TEN CENTS

The Negro Drive for Equality Sparks the Civil Rights Fight in Senate

By GORDON HASKELL

The spotlight in the civil rights struggle is now on the United States Senate. The question is: will this traditional burial-ground of all measures designed to give support to the Negro struggle for full equality prove any different this time? Will the clear-cut issues surrounding enforcement of the right of Negroes in the South to vote, for office, and in general to become full-fledged citizens of their country, be once again buried and obscured in the crossfire of petty partisan interests, deals and accommodations, as has happened in them in the past?

The one way in which this year's "struggle" over civil rights legislation in the Senate differs from all its predecessors is this: the Southern racial leadership has been forced to at least present an appearance of being willing to consider the substance of the legislation put before it. In a way, this is and can only be slight satisfaction to everyone really concerned with civil rights, as it is clear that the actual purpose of the Southern leadership has not changed a bit: They are out to kill any civil rights legislation, as in the past.

Nevertheless, it would be a mistake to overlook the very significant difference between this fight and past ones, for it is a sure sign of the effectiveness of the Negro struggle for equality over the past few years.

Down South, politicians and other representatives of the established order find themselves as ever in their speeches and proclamations is which they say Negroes will never be given equal rights. The fifth with which they rifle their groves, the threats and apparent success of the White Citizens Councils in organizing terror and economic intimidation of Negroes has driven some to believe that the day of equality for Negroes in that area is farther off than ever; that the reaction of the riots has proved to be stronger than the force of the action the Negroes and their friends have been able to bring to bear upon Jim Crow.

The force of the Senate debate demonstrates the wrong such as it is for the country in the year past. The Southern leadership simply said "No!" and their beaks in, and shuttered. They did not bother to acquaint themselves with the objections of the bills placed before them. They did not stop at the inner books and historical texts to find arguments directed at one or another section of the bills as drafted. They did not and it necessary to try to split their opposition by argument. They just said "no!" up the parliametary maneuver of the Jolly Rodee of the Senate, its headmaster and waited for the opposition to founder and break up on the reefs of the Senate cloture rule.

Filibuster?

But this year, that will not do. True, the Senate is prepared for a filibuster, any way, but however much they cite precedent and baffle the Negroes in the hope of getting on their own Southern newspapers and legislatures, they recognize that when the whole American people are looking on, and beyond that, millions of people all over the world, a different pose, a different tactic is indicated.

So, the South has made its stand on the trusted old ground of white supremacy, Negro "inferiority" and preservation of the purity of the race. Instead, they have sought out less familiar but more respectable grounds with which to give a bit of palatability to their reactionary purposes. They stand on the right of trial by jury, and against "Rosie-ole" school integration backed by federal troops.

There would be little point to going into the merits and demerits, advantages and disadvantages of substituting trial by jury for trial by judge in cases involving violations of the color bar. The point is that one is really less interested in these "lemons" than those citizens who are bowing about them in the Senate in illustrated by the fact that none of them has ever raised this question in their own state for election.
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Dilemma for All Sections of the Communist Party

Democracy and the Shake-up in Russia

By H. W. BENSON

Less than six months ago, the national convention of the Communist Party ended in New York. It was an event of genuine political significance affecting the course of radicalism in the United States. It came as the climax of a deep-going discussion inside the Communist movement lasting for at least a year a serious-minded party members and leaders, caught a way out of the crisis into which their movement had been plunged by the revelations of the 20th Congress and the Hungarian Revolution. The best among them were turning away from totalitarian distortions of socialism and toward the American working class movement and democratic socialism. It was a real discussion, an honest internal struggle between divergent basic views. Anyone who still does not understand this can hardly comprehend what has happened to the socialist movement in this country.

The convention relented the drive of William Z. Foster to re-Stalinize the American party, an attempt backed by the authority of Jacques Ducos whose new letter of advice was spat out. But at the same time, the convention evaded the main issues of the party victory! It did not even consider the State proposal for a Political Action Association; it dodged the Hungarian events; it failed to solidarize itself with the struggle of the Polish people, under the leadership of the Communist regime, for independence from Russian domination. Then, its sessions ended with a question mark.

Hundreds streamed out of the party in disappointment over its failure to make a real turn, the tendency which leaned toward democratic socialism. Many of these, finished with the Communist Party, now await the rebirth of a militant socialist movement.

Others, who were just as dissatisfied, decided to remain in the party, await new events, and renew the campaign for a turn toward social democracy under more favorable circumstances. Now, six months after, it is possible to take stock. Has the party moved further toward democratic socialism or has it begun to slide back toward Stalinism?

The most significant event in the Communist world since the convention was the shift in Russia which entrenched the power of Stalin and eliminated two of the remaining highest ranking leaders: Malenkov and Molotov. The state of the American Communist Party is revealed instantly after this: before the last convention, a wide-ranging discussion, debates, articles, bulletins, an effort to grapple with basic socialist problems. Now, after the Russian events, almost nothing. A column in the Daily Worker (Continued on page 4)
er, a short column by Joe Clark, and that is all.

It is true that the discussion is not as simple as it appears. Not the least difficulty is a general, growing awareness of the forces for and the urgencies and the coexistence of Foster and his co-thinkers. This is not to say that the Fosterites are unified. They have been working out only by default. And when the facts move forward, it automatically slips backward. Furthermore, the Gassetian Gates wing was weakened by defections, not to Foster, but out of the party in despairs, through the New York state convention in New York, once a stronghold of anti-Stalinism, the Fosterites and allies took control. The Gassetes were voting with their feet. Pro-Gates delegates, elected before the convention, quit the party before it could assemble. The Fosterites could take over only because their rivals were disintegrating by the minute. Why? Those who left the party now have no future with it. They were not guided in any fight for democracy; they felt free from the discipline; they saw no alternative acceptable to them on the outside. So far, this situation remains unchanged.

Fosterites Gain

The Daily Worker remains under the editorship of Fosterite John Entwistle, a position that does not seem to reflect openly the changing of the guard in the party. It is the task of the real situation only by realizing what the Daily Worker does not say.

Fosterites (in New York). The tone of old-styled Stalinism is heard from John Entwistle's pen. He accused his resignation from the Communist Party, Howard Fast expressed horror at Stalin's persecutions of the Jews. In a similar vein, the Daily Worker is urging for maintaining dictatorship and censure on the works that led to freedom in Russia. One can understand why these lines are appearing in the current issues, even republicate Fast's act of resignation and dissociate himself from it. After all, he never renounced the party, if possible. But what about the rank and file of the party, victims of his criticism of the Russian regime? What is that something different? Is it permissible to agree with the Russian communist party and remain inside the party nevertheless?

The arrogance of the time has only begun itself. Foster feels so free in public to denounce Fast for his views on personal and political conditions of the Russian revolution, that the statement of no one, he discoveres that all Hungarian history points to the conclusion that the Hungarian Revolution was essentially the result of a reactionary and imperialist victory. This in turn led him to a reasserted faith in the left of the leadership. He notes that the magazine "communist," properly enough, the first of the world, and "Socialist."
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