

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

DECEMBER 19, 1955

FIVE CENTS

FRANCE: Conference of the 'New Left' . . . page 3

VIETNAM: SP Leader Exposes Diem's Fraud . . . page 6

BRITAIN: After Twenty Years of Attlee . . . page 3

MIDDLE EAST: The Asian Socialists' Plan . . . page 6

Hillquit, Deutscher, and Stalinist Illusions . . . page 4

HISTORY WAS MADE:

Merger Stirs Labor to Hope, NAM to Fear

Labor Party Threat Takes the Spotlight Despite—or Because of—Meany's Protests

By GORDON HASKELL

The unification of the American labor movement has been presented by its leaders and spokesmen as primarily a defensive move. The labor movement, they say, has to unite because the employers and an employer-dominated government are making things tough for the workers of the country and the organizations which represent them.

But in the very act of drawing together for self-defense, the organized labor movement in this country has created a potential force which could have almost incalculable political consequences, and which, even under the worst circumstances, is bound to have considerable ones. As we reported last week, the merger convention, repeatedly and despite itself, tended to take on the appearance of an enormous political rally.

What was new was the feeling of potential political power. What was new was a reflection of this political power in the constant denials by leading spokesmen of the new movement that it exists, or that it will be used, while at the same time their adversaries in the capitalist class were howling to high heaven that the dam which has been holding back labor's political power is about to break (if it hasn't already broken), and their way of life is doomed as a consequence.

It was no doubt an accident of history that the National Association of Manufacturers met in their 60th annual convention a few blocks from where the AFL-CIO was gathered. As the militant, class-conscious wing of capitalist conservatism, the NAM sought to awaken the whole of the capitalist class to the danger inherent in the AFL-CIO merger. Unlike the labor leaders, who try to assume the mien of politically powerless educators as a protective coloration, the leaders of the NAM try to appear before the public as the prophets and agitators of an embattled minority movement which is in stubborn but almost futilely

principled struggle against the engulfing wave of "communism."

The NAM elected as its new president one Cola G. Parker, who informed the assembled capitalists that increasing government controls are pushing the nation toward "the achievement of a Communist state as blueprinted by Karl Marx."

He made it clear that what he was talking about was, among other things, the graduated income tax, free education, the minimum wage ("The government tells us and then they must get a dollar an hour, even though their productivity may be so low that no one will pay them a dollar an hour"), and worst of all, the union shop. ("Worse yet, in vast areas of endeavor, a man cannot get a job unless he first belongs to a

(Continued on page 7)

By JACK WILSON

For once, the much belabored clichés of "historic occasion," "milestone in labor history," "new chapter," etc. really described the event: the merger convention of the AFL and CIO. The first day of the AFL-CIO convention gave a misleading and superficial impression: it sounded just like the same old routine but it simply was not.

Nor could the event be understood in terms of journalese. The AFL did not "swallow up" the CIO; the CIO did not "capture" the AFL; it was not a "marriage" or a "honeymoon." These are expressions that evade critical analysis. What did happen was the formal and permanent appearance on the American social scene of a single, powerful, hitherto dreamed-about, unified labor movement—whose strength frightens many like the National Association of Manufacturers, which met simultaneously in the city in a somewhat dazed condition.

Another difficulty in properly appraising the AFL-CIO convention stems from the prosaic character of its overwhelmingly decisive feature: the plain and unadorned fact that it happened. If nothing else occurred, this alone would give content and weight to the event. More, however, did take place and it combined to furnish a real exciting step forward in labor's destiny.

In many respects, the unity of labor is not so much an achievement of trade-union leaders—although this is a factor—as it is an end-result of the conservative social climate and reactionary political pressures that dominated the nation in recent years. It may well turn out to be the most lasting monument to the anti-labor administration in Washington.

Labor unity, in the strategic sense, was a defensive action. It is a concrete answer to the perplexities of failure on the political and economic fronts. The Taft-Hartley Law is still on the books. No important social legislation has been passed in almost 20 years. This convention was another way in which labor said that the old methods were not enough any more.

BECK BACKS DOWN

In achieving labor unity, the 15,000,000 organized workers set up a new and different set of rules for operation, which will have a slow but significant impact in the internal growth of the organization. The convention did take up three Rs—racketeering, racism, and raiding—and furnished a moral and political, as well as constitutional, force for change that far exceeded most observers' expectations.

An important case in point on the impact of the new AFL-CIO organization, as well as a clue to the future for racketeering and raiding, was the series of incidents involving Dave Beck, Teamsters union president, whose pre-convention role was built up partly through his ignoble attempts to act as a big-time political operator, and through the anxiety of newspapermen to get headline news on a Reuther-versus-Beck basis.

Beck announced he was going to enter the new Industrial Union Department of the AFL-CIO, bringing a bloc of 1,300,000 votes against Walter P. Reuther, and

(Turn to last page)



GEORGE MEANY

Sidelights on the Convention

By LEE MARCY

Those delegates who have endured previous AFL convention with their stifling smoggy atmosphere quickly sensed the fresh breezes coming in from the CIO—gentle zephyrs right now perhaps but presaging some gales to come. Straws in the wind: Mazey's speech on civil rights, Reuther's broadside against racketeering and raiding; election of two Negro vice-presidents; and increasing awareness of the need for political activity.

UNION SCALES

A new note was introduced into the convention by an outburst of song. First, the Kohler Strike Chorus roused the convention with the stirring strains of "Solidarity," "We Shall Not Be Moved" and other songs. The chorus, coming out of the bitter Kohler strike of some 3000 UAW workers in Wisconsin for the past 20 months, sang the class struggle into the convention hall.

Old-time AFLers commented on the CIO tradition of singing, a tradition they seemed happy to take over. Harold Rome, Broadway composer of "Pins and Needles" fame, wrote a special song for the occasion, which was premiered at the convention.

The new song was entitled "One Union—AFL-CIO," beginning "The eyes of the world are upon you," and it had things to say like "Labor united, March-

ing hand in hand" and "Building the new tomorrow now..."

Broadway performers also sang two songs from Harold Rome's *Pins and Needles*: "It's Better With a Union Man" which is about "Bertha the sewing-machine girl, A winsome and class-conscious lass"; and "One Big Union for Two" ("I'm on a campaign to make you mine, I'll picket you until you sign In One Big Union for Two...").

STRIKE TALK

Another innovation at the convention was the recurring reference to strikes now in progress—again and again Kohler, Westinghouse, the Florida hotel strike, and the airlines strike.

Not only speakers from the floor but an excellently written booklet distributed to the delegates presented the issues of the Kohler strike and appealed for a boycott of the Kohler products. Carey spoke on the Westinghouse strike and enumerated the strikebreaking techniques of this giant monopoly. Miller of the Hotel Workers Union described the difficulties of the union in organizing the swank hotels of Miami and carefully listed the recently organized hotels in which the delegates were cordially invited to book reservations.

As the delegates filed out of a session, Teamster organizers, now engaged in a campaign to unionize New York's 25,000 taxi drivers, lined up on the street out-

(Turn to last page)

CANADA TOO

The Canadian labor federations that were the northern counterparts of the AFL and CIO are merging too, bringing labor unity across the border.

In 1940 the Canadian Trades and Labor Congress (TLC) had finally followed the example of the AFL and expelled the "upstart" CIO unions, which proceeded to form the Canadian Congress of Labor (CCL). Following a no-raiding agreement which became effective last Jan. 1, the TLC approved merger at its convention last May, and in October the CCL followed suit. The actual merger convention, however, is scheduled for April 1956.

The TLC brings about 600,000 members and the CCL about 400,000 to the united movement, making up a million workers for the single federation.

Harvey Case to Test Draftee Witchhunt

By GODFREY DENIS

The current issue of the *Progressive* has a long article by Milton Mayer on one of the "draftee" cases, recently brought to public attention by the Watts Report on the "loyalty" treatment of draftees in the armed forces. The *Progressive* article is of special interest to the readers of *LA* because it spotlights a case based on membership in the Socialist Youth League and ISL, that of John Harvey.

The Harvey case, much like the Barry Miller case before it, is the sort of thing that liberals should have their noses rubbed in every day. In the first place it answers the common illusion that the witchhunt is directed only against the Stalinist "conspiracy." Secondly, it is a clear case of persecution of political ideas expressed before the individual's induction at that. Thirdly, it is a demonstration of the hair-raising crudity and ignorance of the governmental authorities involved.

About three months before Harvey's discharge from the army he was told to report to Army Intelligence. Two men, civilians, began questioning him. The first question was whether he had attended the University of Chicago. The second question was, "Do you know that there are Jews there?"

Then they began asking him about the organizations he belonged to. The comment on the fact that he had belonged to the NAACP was: "Why do you belong to that, if you are a white man?" When Harvey answered that he believed in racial equality, one of the men said "Do you know that two Negroes raped a white woman near the University of Chicago?"

ALLEGATIONS

He was then asked about the SYL and whether he belonged to the Labor Youth League (Stalinist). After the questioning he was given a statement to sign, and a week later he was taken to the Criminal Investigation Division and given a lie-detector test. (He was not informed that he did not have to take the test.)

Harvey heard nothing more about the whole matter until his discharge. Then he was told that his discharge would be left undetermined until certain derogatory material in his file was disposed of. He was also given the alternative of resigning from the Reserves and accepting a less-than-honorable discharge or standing trial before a Field Board of Officers.

Retaining the noted civil liberties lawyer Francis Heisler, Harvey decided to stand trial and eventually received a letter of "Allegations."

"(a) You were a member of the Independent Socialist League. . . .

"(b) You were a member of the Socialist Youth League. . . .

"(c) You were a member of the Labor Youth League. . . .

"(d) You have parents who were once active in the Young Communist League.

"(e) You have a wife . . . who was an active member of the ISL; whose address book contained the names of several known members of the Communist Party; and whose apartment contained numerous Communist publications including the Communist Manifesto.

"(f) You have a grandfather, John Sebastian Truhar, who attended meetings of the CP regularly.

"(g) You wrote a number of articles for a newspaper published by the ISL."

FANTASTIC CHARGES

Harvey replied that Allegations a and b were true; for a few months before leaving college he had belonged to the ISL and SYL. However, he stated, the organizations in question were anti-Stalinist and had been contesting their listing as subversive for more than six years. The other allegations, he said, were false; for example, far from belonging to the LYL he had, as a socialist delegate, fought them in various campus organizations.

The allegation about his parent's membership in the YCL was probably false, but he did not know, since they had been divorced when he was six months old and he had lived with his grandfather until he was 13; he had met his father only four times since the divorce.

The allegation about his wife was answered by her affidavit that she had

never belonged to the ISL; had no address book, with or without CP names; and that the copy of the Manifesto was one which he, not she, had been required to buy for a course at the University of Wisconsin.

His grandfather was a bitter anti-Communist; and he himself had never written any articles, either for the ISL press or any other.

At the hearing, affidavits from Norman Thomas and other respectable citizens were presented on behalf of the two socialist organizations; and in addition to Harvey, Mrs. Deborah Meier testified for the defense, as an officer of the former SYL. The defense went over the views of the two socialist organizations involved, described the long and to-date fruitless struggle to obtain a hearing on the subversive listing from the attorney general.

After this the board questioned the witnesses (Harvey and Meier) about socialist politics; wanted to know what course Harvey had taken at U. of Chicago; whether he had any contact with Kermit Eby or Maynard Krueger (a former SP candidate); whether Bishop Sheil spoke to the campus group; and whether Harvey had read Marx.

GRANDFATHER'S STORY

During the testimony some attention was paid to the grandfather "who had attended CP meetings regularly." It turned out that the grandfather had very good reasons for being a bitter anti-Stalinist. This grandfather had gotten a job in Russia in the thirties. The conditions there made him unhappy and he soon tried to get out. This proved difficult; after getting Harvey and his grandmother out, he had to wait for a year before he himself could escape and stow away on a freighter.

Counsel Heisler's motions to produce the information on which the allegations were based was refused, as was his motion (following the refusal) to strike out all allegations as either false, unproved, irrelevant, or disproved, and in some cases as unconstitutional under the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution. The board overruled all the motions.

Heisler then summarized. He pointed out that the burden of proving his client's innocence, which he had assumed, was unconstitutional in the U. S.; that the army had refused to introduce any evidence in support of its allegations, or to permit the defense to confront either the accusers or the information on which he case was based.

In American jurisprudence, Heisler added, a man is not held responsible for murder until he has reached the age of seven; how much less responsible should he be held for his grandfather's (unproven) subversion.

"INTELLECTUAL CEMETERY"

His closing words were: "Are we going to try to make of this country a place where there is no loyalty except in unanimity? If we are, we are going to make an intellectual cemetery of this country. Are we going to say to our young men that if they read, if they talk to other people, even though they have served their country and done nothing wrong, we are going to put a blemish on them and on their children and grandchildren?"

Two months after the hearing Harvey was informed that the investigation on his file had been completed and that he would be retained in his present status in the army reserve. He thought this was a vindication, but some months later he was informed that he was to get not an honorable discharge but a "general discharge under honorable conditions"—a category which also acts as a branding stigma, though not as bad as "dishonorable discharge."

"But Cpl. Harvey," writes Mayer, "wanted an honorable discharge, the kind of discharge every man gets who has done his two years' time without kicking a major-general in the pants. So he is going to go to the U. S. courts and ask for relief in the form of a writ of prohibition restraining the U. S. army from inquiring into matters which pertain to the life of an American citizen prior to his induction or subsequent to his discharge."

And defense counsel Francis Heisler, he writes, is determined to carry the case to the Supreme Court if necessary.

ELECTRICAL WORKERS

Notes of a Westinghouse Striker

By JOE SENTNER

Pittsburgh, Dec. 11

In a letter to strikers dated December 1, the Westinghouse company played what must have been its trump card. In no fewer than three places in the long letter the fact is mentioned that the Christmas season is near at hand. Instead of how many shopping days to Christmas, it was how many working days until Christmas.

In a newspaper ad, the company says it wants the people to go back under old conditions and continue to bargain; so that they will have a pay check for Christmas, you see. Santa Claus is a strikebreaker, they think.

Just before national negotiations began, day-workers at the East Pittsburgh plant struck for a month in protest against a time study aimed at increasing their work-load without increasing their pay. The strike was resolved temporarily by having the issue placed on the agenda along with the wage-reopener, and Carey [IUE president] thought this was a victory.

The leaders of the East Pittsburgh local knew better because of past experience, since they are the ones who do the bargaining from day to day. If memory serves, Carey had a bad time of it getting the East Pittsburgh local back to work at the time.

A majority of the grievances in the East Pittsburgh since the IUE came in have not been satisfactorily settled. Since the local was split just about down the middle in the two elections between IUE and UE it is understandable that the company could be so arrogant in its dealings with the local union.

COMPANY TWISTS

Getting the company to sit down and talk over a matter is one thing. Trying to get a decent settlement is quite another. The issue of time study of day-workers gave the company a great lever with which to pry and they are making the most of it.

Look at the situation. Instead of the company considering the demands of the union, the company is making the demands: the amount of increase, length of contract, and time study of day-workers. If the union would relent a little on its wage demands and the question of length of contract, the company might relent on its time study of day-workers. But the union can't move first unless it knows that the company will let up on its demand for a time study of day-workers. If the company stands pat on the issue, the union has to make greater gains wage-wise in order just to break even.

A letter to employees from the company makes clear that it wants to establish work standards for day-workers. It states that, under the company's proposed contract, if an employee fails to meet a work standard, the employee could be "discharged, released or downgraded." The union has demanded that grievances arising from a dispute over such an action be arbitrated if they cannot be settled; otherwise, the union would have to strike over every such grievance or lose the grievance (and a man's job).

The company says it is willing to submit to arbitration whether or not there is just cause for the employee's complaint, but two paragraphs later, says, "Westinghouse is not going to let some third party decide whether that [work] standard is right or wrong."

No wonder the union calls the company's arbitration proposal "an unworkable legal monstrosity." The union says the company flatly refuses to arbitrate the grievances brought on by the day-to-day conditions in the shops.

That is the company's offer on arbitration. It's not worth an inflated tin dime—or is tin worth more than a dime these days?

SUCKERBAIT

The union runs an ad in the daily papers, "You can't be sure if it's Westinghouse." The company sends a letter to employees saying that the union is destroying confidence in the product of their daily labor. Of course the union means the company's word isn't worth the paper it's written on.

In another case, the company has a full-page ad. The first row of figures shows the flat increase in wages over five years for a machine operator who now averages \$2.10 an hour. This is what the company claims it is offering. It adds up to a \$2031 raise for five years, according to the ad.

This figure was probably arrived at with slide rules, electronic computers, and Univac. With simple arithmetic, all I get is \$700. Of course there are some fringe benefits (you get the fringe of your throat cut by a time study).

The IUE is putting up a splendid fight. Of course, this is not possible without support from the other unions. This first big battle by the IUE can help toward making it one of the leaders in the labor movement, and not just the business organization that Westinghouse apparently thought it was.

Dutch Colonialism

In the Netherlands West Indies, the Dutch colonialists are carrying on flagrant police repressions of the trade-union movement, according to denunciations made public by the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions.

In connection with a strike of phosphate miners, three members of the Executive of the United Miners Union of Curacao were arrested on October 18 under a law which prohibits strikes in certain conditions; one has since been released, but two are still in prison. Police officers were also used to visit strikers at their homes in an attempt to intimidate them into resuming work.

This police action culminated in the closing and sealing of the offices of the Confederation of Workers of Curacao and the confiscation of the confederation's records and a duplicating machine. Another form of intimidation is the threat of deportation which has been held over the heads of the foreign workers who form about half of the labor force at the mines.

Earlier, the authorities had interfered to prevent representatives of international trade union organizations from addressing a meeting on August 12 which had been called to celebrate the foundation of the Confederation of Workers of Curacao. It was as a result of a successful organizing campaign activity supported by the International Federation of Petroleum Workers, the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions and its Inter-American Regional Organization that the petroleum workers, who constitute the great majority of the working population of the island, had been organized into an effective trade union.

ISL and Young Socialist League
invite you to our joint

New Year's Eve Party

SAT. EVE. DECEMBER 31, of course

9 p.m. and, naturally, on and on

LABOR ACTION HALL, 114 West 14 Street, New York City

FRANCE

Conference of 'New Left' Grapples with Its Future

By A. GIACOMETTI

Paris, Dec. 6

Last month the New Left held its first national congress in Paris. A little under 300 delegates were present, representing 30 departments where organized groups of the New Left already exist. (France has 89 departments.)

Working parties from the various groups that make up the organization (Centre d'Action des Gauches Indépendantes, Jeune République, Union Progressistes, local groups, etc.) had met before in May and then in December 1954, to elaborate a general political orientation as a basis for common action. The congress has largely confirmed this orientation, but it has also brought out some new features which deserve close attention.

In the midst of the present political crisis, an essential task of the congress would have been to map out a clear course for the labor movement. As could have been foreseen, the congress failed in this respect.

It confirmed the policy of the organization to work for a "Popular Front," i.e., an electoral coalition of the Socialist Party, the Communist Party, the "Mendésist" wing of the Radical Party, and the New Left. This decision was followed this week by appeals to these parties to present joint tickets in the coming elections.

In earlier articles, we have pointed out the utter futility of this orientation. The overtone toward the "Mendésists" can only lead to a dead end. On all important issues (demands of the labor movement, colonial wars, foreign policy) the followers of Mendés-France have taken positions that are clearly incompatible with a socialist or even a generally progressive policy.

If they should accept the socialist minimum program of the New Left, it could only be in bad faith, as they are tied to economic circles who oppose every point in it. In a "Popular Front," their function could only be to safeguard the interests of the bourgeoisie, and to neutralize the social content of the popular coalition, as Daladier's Radical Party did in 1936.

The overtures to the CP are equally futile and dangerous. Included as a decisive element, the CP could make or break any "Popular Front" and would place all other parties in a dependent position. It is clear, furthermore, that the CP is prepared to ally itself with other parties only if it can use the coalition as a tool of its own policy.

WILL IT REPEAT?

Many militants of the New Left, considering a "Popular Front" merely as a reflection of the mass upsurge taking place in the labor movement, would argue that the pressure of this upsurge would force the Popular Front coalition to move in a progressive direction, if need be, in spite of itself. They fail to take into account the fact that in its present key position, the CP can only represent an obstacle to such an upsurge and that, once in government, it would do its utmost to undercut it.

Its attitude of keeping a lid on the strike wave of the last few months, and of non-support to the North African nationalists, augurs ill for a coalition in which it would play a decisive role. To propose, under these conditions, an alliance with the CP is to paralyze one's own action and invite certain defeat. As a concession to the mood of "détente," it is a demagogic move and can be justified only on a demagogic and opportunistic basis.

The advocates of a "Popular Front" also point to the lasting social gains obtained for the workers by the government of 1936. They fail to mention that the strikes of June 1936 had more to do with the conquest of these gains than the juridical activities of the Popular Front government. They also forget to mention that the opportunism and the unsound political basis of the Popular Front of 1936 contributed heavily to the defeat of the Spanish revolution and to its own defeat in France two years later.

To repeat a similar experience today, on the basis of a purely verbal and for-

mal "unity of the Left," is to endanger the chances of a real recovery of the socialist movement.

Fortunately, the New Left did not confine itself to repeating its familiar mistakes; on questions of organization and program it took some steps forward.

Politically, the New Left asserted itself as a socialist organization, resisting any attempts by the CP to turn it into its own middle-class front.

In the General Report adopted by the congress, its stated objective is to "build a socialist democracy—which implies, in particular, the abolition of private ownership of the means of production, of exchange and of credit, which conflicts with the interests of the collectivity." In order to achieve this aim, it "appeals to the wage-workers and to their natural allies in the peasantry and the middle classes."

The question of the perspective of the New Left, as an organization, led to an interesting debate. Pierre Le Brun, speaking for the pro-Stalinist tendency, attempted to confine the New Left to the role of a loose coalition of groups which temporarily allied themselves for the purpose of bringing about the "Popular Front." On the opposite end of the political scale, Montariol from Toulouse defended the idea of the New Left as an independent socialist workers' and peasants' party which would, however, also work for a "Popular Front."

In the course of the discussion, Montariol stated that the function of the New Left was not to compete with Poulade or the Radical Party, and that it had better things to do than follow the line which François Billoux (CP) had set down for it. On the contrary, it was necessary to orient the organization toward the workers and the youth. In this position he was supported by the delegates of the Rhône and the Puy-du-Dôme federations.

INDEPENDENT ORIENTATION

The majority of the congress rejected Le Brun's perspective, but did not rally to Montariol's position either. As *France-Observateur* put it, it preferred to "build a real political organization, working for a Popular Front, but having its own life, its independence, its own perspectives and hopes for existence and development, yet capable of transforming itself in response to events."

Among the tasks which Montariol outlined for the New Left were: work for trade-union unity for which the New Left, as an independent organization, is well qualified; reconstitution of international socialism, by re-establishing contact with the "Bevanite wing, the Belgian socialist minority, the minority of German social-democracy, the Nenni party, the Yugoslav Communist Party, etc." Again, a fundamentally healthy general orientation, and appalling confusion on specific questions.

The tendency toward setting up the New Left as a specific political entity was expressed in another way by Jean-René Chauvin, of Paris, who proposed that the various elements of the New Left dissolve as separate organizations and merge completely. The Centre d'Action des Gauches Indépendantes took the lead in this direction, setting an example that has yet to be followed by the other organizations.

Positions such as Chauvin's or Montariol's reflect most of all the desire of the membership to create an organization which would be more than a satellite of one or the other major formations, and more than just a sum-total of several small groups: a new working-class organization at once democratic, socialist and independent.

Many of the delegates to the congress had not been members of any organization before, not even of those who allied themselves to form the New Left. Most of them were young, with a high proportion under thirty years. Others, who had been associated in the past with different political traditions, also joined the organization, including veterans of revolutionary socialist movements such as Daniel Guérin and Colette Audry.

LONDON LETTER

20 Years of Attlee

By OWEN ROBERTS

London, Dec. 7

Before, a packed meeting of the Parliamentary Labor Party this morning Clement Attlee announced his immediate retirement as leader of the party. His resignation marks the end of a twenty-year term of office during which Labor rose from tragic defeat to glorious victory, and slid back to defeat once again.

Attlee was elected leader of the party in 1935 on the eve of a general election. The background to his election was the situation in Ethiopia which had developed to crisis point.

The majority of the party, including Attlee, were in favor of falling in behind the old League of Nations and supporting economic and, if necessary, military sanctions against Italy. Opposition to this line of action came from the pacifist wing of the party with George Lansbury, the party leader, at its head, and the Socialist League, led by Stafford Cripps. The Socialist League took the stand that Labor's foreign policy should be based on alliance with socialist government, and therefore collective security in a capitalist world was an impossibility.

At the party conference that year the pacifists and the Socialist League were defeated. Ernest Bevin and the trade-union votes pulled the whole policy of the party in line with support for sanctions against Italy and backing for the League of Nations.

Lansbury resigned and in his place Attlee was elected. He was chosen on a temporary basis in an endeavor to pacify the warring factions within the party and because he was not closely identified with any of the opposing forces.

After the general election the question of leadership came up for review and fresh elections were held for the position. There were three candidates—Attlee, Herbert Morrison and Arthur Greenwood. Attlee had a comfortable lead in the first ballot and in the second he scored a two-to-one victory over Morrison.

Now, twenty years later, Morrison is again a contestant for the position which he has long cherished hopes of attaining. And once again it looks as if he will be frustrated, this time by Hugh Gaitskell.

It is around Morrison and Gaitskell that the fight for leadership will revolve, with Aneurin Bevan providing the inevitable third. All signs—and all the prophets—seem to spell out that Morrison will be defeated by Gaitskell, whose stock within the party has risen rapidly during recent years. Should this be the case then a whole series of interesting possibilities are opened up.

Morrison is at present deputy leader of the Parliamentary Party and rumor has it

CO Goes to Jail

Los Angeles, Dec. 8

On December 5, conscientious objector Vern Davidson surrendered to federal authorities in Los Angeles to begin serving a three-year prison sentence for refusing to serve in the armed forces. The Supreme Court late in November had turned down an appeal, thus ending any hope of his winning his legal recognition as a conscientious objector.

He will now win that recognition by serving a three-year prison term for a crime of conscience. Judge Westover turned down a request from the defense attorney, J. B. Tietz, that probation be granted since Davidson was already engaged in work of public importance (in a state hospital in Berkeley, Calif.).

Thus ends a three-year legal struggle which had won national support by pacifists and socialists. A. J. Muste and Norman Thomas were among those who supported the case.

There have been three members of the Socialist Party arrested since 1953. Davidson is the first member to be actually imprisoned for draft refusal. The case of Don Thomas has not yet been brought to court; the case of David McReynolds was dismissed. Burt Rosen, a socialist but not a member of the Socialist Party, had earlier served a prison sentence for refusing to register and has since been released.

The crucial point in the Davidson case was the requirement of the draft law that COs must believe in a Supreme Being to be given CO status.

that, should he be defeated in the election for leader, he will resign as deputy leader. Having played Number Two for so long he considers that the vote for leader is one of confidence in himself, and that if his standing in the party is what he considers it should be, he will be elected as a matter of natural right of succession. Should this rumor be true, and should it also work out that Morrison is defeated, a new deputy leader will be required.

On the other hand, assuming the prophets are wrong and Morrison is elected as leader, it will still be necessary to have a further election for deputy leader. So it looks very much as though the election of Number Two will rank high in the big stakes very soon, particularly as Bevan stands an outsider's chance of pulling such an election off.

FOR No. 2 SPOT

He will face formidable opposition. James Griffiths, for instance, has pursued a middle-of-the-road course for some years and many predict that he will fight hard for the position of deputy leader on the basis that he has the faculties for providing stability and smoothing out faction fights. But even so, Bevan seems to have a fair chance of scraping home.

If, as expected, Gaitskell is elected leader, this will probably lead to a reshuffle in the composition of the National Executive Committee of the party as a whole. Gaitskell at present sits on the NEC as treasurer, having defeated Bevan in a contest for this position during the past two years. If elected leader of the Parliamentary Party he automatically gets a seat on the NEC and thus the position of treasurer could be fought out with a different right-wing contestant at next year's conference.

It is difficult to see whom the right wing could offer as a likely opponent to Bevan without reducing the affair to a farce. It could be that Morrison will be willing to have a go.

Another interesting possibility arises because the deputy leader also has an automatic seat on the NEC, thus presenting another move around and yet a further opportunity for a right-versus-left conflict.

Nomination papers for the position of leader are now being circulated among the Laborite members of Parliament. Ballot papers will go out this week-end and the result will be announced in a week's time; it may be found necessary to hold a second ballot as the standing orders of the Parliamentary Party require that the successful candidate shall have a clear majority over all others. It may therefore be some time before it is finally known who the leader is going to be. In the meantime Morrison takes over in his role as deputy.

Bedizening the Lords

Before the announcement that Labor Party ex-leader Clement Attlee was accepting an earldom to enter the House of Lords, the *Bevanite Tribune* columnist Robert J. Edwards wrote:

"Now I would like, very humbly, to offer Mr. Attlee some advice. In doing so, I have the feeling that a very large number of his active friends throughout the Labor movement will share my view.

"According to Massingham, the Conservatives 'would give so distinguished a recruit an even warmer welcome' than the Labor peers if he went to the Lords as Lord Jowitt's successor.

"You bet they would. His arrival there would give that decaying institution a temporary filling. As Massingham says, 'Lord Salisbury has long felt that the Labor Opposition ought to be strengthened.'

"In order, of course, to disguise (a) the Lords' totally unrepresentative nature and (b) its only useful purpose today: to block socialist legislation.

"Clem, don't go near the place! It doesn't deserve you.

"Let it die."

Read the

NEW INTERNATIONAL
America's leading Marxist review

BOOKS AND IDEAS "Shape-Up and Hiring Hall"

Dock Gangsters and Their Friends

SHAPE-UP AND HIRING HALL, by Charles P. Larrowe.—U. of California Press, Berkeley, 250 pages, \$4.50.

By BEN HALL

For 26 years, from 1919 to 1945, there were no major strikes among New York waterfront workers. And it was in these years that the International Longshoremen's Association became a union riddled by racketeering and dictatorship.

Larrowe, associate professor of economics at the University of Utah, has written this book as "a comparison of hiring methods on the New York and Seattle waterfronts," and he describes in great detail how the union hiring hall on the West Coast operates, in sharp contrast with the East Coast shape-up.

LABOR ACTION readers, however, will find the supplementary and background material of greatest interest. The author's account of the recent struggle on the New York docks is exceptionally well informed and accurate.

Thugs and gangsters, he points out, made their appearance in big numbers on the New York waterfront in the thirties. ILA President Joe Ryan was chairman of the New York State Parole Board, which put him in a strategic position for recruiting strong-arm men. Larrowe's account does not deal with the rise of the CIO in New York, but one must suspect that the recruitment of gangsters into the union would facilitate the use of strong-arm methods against any possible rank-and-file movement such as upset the International Seamen's Union in those days.

Racketeer elements were welcomed as foremen by the employers. One company official explained:

"Yes, our labor policy is tough. It has to be . . . because it is a rough, tough business. Now about criminals working on the docks: this may sound terrible to you, but I don't care whether they are criminals or not, just so long as they don't hurt me. In fact, to be perfectly frank, if I had a choice of hiring a tough ex-convict or a

man without a criminal record, I am more inclined to take the ex-con. Know why? Because if he is in a boss job, he'll keep the men in line, and get the maximum work out of them. They'll be afraid of him."

Even so respectable a journal as the New York Times did its part to make life easier for the racketeers at critical moments, not because the honorable editors admired crooks but because they prefer union bureaucrats to "unreasonable" rank-and-file militants. When the ILA regime was shaken by a rank-and-file strike in 1951, the Times editorially came to Ryan's defense:

"In fairness to the ILA leadership and to the shipping industry, which is in a sense partly responsible for waterfront conditions, it must be conceded that the average dock wallop is in a class by himself as far as organized labor is concerned. He can be maddeningly contrary and irrational and is often unpredictable. Leading shipping executives who have dealt with Joe Ryan and his ILA for many years shudder to think what would happen if the Ryan hierarchy were overthrown by men with less control of the hot-headed, opinionated and stubborn sea-lawyers and salt-water politicians who make up the Eastern seaboard's waterfront labor force."

Larrowe tells the story of the AFL's debacle in the fight against the ILA. Of the five-man committee appointed by the AFL to direct the campaign, only Dave Beck and Paul Hall took an active part. Beck was interested only in getting a foothold for the Teamsters on the waterfront. In the middle of the campaign, he announced that the Teamsters were claiming jurisdiction over public loaders who had always been in the longshore union.

Hall supported him. Martin Lacey, president of the Teamsters joint council, was a friend of ILA officials. Ten top New York AFL officials petitioned Meany to bring the ILA back into the AFL while the fight went on.

This book makes available the only detailed account of these events.

From the STALINIST JUNGLE**CHINA**

The tasks assigned to trade unions in a CP-controlled country were admirably outlined recently in a report from the official Chinese news agency on the second national congress of the Chinese coalminers union. "These basic tasks," the report says, "include that the union shall, under the leadership of the Communist Party, maintain close contact with the broad masses and carry out propaganda on the first Five Year Plan; that it shall consolidate labor discipline; that the masses of miners shall be aroused to reach new records in labor competition; that the potentialities of

existing coal mines be developed to the fullest extent in order to ensure the fulfillment and over-fulfillment of the targets laid down by the Five Year Plan." The last task, which looks as though it might have been added as an afterthought, was "that on the basis of developing production the material and cultural lives of coalminers shall be improved step by step."

HUNGARY

The Hungarian CP has lately been showing some concern over the question of democracy within the trade unions which they control. The problem they are faced with, of course, is from their point of view well nigh insoluble: how to raise the prestige of the unions among a largely hostile working-class without letting the organizations out of their control.

Some interesting light was thrown on this problem by an article which appeared in the trade union newspaper *Nepszava* on October 1, under the heading "Trade Union Democracy." It mentioned factory council elections which had taken place recently in a textile factory at Kobanya, where a nominating committee "settled the whole matter in two or three minutes."

EAST GERMANY

In spite of their disastrous experience the last time they attempted to raise output "norms"—which provoked the historic uprising of June 17, 1953—the East German dictators are again proposing to take the risk of trying to get higher output from the workers without increased wages. This move was foreshadowed in a speech by Walter Ulbricht, Communist Party general secretary, at a meeting of the party Central Committee which took place in Berlin at the end of October. The reason he advanced for the new move was that slow and careless work had allegedly reduced production in the Russian Zone by hundreds of millions of marks. He revealed that 383 state-owned enterprises had been operating at a loss during the first eight months of 1955.

—ICFTU Spotlight

**HILLQUIT AND DEUTSCHER
Illusions About Stalinist Democratization**

By PHILIP COBEN

Now that Moscow is back on the track of a "hard" cold-war policy—breathing fire instead of Geneva spirits at the U. S.—there is less of the shallow talk about how the Kremlin is on the way to democratizing Russia from above.

This kind of talk has been one of the accompaniments of the cold war, in its own way. It works from two directions.

On the one hand, a soft Kremlin line inspires bourgeois journalistic wittings to speculate along these lines, not because they are victims of Stalinist propaganda but simply because they understand nothing about Russia.

On the other hand, others have plugged the "democratization" illusion for a quite different reason, typified by Isaac Deutscher, who was not converted by the Geneva spirit. For this type, the West should entertain these fond hopes of the Kremlin because this fact alone would soften Moscow's line. The reasoning is that Moscow's "hard" line is only a reaction to capitalist encirclement and antagonism: pat the dog on the head and he will cease snarling.

In any case, the cold war has been closely woven into this brand of politics. But illusions about Stalinism are far older than the present war crisis.

By way of a political curiosity, but not only that, read the following and guess who wrote it. It would seem to have been written just yesterday by (say) Aneurin Bevan, or the *Nation*, or Deutscher him-

self. . . in the Soviet government we notice a steady, perhaps slow, but nevertheless definite development away from dictatorship and toward the usual forms of democracy. While all the institutions of dictatorship are there, while the interdictions on civil liberties are in full force, you nevertheless can see today, in getting your reports from Russia and from the political fields of Russia, that there has been a change—that the abject terror which used to permeate the political atmosphere of the country is gone or going. There is opposition; and the opposition is not being shot immediately. They are thrown out of the party, they are being called names, they call names in return; but there is some discussion. And the moment that dead silence is broken, the moment that there is any discussion on political issues and it is tolerated, that moment the absolute dictatorship is gone, and can no longer be maintained. . . .

"Personally I have no doubt that it will take but a few years, and Russia will find herself in the position in which it really belongs, by its economic situation, by the classes of people, by the political education, and by its entire history. It will be one of Europe's comparatively backward countries—but nevertheless a Western European country, very largely, in its political organization and in its economic structure. At any rate, from all indications, the development is proceeding inside of Russia and is proceeding toward the line of greater democratization and of diminishing dictatorship."

HAILING STALIN

That could have been an excerpt from Bevan's book *In Place of Fear*. But it isn't. It is a quotation from the right-wing American Socialist leader Morris Hillquit. Naturally it dates back, and its date is one of the most interesting things about it.

It is from a lecture by Hillquit on "The Crisis of Democracy: Fascism and Soviet Rule" which was given in the Rand School on November 29, 1927.

From one point of view this was not remarkable at all. The SP, for all of its virulent anti-Leninism, anti-Bolshevism and anti-revolutionism, remained staunchly for "the defense of the Soviet Union" well into the 1930s. It also remained full of illusions about the "Soviet rule" of the Kremlin bureaucracy. I remember that, as late as 1934 in the SP, or at least among the SP Militants, a harshly critical attitude toward the Moscow regime was looked upon as a "Trotskyite" pattern.

So something like the passage we have quoted could have come from SP leaders at any time well into the next decade.

But now look back at the exact date. Hillquit was being utterly convinced of Stalinist democratization not just at any old time in this period. The month and year is that of the culmination of the Stalin counter-revolution.

Hillquit was being convinced by the fact that a fight was going on, the famous struggle of the Left Opposition against

the entrenched bureaucracy, or as it is journalistically abbreviated, the Stalin-Trotsky fight. By the time he spoke, Oppositionists had already been expelled right and left by the Politburo. Trotsky himself had been virtually expelled from the party already by these "democrats" of the Stalinist gang. Only three short days after Hillquit's glowing words, the 15th Party Congress in Moscow put the formal finishing touches on the wholesale expulsion of the Opposition. The old Bolshevik party was decimated. It had been gutted, and its entrails lay bleeding.

With this sight before him, and because of it, Hillquit drew the conclusion—Stalinist democracy was on the march!

Now, in hindsight, of course, this reaction by this right-wing SP leader may seem fantastic. I would not seek to gainsay that. But Hillquit at least had some basis for his fantasy. At least in his case, stupefying though it may seem now, he was able to point to real opposition fighting that was going on. Earlier in the month of November 1929, the Opposition had even pulled a "demonstration" in the streets in connection with the Russian Revolution anniversary celebration.

THE DEUTSCHER TYPE

The illusionists have to be of a different breed today. They do not even pretend to point to the existence of any organized political opposition. They do not look in that direction. They look at the tops, the summit of the dictatorship, and fall down and worship if (say) a Malenkov is replaced by a Khrushchev without an immediate blood-purge. In fact, if real opposition raises its head against the tyrants in East Germany, they frown on it and shush: "Quiet! Lie down! You'll scare the despots out of their democratization!"—as Deutscher did in the case of the East German workers' revolt.

In 1927 Hillquit's reaction was of a social-democratic type. That is, the essential basis of his thinking was as follows: *As between Stalin and Trotsky (both detestable Bolsheviks, to be sure) Trotsky is more revolutionary, raving as he does about world revolution, while Stalin is more realistic. Revolution=terror=dictatorship. Realism=moderation=democracy. Hence Trotsky's road means more dictatorship, while Stalin's means the road back to democracy.*

It was indeed in this period of the triumph of Stalin over the Trotskyist Opposition that shoals of Russian Mensheviks made their peace with the Moscow regime—ingrained reformists who never could abide the Bolshevik party in its revolutionary days.

History has plentifully commented on the meaning of this social-democratic type of reaction to the Stalinist counter-revolution, in an episode which is now virtually forgotten but which is extremely illuminating about the thesis that "Stalinism flows from Bolshevism."

This was what was behind Hillquit's curious words about Stalinist democratization in November 1927. But, as we said, it was a social-democratic type of reaction. It sought at least to point in the direction of opposition. The Deutscher line seems to say exactly the same thing today, but it is qualitatively different. It points toward the "progressive" dictators. This is why it is fundamentally Stalinist.



**LABOR
ACTION**

December 19, 1955 Vol. 19, No. 51

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

Editor: HAL DRAPER

Associate Editors:

GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL

Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

He Missed a Guard Meeting

By CHARLES WALKER

Berkeley, Dec. 9

A 17-year-old Redwood City National Guard member was jailed for 10 days in the San Mateo County juvenile home for missing a meeting of his Guard unit last week. He was picked up and sentenced at the order of Major Don A. Rascon, National Guard court-martial officer, for not attending the meeting of Field Artillery Battery 637, San Jose, even though the youth claimed to have missed because of poor transportation. It was his second absence; the first had drawn a \$15 fine earlier.

"District Attorney Keith C. Sorenson [of San Mateo County] said Section 464 of the Military and Veterans Code empowers National Guard officers to direct civilian police to arrest a guard member," said the San Francisco *Call Bulletin*, Dec. 9.

John Cowgill, chief probation officer, protested that the youth shouldn't have been sent to the Hillcrest Juvenile Hall, because the juvenile Hall isn't supposed to be used for a jail! He is appealing this "serious thing" to the California Youth Authority. Presumably next time a 17-year-old youth misses a meeting he should go to the county jail.

Cowgill also was afraid that "This may be the first of a series of cases whereby military authorities are taking advantage of a law which is rarely used." "He predicted that juvenile halls throughout the state may be filled with National Guardsmen who have missed weekly meetings."

So next time someone questions the reality of Garrison State trends in the U. S. you might show them this little piece of news.

CHIANG'S BULLY-BOY

In its Dec. 2 issue, the right-wing Republican magazine *U. S. News & World Report* published an interview with the son of its hero Chiang Kai-shek. Chiang's son, Chiang Ching-Kuo, is heir-apparent of the "Nationalist" Chinese and sub-boss on Formosa, reportedly in charge of the police-state side of the Chiang regime.

The following question and answer, dealing with youth, gives a vivid insight into the mentality of this reactionary warlord. Note particularly what is listed as the "weaknesses" of youth.

Q.—Why are the Communists so successful in getting young people to work for them, not only in China but elsewhere in Asia?

A.—The Communists are experts in exploiting the weakness of the youths. You must understand what young people are like. First, the young have high curiosity; anything new, they go for it. Second, they all want to be Robin Hoods, and take away from the rich and give to the poor. They are against colonialism and capitalist oppression. But the youth have difficulty distinguishing between right and wrong. Finally, the youths are very active, they are always eager to do something. They say: "Let's strike, let's go out and shout slogans and make trouble." So they begin to follow the Communist line, and then the Communists get control of them.

In other cases the youths find themselves violating the law. They may not be Communists, but they cannot go back. They've broken the law, and they suddenly find themselves slaves of the Communists. So you see, the attraction of Communism to the youth is really the weakness of the youth. The Communists exploit that to the fullest extent. The Communists say that religion is the opiate of the people. But it is Communism that is the real narcotic. They point and disguise their weaknesses and wickedness in such colors as to make them appear virtues."

Are the Campuses Awake Yet?

By MICHAEL HARRINGTON

It would be difficult to make any large generalizations on the basis of the tour which I made for the Young Socialist League in November. Several college campuses were visited, but four of them were anything but typical: Oberlin, Antioch, the University of Chicago, and the University of Wisconsin. These schools have, of course, always been noted for being more alive, more political, than the American campus as a whole. The University of Pittsburgh, for example, about which I was told, is probably more characteristic of the student situation today.

And yet the very nature of the evidence—the fact that though it is small, it is probably typical of conditions on the more advanced campuses—does admit of some interpretation. In this context, Pittsburgh figures more by way of contrast than anything else.

Given these qualifications, I think a tentative statement can be hazarded: that the atmosphere of conformity continues, that political apathy continues, that there is no sign of a real American student movement today. At the same time, it must be kept in mind that there is some difference, that the campus is freer and less conformity-bound than it was two or three years ago.

But what must be understood is that the student awakening has not yet taken place. This point is in contrast to the point of view being pushed by the Stalinists today. To read their literature (the article by the Labor Youth League student secretary in the October *Political Affairs*, for example) one would think that the American student is tending toward a period of social movement like that of the Thirties. This is simply not true.

When compared with the four above-mentioned schools, Pittsburgh stands out in a category all by itself. The situation there is one of almost total student inactivity, a fact related to administrative repression of all student political activity. This should not be seen as a development of McCarthyism since it is the continuation of tendencies which have been present at Pitt for some years before the rise of the senator from Wisconsin.

At the University of Pittsburgh no student organizations with affiliations to outside organizations are permitted (fraternities are an exception). As a result, there are no Young Democrats, Young Republicans, SDA or YSL on the campus. More recently the agitation of one of the Pittsburgh newspapers, which criticized this setup from a conservative viewpoint, won some concessions. In 1952, to be repeated in 1956, the students were allowed to organize groups in support of the presidential candidates. However, as soon as the election was over, these were disbanded.

In addition to this administrative repression of student activity, the Pitt situation is further complicated by the nature of the school. It is largely a commuters' college and it lacks a real campus. The "Cathedral of Learning," the university's main building, is a skyscraper (which local wags have dubbed "The Height of Ignorance"), and there is little campus or campus atmosphere. This makes political work all the more difficult.

As a result of these factors, it is all but impossible for the students at Pitt to lead an active political life. This is not simply true for "outside organizations," but for any kind of purely local campus action as well.

ANTIOCH

Antioch College is, of course, in direct contrast to this situation. It has long been known as an unusual campus and this still holds true. In a day and a half on the campus, I spoke to five different audiences, all of them quite interested and attentive.

At Antioch, the Socialist Discussion Club is probably one of the main foci of political debate. The Stalinists, who long maintained a large and active YPA on the campus, are nowhere to be seen (organizationally) this year. There is an SDA, but the Socialist group would seem to be the more active of the two.

Furthermore, Antioch has a long tradition of association with the pacifist, socialist and communitarian movements. This is reinforced by the town of Yellow Springs in which the college is located.

And yet in recent years some of the more political students have noticed a considerable change in atmosphere. The college has in the past operated on a sort of democratic interplay between students and faculty. This, they note, has been severely limited in the past few years. More and more Antioch is coming to resemble the traditional American campus on which students and faculty are divided against each other.

Another characteristic is of considerable importance at Antioch. There is a tradition of intellectual ferment and curiosity. This means that a speaker will find an attentive audience, interest, questions, the desire to carry the discussion on over a cup of coffee. But there is also an attitude that this interest should not run to organizational commitment. This, it would seem, is regarded as a loss of objectivity, a dangerous essay into partisanship.

On the whole, then, Antioch still retains its characteristic of an extraordinary student interest in politics and social programs. Yet this must be placed in the perspective of a developing conservative tendency on the part of the college authorities, and the attitude which is hostile to organizational commitment. It still makes Antioch one of the most intellectually alive schools in the United States, but it doesn't add up to the intimation of a vast student movement.

OBERLIN

Oberlin College will have its Mock Political Convention in the spring. This year the students voted to make it a Democratic Party convention—a surprising reversal of the usual situation. (Whose party the convention is representing does not determine its politics; merely the party of the candidate whom the students will nominate.)

As a result of this fact, the Oberlin campus is more political than most in the United States today. But here again, this statement must be placed in a qualifying perspective.

The Debs Club at Oberlin has not been very active this year, although it has functioned. (At its first meeting it had

sponsored this writer on the subject of North Africa.) There is a fairly considerable SDA, an ADA "Pressure Group" (for the Mock Convention) and a socialist "Pressure Group." At present writing, it is not quite clear what political line will be taken by the socialist pressure group. In addition, there are Stalinist-Stalinoid ideas around, but no formal Stalinist-Stalinoid kind of organization.

On the whole, Oberlin would seem to be more political than almost all of the colleges in the United States—and yet not too political. The cooperatives on campus are a boon to political discussion, and the Mock Convention should have a considerable impact. Yet here again, there is no sign of a vast political awakening on the part of the students.

CHICAGO AND MADISON

The University of Chicago has long been a significant and active arena for political action. There is a campus-recognized chapter of the Young Socialist League, a recently revived SDA, a newly formed League for Civil Liberties. It is still possible to get quite a few students out for a meeting, and the LCL has demonstrated that the campus can support an independent civil-liberties organization. Yet this in no way means that the school is on the verge of a Thirties-type development. Socialists are quite active, and influential, on campus. There is an atmosphere in which politics is possible. But not too much more.

The University of Wisconsin is an anomaly. Situated in McCarthy's own state, it is one of the freest campuses in the country. It has, for example, a campus-recognized Labor Youth League (which is, however, quite small), a Liberal Club and a Young Republicans Group. SLID has been active here within the last few years and there is something (though not too much) of a socialist tradition and heritage.

At present, however, there is no organized socialist group. Like Chicago, Wisconsin is a place where politics is possible; like Chicago, this does not mean that there is any wave of political activity.

Clearly, one tentative generalization emerges from all of this: there is something of an awakening among students, at least on the more advanced campuses, and political activity is more possible today than yesterday. But one must most emphatically deny that these five campuses provide evidence of a new student ferment. That still lies ahead. For here and now, the tour proved that socialist thought and organization can be an important factor on the campus, even today.

Reverberations from Georgia Tech

Last week's *Challenge* story on the Georgia Tech affair made the important point that while we cannot conclude from the demonstrations of the Georgia Tech students that they are militantly anti-segregation, it is heartening to know that they are not ready to swallow anti-Negro chauvinism to the point where it will prevent Georgia Tech from playing in the Sugar Bowl. It went to press too early to allow us to note the widespread protest which occurred among students and in sport circles outside the Georgia Tech campus.

Item: Student demonstrations, in which Georgia Governor Griffin was hanged in effigy many times over, took place at several other campuses in that bastion of racial chauvinism, Georgia. Included were the University of Georgia, the other of the two components of the state university system, and a number of private colleges and universities.

Item: Students at the University of Oregon, in Eugene, made clear their feelings on the outrage by demonstrating in a fashion similar to Georgian stu-

dents. Outbreaks of student feeling also occurred elsewhere.

Item: At the University of Pittsburgh, Griffin's stand produced an immediate, intense and hostile reaction. Negro full-back Bobby Grier's teammates were fighting mad. As quoted in Pittsburgh newspapers, tackle Jim McCusker said: "The whole team is mad. Nobody's going to have trouble getting us up for this game." And Don Agafon, another member of the team, when asked if the team would play without Grier, answered: "We're a team. We don't play without one man."

University of Pittsburgh students responded to the position taken by the Georgia Tech students by coming to school with signs saluting the actions of Georgian students and condemning the governor. Plans were also made to burn Griffin in effigy, but the school administration headed off the action. However, the Student Council adopted a resolution thanking the Georgia Tech students for their stand and telegraphed this message to the Georgia Tech Student Council.

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

INDOCHINA

SP Leader Tells of Diem's Fraud

The following communication is by the secretary of the Socialist Party of Vietnam, received via our Paris correspondent André Giacometti, who also translated and annotated it.

Although there were some indications in the press on the nature of the Diem referendum, this is perhaps the fiercest frontal attack on it that has been published. We may add also that, according to information received, the Diem government has prevented the SP of Vietnam from using its own printing press or publishing anything; and that last month, when the party secretary wished to attend a Socialist International conference in Bonn, he was prohibited from leaving the country by refusal of an exit visa.

Aside from the question of the referendum, we reserve comment for another time on the general policy which the SPV is apparently following; to judge from some of the documents we have seen, and as is indicated in the present communication by its remarks on economic versus political questions.—Ed.

By PHAM VAN NGOI

Saigon

The referendum organized against Bao Dai last October 23, like the coming legislative elections whose purpose is to establish a so-called "national assembly," was simply electoral banditry.

Voters slipping bundles of ballots with impunity into the ballot box were one of the characteristic features of this so-called "popular consultation." The system of open baskets (into which the voters were made to throw their ballots carrying the name of Bao Dai) placed

under the vigilant surveillance of the police, has no parallel anywhere in the world.

The chairmen and members of the election boards totally ignored the most elementary rules of voting procedure. There were fifteen members per board, and each was given 300 piastres for lunch. Everyone hastened to get to lunch, and their excessive zeal surpassed all bounds.

The ballots were exhausted by 9 o'clock in the morning. Ballots carrying the name of Diem were in the ballot box also by 9 o'clock. At Raoh-Gia, a town of less than 8,000 inhabitants, means were found to have 12,000 votes out of 6,000 registered voters. Some newspapers had the audacity to write that this was normal, and that the surplus of votes was due to tourists coming from other provinces.

The election boards received explicit orders to count 98 per cent for Diem and 2 per cent for Bao Dai.

For the coming legislative elections, the candidates must present a complete dossier with a certificate of loyalty issued by the government, which will automatically eliminate all opposition and non-official candidates. In order to hide the large number of abstentions and the lack of interest of the people, the government will have recourse to a system of proxy votes, whether true or false.

As for the attitude of our party in regard to this circus, I think I can tell you that probably our party will take little interest in it because the basic problems of Vietnam are more economic than political.

Vietnam was, until recently, a large

producer of rice, the surplus of which was exported. But, because of the peasants' mistrust of the present regime, production has practically stopped. As a result the price of rice, the fundamental food staple, rose in Saigon, a city of 2 million inhabitants, from 350 piastres per 100 kgms. in March 1955, to more than 800 piastres, sometimes reaching 1,100, these last months. [At the present time, 100 Vietnam piastres are worth \$2.85. In 1952 the same amount was worth about \$5, and after the devaluation of May 1953 about \$3.50. In 1952 the average daily wage for a skilled worker, of which there are few, was 40 piastres; for an unskilled worker 22-25 piastres, and for women employed in construction 18 piastres.—A. G.]

But when the rice fields cease producing, all of Vietnam must stop. However, since the will of the peasants will not be represented at the coming pirates' elections, the fundamental economic problems can hardly be resolved: the representatives of the new parliament of Diem, not having been freely chosen by the population, will not be followed by the people. For these reasons, as well as many others, I think it is hardly likely that our party will take part in these elections organized in the manner of Diem.

As for the workers in our country, there exists a serious problem: the absorption into the economy of about 40,000 people now employed by the French and who will be unemployed when the French finally leave. Clearly, the economic issues are the most pressing at present. They will prove fatal to the present regime.

In a later letter I will write in greater detail on these points.

Asian Socialist Conference Presents Peace Proposal in Israeli-Egyptian Clash

The Asian Socialist Conference, which unites the socialist parties of Asia independently, has issued a statement on the Israeli-Egyptian crisis in the Middle East which deserves attention. We note that on the one hand it implicitly hits the Arab leaders' refusal to accept the permanent existence of Israel and work with it, and on the other hand asks for Israeli concessions on the Arab-refugee question. Following is the text of the statement.—Ed.

In the past few weeks news of mounting tension has reached us from the Middle East, and we of the Asian Socialist Conference feel that the moment is ripe for calm thought and sober counsel. The violent clashes between Israel and Egypt represent a serious menace to peace in that area. Moreover, the des-

perate arms race and the urgent military pacts load the unhappy situation with danger for world peace.

While this anxious situation prevails in the Middle East, while the tempers of Israeli and Egyptian alike run high and angry slogans and cries for war fill the air in that troubled area, we of the Asian Socialist Conference consider it our sacred duty to raise our voice for calm and peace. War in the area, should it break out, will not be contained but will spread over the world, inflicting destruction and misery on all; war at this critical juncture would forever extinguish the hopes of a socialist society which must be sustained by durable peace.

We therefore consider that the following conditions for the restoration of peace in the Middle East should be established with the sincere cooperation of the parties concerned and of all nations to whom peace is precious.

(1) The Arab states and Israel, all of them members of the UN, should refrain from the use of force and explore all available methods for the peaceful settlement of their outstanding disputes, as indeed they pledged themselves to renounce force when they subscribed to the United Nations Charter.

(2) The Arab states, faced with the fact of Israel's existence, should give her due recognition and work with her in harmony for the peace and prosperity of the region.

(3) Israel should immediately set about solving the problem of Arab refugees, and the socialist forces in Israel should throw their weight behind development programs which would absorb the unhappy victims of war and restore to them their human dignity and a happy and fruitful life.

(4) The Big Powers—the U. S., the USSR, Great Britain and France—should use their good offices to restore peace in the region rather than increase tension by abetting the arms race in any direct or indirect way.

(5) The Colombo Powers—India, Burma, Indonesia, Ceylon and Pakistan—should use their friendship with the Asian and African nations to offer their good offices to restore peace in the region.

(6) The United Nations should use its machinery and influence for a relaxation of tension in the Middle East, and help to build an era of peace and productivity in the region.

JOIN THE NAVY AND SEE JIM CROW

The navy is still segregating Negroes even though it was the first of our armed forces to start integration. . . .

Today, while slightly over 50 per cent of Negro enlisted men are in other branches, the Cooks and Bakers branch remains all white and the Stewards Branch all Negro or all Filipino for wardroom messes [officers quarters]. . . .

The second complaint by Negroes of navy procedure has to do with officers, including difficulty in being commissioned and also in promotion to command ships. It is extremely hard for Negroes to be accepted in the Regular Navy ROTC (also known as the Holloway plan), in which the government pays college tuition, expense of uniforms and textbooks, and \$50 a month toward living expenses for four years of college. . . .

When Negroes do receive commissions in the navy there is no chance for promotion to commanding ships. Of about

a hundred Negro naval officers in the service, most are in the medical and chaplains' corps. Lieutenant-Commander Dennis D. Nelson, the highest ranking Negro in the navy outside those corps is now on duty in the Office of Public Information at San Diego Navy Yard. For Negro officers, public relations and recruiting are a frequent assignment. No Negro officer has yet commanded a ship with a mixed crew, although such is now done in the Coast Guard. During World War II there were a few examples in the navy of Negroes commanding small ships with all Negro crews. . . .

Because of the continued discrimination, Lester Granger resigned in April, 1954, as Civilian Adviser to the Secretary of the Navy. In June, 1955, the American Civil Liberties Union sent a protest to the White House, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the Navy.

—The Crisis

SP of Uruguay Adopts Strong 3rd Camp Line

The Socialist Party of Uruguay, noteworthy as one of the most advanced socialist movements in Latin America, adopted resolutions at its National Congress on Oct. 25-30 which put it plainly on the side of a Third Camp approach to the war crisis.

Besides a passage in the resolution on Peace and Freedom, a special resolution was devoted to "The Third Force":

"Congress reaffirms its repudiation of Stalinist Communism, a system that denies freedom and socialism, rests on police terror and state capitalism, leading to the shameful exploitation of the working masses at the hands of the bureaucracy and a privileged minority of the party.

"Congress rejects capitalist imperialist exploitation and colonial regimes which bring despair and starvation to millions of people representing more than two-thirds of mankind.

"Congress condemns in particular the capitalist imperialists of North America who deprive the Latin American countries of their wealth and maintain them in backwardness and poverty, adding to the oppression imposed upon these countries by their own oligarchies and dictatorships.

"In the interests of peace Congress demands the establishment of a third force independent of the two imperialist world powers and aiming at peace, liberty for all dependent peoples and the realization of socialism in freedom."

In a special brief resolution on Guatemala, the party congress declared "its solidarity with the people of Guatemala in their fight against the dictatorship of Castillo Armas, imposed by reactionary capitalism and North American imperialism."

In view of the unmistakable and smashing denunciation of Stalinism in the first resolution, this cannot be misinterpreted as flowing from any pro-CP sympathies. The same should be clear also in reading the following passage from the "Peace and Freedom" resolution, which strongly stresses the value of a breathing-space in the world war crisis:

"To recognize the great opportunities offered by peaceful coexistence for the advance of socialism does not mean to be indifferent or neutral toward the totalitarian threat, no matter whether it emanates from fascist, Communist or any other quarters. Nor does it mean neutrality toward capitalist imperialism.

"What it does mean is a decisive and historically necessary affirmation of socialism as a third force which can lead the peoples toward freedom and universal brotherhood."

Popular War?

Florence Hoidahl, a columnist for the weekly Mt. Vernon (Iowa) *Hawkeye-Record* had this to say in her column of Sept. 15, 1955:

"It is always amazing to learn of a new problem that should be the concern of every citizen, but of which very little is known by the general public. Charlie Gebhard of the Waverly (Iowa) papers calls the record of deserters the 'great untold story of World War II.' His work at one time brought him into official contact with that record.

"Would you believe it that during the period of Jan. 1, 1942, to Jan. 1, 1944, there were 60,000 deserters confined at the Great Lakes, navy center alone? Court martials in World War II numbered 1,500,000, nearly all desertion charges. Some were necessarily repeaters, because the overcrowded conditions of the prisons influenced the courts to suspend many sentences and restore the men to active duty, whereupon these men immediately went over the hill again. It is a sad commentary on human nature and its sense of values."

—The Peacemaker

A-Bomb 'Defense'

A recent conference at Montebello, on the Otawa River, discussed the nature and prospect of future wars. . . .

George V. Ferguson of the *Montreal Star*, who attended, reported this hard-boiled attitude to civil defense in Canada:

"Some light relief was offered, in this grim prospect, by the remark of a Canadian delegate. He said an industrialist, a friend of his, had refused to spend any money on civil defense. Most of his plant buildings, he said, had flat roofs. In their spare time, he got his painters to decorate these roofs with huge white arrows, pointing south. Under the arrows were painted in vast letters, 'New York—375 miles.' That was all he needed to spend, he said, on civil defense."

—Vernon (Canada) News
Nov. 3

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, New York City

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

Send for our free book list.

NEW YORK
ISL-YSL
NEW YEAR'S EVE
PARTY
See page 2

Labor Party in Spotlight - -

(Continued from page 1)

union. Where do we stand on freedom when we grant to a private organization that power over a man's livelihood?")

That the NAM has always been opposed to the graduated income tax, the minimum wage, and the right to organize, let alone to form a union shop, is known to everyone. That they have been prime movers behind the "right to work" union-busting laws which have passed in a number of states, and that they give aid and material comfort to employers who seek to resist union demands, is no secret.

In short, their whole history, program and leadership is testimony to the fact that whatever academic writers may say about the lack of class-consciousness in America, this is one organization which is class-conscious to the core, and which at times expresses this consciousness in such extreme forms that it risks the danger, despite the financial power of its membership, of landing in the crackpot area of the right wing of American politics.

NAM DEMANDS

Nothing could have more strikingly illustrated the difference in the political posture assumed by the organized labor movement on the one hand, and one of the most powerful employer organizations, on the other, than the dramatic NAM luncheon "debate" between George Meany the new head of the American labor movement, and Charles R. Sligh Jr., chairman of the board of the NAM.

Meany's speech was full of conciliation, deprecation of the strength of the labor movement, of the political influence of its leaders, and emphasis on the modesty and narrowness of its aims and demands. He said it was "silly" for labor and management to quarrel, because they have so much in common. He sought to quiet their fear that the united labor movement would mean united workers' strength in politics, or that there is any chance that labor would use its unity to put the squeeze on the employers by an intensified use of the strike weapon.

"I never went on strike in my life," Meany told the strike- and union-busters packed into the room before him, "never ran a strike in my life, never ordered anyone else to run a strike in my life, never had anything to do with a picket line. . . I have no experience with that type of power."

What could be more conciliatory, more reassuring, more calculated to soothe the fears and hatreds of the assembled capitalists? What could more clearly indicate the real intentions of the leaders of the new labor movement to be modest in their demands, careful in the use of their new united strength, restrained in the ways in which they would put it at the service of the people who comprise the labor movement?

But it was all in vain. Chairman Sligh would have none of it. He presented Meany with a five-point "code of conduct" which he proposed should be signed by labor and "industry." The "code of conduct" reads like the ultimatum which every employer dreams of presenting to his workers at the end of a disastrous strike. It is like a mutual-suicide pact in which we agree that you will commit suicide, and I will help you pull the trigger as my part of the bargain.

It provides for the open shop; for the unions to cooperate in keeping the open shop; for a "striving for the utmost efficiency and productivity and the elimination of economic waste of every type"; for "an end to monopoly, whether on the part of organized labor [read: an end to unions] or of industry"; and finally: "keep politics out of labor-management relations and avoid trying to obtain by political pressure what cannot be justified economically."

OUTBURST

Since the NAM's idea of a debate is to have its speaker take the floor last, with no rebuttal, Meany got into an argument with Sligh after the formal "debate" was over. The press swarmed around, only to find the man who had assured his own convention that no one among the labor leaders is thinking of a labor party telling Sligh:

"If the NAM philosophy to disfranchise unions is to prevail, then the answer is clear. If we can't act as unions to defend our rights, then there is no answer but to start a labor party."

Actually, Sligh didn't need this statement, made in anger, to convince him that the unions are actually out to gain political power. He had told the gathering a few minutes before that "a pro-

claimed purpose" of the AFL-CIO is "vastly stepped-up political activity," and asked, "Is it the primary purpose of this organization to seize political control of the country?"

Meany's outburst after the NAM banquet was neither the beginning nor the end of the discussion of a new kind of political role for labor in America, which surrounded the unity convention like a dense fog. The reason it was foggy was that everyone felt it was there, could see it and feel its breath on his cheek, but no one knew or would talk about the way through it.

The leaders have other, practical and pressing problems thrown up by the unity with which they have to grapple right away. The problem of labor's political role, though also pressing, cannot be disposed of in the same way as the distribution of posts, and the testing and weighing of the changed distribution of power inside the new organization which is bound to absorb much of their attention in the immediate future.

But much as they would no doubt like to devote themselves to these "internal" problems of the labor movement, the question of its political future will not wait for their convenience. For one thing, we are entering a presidential election year. For another, the problem interests the whole country and even the whole world as it is fraught with such deep historical significance.

DEMOS CHEERED UP

Washington columnist Doris Fleeson reported Dec. 12 that the Democrats are rejoicing at the new unity, while the Republicans are downcast by it. What pleases the Democrats most (including the Democratic leaders inside the labor movement) is that the Republicans have been setting up such a howl at the unity that both the leaders and the ranks of labor are bound to react to it. In the words of an anonymous "labor brain-truster":

"Here I've been struggling to put the issues of the campaign in form so that our people would understand what we've been up against in this administration, and I was getting nowhere. We can forget the explanations. If someone is beating you over the head with a meat-ax, the thing ceases to be academic. You know he doesn't like you and you aren't going to respond with any love or affection either."

That the labor movement will not respond with affection for its open and avowed enemies goes without saying. Their reaction, to date, however, has been to seek to huddle together with just about everyone in the Democratic Party, friend, half-friend or foe, in the hope that this will protect them from the open attacks of the NAM-minded Republican leaders. Whatever may be said in favor of this tactic, one thing it has not done is to end the attack of the enemy, or to cut down his strength in any significant way. As a matter of fact, on crucial questions such as the junking of the Taft-Hartley Law, it is hard to say in which of the two parties the enemies of labor are more thickly fogathered.

MEANY PROTESTS

The most extensive public discussion of the political role labor will assume in the future took place on the CBS TV and radio program "Face the Nation" on December 11. George Meany, that stubborn foe of a labor party, was being interviewed by four newspaper men. Here are extensive excerpts from the program which all but speak for themselves, as the labor leader keeps protesting alternately that he is against a labor party and might have to form one.

"Q.—Mr. Meany, do you believe that the merged Federation should and will endorse the presidential candidate in 1956?"

"A.—I believe the merged Federation, the same as any other group, has a right to endorse anybody they like for political office. . . . Whether they will or not, I can't say. . . ."

[In response to another question, Meany said, "I am not going to get into a political discussion," but then a reporter quoted his statement at the NAM about forming a labor party. . . .]

"Q.—Is that possible in this next election?"

"A.—Well, of course the trade-unionists of this country don't want a Labor Party. We don't believe in a Labor Party. We don't believe in divisions on class lines in this country. We don't believe in religious parties or in religious unions.

We believe in the free American system under which we now work.

"However, the NAM has come out with a program, and their program—and let me just give you one point in their program—to keep politics—and of course this is a weasel-worded program—to keep politics out of labor-management relations and avoid trying to obtain, by political pressure, that which cannot be justified economically."

"Now, of course, they neglect to mention that they are spending a good deal of their money trying to destroy the trade-union movement and render it impotent through these right-to-work laws, and of course they are advocating much more, greater control under federal laws, see, and then at the same time they and their friends are saying that unions, as such, should be prevented from expressing their views politically."

"And then, of course, we have representatives of the United States Senate who say that unions should be prevented by law from taking part in political action."

"Now, we have every type of society in this country taking part in political action. For instance, in any one state, you would find that in addition to the Republican and Democratic Committees of that state during an election year, there would be committees from the florists, committees from the grocers, committees from the real estate brokers, committees from the lawyers, committees from every segment of the economy, collecting money for political purposes and using it."

"Now, if they are going to make second-class citizens out of trade-unionists, as such, the answer is quite simple. We are not going to abandon our purpose of advancing the cause of the workers of this great nation."

"IF WE HAVE TO"

"Q.—And you would form a political party?"

"A.—If we have to, in order to continue to advance the cause of workers in this country. If we are prevented from doing that as trade unions, if our trade unions are rendered impotent by law and then we are prevented from participating in normal political activity, then of course the only thing to do is to go into that phase of political activity which is perfectly legal."

"And I not only say that we would start a political party, we would be compelled under those circumstances to start a political party, and I would be the first one to advocate it."

"But let me make this prediction: That isn't going to happen, because they are not going to be successful in their attempt to disenfranchise the workers of America."

"Q.—If you don't form your own party, I take it you would prefer to act through one of the existing parties."

"A.—No, we don't want to act through any party. We want to educate our own people to vote intelligently. We want to have them vote for candidates that have some sympathy for the aims and the aspirations of the great mass of American workers."

"We know full well that no one controls the votes of the American people, that we don't control them, we don't pretend to control them, and we don't care what party the people come from, if they have some sympathy for the things that are important for the welfare of the great mass of the working people of this country. . . ."

NO, BUT . . .

"Q.—Mr. Meany, isn't a third party a violation of the traditional position of organized labor in the United States?"

"A.—Joe, the traditional position of the labor movement is against a labor party. I have stated very emphatically, time and time again, that I am opposed to a labor party, but if they are going to destroy unions by legislative action and by political action, if they are going to disenfranchise the workers, as such, if they are going to prevent the workers entering into a political campaign by legislation, then I say that our objective still is to improve conditions, and that if we have to form a labor party in order to carry out our objective, we are certainly not going to abandon our objective, then I say to you very frankly we will go right down that road, if we are compelled to, and only if we are compelled to."

"Q.—Well, you are saying that under certain—"

"A.—Certainly you are not saying that we would stick to a tradition of no

labor party and let the entire movement and all its principles and objectives go by the board, and surrender completely to those who do not believe in decent living conditions and decent wages and hours, and so on and so forth."

"Q.—Well, you are saying that under certain extreme conditions a labor party might have to be formed. I would like to know whom you think would support such a party. You say there are no classes in America. Who would you support?"

"A.—Well, if those conditions prevailed, then we would definitely have a group of second-class citizens; that would be the workers."

"Q.—Mr. Meany, I can't quite tell from your answer whether you think these conditions are now about to prevail or do prevail."

"A.—No, no. I made it quite clear I don't think these things are going to happen. I am just saying that if this program under which the National Association of Manufacturers goes on day in and day out, month in and month out, fostering legislation, expending their money to have laws enacted that destroy the freedom of the worker in his trade union, that if they are eventually successful in that, and then the political parties come along and say, 'Well, we are going to deny trade unions the right to enter into political activity,' I say if that sad day comes, then naturally the entire economy will collapse and we will be in the position that England was back in the 1880s and 1890s, and our only salvation would be to then follow that policy of political action."

"Q.—Mr. Meany,—"

"A.—I think that is crystal-clear, that I am opposed to a labor party. I don't see any such possibility, but I merely say that if these people were successful in destroying our right to use our franchise the way we see fit because we happen to be trade unionists and workers, then I say that if that day, that sad day comes, then our only recourse is to direct political action."

"Q.—Mr. Meany, you said—"

"A.—And I don't look to that to happen."

WHY HE INSISTS

Meany keeps insisting that this is not a real problem, that it does not face the labor movement now, and that it will not face it in the foreseeable future. But although in other parts of the interview he makes it clear that he considers the Democratic Party the "friendlier" to labor of the two major parties, in discussing labor's defense against the NAM's attack, he nowhere refers to labor's Democratic friends as the trustworthy allies who can be counted on in a time of need.

Suddenly, out of a clear blue sky, as it were, in the early stages of a presidential campaign in which even the left wing of the Democratic Party appeared to have become reconciled to a recementing of the ties of party unity at the expense of all considerations of program and principle—suddenly, there is talk of a labor party.

Suddenly, just as the old ex-socialists and ex-New Dealers were settling down in their well-paid jobs with a sigh of real conviction that American capitalism is and always has been fundamentally different from all other capitalisms precisely in that it lacked and lacks a real class structure, charges are flung back and forth among capitalists and labor leaders that each is seeking to destroy the other and establish a totalitarian society in its own image.

Meany still thinks of a labor party as the desperate last ditch of a labor movement which has been driven from every other position. No doubt he is ahead of some of his colleagues even in this notion. But if a labor party would serve the working people of this country as a last line of defense, why would it not serve them even better as a rallying ground from which to launch a serious offensive against their economic and political enemies?

Meany, and Reuther and the other leaders, may not yet have thought of the answer to that one. It may be that they will not have to give that answer during the coming presidential campaign. But the united labor movement will pose the question so persistently, so insistently, so constantly and with such urgency in every moment of tension or crisis, that they will have to answer it eventually not only to reporters on radio programs, but to the millions of men and women whom they lead in the united American labor movement.

History Was Made --

(Continued from page 1)

there were suggestions that an alliance with Dave McDonald of the Steelworkers union was in the making. The variations on this speculation were endless, of course.

What happened? Once the new AFL-CIO constitution was adopted (and the Teamsters voted for it) Beck was confronted not by Reuther, or a small segment of the new union movement, but a formidable set of rules and pressures symbolized in George Meany, newly elected president of the AFL-CIO. Beck's bluster and bluff turned to squirming and evasion when Meany started to call the turn.

At the special constituent convention of the Industrial Union Department, the Teamsters sat meek and mild as Meany laid down the law on representation and elections. The Teamsters can send 400,000 members into that department, and this is exactly what the new president of that department, Walter Reuther, wants. A close reading of the new constitution shows who'll be the power, backed by Meany. The revolt of the Teamsters didn't even materialize.

REUTHER'S ATTACK

But there was more to come. On the last day of the gathering, when a resolution was being presented, Walter Reuther took the floor to announce that the former CIO was giving \$4,000,000 to the forthcoming campaign. Then he electrified the convention by his hard-boiled speech against raiding and racketeering.

There wasn't an individual in the room that didn't know he was talking to the Teamsters, and he really laid it on the line. Not in 15 years has this reporter heard Walter Reuther speak like that. His denunciation of trade-union cannibalism was vitriolic; his contempt for union lead-

ers who think of success in terms of real estate and banks was demonstrated in his tone and manner.

What made this speech important was the spontaneous and huge response he got from the delegates. This was the speech every honest union man in the AFL—and their are millions of them—had been waiting to hear.

We learned later what happened at the Teamsters' table when Reuther was firing away. The delegation was burned up; one important bigwig told them, "Wait till he finishes. Beck will take care of that."

We suspect it is going to be a long wait, for one thing protruded itself on the consciousness of many delegates, perhaps even Beck. The raiders and racketeers, and those working with them, just don't have what it takes to meet Meany and Reuther head-on. The latter represent too much. No doubt Reuther wished Beck had taken him on in debate: what an exposé that would have been!

The labor movement has come a long way from the days when Dave Dubinsky could be slugged at an AFL convention in New Orleans by Joe Fay for daring to introduce the subject of racketeering dangers.

Beck made two maneuvers off the convention floor that served to lose him friends and influence in this vast new union movement, whose very size reduces each individual leader to a less powerful role. Beck admitted that the No. 2 man of the Teamsters, James Hoffa of Detroit, is preparing to give \$500,000 to the racket-ridden International Longshoremen Union, which was expelled from the AFL. Likewise, to show how principled he is, Beck admitted that his lieutenants had made a mutual-assistance pact with the Stalinist-dominated Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers Union, an alli-

ance which is directed against the Steelworkers union headed by Dave McDonald.

In these important organizational questions, one new development is becoming increasingly clear to the labor movement. There are only two dominant figures, George Meany and Walter Reuther; they stand head and shoulders above the others; and they represent the vast majority of the unified movement. Armed with constitutional support, and working through a special ethical-standards committee, they have the power to clean up some of the mess in some of the unions, one of which appears slated for early attention, the so-called AFL Auto Workers (UAW-AFL).

As a matter of fact, the Reuther speech focused properly the whole subject of labor's internal problems, for until that point it had seemed to be the exclusive prerogative of guest speakers to sound the theme of "Clean up your house and keep it clean." Everyone from Adlai Stevenson to Mrs. Roosevelt had touched on this point. One speaker, Rabbi Goldstein, went further: he gave the delegates a very blunt talk on the three Rs, and on civil liberties, including the question of government security files, and dossiers, etc.

GHOST AT THE FEAST

Regrettably, the policy decision on civil liberties remained inadequate in spite of a brave speech by Emil Mazey of the Auto Workers for a more basic approach and solution.

No one can say that an equal deficiency existed on the crucial question of racism and discrimination. This was not one of those conventions where A. Philip Randolph had to speak eloquently but futilely to a half-deserted auditorium and uninterested delegates. In guest speeches, in major constitutional provisions, and in important policy speeches, the new federation was committed to a program of hard work and progress in wiping out the existing discriminatory practices, and in expanding the role of Negroes in the union movement.

The reaction of many Negro delegates from AFL unions showed the change. Between the drive set forth at this convention and the great efforts of the NAACP, the organized labor movement is pointing to a period of progress in this crucial area.

An interesting, and at first glance inexplicable, feature of this convention was what we may facetiously call the Debate on the Labor Party Question. It was, to be sure, a one-sided debate; nevertheless it was important.

No delegate had spoken for a labor party. It was not discussed by the resolutions committee. But it most certainly was a topic at the convention. Meany said he saw no need for it. Ditto Reuther. Stevenson assured the delegates they didn't need one. The New York Times blessed the convention for being reasonable; and the convention resolution itself proclaimed non-partisanship.

But the idea of a labor party was Banquo's ghost at the feast: it was present. It was there because the giant strength, the potentialities and the possibilities of this new power are impossible to ignore. Where will labor's idea of more-rather-than-less political action lead? Especially if victory in 1956 doesn't bring results in 1957? This thought disturbs many of the more far-seeing politicians.

FOREIGN POLICY BACKSLIDE

Also illustrative of this inherent political power were the numerous side incidents. This was a convention worth hanging around just to get introduced, as Governor "Soapy" Williams of Michigan did, among others. It was a convention where guest speakers urged labor to be reasonable. It was a convention where Governor Harriman of New York hoped—vainly—to get support by donning his costume of New Deal vintage and denouncing big business. Even Stevenson found it necessary, after denouncing the Republicans for fomenting group conflict, to talk about the contrast between General Motors' fabulous profits and the 8,000,000 American families living on less than \$2000 a year.

Traditionally the AFL has the commander of the American Legion in to speak, and it happened again. The impact of his views were such that time and again Meany had to call the delegates to order. "Please show some courtesy to the speaker," he pleaded, largely in vain. It wasn't quite the season for that vegetable. The labor movement has other more pertinent things on its mind,

The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

right now, not the least of them being the 1956 elections.

Unquestionably the one major failure of this convention was the retrogression in the views that prevail at present in the field of foreign policy. Here, unmistakably, the more flexible and closer-to-life policies of CIO leaders gave way before the political backwardness of the AFL leaders dominated by Jay Lovestone.

Not only in policy, where he sounds like Senator Knowland on the Formosa question, but in the work in the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, Lovestone dominates with his personal influence of Meany. Putting it in the factional language of the labor movement, Lovestone is cleaning out the Reutherites.

How long this situation will remain unchanged, in the face of Stalinist successes throughout the world, is a matter of speculation. This important field of activity is going to be watched attentively. To the new sores of defeat were added, for many CIO leaders, a painful remembrance of the UAW faction fight in which Lovestone braintrustered for Homer Martin against the tendency in which Walter Reuther was so prominent.

This convention didn't solve any problem except the vital one of unity. On a state level, on a local level, in organization drives, and a multiplicity of other areas, many issues need to be settled.

Part of the uneasiness of some CIO officials over unity came from a fear of these impending changes. In the coming period a new stage has been set, a new arena for union leaders' operation exists. In this, many old leaders will be found wanting; sinecures won't be so secure.

Yet over-all, the impression is unmistakable. Labor in America took a giant step forward by the assembling of this convention, by making labor unity, and by facing up squarely to three key issues, the three Rs of racketeering, racism, and raiding. What Walter Reuther did at this convention was to give an answer in life to the shrieking accusations of Michael Quill.

If the Teamsters or anyone else make the suicidal mistake of splitting, they have already the example of the forgotten man of labor, John L. Lewis, whose failure to change with the times left him high and dry. As for the racketeers, their hard days are ahead.

Convention Sidelights --

(Continued from page 1)

side the hall and loudly urged the delegates to step right into their taxis and talk unionism to the drivers. Do your bit for unionism—convince your cabbie while he drives you to the nearest cocktail party. The Teamster organizers took it for granted, of course, that subways and buses were beneath the dignity of delegates.

WARNING

It remained for Rabbi Israel Goldstein of the American Jewish Congress to present what might be considered the most strongly worded "programmatic" speech to the convention. What Meany and Reuther in their opening speeches skirted rather timidly, in the interests of a "moderate" approach, Goldstein slugged out in vigorous fashion.

He enumerated many of the basic tasks facing the united labor movement, and was especially emphatic on civil liberties. He pointed out:

"Another important area in which the labor movement can see to it that democracy begins at home is that of civil liberties. The labor movement has not done all that is within its power to do to protect its own members. There are many thousands of employees working for government contractors or employed as seamen and longshoremen, white-collar workers, who are subjected to arbitrary security risks and are often discharged without a hearing on the basis of so-called confidential information, confidential because it cannot stand the light of day. Indeed there are efforts on foot in Congress to extend the security program to any industrial establishment which may be classified as a defense facility. If this trend continues, every trade-unionist will soon have a dossier in the FBI files complete with his fingerprints, photograph and life history of himself and his close relatives. This device can be readily used for union-busting...."

LABOR POLITICAL ACTION

According to the press, it took "six labor leaders" working on Adlai Stevenson before his speech to the merger convention, to convince that gentleman and scholar to insert a last-minute sentence expressing his perturbation at what was happening in a certain part of the country, which was the only way he was willing to refer to Mississippi. The incident confirmed Stevenson's obvious determination to say nothing that might

lead to a break with the Southern racists.

SALUTE TO AFRICA

An impressive delegation of leaders of foreign trade unions attended the convention, gathered to attend a meeting of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions following the AFL-CIO convention. At one session, they sat on the platform and were individually presented to the delegates.

The greatest applause hailed the union representative from the African Gold Coast, strikingly dressed in native costume. Such a spontaneous outburst underlined the rising strength against racism within the labor movement.

The convention was not without a touch of romance, albeit an unorthodox one. Since this was a marriage of two forces, an AFL official presented President Meany with a ring to commemorate the event. But what with the growing trend toward double-ring ceremonies, Walter Reuther got his ring too.

This reporter wasn't close enough to see if they went on the proper ring finger, but while the principals were holding hands (handshakes to you) and photographers were at work, some delegates yelled interpretive comments.

LOVESTONITE

On the following Tuesday, George Meany made clear he wasn't the burning-eyed radical that the shivering NAM thought he was, with a speech going down the line for the Knowland-China Lobby-Lovestone line in foreign policy: Nehru and Tito are "allies" of Moscow "in fact," American liberals are too "anti-anti-Communist," etc. The Lovestoneite line of this speech that was written for Meany was so crude that there wasn't a drop of applause for any of its punch-lines from the crowd of trade-union officials and clergymen.

In contrast they responded with sharp applause at passages in Reuther's speech, which followed, that could be taken as an indirect reply to Meany, like:

"We have no right to preach morality to the world or point an accusing finger at other nations unless we are fighting equally hard against injustices at home. We must be as courageous in fighting what goes on in Mississippi as in fighting tyranny behind the Iron Curtain."

Coming after Meany's tirade, even these liberal platitudes sounded good.