has the power to do something, and is doing nothing—Powell's switch can be understood only as a means of venting anger against the Democrats and Stevenson.

In her Feb. 6 column, Washington columnist Doris Fleenon wrote up "what is coming to be known as the great debate inside the Stevenson camp." It "raged far into the night" at the Fresno meeting of the California Democratic Council, where Kefauver had "sent" the delegates with some militant talk, while Stevenson's speech "began with St. Paul and ended with Toynebee."

"Underneath the Fresno platform which Sen. Kefauver had just quit, a tight knot of Stevenson staffman and supporters huddled tensely...."

"Passionately the local Democrats argued that Stevenson had to 'pep up' his remarks, demagogue it at least enough to keep alive the warm partisan temper Kefauver had so skillfully evoked...."

SAY SOMETHING, ADLAI

But Stevenson stood firm as a rock: "I don't intend to take positions in this campaign which would reduce my effectiveness as president."

This last public statement, by the way, is the answer also to those Stevenson apologists who are kidding themselves that their tin hero is only biding his time: just let him get elected president and he'll show 'em....

In a phantasmagorical editorial, on

Feb. 9 the New York Post—which long ago committed itself to Stevenson head over heels—displayed its bleeding heart over its Galahad's views on civil rights.

The editorial began by claiming to believe that Stevenson honestly holds the views he expressed, and that he is not merely interested in holding Southern racist support; that he is bedeviled by heartburn over "Lincoln's agony" in failing to stop the Civil War, etc.

After this half-hearted attempt at a moral whitewash of the man, the Post stated its disagreement with his stand as "inadequate." It also cogently showed up his argument about "gradualism."

What is fantastic about the editorial is its explicit idea that the trouble with Stevenson is not that he proposes to do nothing about the situation in the South, but simply that he has not sufficiently expressed his moral distaste for it in words.

Stevenson's failure, it says, "is not in his refusal to embrace certain particular legislative or political formulae." And men may "reasonably differ" over the Powell amendment.

Nowhere in the editorial, in fact, is Stevenson criticized for his stand on any of the proposals to do something about the Southern racists. Rather—

"The deeper failure is the absence of articulate passion over the injustices...."

"It is not in behalf of any detailed blueprint that we wish Stevenson's voice were raised far more clearly. It is in behalf of simple justice... [etc.]"

"Surely Stevenson must be moved by the human ordeal of this girl.... Why doesn't he say so...?"

"Once again men may honorably differ on exactly what steps could or should be taken in such a crisis. But surely [it] warranted a fervent cry for justice and a call for the restoration of democratic government...."

PRAYER TO AN IDOL

All of this ends with a prayer, literally:

"We pray that in the end Stevenson's devotion to justice and equality will be heard far more plainly... because his own soul has been stirred."

The Post doesn't say whether, in its view, "men may honorably differ" about the justice shown by the University of Alabama authorities in ousting Miss Lucy from the school in response to mob action. Stevenson has endorsed the university's stand.

These liberals also gloss over the fact that Stevenson's stand is one of the main public forces encouraging the racists' resort to violence. When violence and mob rule makes the Stevensons call for a back-down, the new KKKers say: Boys, it's working!

But what the Post wants is (to use the term introduced by Doris Fleenon) that Stevenson "demagogue it enough" to save face.

After all, what's the alternative? Split the Democratic Party? Isn't Negro blood and freedom a small price to pay for the privilege of keeping labor and the liberals happily united with Lyndon Johnson, Herman Talmadge, the votes of the White Citizens Council and the natural-gas senators, so that those bad Republicans can be kept out of Washington?

Bible Lesson

Adlai Stevenson, justifying his persistent "moderation" about doing anything to defend Negro rights in the South, quoted the Bible the other day—1 Corinthians, to be exact.

"It seems to me that the right answers to most of today's hard problems do not lie at the extremes," he said. "But restraint and responsibility in tone and emphasis do not mean dilution or half measures. They mean, as St. Paul said to the Corinthians, 'And every man that striveth for the mastery is temperate in all things.'"

One should also quote the verse before and after that one, because it just so happens that Paul was talking precisely about the 1956 presidential race:

"Know ye not that they which run in a race run all, but one receiveth the prize? So run, that ye may obtain."

"And every man that striveth for the mastery is temperate in all things. Now they do it to obtain a corruptible crown...." (9-24, 25.)

Fight for Negro — —

(Continued from page 1)

jail sentences will intimidate the rest into giving up. All indications say this is false.

As the wife of one of the Negro leaders whose home was bombed said: "Whoever is responsible for these bombings isn't going to end the boycott that way. We're all in this to the end."

Other violence has occurred in connection with the efforts of Negroes to vote. NAACP leaders have been murdered after registering for elections and announcing intentions to exercise the franchise.

During the past several elections there has been an increase in the number of Southern Negro voters. Under the leadership of the NAACP, the Negroes are determined to increase the total still further this year.

A Miami representative of the NAACP has charged recently that 12 Negroes who registered to vote in a rural Northwest Florida county have been subjected to violence, the burning of crosses near their homes, and in one case, the firing of a barrage of bullets into his home. The Governor of Florida has promised an investigation, but one can guess what it will amount to.

Accompanying the physical violence, there has been intensive economic pressure directed against Negroes who try to vote, who file petitions for school desegregation, who speak out in protest against Jim Crow.

NEO-KLAN

Organizing the campaign to forestall Negro advances are the mushrooming White Citizens Councils. The WCC was formed in Mississippi in 1954, and under slightly different names, has spread to most other Southern states. Recently the Councils, which are composed of leading Southern citizens, businessmen, professionals, state and national government figures, etc., have formed a federation of the state organizations. Despite the "respectability" of their membership and leadership, the WCCs have connections with other right-wing and even fascist groups in this country (Gerald L. K. Smith, for example), and have gone in for anti-Semitic propaganda.

Officially most of the WCCs have deplored violence and confined their efforts to economic pressure. As James Desmond wrote in a series in the N. Y. Daily News last November: "It is a weapon that works. Negroes have been fired from their jobs, kicked off their tenant farms, refused credit and badgered by public utilities for dissenting from the ruling white class in communities where the WCC is strong." Nor have whites been immune. Anti-Jim Crow whites in the South have been subjected to the same kind of pressure from the WCC.

The meaning of this pressure was brought dramatically home to Northerners recently by press accounts of a loan made to a Southern Negro by a New York local union. A Southern bank had threatened the Negro with foreclosure on his home unless he repaid a loan, in order to punish him for anti-Jim Crow action. The union loan to this victim has shown one of the things which the labor movement and other democratic forces can do to help the Southern Negroes' fight.

NULLIFIERS

While officially eschewing violence, the WCCs openly or covertly encourage it or blink at it. A WCC leader recently praised the actions of the mob which prevented Autherine Lucy from attending classes. They have also issued inflammatory statements that only violence will end Jim Crow in the South.

The Autherine Lucy case (detailed in last week's issue) has been the most dramatic focus of the major fight over school desegregation and the Supreme Court decision. In the interim provided by the court for enforcement, most of the Deep South leaders have announced plans to circumvent it by hook or crook.

Many of the "legal" methods projected were described in LA's issue of Dec. 12. Mississippi Sen. Eastland has taken the lead in rallying white-supremacy meetings and the WCCs to subvert the court decision. It is only in the U. S. that the head of a legislative Internal Security body is the leader of the only existing movement openly calling for the subversion of government policy by force and violence.

Some states, led by Georgia, have taken the tack of simply announcing that the desegregation decision will not be obeyed, period. They pass legislative resolution declaring the decision "nullified," or "interposing" the state government between the federal court and the people.

Associated with the latter gimmick is a plan to offer an anti-segregation amendment to the Constitution, which the Southern states would then block, after which they would claim that the country has "rejected" federal interference in states rights.

POWELL'S TEST

Congressman Adam Clayton Powell Jr. (Dem., New York) has offered an amendment to the current aid-to-education bill which calls for withholding of federal funds from school districts which had not yet taken steps toward integration. This amendment clearly deserves the support of all who claim to be democrats.

But sad to relate, the labor movement and the liberals have shown a lukewarm attitude toward it. That Eisenhower and Stevenson should oppose it occasions no surprise. But that so many liberals and labor leaders (Reuther and the UAW leadership being honorable exceptions) should remain mum or openly oppose it is a disgrace.

To answer the spurious argument that the president has such powers already, Powell has challengingly proposed to withdraw his amendment if the president will publicly declare his intention of using this power.

Some liberals apologize for their attitude on the ground that the Southern senators will filibuster the whole aid-to-education bill to death. Just as the University of Alabama officials gave in to mob rule in the Lucy case (charitably assuming they did not welcome it), these liberals propose giving in to the more refined Southern mobsters in the Senate.

Throughout, much of the press gives the impression that in the South the fight is between a monolithic Negro race and a monolithic white race. This is a distorted picture.

There are strong elements in the South who are against Jim Crow and who wish its abolition. And while these are probably in the minority, they are reinforced by a more sizable number of Southern whites who, while not firm opponents of Jim Crow, are ready to comply with the federal rules, as the student reaction to the mob violence to the University of Alabama shows.

These two groups of whites, together with the Negroes, most likely compose a majority of the population of the South. And while the Negroes of the South have been putting up a valiant struggle in behalf of their rights, they, together with the Southern whites who wish to resist the racists, need aid.

DRIVING AHEAD

A Washington government that was seriously anti-Jim-Crow could strike decisive blows: like the Powell amendment; like Department of Justice intervention against racist violence; like punishing the Jim Crow states by depriving them of congressional representation in accordance with the Constitution's requirements. But this will not come from Eisenhower—or Stevenson.

The Negroes are not banking on Washington. They have the right and the duty to defend themselves in every possible way against the lynchers, new KKK groups, racist terrorists and assassins. They are driving ahead with the lines of struggle sketched above.

During the war the March on Washington movement led by A. Philip Randolph wrung the FEPC from Roosevelt. A similar mobilization today could wrest decisive gains in enforcement and legislation from a reluctant administration and Congress. It is typical of them that labor leaders and liberals have been cool to such a militant course.

A good first step in this direction is the civil-rights lobby planned for March 4-6. Under sponsorship of the NAACP, many unions, the ADA, the Civil Liberties Union, the American Veterans Committee and other groups, 2000 delegates representing 50 organizations will gather in the capital. It can produce results, especially if backed up by supporting demonstrations and mass rallies.

It is perhaps vain to expect trade-union politics and liberal and Negro leaders to proclaim that they will not support any candidates or any party that remain callous to the needs of the Negro fight. But surely the rank and file behind these leaders should make clear to them how they stand.

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

Late News on the Civil War

Stevenson Comes Out 4-Square Against Firing on Fort Sumter

By GEORGE RAWLINGS

The Civil War seems to be very much in the news. For one thing, Adlai Stevenson has just come out against it, though not in time.

For another, Senator Eastland of Mississippi is rallying the South for the battle of Bull Run, also behind schedule.

For Eastland this seems to be in character. An article on him in the N. Y. Post quotes a friend as saying, "As a boy Jim could fight the Civil War all over again—and he could now."

For Stevenson, this last-ditch opposition to firing on Fort Sumter is less in character. After all, Stevenson is supposed to be a literate scholar.

However, it has been understandably difficult for this honorable man to admit that he is inhibited by his deal with the Southern racists for support toward the Democratic nomination. He has preferred to pose in the mantle of Abe Lincoln, soul torn in anguish over the prospect of splitting the union.

"I think that would be a great mistake," said the new Lincoln, when asked whether the federal government should use force to compel integration in the South. "That is exactly what brought about the difficult Civil War and division of the union."

It was the liberal apologists for Stevenson who saw the Lincoln touch in this, somewhat mistaking the source of the candidate's evident anguish, not to speak of embarrassment.

To compare this Stevenson with Lincoln, however, requires great will power, enough to ignore both history and logic as well as plain morals.

The comparison displays a thorough lack of any historical feel or sense. To begin with, the whole social context is radically different, making any glib analogy a matter of doubletalk.

LINCOLN'S ROLE

Lincoln was the leader of a new minority party in 1860, a party which had managed to win the election because of a split in the ranks of the Democratic Party, which was breaking up under the pressure of the sectional conflict. This party was oriented to support American industrial capitalism, which was hampered by two other class forces. One was the control of the Senate by Southern slave-owning planters whose class interests were in conflict with industrial capitalism; the other was the Northern farmer who needed free land—free both of high prices and of slave-labor competition—and whose expansion would provide for widespread expansion of railroads, merchandising organizations, ag-

ricultural equipment and land speculation.

The Southern aristocracy believed with much justification that they had serious prospects of winning either a political or a military struggle with Northern capitalism. And it was the dominant class in the South, at the head of a unified social system, not yet threatened by a rising native capitalist class.

Lincoln's entire line of attack was clear: break the Southern resistance to Northern (i.e., capitalist) expansion. His formulation was summed up in the slogan: "This nation cannot exist half-slave and half-free"—i.e., with two different social systems.

RISKED WAR

Lincoln recognized the need for a radical transformation of the South. He acted in such a way in the first months of his presidency as to make it quite clear that he was risking at every point the possibility of war if his demands were not met.

When he sent supplies to Fort Sumter over Southern protests and with full knowledge of the high likelihood that this could mean war, Lincoln was not following a policy of "moderation," but rather of revolutionary war.

It is true, of course, that Lincoln until his death represented the center grouping of the revolutionary Northern bourgeoisie, with such as Johnson (War Democrat governor of Tennessee, later vice-president, and then president upon Lincoln's death) to the right of him, and the Radical Republicans (led by Sumner and Stevens) to the left. Lincoln vacillated at all times upon the question of carrying the social revolution to its conclusion: the creation of a class of yeoman farmers recruited from the former slaves and poor-white farmers who would profit by a distribution of the land of 70,000 Southern planter aristocrats.

He was more "moderate," then, than the Radical Republicans, and partially was responsible although unwittingly for the failure to extend the social revolution in the South and for the consequent colonial status of the South.

But this does not in any way mean that Stevenson's "moderation" is the same as that of Lincoln. Only the word

is the same—the reality is quite different.

NO HONEST ABE

Stevenson is the leader of a party which essentially is the majority party, despite the present Republican executive raised to power by the huckster-virtues of Eisenhower.

Instead of leading a party pledged to effect any kind of social transformation of American society, he is leading a party which is trying to regain power by moving right.

The Southern racists are not a force comparable to the Southern aristocracy of the Confederacy. They are fighting a delaying action, at best, and have no serious prospects of winning any sort of war.

They become more and more irrelevant as a group that can hold independent social power to the extent that the South becomes integrated into the national economy, that union organization take place, and that there is a militant response of Southern Negroes to racism.

There is no possibility of the resumption of anything that could be called "Civil War," a notion so absurd as to show up as pathetic the historical understanding of the witty intellectual.

It is true that some Southern elements may really resort to sporadic or limited violence, especially if encouraged by Northern appeasers who are in a hurry to raise the bogey of civil war; and it is even possible, though not probable, that a federal government which is willing to crack down with all its weapons might include among these weapons the use of force against local KKK rioters, etc. But this is not civil war, unless Stevenson really claims to believe that Eastland, Talmadge and Co. will secede.

THE CONTRAST

Lincoln was a leader of a revolutionary movement, who was a "moderate" only in comparison with the radical wing of the then Republican Party. Stevenson is a moderate even in comparison with Earl Warren.

Lincoln risked splits with various sections of the Republican Party in order to push forward his program. Stevenson struggles to keep the Southern Democracy behind him at all costs.

Lincoln acted in a fashion that clearly risked war. Stevenson acts in a way which cries for appeasement of and submission to the demands of the racists.

Lincoln faced the concrete probability that the Southern aristocrats would fight back with some belief that they could win. Stevenson faces the concrete situation in which the Southern racists are weaker than ever before and could not even contemplate standing up against any sort of sustained and courageous enforcement of the Supreme Court decisions.

Stevenson and Lincoln have little in common outside of Illinois residence. Those who attempt to draw a close parallel between these two are engaged in self-delusion at best.

If one must have superficial parallels in history, then Adlai Stevenson's counterpart in the Civil War decade was President Andrew Johnson—but even that may be doing a greater dishonor to Johnson than is warranted; for Johnson was the leader of the "Mensheviks" of the Second American Revolution against slavery, a faction which was at least verbally committed to the then revolutionary cause.

Three New Pamphlets by Leon Trotsky on the 1905 Revolution

"1905: Before and After" ..25c
 "1905: Results and Perspectives"25c
 "In Defense of Insurrection"10c
All three for 50c.
LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
 114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

100 YEARS AFTER THE DRED SCOTT CASE

Speaking of the Civil War—like everybody else these days—columnist Thomas Stokes, whose nationally syndicated Washington think-pieces are pro-Democratic, thinks back a hundred years and sees his favorite party "disintegrating" under the impact of the civil-rights issue. (That's putting it strongly unless he means its liberal wing is disintegrating.)

"History repeats itself, but never in the same way. . . . But, as we stand off and take a calm look at the political scene today and see the disintegrating effect on the Democratic Party of the May 17, 1954 public school desegregation decision of the Supreme Court, it is almost reflex to think back to the March 1857 decision of the Supreme Court in the Dred Scott case." (Feb. 14 column.)

In that case a Democratic chief justice upheld the slave-owners. Three years later a new third party won its first national election; the Democrats split into fragments.

"Nobody would, of course, forecast any such catastrophic effects upon the present Democratic Party," he assures us, but they're "sorely troubled."

He Will Not Be Moved

Stevenson has rejected even the one proposal made by President Eisenhower, who himself hasn't been exactly in the forefront of those proposing to do something about the Southern racist war on the Negroes.

Eisenhower suggested that a special commission be created to study possible violations of the civil-rights provisions of the Constitution.

The Lord knows, or at any rate every Negro knows, that this weak proposal was just a stall. The situation in the South cries not for a study commission but for decisive action.

Yet Stevenson, going down the line for his Southern friends and fellow-voters, came out even against this much. He said:

"Such a study seems unnecessary. Where such violations have occurred, the Department of Justice already has adequate investigative machinery to establish the facts and full authority to take appropriate action.

This would make sense if Stevenson were proposing something better. It is just cynicism from a man who, at the same time, is arguing against any federal "coercive action."

Orwell's personal account of the Spanish Civil War

HOMAGE TO CATALONIA by George Orwell

\$3.50 Order from: LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE 114 West 14 Street, New York City

At last available!

The SECOND volume of Leon Trotsky's THE FIRST FIVE YEARS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

384 pages.....Paper covers \$3.00

All orders must be accompanied by payment.

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

Is Lyndon Johnson Really Jeff Davis?

In anticipation of the Lincoln's Birthday celebration, it was not only Adlai Stevenson who brought up the Civil War but also the senators involved in the natural-gas steal.

In the World's Greatest Deliberative Body (as the upper house is affectionately known among its inhabitants) the war against the Damn Yankees was fought all over again.

Following is a scene out of the congressional debate on the Harris-Fulbright bill. It shows, incidentally, that while Southerners have often criticized the absentee corporations which dominate their section, in practice (as in the case of this gas bill) they often end up as spokesmen for these same absentee owners.

SEN. DOUGLAS: . . . I do object to the guarantee of excessive profits by state action, paid by the consumers, and not going to the citizens of those states, but going to carpetbag companies which come down there and masquerade as native sons.

SEN. MONRONEY: Are you referring to any Oklahoma corporations?

SEN. DOUGLAS: I launched upon this response to Senator Fulbright's statement that it was the Yankees who were trying to keep the Southerners down. I was not aware of the fact that John D. Rockefeller pulled the lanyard of the gun which fired on Fort Sumter, or that Sir Henry Detterding and Queen Wilhelmina, of Royal Dutch Shell, served in Pickett's division which charged across Gettysburg and Cemetery Ridge, or that Mr. H. L. Doherty held the bridle of Traveler as Lee moved southward to stillness and tragedy at Appomatox.

What is happening is that Eastern companies come down and foreign companies come down into these states and are dressed up in Confederate uniform and are said to be native sons, and I simply urge my colleagues not to be taken in by that.

SEN. DANIEL: I don't know about Oklahoma, but we [in Texas] do have some native sons who are engaged in the business.

SEN. DOUGLAS: I have heard of them. I think I have not only heard of them; I have felt them, I think I have felt their marks upon my head.

SEN. MONRONEY: I might add that Oklahoma has its share of native sons who are still in the oil business.

SEN. PASTORE: Are there any further questions on the Civil War? (Laughter.)

Stevenson Down the Line for South — —

(Continued from page 1)

attend classes at the University of Alabama is deplorable. The fact that this came about as the result of mob violence is intolerable. At this point the sovereignty of the State of Alabama became the issue—and there can be only one proper answer. The law must be obeyed."

From the phrasing of the above statement, it appears that in Stevenson's hierarchy of values obedience to the law stands far above the rights of an individual. But let that pass. The real point is that in the rest of the statement he nowhere suggested that Alabama or anyone else really do anything to enforce the law: he did not even refer to the fact which is clear to anyone at all who has been reading the dispatches; that the officials of that state are in a conspiracy to violate it. Quite the contrary. He apologized for them.

Immediately following the quotation above he continued:

"But it seems to me the extreme interpretation many people have put upon the incident is unfortunate. In the first place it appears that the officials of the university have behaved responsibly from the beginning. Now Governor Folsom has said that they will have his full backing—that he will never support mob rule over constituted authority...."

"As things now stand, I think we can assume that order will be restored on the campus at Tuscaloosa and that Miss Lucy will return to her classes...."

HE IS "SURPRISED"

Stevenson did not bother to explain whether his praise for the behavior of

the officials of the University of Alabama referred primarily to their initial resistance to the admission of Miss Lucy, or their present announced determination to keep her out of school and to go to the Supreme Court if necessary to do it. At the time he made the statement these actions of the university authorities had been announced in the press of the whole country.

On the following day, which just happened to be Lincoln's birthday, Stevenson issued a full statement on his stand on the question. This statement began with the astounding assertion that "I am surprised that anything I could say on that subject [civil rights] would still be news. My attitude has not changed since I first had a part in integrating Negroes in the naval service fifteen years ago and my views have been reflected in my subsequent public record."

Here is a man running for president of the United States. He is seeking to run as the nominee of the Democratic Party. That party's internal affairs are enlivened by the fact that it contains within it both the strongest Negro and white supporters of civil rights and its most adamant and active opponents. The issue of civil rights is being fought out in the South with gun, whip and economic boycott, with state governments in open defiance of a Supreme Court decision, with a courageous struggle by the Negroes of the area for the realization of the right to vote, ride as equals in public transportation, and go to school, which they have finally won by judicial decision.

And yet this man is "surprised that

anything I could say on the subject would be news."

ECHO OF THE SOUTH

From this promising beginning, his statement went on to its predestined climax in the assertion that "I can think of no greater disservice to our country than to exploit for political ends the tensions that have followed in the wake of the Supreme Court decision."

"Our purpose must be to attain unity, harmony and civilized relations, not to set section against section or race against race. And as a practical matter we must recognize that punitive action by the federal government may actually delay the process of integration in education."

He then went on to state one of the pet claims of the moderate wing of the Southern white-supremacist leadership in clear and unmistakable terms, and to state it as his own:

"Certainly we will not improve the present condition or future prospects of any Negro citizen by coercive federal action that will arm the extremists and disarm the men of goodwill in the South who, with courage and patience, have already accomplished so much."

This is just a rephrasing of the "outside interference" thesis on the basis of which people like Governor Folsom denounce the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People for pushing the struggle for equality in the South.

But his Lincoln's Birthday statement, instead of ending the problem for him, just opened it up further. Roy Wilkins, NAACP executive secretary, attacked

Stevenson for his position, and stated that it was precisely this kind of thing which encourages the Southern leadership in Congress to frustrate all anti-discrimination legislation.

Stevenson came back next day with a statement which, though it was obviously designed to conciliate Wilkins, made the presidential candidate's real position clearer:

"I have never suggested," Stevenson said, "that our Negro citizens should not claim their rights, or should claim them gradually. Claiming the rights, however, does not necessarily secure them. That is our problem. I agree with Mr. Wilkins that this problem can be solved by goodwill, good deeds and with understanding and forbearance. This is exactly what I have been saying."

Just where and when Wilkins said what Stevenson quoted him as saying is unclear. But Stevenson's point is quite clear. As far as he is concerned, the Negroes in the South can go ahead and "claim" their rights. They need not even "claim" them gradually, but can do so all at once. From the context it is clear that by "claim" Stevenson means they can talk about them.

For the moment they start to do something about them, and their action is resisted by the whites, Stevenson's contribution to the ensuing struggle will be to talk about goodwill, good deeds, understanding and forbearance.

CYNICISM

It is a positively eye-popping example of political cynicism cloaked in clouds of rotarian oratory.

One Negro leader after another in the South is bombed, shot down in broad daylight on the courthouse steps when seeking to register, boycotted, threatened and terrorized. One state holds a constitutional convention to get around the Supreme Court decision on school desegregation, and the state legislatures of at least three others vote to defy it. A United States senator addresses a howling mob and urges them to do everything in their power to violate the rights of their fellow citizens and the law of the land which, almost a hundred years after the freeing of the slaves, has spelled out these rights for them. All these people, every single one of them, are members or leaders of the Democratic Party.

And what does Stevenson have to say to them—this Stevenson who is seeking the nomination of the Democratic Party for the highest office in the land? Does he denounce them? Does he urge that they be arrested? Does he demand that not one penny of federal money be spent in their area until they comply with the provisions of the law? Does he, at least, say that any man who advocates violation of the rights of others and of the laws which guarantee them should be run out of the Democratic Party of which he seeks to remain the head?

No. He talks about the wisdom of gradualism; the excess of passion; the determination not to "exploit for political ends" one of the most pressing political issues of the day.

He places the enforcement of law above the rights of the individual in his scale of values, and then endorses the action of those who either are violating the law, or at least show no intention whatever of enforcing it.

That is the plain truth about Adlai Stevenson and his stand on the struggle which is convulsing the South.

We are not psychologists, and we have no access to his inner motivations. But on the face of it, one thing is clear. He has made his deal with the Southern leadership, and he firmly intends to stick by it.

Here is certainly one man who much prefers to be president than to be right!

'Nation' and Eisenhower — —

(Continued from page 1)

course, made "peace" synonymous with any and all tendencies toward a negotiated deal for appeasement of Russian Stalinism ("coexistence"), and while he thought he saw hope in this direction from Eisenhower and Charlie Wilson, he was even more sure that it was the Democrats who were most insistent on intensive cold war.

Stone, in turn, had a predecessor of a sort: Henry Wallace in the days when he was on leading strings as front man for the Progressive Party. In 1948 Wallace, while running for the presidency, made it clear that, in a choice between Truman and Robert Taft, he would prefer Taft.

Why Taft? He preferred Taft insofar as he felt Taft was an "isolationist," insofar as he felt that Taft was blind to American capitalism's international interests, insofar as he considered him to be a "troglydyte" or "dinosaur" in foreign policy.

If good old Charlie Wilson (whom Stone actually called "a blunt and honest old shop foreman") was so hip on doing good for both GM and the country that he wanted to cut the budget, therefore to cut the war budget, therefore to come to some peaceful deal with Russia, so that taxes could be reduced and free enterprise rewarded for its sufferings... why, then, he is a "progressive capitalist" or something, and certainly far preferable to warmongers who invent slogans like "containing Communism." Or so Stone (and the *Nation* editors) reason.

This is what the Stalinoid means by the "liberal Republicans."

It is the politics of the lesser evil, as before; but it is lesser-evil politics applied on the basis of demoralization and disillusionment with the Democrats.

It is a distinctively Stalinoid twist on the lesser evil approach insofar as it makes the cry of peace the "overriding" issue. Unlike home-grown liberalism, Stalinism has always derived its domestic policy from its foreign policy—i.e., from the politics of acting as a border guard for Russia.

BANDWAGON

Hence the *Nation*. It is now groping in the footsteps of Stone and Wallace, under the impact of the spreading waves of disgust with Adlai Stevenson's watery liberalism.

His health aside, says the *Nation*, "there can be little doubt that most liberals" would rather see him nominated than any other Republican. This will be news to Stevenson-liberals who will be overjoyed if Eisenhower doesn't run; but you see, the *Nation* doesn't say it's FOR Eisenhower.

"After all, liberal sentiment had much to do with bringing the president forward as a candidate" in 1952, says the

Nation. This will be news to literate people who thought the Dewey-Eastern wing of the GOP fat cats brought the general out to charm the voters. But still, you see, the *Nation* isn't quite FOR Eisenhower....

We can't decide whom we're for, explains the *Nation*, until we have answers to "key questions." First key question is: "Will the president run?" Second key question is: If not, will Warren run?

The editorial might have been entitled, "Should Liberals Climb Aboard Eisenhower's Bandwagon Before the Band Is There?"

This leads to the second phase of the editorial. A theory is developed that liberals should in general withhold their commitment until the last possible moment. For "the liberal or independent vote is courted because it is uncommitted.... The moment they are committed, their influence declines." After all liberals are "a permanent political minority."

Was there ever such a frank avowal of political impotency? Can one imagine this puerile nonsense from a movement which did not feel utterly bankrupt? The picture of the liberal held by the *Nation* is not that of the crusader barging into public life with a program and some aims to fight for, a banner. It is the picture of the liberal sitting back by his TV set listening to rival speeches and reminding the candidates that they have to bid for his vote.

NO KNIGHT ERRANTS

Then comes the third strike on the self-confessed bankrupt. "This year," says the *Nation*, "liberals should be particularly wary of premature commitment." Because this year, it proceeds to explain, there is less difference between the parties than ever before! "On any number of major issues," they have "basically the same position" or are split in the same way; both are run by their right wings.

This puts the liberal, no longer a Crusader, but just a passive TV bystander, in something of a quandary in choosing even a lesser evil, doesn't it?

Solution: thus the liberal "must be concerned this year not so much with platforms or party records or preferences for this candidate or that."—Look at what the lesser evil has become!—"The formula which should guide his thinking should be: which candidate can most effectively and skillfully mobilize the best elements in his party and the country behind a program that will forward the search for peace in the world and the continued well-being of this country?..."

So that brings us right back to where I. F. Stone was two years ago.

We must not, certainly not, fight for our own liberal liberal program: "The bal-

ance of forces within the country is not so preponderantly on the side of the angels that we can tolerate much knight-errantry," say these liberal editors of the *Nation* in accents that unwittingly echo the brutal cynicism of all political hacks about "idealistic" politics.

The putrescent state of this liberalism is so advanced that you can smell the rotting flesh as it crumbles off the bone.

These moldering liberals do not even bother to explain why another Eisenhower administration would be a bulwark of peace. But they are ready to weigh this in against every other consideration: "One well-placed H-bomb would put all the publicly owned power dams in the Pacific Northwest out of operation for a long time."

Therefore, presumably, what difference does it make whether this pacifist Ike is also the patron saint of shameless capitalist exploitation? As long as he keeps us out of war....

For these people, foreign policy and internal policy exist in two separate watertight compartments.

ON THE DOUBLE!

This has a mirror-image: the traditional liberals who are willing to go along with a reactionary foreign policy because of domestic-policy considerations. These are the bisymmetric opposites of the *Nation* type of Stalinoids.

They are no less impotent and demoralized. In its February 6 issue, the *New Republic* sounded off an editorial blast against the *Nation*: "Must We Be Saved by the GOP?" After attacking its colleague's leaning toward Eisenhower, the *NR* ended up with one of the world's most rousing calls to action:

"Stand by your guns! Men who believe in Stevenson's ideas rally to Stevenson; those who believe in Eisenhower's Republicanism rally to Eisenhower; but let no journal of opinion flirt with candidates who repudiate its ideas...."

Stand by your guns, men!—What guns?—Why, any old blunderbuss you have, of course!

Marchons, citoyens, forward to the fray in whatever direction you like. Any fray.

Damn the torpedoes full speed ahead in a perfect circle.

The Lesser Evil has turned on itself and is biting its own tail: Don't "throw your vote away" on a third party, vote for Eisenhower and peace! If we form a labor party, won't those bad reactionary Democrats get elected...?

—All this is the stewing, shabby, cankered politics of a liberal-labor tradition that has come to a dead end. These liberals are nothing but a withered appendage to the two-party system. When will labor cut-loose from these straw men, and go into politics on its own?

A Basic Pamphlet—

**SOCIALISM:
THE HOPE OF
HUMANITY**

by
Max Shachtman

Read it! **10 cents**

Labor Action Book Service

114 West 14 Street, New York City