



Westinghouse Backing Down?

Pittsburgh, Feb. 6 With union and company agreement to a federal mediator's proposal, the long Westinghouse strike of the Electrical Workers (IUE) may be nearing an end.

One agreement is that there shall be no time-study (the main issue in the strike) for 90 days after a return to work while negotiations go on to take up other issues in the dispute. It is expected that the other issues can be settled during this period.

If there is no agreement reached on time-study at the end of the 90 days, then the strike may be resumed. However, as of now, the possibility is that Westinghouse may yield on accepting an arbitration clause in some form. If the

union gets the arbitration clause in the contract that it is asking for, then the company will have made an important retreat on the time-study question which has been the focus of the fight.

The break is a recognition on both sides that they have been hopelessly deadlocked in the strike, By no means is it a thorough victory for the union. The IUE will have to build its forces quickly and prepare for the end of the 90-day period when it might be forced out on strike again.

However, it should be noted that for the first time the Westinghouse Corporation has backed down from its position of "We have the unconditional right to manage."

Democrats Take Lead In the Bipartisan Natural Gas Sellout

By SAM TAYLOR

The passage of the Natural Gas Bill by the Senate has produced an explosion in Washington; an alleged bribery of a senator, a milliondollar-plus slush fund, lobbying on a grand scale, charges of "giveaway," "grab" and gouging the consumer. Democrats and Republicans lined up both for and against the bill, and liberal and conservatives likewise. The differences that supposedly separate the Democrats as the party

of the people and the Republicans as the party of Big Business were drowned in a sea of oil and suffocated in an atmosphere of gas.

The bipartisan effort to raise consumers' gas prices was spearheaded by the leader of the Democratic Party in the Senate, Senator Lyndon Johnson of Texas. It was the first piece of legislation on the agenda at the opening of the second session of the 84th Congress. So powerful is the oil and gas lobby and so committed to serve its interests is

the leadership of the Democratic Party that it placed natural gas ahead of all other business. There is a crying need for school construction, a vast need for lowand middle-income housing, Negroes are being terrorized and denied their rights -but all of these will have to wait till. the oil industry fattens up at the expense of practically everyone else.

Where does this leave the Democratic Party on the issue of "domination of the government by big business" and "giveaway" of natural resources? A number. of liberal senators and columnists have commented that it takes the wind out of that issue.

Senator Hennings of Missouri has attacked Senator Johnson and Representative Rayburn, who championed the bill in the House, as a "small part of the Democratic leadership in both the House and Senate." But they are the leader-ship, and they *did* push through the Harris-Fulbright bill on the issue.

LIBERAL STOOGES

Despite the furor raised in the last day or two before the passage of the bill, the bill was herded through Congress for the most part in an atmosphere of indifference, apathy and cynicism on the part of most senators, including the opponents of the bill. Washington columnist Doris Fleeson, writing an apologetic article on the plight of the Senate liberals, moans:

"Majority Leader Johnson shrewdly

Where Are the Liberals In the Election Race?

By GORDON HASKELL

The political campaign is already in full swing in the United States, ten months before the votes will actually be cast. The politically accidental occurrence of President Eisenhower's heart attack opened the campaign prematurely for the Republican Party, and the Democrats, having failed to build up much of a basis for a political campaign in the first three years of Republican rule, are now trying to catch up as much as possible.

The chances of the Republicans to retain the presidency in the coming election, and to hold their own or improve their position in both houses of Congress, may well depend on such factors as Eisenhower's final decision on whether he should run or not, and the state of the national economy during the summer and early fall. If the president should refuse to run again, the struggle for his successor might decisively wreck his party's chances, all other things being equal. Further, a decision by Eisenhower not to run might have a very material, though temporary effect on the economy. The U. S. News & World Report for February 10 correctly observes that "many businessmen, rightly or wrongly, tend to show less confidence in policies of a government under a Democratic president than under a Republican." This lack of confidence could affect decisions about plant expansion, inventory build-up, and the like. If the economy should show signs of softening late this spring, such decisions could give it a further, and rapid push downward. Republcans and businessmen have been and continue to be their own worst political enemies in this country, and they may be given another chance to prove it. As the inter-party struggle lines up so far, there appears to be even less real reason for most businessmen to fear a Democratic victory than there has been in the past. The same publication, which is rabidly pro-Republican, and inside the

Republican camp leans to the Knowland wing, writes:

"No matter how the battle over the presidency comes out: "Congress in years just ahead will re-

main under control of a coalition of 'conservatives.' Business will have little to fear from new laws.



"Tax policies, as they affect business, will be little changed. Tax rate on corporation income will stay at 52 per cent. Dividend credit, however, is likely to remain in law. Amortization at the faster rate will still be allowed. Capital-gains tax will not be changed. Punitive taxes will not be tried.

(Continued on page 7)

Labor Action Bares Red Plot!

It looks as if the NAM is right in its accusations that Eisenhower is a Creeping Communist.

The Washington administration, which poses as pro-capitalist and even Republican, was exposed in a news item of January 29, dealing with the plans by the Office of Defense Mobilization for pinning things together in event of an H-bomb attack

"As visualized by some planners, food rationing in the early days following a nuclear bomb attack would be of the soup kitchen variety. Communal feeding would be the rule."-N. Y. Times.

We cannot understand the reasons for this impermissible concession to collectivism. Does the government always have to be dragged into competition with private business? What is this mania for security that afflicts our national planners and socializers?

There are lots of good, deserving capitalistic private-enterprisers that could take care of that little situation, if only the dead hand of government bureaucracy were lifted.

For example, the Waldorf Astoria Catering Service.

advantage of the election-year necessities of two Democratic liberals-Monroney (Oklahoma) and Fulbright (Arkansas)-whom he persuaded to lead the fight for the bill, a circumstance which Johnson enjoys rubbing into his liberal critics."

The two Democratic contenders for the presidential nomination found other things to keep them busy while the issue was before the Senate. According to Doris Fleeson again, they were unable to make their opposition to the bill felt: Kefauver was away from the Senate during most of the debate and Stevenson "kept his hands off." They were too busy running for the Democratic nomination, in order to return the government to the people as they quaintly put it, to take part in or try to lead an effective opposition to the bill.

Kefauver, it must be pointed out, did return to Washington for a short period, a day or two, and announced his opposition to the bill.

But Stevenson is yet to be heard from. Fleeson concludes that "The gas bill will hurt Democrats in the pivotal states where they win or lose elections. It does not fit their general philosophy as ex-(Turn to last page)

CHALLENGE TO MEANY AND REUTHER

WHEN JOEY FAY **GETS OUT OF JAIL**

By BEN HALL

Joe Fay will soon be out of jail. The New York State Parole Board has recommended his release; he has only to promise to refrain from union activity.

Fay was a vice-president of the International Union of Operating Engineers before his conviction for extortion in 1945; in 1948 he began a seven and one-half to fifteen years' sentence. But even behind bars, he continued to wield power in the Building Trades.

Now Fay emerges. The union he influences claims 200,000 members, the men who operate steam shovels, derricks, piledrivers and other heavy building-construction machinery.

In December 1954, the Operating Engineers set up a joint committee with the Teamsters, Hod Carriers, and Carpenters—an alliance of the extreme right wing to defend its

common interests in the labor movement. Fay's reappearance throws the national spotlight on this union and raises the question of enforcement of the anti-racket clause of the AFL-CIO constitution, section 7:

"It is a basic principle of this Federation that it must be and remain free from any and all corrupt influences. . . . The Executive Council shall have the power to conduct an investigation, directly or through an appropriate standing or special committee appointed by the President, of any situation in which there is reason to believe that any affiliate is dominated, controlled or substantially influenced in the conduct of its affairs. by any corrupt influence. . . ."

If this clause doesn't apply to the Operating Engineers, it fits in nowhere on this planet.

"One reason Meany is cheered by the impending merger," reads a Times biographical sketch of the federation president, "is the improved opportunity he will have to tie a can to some of the unsavory characters who now infest AFL organizations." He has his chance right now.

RECRUITER

The International Ladies Garment Workers Union, in its paper Justice, reported on April 1, 1955: "The unity they have established is the prerequisite for ridding organized labor of unsavory elements in its midst. It embodies the spirit of the resolution against racketeering in the labor movement introduced by our union at the 1940 AFL convention in New Orleans." The author of the resolution was David Dubinsky. Fay, then a powerful AFL figure, sought him out in a convention hotel bar and physically assaulted him. The Lithographers' Union, naming "certain labor racketeers," refers to "the records and activities of labor misleaders of the character of Joe Fay." One wonders: will Fay return to his old haunts? And if not, does his spirit go on? In 1953, the then State Senate majority leader, Arthur H. Wicks, visited Fay in a Sing Sing cell; in the erupting scandal Wicks explained that union officials in his district said he would have to see Joey to settle strikes in the area. Wicks was subsequently forced to resign; Fay was transferred to a distant prison.

tors told the New York Crime Commission that year that pressure came from building-trades unions to hire men fresh out of Sing Sing upon Fay's recommendation. He recruits future strongarm men from friends at hand.

FAY'S CAREER

When Fay went to prison, his union membership was revoked but his wife went on the union payroll as an "adviser"; his local told the parole board in 1952 that his old job as business agent would be open whenever he could return to active duty; and the trustees of the welfare fund, very trusting, announced that they were eager to have him as assistant to the fund's administrator.

Fay's career reveals much about the Operating Engineers. He became a big power as heir of two notorious racketeers who preceded him.

In 1934 he took over from Theodore Brandle, ruler of the Jersey City building trades unions who finally went to prison after a seven-year reign of graft. He won a foothold in New York when he was sent by the International to "reorganize" its Local 125.

In the early thirties, the local was dominated by International Vice-President Commerford, called "Lead Pipe" Pat for his peculiar methods of influencing oppositionists. Commerford, a vice-president of the State Federation of Labor and of the New York Building Trades Council, ended up in jail as a racketeer. Local members revolted, went to court, and put in a re-

strike at a subway-construction project. Fay told him to call it off. Redwood declared that his men would never go back "with a gun stuck in their backs." The next day he was shot to death by gunmen as he drove up to his home. The prosecutor of Bergen County charged that Fay and a subway contractor had plotted the murder but neither was ever indicted.

The International administration, which made Fay its agent, remains. In 1953 the murder of Thomas Lewis, president of Local 32E of the Building Service Employees Union, opened to public scrutiny a festering racket in welfare funds.

In the course of its investigations, the New York State Insurance Department issued a subpoena for the appearance of a vicepresident of the Operating Engineers, Joseph J. Delaney, the man appointed to replace Fay. The subpoena was never served and Delaney never appeared. He was abruptly called out of town for "union activity." Later, testimony revealed that this successor to Fay had received \$13,650 in the 14 months before Lewis' death for fictitious services as a "labor consultant" to an agency controlled by the murdered man. Delaney's assistant Richard H. Nolan received \$9,100.

An over-suspicious member might suggest that something here hints at the need for a union housecleaning.

"THERE IS REASON"

Plenty of work for Meany piling

Fay is not alone. The careers of two lieutenants, who went to jail with him, might indicate whether or not (to use the phrases of the AFL-CIO constitution) "there is reason to believe" that the union is "substantially influenced in the conduct of its affairs by any corrupt influence."

In Westchester County, the International Union of Operating from any taint of corruption....

Engineers was dominated by Fay's associate Martin J. Parkinson, who went to Sing Sing for two years. In his absence, Locals 137. 137A and 137B were run by his brother James L. Parkinson, known familiarly as "Leo." Leo carried on the good work.

As trustee of the locals' welfare fund he admitted receiving commissions of 9 per cent which totaled \$2,769 between December 1952 and July 1953, a trifling sum compared to the achievements of experts in the field. But his poor showing has perhaps been remedied. When Martin got out of jail. he was "invited" to return to run the local at a membership meeting of 100 members. The vote was an open, standing ballot.

"There is reason to believe" that a Meany investigation is needed.

ON THE AGENDA

In Long Island City, the Operating Engineers are run by the De-Koning family, long-time associates of Fay and operators in their own right. In 1954 William C. De-Koning Sr., president emeritus of Local 138, went to prison for extorting \$360,000 from contractors.

His son. William Jr., got a suspended sentence under the condition that he stay away from the local. But as soon as Junior's probation was over, he returned to Local 138, produced a letter from International President William E. Maloney empowering the local to elect a new business agent and lo! he was back at the old standbusiness agent and president.

One member, Peter Battalias, protested. He was fined \$750 by William Jr. and barred from meetings for 5 months. He appealed to the International Executive Board which listened in bored inattention to his tale of local corruption, dictatorship and beatings, reduced his fine to \$100, but retained the ban on attending meetings. There seems a lot to investivate here too.

And not only on a local scale. "Thus far," reported A. H. Raskin in the New York Times over two years ago, "the parent union has shown no interest in trying to establish how or why a convict can influence the affairs of its locals in the metropolitan area."

That should be very interesting to the AFL-CIO Committee on Ethical Practices, which is "vested with the duty and responsibility ... to keep the Federation free

form administration

BULLY-BOY

But the International intervened to preserve racketeering "order," expelled the local and set up a new one; it was immediately recognized by the employers. The man sent in to restore the corrupt status quo and wipe out the reformers was Joseph Fay.

Fay guickly moved to construct the machine that was later powerful enough to extract hundreds of thousands of dollars in graft from contractors on the New York water-supply system. Together with a vice-president of the Hod Carriers Union, James Bove, he centralized control of the whole Building Trades in his hands.

One man refused to submit; Norman Redwood, president of Laborers Local 102 was an honest Three Orange County contrac- man; in 1937 his union went on

Kutcher Rally in New York To Press for Right to Job

James Kutcher, the legless veteran who lost his job, may lose his home, and risked his pension, rather than give up his minority political views, will tell his story to the public at a meeting to be held at 8 p.m., Friday, Feb. 17, at Com-munity Church, 45 East 35 Street, New York.

Others speaking on Kutcher's behalf will be James A. Wechsler, editor of the New York Post, Morris Iushewitz, secretary-treasurer of the New York City CIO Council, and Kenneth M. Birkhead, national executive director of the American Veterans Committee.

The meeting is sponsored by the Kutcher Civil Rights Committee. The meeting will hear a first-hand account by Kutcher of what happened in the recent pension-forfeiture hearing. Other themes of the meeting will be the important civil-liberties issues raised by Kutcher's job, housing and pension cases. Admission to the meeting is free.

den and the second

2.1

Kutcher has been defended in the job and pension cases by the noted liberal attorney Joseph L. Rauh Jr., who serves without fee. After years of appeals through the myriad loyalty boards and into the federal courts, Rauh has now brought the job case before the Circuit Court of Appeals in Washintgon, D. C. This is the court immediately below the U. S. Supreme Court.

Argument will probably take place in the Circuit Court the same week as the New York meeting.

Two years ago when Kutcher's case was before this same court an important, though partial victory was won. It set a legal precedent that has been a basis for recent civil liberties victories in the courts. However, it did not end the Kutcher case, restore his job, or answer all the constitutional questions raised. It is hoped that Kutcher's case, strengthened by the victory won in the pension hearing, will be ruled on in full this time.

states sitts

Page Three

POLAND Is Heretic Gomulka **On the Way Back?**

By A. RUDZIENSKI

The new sensation in the Polish "thaw" policy is an article in Nowe Drogi (New Way), the theoretical organ of the Stalinist ruling party's Central Committee. It officially puts forth the condemned theory of a "Polish road to socialism" which was the reason for the jailing of poor Gomulka, the ex-premier of the republic who was charged with "Polish Titoism," service to Western imperialism and other mortal sins.

Following the rehabilitation of the old leaders of the CP that had been dissolved by Stalin, on the charge that they were agents of the Polish police even before 1937 [see LA for Oct. 31 last], this is the second most important event in the "thaw" policy of the Warsaw regime.

After recalling that the road to socialism is common to all peoples, Nowe Drogi tosses forth the statement that "we have paid too little attention to what is independent, different in our movement, in our method of building, in the forms of our struggle, in our slogans; to what is different and special in the conditions of development of our country. The peculiar conditions of this historical period which is seeing the development of our popular revolution and our changes, our historical past and traditions, as well as the present international situation in which we are building the new social order, and the fact that Po-land belongs to the powerful socialist bloc-all these phenomena are not without influence on our particular road to socialism, and on modifying the (in principle) common road." (Please excuse the complicated and ungrammatical style of the Stalinist writer; it is very difficult to translate.)

The last sentence is trying to say diplomatically that the particular (national) conditions must bring about modifications in the road which is common to all "socialist" states; but the cau-tious "theoretician" prefers to use a double negative in place of a simple affirmative. He wants to avoid too strong a statement-just in case.

But this cautious sentence may mean not only a turn in the party's present policy but also the rehabilitation of the "Palish road to socialism" which was condemned as a Titoist heresy in Poland and elsewhere.

WHAT CHANGES?

The "theoretician" recalls a quotation from Lenin (I am translating from the Polish paper): "All peoples will achieve socialism; it is inevitable; but they will not all get there in the identical way; for every people will contribute something of their own to this or that form of democracy, to this or that form of the proletarian dictatorship, to this or that rhythm of the socialist transformation in the various spheres of social life. There is nothing more poverty-stricken than, in the name of historical materialism, to paint the future in one gray color."

After thus invoking the support of the "Holy Father," the author explains that the particularity of the "different road" to socialism in Poland lies in the different agrarian structure and in the different tempo and manner of collectivization.

This is no more and no less than the old argument made by Gomulka which was so rabidly condemned by Stalin.

The question now arises whether the cautious rehabilitation of the old theory also signifies the official rehabilitation of Gomulka himself in the party. Or does it mean other changes in Russian policy in Poland, that is, the possible broadening of the base of the regime?

According to sources in the Polish emigration and elsewhere abroad, Gomulka is still supposed to be the most popular figure in the country and his popularity has not been diminished by his imprisonment; rather it has grown. Whether the return of Gomulka to power is assured or not, the most important thing here is a possible turn in Moscow-Warsaw relations, that is, a possible concession of greater autonomy to the Polish regime, as well as the possible broadening of its social and political base.

REGIME CONFESSES

A problem like this develops-on the basis of the internal situation both in Russia and Poland-where the position of the Stalinist regime is very difficult, the resistance very strong, and the composition of the new bureaucratic class very different from that in Russia. The grounds for a "different road to socialism" lie not only in the strong peasant resistance to the totalitarian expropriation but also in the Russian conquest of Poland by invasion, in the destruction of the revolutionary workers party, and the consequent weakness of the imposed Stalinist regime, which is isolated from the people and hated as a foreign instrument.

Nowe Drogi is right in saying that the peculiarities of the "popular revolution in Poland" can be expected to bring about modifications in its road to socialism. Poland never had a bolshevik revolution; there was a democratic revolution whose last act was the reconquest of national independence in 1918 and the creation of a democratic republic. Later, there was the anti-Nazi war, the Stalinist invasion, and the anti-Stalinist resistance

Although the Stalinist regime was able to liquidate the remnants of Polish feudalism and destroy the economic and social power of the great landlords and annihilate private capitalism by its bureaucratic nationalization of industry, still it was never able to acquire the authority of a really revolutionary regime. It was not able to eradicate and strov the Nationalists and the workers' and peasants' resistance because these were defeated in struggle but not demoralized. By admitting the need for a "different road to socialism," the regime confesses defeat in the agrarian sphere, where hardly 6 per cent of the peasants have accepted collectivization; it confesses that it cannot demolish the political resistance in the same way as in Russia. At the same time the Stalinist party expresses its disposition to conciliate other sections of the bureaucratic class in Poland, whose composition is different from Russia's. In the higher technical posts, these are made up of ex-Nationalists, ex-Pilsudski men, ex-Socialists, ex-Catholics, ex-Populists. Perhaps the Kremlin finds it in its interest to try to make a new deal in Po-land and, by admitting a "Polish road to socialism," seek an understanding with other political sectors of the Polish nation-in the first place the Nationalist Party, which has always favored the aim of an autonomous Poland within a Russian empire; and then the Peasant Party and even the Socialists. Thus perhaps it hopes to create a solid regime of Russian-Polish cooperation. It is a very difficult thing for them to try to do; it is highly dubious; but it is not excluded.

Labor MPs Give Bevan **Highest Vote Ever**

By OWEN ROBERTS

LONDON LETTER

The last seven days in Britain have witnessed several slick moves by the Labor Party right wing designed to strengthen their hold on the party leadership and to freeze out the influence of Nye Bevan. The moves were conducted on two fronts-the National Executive of the party and the Parliamentary Labor Party.

Following the decision of the disgruntled right-winger Herbert Morrison to throw in his job as deputy leader of the Parliamentary Party after he had received a firm thumbs-down for the top leadership job, an election was necessary to fill his vacated seat. When Parliament wound up for the Christmas recess the big question in every mind was: would Bevan stand for election? The answer was important to left and right wing alike.

When Parliament reassembled last week Bevan accepted nomination and the fight was on. It had been rumored that two others had decided to accept nomination: right-winger Alf Robens who is now considered the Labor expert on foreign affairs, and middle-of-theroad Jimmy Griffiths, only non-Bevanite member of the NEC elected by the rankand-file votes of the constituency parties.

At the close of nominations only one other candidate appeared in the field alongside Bevan; he was middle-of-theroader Griffiths. This meant that Bevan's chances of gaining the position had declined, for a split vote would have been in his favor. But with right-winger Robens out of the way, many of the undecided voters might be persuaded to place their cross against the more acceptable Griffiths.

VOTE AT PEAK

It is said that Robens' decision not to stand was not unprompted, and that slight pressure from the right wing made him see that if he persisted in standing then he was increasing the chance of a win for Bevan.

With such a setup the right wing could not but fail to get their man home, but they only just managed it. The result, announced to a meeting of Laborite members of Parliament an hour ago, gave Griffiths 141 votes as against 111 for Bevan. This is a much narrower margin than was expected in the circumstances. and for Bevan it was the highest vote he has yet collected while standing for office within the Parliamentary Labor Party. It was a victory for those on the left who had been urging Bevan to stand as a demonstration against the right wing.

The new deputy leader is a 66-yearold Welshman who entered Parliament in 1936 after ten years as a leader of the Welsh miners. He left school at the age of 13 to work in the pits and spent 16 years at work as a miner. At the age of 17 he became the secretary of his local branch of the Independent Labor Party and he eventually spent two years in London at the Central London Labor College, a college maintained by the trade unions which, before going out of existence, set many of the preesnt leaders of the British Labor movement on their way.

London, Feb. 2

who is at the moment carefully digging

in as the newly elected leader of the party.

The second slick move by the right wing occurred a week ago when the NEC held its regular monthly meeting at Transport House. An important item on the agenda was the question of the party, treasurer, which carries with it a seat on the NEC.

For the past couple of years Bevan and Gaitskell have used the election of treasurer as a battle ground between left and right, with Gaitskell always taking the honors. When Gaitskell was made" leader of the Parliamentary Labor Party

-which also carries a seat on the NEC -many people thought that he would, hand in his job as treasurer and that this post would then, in accordance with past practice, go to the next on the ballot, in. other words to Nye Bevan.

BRIGHT BOY

But the right wing did not feel in-clined to hand over to Bevan so easily; so it set the party secretary, Morgan Phillips, raking around in the files to see if he could discover any escape among the relics of the past. Phillips, living up to his reputation as a bright boy, saved the day for the right wing.

He discovered that back in the 1930s the late Arthur Greenwood, during Attlee's illness, had for a brief period held the dual office of leader and treasurer. This was sufficient of a constitutional precedent for the right wing and they, promptly pushed through a motion that Gaitskell too would show his abilities by performing both jobs at once.

The left wing has one small consolation from all this-perhaps. As deputy leader Griffiths gets an automatic seat on the NEC and therefore the seat which he holds at present from the constituency party section falls vacant. Unless any other peculiar circumstance can be found this will be filled by the next highest on the ballot result—which means pacifist Sidney Silverman comes on to strengthen the left wing of the NEC.

But, with the experience of the past week still fresh, perhaps it would be a little unwise to place a bet on Silverman's rights of succession.

NEW LIGHT ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

The following item is reproduced from the magazine CHICAGO, February issue:

The new chief of the Daily News' Washington bureau, Edwin A. Lahey, indulged in some real Capitol Hill logic in

SHACHTMAN TOUR SAN FRANCISCO & EAST BAY

Max Shachtman

will speak in Berkeley

MONDAY EVE. March 5 at 8 p.m.

Labor Unity and Labor Political Action

FINNISH BROTHERHOOD HALL 1970 Chestnut Street

BERKELEY

MOUTH-ORGAN EXPERT

Griffiths is unique in that he is the only non-Bevanite to maintain his seat on the NEC after the landslide at the Morecambe Conference of the party in 1952. This is partly due to the fact that he has a gift of oratory which can make even right-wing policies seem ultra-revolutionary. A pressman once remarked, after hearing Griffiths speak, that he could make an order for a pound of potatoes sound like a call to battle.

It is, however, many years since he used his ability to give voice to any topic causing friction between the right and left wings of the party. This is what makes him so useful to Hugh Gaitskell,

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.

a report on the case of Gil Green, the local Communist who has been hiding from the government for five years. The story read, in part:

"A poverty-stricken young man named Gil Greenberg 30 years ago went to a public library branch on the West Side of Chicago to find some answers to the problems of his world.

"Greenberg should have stood in the pool hall at Kedzie and Van Buren with the rest of the guys. "That fateful trip to the library set

Greenberg off on a life that ultimately, made him a criminal and a fugitive "The young Greenberg, now 48-yearold Gil Green, found what he thought were the answers in the writings of Karl Marx, Gustavus Myers, Jack London, Edward Bellamy and other characters who didn't think that the status quo was here to stay...."

Here Lahey implicitly presents a revolutionary three-fold program for fighting Communism:

(1) Revise all social science books to teach that things have always been as, they are now and always will be.

(2) Close the public library. Encourage attendance (3) at pool halls. A. W.

Page Four

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

Israelis, Arabs, and "Special Responsibility"

To the Editor:

I had wanted to comment on Hal Draper's Nov. 14 article on the Israel-Arab crisis ["Power-Politics Behind the Israel-Arab Crisis"] but the time flew and I thought it no longer in order. The printing of another reader's letter, in the Jan., 16 issue, referring to Draper's article, reassures me that it is never too late.

Despite my warm feelings for Comrade Hal Draper and my respect for his loyalty, unsurpassed devotion and courage in the struggle for the socialist liberation of humanity, he manages to annoy me when he writes on Israeli and Zionist questions. The irritation occurs even when there is no significant difference in analysis or essential policy.

His Nov. 14 article makes explicit one of the main features of his approach that I dislike. He is aware that the Arab nationalist movements (not merely the feudal elements but all wings, including the socialist and Stalinist) work "to eradicate Israel as a state" and also correctly describes the suicidal and provocative nature of Israeli defense policy. So far, so good!

Then he gives a peculiar twist to ISL policy when he proclaims "we have the right to make our demands on the Israelis first" (my italics) and advances "the concept that a special (H.D's italics) responsibility in working toward a democratic solution falls on the Israeli working class."

A strange position! Not the ones who openly and avowedly plan and work for the total destruction of the other camp have a "special responsibility" nor are they the "first" to get demands to change, but those who defend themselves against extermination, albeit stupidly. One doesn't have to be a Zionist or even a "crypto-Zionist" to be struck by the unnaturalness of this attitude. The anti-Zionist, socialist Jewish Bund, while sharply critical of the chauvinist aspects of Israeli policy, never strikes this ridiculous pose.

It is like saying that the Jews living in the small towns of the Russian Pale (who, culturally, were somewhat more advanced) bore "a special responsibility" to prevent the pogroms visited on them by the peasantry. Incidentally, there

Racist Symbol

The Virginia state senator who gave his name to the Gray Commission, which invented the white-supremacists' plan of circumventing the Supreme Court's desegregation decision, is as anti-labor as he is anti-Negro, reveals the AFL-CIO News.

In this respect he is a symbol.

State Senator Garland S. Gray closed down his lumber company in 1952 rather than negotiate with the union. "No damned union is going to run my business," he said at the time.

Six days before he decided to close the plant, his employees had voted 99-8 in an NLRB election to be represented Woodworkers. the International bv Seven months later the business reopened under the name of Elmon Grav & Co., nominally under the ownership of were those like Dostoyevsky who said as much. Dostoyevsky, with a measure of truth, pointed to the snobbish, chauvinist attitudes of the Jewish townspeople toward the goyim as a provocation. There are great differences between the two situations but the similarity is sufficient to be nettling.

In hastening to point out the differences between the two situations. I hope that Hal Draper does not read me a lecture about the undemocratic Character of the Israelis too have organized pogroms tine nor point out that, in this case, the Israelis too have organized progroms (Deir Yassin and Kibya). I, and others who feel as I do, were far from the last to bring the implications of these acts to the attention of the socialist public.

I would also like to comment on his repeated references to "blood-politics," "tribalism" and Nazi-like "racialism" when writing about Israeli nationalism (incidentally, never when talking about Arab nationalism) but that will have to wait for another "Letter to the Editor." ED FINDLEY

COMMENT

(1) Comrade Ed (not to be confused with Al) Findley should have quoted the reason I gave for the "special responsibility" of the Israeli working class: "precisely because it considers itself politically and socially more advanced than the forces in the backward Arab societies."

(2) I have to straighten out his claim that this is " a peculiar twist to ISL policy.'

For the point was taken quite consciously straight out of the ISL resolution (for which see NI July-Aug. 1951), which begins a little discussion of this very matter with the following words:

"A special responsibility-not a onesided one, but a special responsibilityin this regard devolves upon the working-class movement of Israel, precisely because of its more advanced character and ideology and the more advanced nature of the economy upon which it rests."

So much for the peculiar twist.

(3) This excellent passage in our resolution did not annoy or irritate Ed when it was adopted, or even before it was adopted when he was consulted on the draft resolution. I therefore have a suspicion which I cannot suppress that he has not succeeded in putting the finger on what really annoys him about our anti-Zionism.

(4) From the question of "special responsibility" for a democratic solution, as motivated by the passage he didn't quote, Comrade Ed passes over to the question of blame or responsibility for the present crisis. He does not seem to realize that he has changed the subject. In any case, the article which annoyed him took up this question of blame very fully: it was "so far, so good," he says.

(5) But even on this different subject, Ed's thinking is a little short on consistency, provided he agrees that I am not responsible for Dostoyevsky among my

He compares the "responsibility" of the Israeli Zionists vis-à-vis the Arabs to that of the Russian Jews vis-à-vis the pogromists. Then, to avoid a lecture, he hastens to point out that he understands the differences: the Israeli Zionists are pogromists themselves, he says; the Israeli Zionists are oppressors of a minority people themselves, he says. That is precisely why the comparison with the innocent victims of the pogromists is beside the point. (6) I think I can explain to Ed what he does when he falls into this unthinking comparison. He shows that he has not freed himself from that conception which is the heart and soul of all of Zionist propaganda: the identification of Zionism with Jewry, of the needs of the Zionists with the needs of the Jews. I think, myself, if I dare to express an opinion, that this is an aspect of Ed's tendency to be soft on Zionism and draw back from a principled anti-Zionism." (7) I await discussion on "blood"politics. Meanwhile, however, Ed persuades me that he does not appreciate the idea involved when he refers it to "Israeli nationalism." This is precisely what it does not refer to. It refers, of course, to the messianic Zionist concept of the "Jewish Nation" as comprising all Jews everywhere in the world-quite apart from citizenship, religion, ideology, geographical location, or even knowledge of the fact that an Israel exists-all of whom have to be "in-gathered" into their ancestral land from their present "exile." HAL DRAPER

BOOKS AND IDEAS VOLUME 1 IS OUT **Collecting Trotsky's Works** In New French Edition

LEON TROTSKY: ECRITS 1928-1940. Tome .-Librairie Marcel Riviere, Paris, 1955, 372 pages, \$2.50.

By H. D.

This is the first volume of the projected edition of Trotsky's collected writings from his exile to his death, to be published in the French language. It will gather together all of the great revolutionist's fugitive articles and pamphlets of this section of his life which revolved around the struggle against Stalinism.

According to the plan, the major booksize works of this period, which are already available in various languages, will not be included. These are: History of the Russian Revolution; The Revolution Betrayed; My Life; Lenin; The Third International After Lenin; The Permanent Revolution; and Les Crimes de Staline (the last-named not in English in this form).

The introduction to the first volume, now out, also notes that two other types of writings will not be included: (1) documents which, while written by Trotsky, were signed by a collectivity, such as the Russian Opposition or the Fourth International; and (2) the letters in the Trotsky archive at Harvard which are sealed till 1980, in accordance with Trotsky's wishes.

Otherwise, then, all of Trotsky's writings are to be republished; and this will make .a contribution to the arsenal of Marxist literature which can be enthusiastically welcomed. It is only regrettable that the same job has not been done in English.

Since this is not intended to be a review of the first volume-indeed, a review could only be an attempt to sketch and evaluate Trotsky's political struggle and theoretical contributions-we want, only to give the reader an idea of the riches that the volume contains. No doubt the overwhelming majority of the contents exist somewhere in English, in back numbers of Trotskyist and other periodicals, but they are accessible to few.

CONTENTS

The first six articles were pieces written by Trotsky at the request of an American press service upon his arrival in Turkey to start his exile. He had been asked to explain how it was that he, Lenin's associate in the leadership of the Russian Revolution, had come to this. The result was a popular series on the politics of what was known as the "Stal-in-Trotsky fight." These are followed by three other pieces under the same heading of "Exile."

Then, three articles on economic problems under Stalinism: "For the 12th Anniversary of October" (1929), "Stalin as Theoretician" (1930), and "The So-viet Economy in Danger" (1932).

The contents continue with his preface to the American edition of Permanent Revolution, under the title "Socialism in One Country or Permanent Revolution.'

Under the head of the internal struggle of the Trotskyist Oppositions within Russia: "On Certain Defections" (1929), "Radek and the Opposition" (1929), "The Opposition Bolsheviks Need Help" (1929), "Tenacity" (1929) "Against "Against Capitulation: Letters to Some Russian Comrades" (1930), "Open Letter to Bolshevik-Leninists Who Signed Rakovsky's Declaration" (1929), "In Memory of a Friend: Before the New Tomb of Kote Zinzade" (1931), "The Stalinists Take Steps: On the Expulsion of Zinoviev and Kamenev" (1932). Under "The Defense of the USSR and the Opposition": four articles; followed by his well-known analysis of "Disarmament and the United States of Europe." Then four miscellaneous articles, including "Hands off Rosa Luxemburg!" (1932). And finally four articles on the

beginnings of the international Left Opposition.

PRO-STALINIST EDITOR

Quite apart from the welcome to be given any project to republish Trotsky's writings, however, is the comment that must be made on the introduction with which this volume is supplied by Pierre Frank, on behalf of the leadership of the Fourth International," the now Stalinized epigones of that once hopeful movement.

This is little more than scandalous. It can now be said with truth that not only Lenin's works, but also Trotsky's, are equipped with pro-Stalinist introductions.

We are referring not at all to the mere fact that the introduction is written by one of Frank's political type, but specifically to the content of this introduction. It expresses the line of the "Pabloite" leadership of this Fourth International which has decided that the Stalinist revolution is the socialist revolution of our time, to be critically supported.

Under the guise of discussing "the place of Trotsky and his theory of permanent revolution in the development of Marxism," Frank swings into praise of the Chinese Stalinist seizure of power. He shows that, after earlier protestations about keeping the regime within the bounds of bourgeois property relations. Mao has ism," in the language of both Stalinism and Pabloism—and this is a great victory for the theory of permanent revolution.

"There is no question anywhere of democratic dictatorship of the workers and peasants,' Experience has cut short the debate. On the scale of the USSR, the states of 'people's democracy,' and China, that is, on the scale of a third of humanity, the theory of permanent revolution has been confirmed. Trotsky could not wish a finer celebration of the 50th anniversary of his contribution to Marxism [the theory of permanent revolution], which . . . makes him . . . the strategist of the struggle for power for three-quarters of the human race."

In other passages also, this variety of pro-Socialist position is assumed or implied, in a general linkage of Trotsky's name and views with the "great" victories of "the revolution" via Stalinism.

This is all the more unclean, if not obscene, in view of the fact that the original prospectus for the edition had utilized for advertising purposes the name of Natalia Trotsky, who has denounced the pro-Stalinist degeneration of the socalled "orthodox Trotskvist" movement.

It is also unexpected in view of the fact that, both in the original prospectus and now at the end of Frank's introduction, credit for helping to sponsor the project is given to a Committee of Patrons not all of whom can be expected to sympathize with Pabloite pro-Stalinism (from various standpoints). These are: Alfred Rosmer, Claude Bourdet, Daniel Guerin, Jean Cassou, Maurice Dommanget, Jean Maillot, Maurice Nadeau, Laurent Schwartz.

But in point of fact, it seems that the

Gray's son. It is still an open shop. Besides masterminding the scheme to subvert the Supreme Court decision, Gray gave two counties \$45,000 for private Jim Crow swimming pools to evade rulings opening public pools to all.

Thousands for racism but not a penny for unions.

A Basic Pamphlet —

SOCIALISM: THE HOPE OF HUMANITY

> by Max Shachtman

Read it!

10 cents

Labor Action Book Service

114 West 14 Street, New York City

There's No Angel Around to finance LABOR ACTION. It has appeared every week since 1940 be cause it's been backed by the dimeand dollars of independent socialists - AND YOUR SUBSCRIP. TIONS.

> A sub is only \$2 a year-Subscribe now!

edition is under the entire control of the pro-Stalinist wing.



class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1874. -Subscriptions: 52 a year: 51 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 riews of Labor Action, which are given is editorial statements.

Editor: HAL DRAPER Associate Editors: GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL Besiness Mgr.: L. G. SMITH



February 13, 1956

Edited and Published by the YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE

FIVE CENTS

Lynch Mob Rules in Alabama As University Uses Race Riot to Oust Lucy

By RALPH HODGES

Using as their pretext several days of rioting, last Tuesday morning the Board of Trustees of the University of Alabama excluded Autherine Lucy from classes for "an indefinite period," falling in with racist mob-rule.

Miss Lucy is the young Negro woman who has fought for several years to be admitted to the University of Alabama as a regular student.

Last Friday, as the result of a federal court order, she became the first Negro ever to be admitted to the University of Alabama. The action of the Board of Trustees has, in effect, nullified the federal court's decision that segregation at the University of Alabama must end.

The background of the "exclusion" order was a series of riots which started on the week-end following Miss Lucy's first day of class. On Monday, a crowd of approximately 1000 gathered outside the building in which Miss Lucy was attending classes. When the dean of women tried to slip her out a rear door into an automobile, in order to avoid trouble, the crowd pelted the auto with rocks and rotten eggs, doing serious damage to the vehicle.

Exactly who made up the crowd is not certain. In any case it is agreed by all observers that not more than 300 students (about 5 per cent of the total enrollment at the university) took part in any of the demonstrations at any time. The remainder of the racist mob was made up of townspeople, high-school students, and some rubber workers from a near-by plant.

President O. C. Carmichael, after the incident described above, called upon the governor to send out troops of the National Guard. Governor "Big Jim" Folsom refused to do so. He is quoted as having said, "it is normal for all races not to be overly fond of each other, including black, white, yellow and red races." The demonstrations, he claimed, were "a result of such feelings."

At a late Monday night meeting, the Board of Trustees declared that "for the safety of those on campus" Miss Lucy was to be barred. The head of the board made the statement: "I don't think that she'd be able to come back ever without the strongest police protection. If they force us to her in again, we'll have to do it, I guess-force is force. But I can't predict what would happen."

STUDENTS REACT

Tuesday evening, Arthur Shores, attorney for Miss Lucy, declared that the university must readmit her within 48 hours or face legal action. His telegram to the university said, "It is regretted that the university would submit to mob rule in excluding Miss Lucy."

The head of Alabama's Board of Trustees, Hill Ferguson, said of the mob that rioted against Autherine Lucy:

"We're in an awful uproar down here. This is out of control. There's no doubt that they would have lynched her if they could have gotten her."

Therefore: either the university yielded to lynchers, or else the "respectable" trustees are using the lynch threat themselves. Either way, it was lynchers who won.

circulated a petition asking President Cormichael to expel any student leaders of the racist mob. The Wesley Club and the Student Religious Association circulated leaflets protesting the riots. A resolution was offered to the student legislature denouncing "mob violence."

Among the faculty, the New York Times reports, at a faculty meeting called by Dr. Carmichael, "at least a strong minority (among some 400 faculty members present) applauded professors who disagreed with the trustees' action and charged that the school had succumbed to "mob rule."

Dr. Carmichael defended the trustees' action as "in the circumstances, about the only thing in this crisis that could be done unless they should have thought it wise to disband the university for a period." In effect, the trustees admitted that the university, theoretically having at its disposal all of the forces of "law and order" in the state of Alabama, was unable and unwilling to guarantee to a Negro that her rights be safeguarded.

Reaction by several Alabama newspapers to the trustees' exclusion order would seem to conclusively demonstrate that the riots were simply used as a pretext for a pro-Jim-Crow Board of Trustees to undercut the federal court's decision that segregation must end at the University of Alabama.

The Tuscaloosa News, a local paper, had a frontpage editorial in which it charged that the move to exclude Miss Lucy was "a breakdown of law and order, and abject surrender to what is expedient rather than a courageous stand for what is right." Many other papers condemned the demonstrations.

ENCOURAGE VIOLENCE

Thus it can be seen that the trustees' hypocritical contention that in excluding Miss Lucy they are only trying to maintain "law and order" is a lie, and what is more, it provides the basis for the *justification of further racist violence*. They are saying that for this kind of violence there is no force which can meet it and the only thing to do is to give in to it. This can be the only conclusion.

If the threat of violence was so severe, then why didn't Governor Folsom sendout the National Guard? The answer, of course, is that Folsom is a racist and doesn't want to interfere in any way with the enemies of "law and order."

The action of the university authorities is an open invitation to more violence, more mob-rule, more intimidation, before which the government can pretend to be powerless.

A considerable question exists, it

Tuesday the Student Government Association of the university, elected student leaders all of whom are Alabamans, voted unanimously to denounce the racist mob and to defend Autherine Lucy's right to stay on campus.

The same stand has also been taken by three student associations.

should be noted, of just how serious the riots were.

Was the National Guard really needed or would the regular Tuscaloosa police have been able to handle the situation? Was the demand by the president for National Guard troops part of a plan to use the riots for an excuse to ban Miss Lucy? This cannot be conclusively decided, but it is a possibility.

Whatever the facts are, it goes without saying that Folsom would have sent out troops if, for example, there had been a strike in which "law and order" demanded the National Guard (violence or no violence). But what can you expect in a racist riot from a man who talks abost hostile feelings among different races as "normal"?

It also goes without saying that the same Board of Trdstees, confronted by a demonstration by a group of radicals (e.g., in the 1930s), or even by "pantyraiding" fraternity boys, would not publicly declare itself to be impotent, but (like other Boards of Trustees) have figured out how to take swift action.

This whole incident takes place against a background of increasing violence in the South. The Negro's struggle for civil rights has been met with terror and intimidation led by or justified by the leading elements in the Southern ruling class. It is little wonder that advocates of racist violence are met with so little resistance by elected officials when one considers that these same officials, sworn to uphold the law, are themselves part of an attempt to nullify the desegregation decisions of the Supreme Court.

These officials, in case one needs rominding, are members (both on a stato and a national level) of the Democratic Party and if any of those concerned with civil rights placed their hopes in a party in which these Southern racists hold the balance of power, then they must start looking for a new party. Because even if Stevenson came out

Because even if Stevenson came out for a strong civil-liberties program (which he is opposing) or if Kefauver does (which he won't), they would still not have the power to do anything about it—especially with a strong Democratie Congress. The only alternative is a new party based upon the labor movement which alone can give voice to the aspirations of the Negro people for full civit rights in the United States.

Our Second Anniversary

Two years ago, the Young Socialist League came into existence. At that time, the socialist youth

movement in America was probably at the lowest ebb in its history. None of the delegates to the convention which unified the Socialist Youth League and the Young Peoples Socialist League into the YSL was under any illusions as to the prospects for the future.

And not then more nerroad that it me

traditions created a single organization, persists and has proven itself in the course of two years as a meaningful, viable orientation.

The YSL has attracted Marxists and non-Marxists, and pacifists and non-pacifists. It has provided all points of view with the democratic opportunity to argue for their position. And in doing so, it has not sacrificed its clear and principled stand in favor of Third Camp socialism.

This, we believe, is an achievement. For some, this editorial may well seem

He also said that the trustees' action seemed to be "planned." As of this writing, the university has not yet replied.

Reaction at the university among the students and the faculty contradicts the rationale given by the trustees for their action.

Among the students, the New York Herald Tribune reports, several hundred

YSL CLASS . NEW YORK SECOND SESSION OF

Hal Draper's class on the Theory of the PERMANENT REVOLUTION

Tuesday, Feb. 14 at 8:15 p.m. COLONIAL REVOLUTION AND WORLD REVOLUTION

Labor Action Hall 114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C. And yet they were agreed that it was imperative that an organization carry on the work of socialist education among American youth. They felt that such an organization could encompass various socialist tendencies and traditions, and that by doing so it could attract new youth recruits to the cause of Third Camp socialism.

That perspective was a limited one, yet it was essential to the American socialist youth movement. In the past two years, the YSL, as the only nation-wide socialist organization working with America's young people, has justified the decision of the founding convention.

Today there is a socialist youth organization in America. It is not a mass institutian, nor could it be. But it has been growing even in the present period of reaction and conservative ideology.

There are many who would never have heard of the socialist anti-war position were it not for the YSL; there are those who would never have had the opportunity to gain a socialist education and to carry out socialist activity were it not for the YSL. No other force in America was facing this problem: it took the organized work of young socialists to do it. Moreover, the broad character of the YSL, present as its founding convention when delegates from various socialist For some, this editorial may well seem as a pacan of self-praise. Yet we feel it necessary to say these things because of the demoralization of so many in the socialist movement, because of all the antiorganizational ideas which are in the air—because of all the people who said that such an organization wouldn't be worth the trouble. Our point is that it has been more than worth the trouble.

The YSL enters the third year of its existence more convinced than ever of the necessity of socialist organization in this period. We can count in our ranks those who would have been denied socialist education and activity—who may have been lost to the movement—were it not for the YSL. And we reaffirm our belief that this can be done today in a movement which democratically unites various socialist traditions and points of view under the common acceptance of Third Camp socialism.

There is much—so very much—that remains to be done. But on this second anniversary of the YSL, we take pride in saying that we have at least made a real beginning in the building of a real socialist youth organization in America, that we have not given in to the conservative mood, that we have fought it vigorously. Get All Your Books from LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE 114 West 14 Street, New York City BERKELEY YSL • CLASS BUNDAY EVENING SERIES ON IMPORTANT BOOKS 6 p.m. Each Sun. eve. in February Feb. 12—Buttinger's Twilight of Socialism. Feb. 19—Kipnis' The American Socialist Movement. Feb. 26—Cliff's Stalinist Russia. Room 31 2161 Shattuck Avenue, Berkeley '4.

WORLD SOCIALISM

An Indonesian Socialist Explains

"A Note on the Indonesian Socialist Movement" in our January 2 issue quoted Rammanohar Lohia's view of why the Indonesian socialists had failed so ignominiously in their country's first general election last year. In brief, the point Lohia emphasized was that the Indonesian socialists had presented no militant independent program of their own; being concerned to act "moderate" and "realistic" in collaborating with the bourgeois parties. So the moderates voted for the Nationalists or the Masjumi, and the workers and peasants who wanted to be militant voted for the Communist Party. The socialists fell between the two stools.

We have now seen (in Socialist International Information for Jan. 7) the explanation given for this debacle by an Indonesian socialist leader, and while we can report it for information, we must admit that we do not find it convincing.

The explanation is given by Wijono, who is a leader of the Indonesian party and also general secretary of the Asian Socialist Conference. The first reason he cites is the unpreparedness of the SP.

"After having been stabbd in the back by the Communists in 1948, the party had to be wholly reorganized, and it was not until 1952 that its first congress was held which formulated the principles and policy of the reconstructed Socialist Party."

This was three years before the election, in a state where all parties were relatively new. But as a matter of fact, according to Wijono's own account, it appears that the SP did not formulate its policy in 1952. For it appears that "the party had not yet decided whether it should develop into a mass party or whether it should continue to function as a vanguard with a strictly selected membership."

This peculiar problem — "vanguard" here obviously means a self-selected elite -reminds one precisely of Lohia's accusation that the Indonesian socialist leaders thought in terms too exclusively of parliamentary maneuverism from the top.

top. "The second congress of the SP," continues Wijono, took place in June 1955, and it was only then that the party decided in favor of building up a mass party, of sponsoring a general struggle for social justice, prosperity and happiness with the active participation of the people, and of fully endorsing formal democracy as an indispensable condition of progress toward socialism."

If it was only practically on the eve of the election that the reorganized SP could even make up its mind on these elementary propositions, it is perhaps no wonder that it was unable to inspire confidence in anyone else.

In addition, Wijono also stresses other factors: the socialists were unwilling to be as unscrupulous as their opponents; didn't want to "buy" votes; the headman system in the villages meant that the powers-that-be had the advantage (but he does not explain satisfactorily why, then, the CP was able to make hay); etc.

The inadequacy of these explanations is suggested also by Wijono's concluding complaints over the inability of the socialists even to get a mass of votes from the trade-union movement and peasant movement where they play leading roles.

We continue to suspect, therefore, that Lohia was nearer the truth in ascribing the failure to the compromising and weak *political program* of the Indonesian party under its reformist leaders, and not to adventitious circumstances. The new Asian socialist movements are all, in different ways, quite understandably experimenting with roads to socialist influence, but so far no one has discovered a substitute for a class-struggle, militant Socialist program.

Tito's Theoreticians Licking Around Nehru

By HAL DRAPER

The Yugoslav Tito regime has been deepening its "theoretical" basis for wooing the Nehru government in India.

As we reported in LABOR ACTION for last Oct. 31, the Titoist theoreticians starting writing last year about how India is "building socialism" under Nehra, with a formulation about socialism which put under the same umbrella the Russian totalitarian system. Swedish-social-democracy, Nehru demagogy, Titoist national-Stalinism, and practically anything else that Belgrade hopes to get a finger into.

It was all simply the theoretical reflection of the regime's foreign policy, in this case, its aim of serving as a neutralist broker for the war camps, balancing one off against the other. Tito is hopingto cement a Belgrade-Delhi axis around which the cold war can turn.

In a recent issue of *Review of Interna*tional Affairs, the Yugoslav government's English-language propaganda magazine, an article on "India's Path Toward Socialism" continues the line.

The "Indian," says the writer Gustincic, hesitates to use the word socialism (which is news), but this should not obscure the fact that the socialist aim is held not only by socialists in India but also by "the men at the helm of the Indian State."

This, incidentally, is precisely the question on which the Indian socialist movement split last year, as the right wing of the Praja Socialist Party moved closer to the position of accepting Nehru as a collaborator. Lohia's movement should be interested.

When the Nehru party adopted its phrase about "a socialistic pattern of society" at its Avadi convention, says the Titoist, this "was not only a propaganda slogan but a directive for a definite and broad action." This is proved, he says, by the character of Nehru's Second Five Year Plan—which is the title given to the Indian regime's plans for stimulating industrialization and economic modernization. This Five Year Plan, like the so-manyyear plans rife all over the world as labels' for government projects of all kinds, is entirely within a bourgeois framework and does not purport to aim at decisive nationalization or collectivization, not even bureaucratic collectivization. This is glossed over by the Yugoslav with the remark that it is "understandable" that the Indians' attention is "centered on the economic aspect of development." After all, in the Titoist ideology, "economic" democracy is supposed to exist without political democracy, and this is their version of how an "economic aspect" divorced from the political context is to be called "socialism."

This Nehru-type "socialism," Gustincic explains, "is something that would not correspond to the European idea of the path toward socialism (not only in the Soviet Union but also in Sweden, for example)...."

The Titoists, one sees, are not doctrinaire or dogmatic or rigid or sectarian: they are willing to recognize anything at all as "socialism," provided it is in line with their foreign-policy needs.

For the rest, Gustincic's proof of the socialist character of the Nehru regime lies in its excellent intentions to do something some day about "the taking of numerous measures of principle which it is as yet impossible to visualize." One is public management of the economy. Another is land reform.

On the latter, Gustincic has a formulation which should not be allowed to disappear into obscurity: "In other words, one of the aims in the Second Five Year Plan is to provide for the victory of the principle itself that land should be who by those who till it, and not by those who control it or invest capital in it."

In case you read that too hastily, you will note that the victory to be achieved by the Plan is the recognition of this land reform in "principle." Other governments have been more hasty about proclaiming reforms in "principle" while postponing any deeds. In India it takes a Five Year Plan even for that. Or so Gustincic says in his enthusiasm.

Indian Socialists and 'Bhoodan'

The Socialist Party of India (Lohia) —which, by the way, has now established its national headquarters in Hyderabad —has visibly drawn a line between itself and the "Bhoodan movement," without actually opposing the latter. This represents a substantial step away from the enthusiasm of the right-wing socialists for this typically Gandhian landreform scheme.

"Bhoodan" is the movement led by Acharya Vinoba Bhave to persuade landholders to voluntarily give up their land to the peasants and thus solve the agrarian-reform problem through saintly charity. There has been a tendency not only for right-wing socialists to orient toward this movement as a social solution, but also to counterpose it to socialist political activity (like Narayan).

Another reflection of the left-wingers' coolness, which we have noted before, is given by a recent statement by the party chairman in the important province of Andhra, P.V.G. Raju.

It seems that Bhave had asserted there was an SP directive prohibiting members' navigination in the Bhoodan Moveary." Raju denies that the party had issued such a directive. (We can't tell from Raju's statement whether his limitation of the denial to this point means that the party leadership does in fact have the extreme hostility to Bhoodan that Bhave implies.)

In any case, Raju swings into an attack on the Bhoodan leaders, ending up with a qualification, as follows:

"We would like to bring to Vinobaji's notice three symbolic incidents in the country. At Nazarathpet, Chingleput District, 100 acres of common land were encroached upon by a relation of a government minister. Socialists protested and campaigned against it, with the result that 130 persons were jailed.

"At Shakkarnagar, Hyderabad, fire was opened against workers on strike, in which 104 women and 500 men were jailed. In project areas in Andrha, the Socialists plan to demonstrate against auction of waste lands and to demand that they be given to landless labor and Harijans.

"Thus we see two cases of Bhoodan in reverse, and another of government as repression, not as law and order.

Portugal's African Slaves

By R. G. KAMAT

One of the most important reasons why the Portuguese are trying to stick on to their rat-holes in India, and also why some of the European powers are sneakingly supporting Salazar, is that the struggle in Goa is to pattern the eventual liberation of millions of Africans in Portuguese and other European colonies in Africa.

In India, Salazar Portugal lives off Goan and Indian resources. In the Portuguese colonies, the role is different, but it is basically one of the same parasitism.

Take, for instance, the two islands of S. Thome and Principle in the Pacific Ocean, owned by Portugal.

In these islands, cocoa is grown and it is sent to England and America. The cocoa plantations belong to European settlers and companies who, as elsewhere in Africa and other regions, expelled the sons of the soil and robbed them of the best lands. The plantation labor is provided by Portugal with slaves brought from the Portuguese colonies of Angola and Mozambique. do posto saying: "Herewith I am sending 20 voluntary workers, properly handcuffed and guarded."

The money paid for the slaves goes into an illegal fund, and it is distributed among all the Portuguese administrators, from the Portuguese gevorner to the *chefe do posto*.

The Portuguese government is fully aware of this system, and it has been reported by the different inspectors general of colonial administration.

I should like in this connection to refer to the case of Henriqe Galvo, who at one time was a friend of Salazar. But because he dared to publish his report about Angola, he was put in prison by the Portuguese dictator.

As a result of the organized slavery

d.

1.12

K

ment and calling it "counter-revolution-

World History—Year by Year The bound volumes of LABOR ACTION

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

Independent Socialist Press 114 West 14 Street, New York Gity

"Now, a movement claiming to bring about a new socio-economic orientation cannot just fail to notice these things. In fact, on the one issue of police-firing in Travancore-Cochin which engaged the attention of the country from August to November 1954, nothing was said about it by the author or sponsors of the movement. Now in December 1955, when the Voice of India' was defeated, a word or two was said about it. If, during that crucial period of August to November a hint was given about the reaction of Vinobaji to at least some of his pre-eminent disciples, perhaps, the 'Voice of India' would have had greater amount of accession of strength.

"Our object in elaborating the matter in this way is this. We have been studying and propose to follow further the course of the Bhoodan movement. We have nothing to say against it as such except that nation-building and nationmaking require the participation of our countrymen and women in other activities, having an important bearing on society and political life.

"Even if a good movement is sought to be made out as the only movement worthwhile for the country, it would become bad." The system of supplying this black slave labor is called a "modern form of slavery" by an English writer, Basil Davidson, who visited Angola last year to collect evidence, and he has since published a book on the subject.

The modus operandi of recruitment of the slave labor is that an agent secures a license from the Portuguese government to engage a certain number of natives on a contract basis. Armed with the license, he approaches the administrative authority called *chefe do posto*, who then secures the slaves of the number stipulated. He receives in return a sum of £25 per man. The slaves secured are well guarded, and they are sent to the site of the work in motor trucks and ships.

Brit Camancho, one-time Governor General and High Commissioner in Portuguese East Africa, has published in one of his books a letter from a *chefe* and forced labor, the population of the colonies has been decreasing. This was pointed out to the Portuguese government by many scientists, including the professors of the Institute of Tropical Diseases in London.

Two years ago, the cocoa planters faced a shortage of forced laborers from Angalo. They therefore approached the Portuguese governor with the suggestion that the local population, which had been free from forced labor, should be used as forced labor. The governor was not willing to do it, because the natives had been subjected to spoliation of their lands. But under the pressure of the powerful cocoa planters, forced labor was locally introduced.

There were some peaceful protests. The governor ordered his men to fire on the peaceful demonstrators, and more than one thousand Africans were killed and several villages were burnt down in the operations of "pacification."

It is interesting to note that even the British Anti-Slavery Society of London has published reports on the Portuguese institution of forced labor in the Portuguese colonies.

> -Condensed from "People" (Lucknow, India).

King of Kings Decrees Democracy – Maybe

By PRISCILLA CADY

Ethiopia has her apologists as well as the next authoritarian country, and a statement frequently made by them is that the country has "one foot in the fourteenth century and the other in the twentieth." It is undeniable that most Ethiopians live the degraded life of feudalism and that the fourteenth century is well represented. But the few paved roads, hospital facilities, schools and airlines hardly strike a balance with the general conditions of backwardness.

But something else of the twentieth cenfury is in force in Ethiopia—doubletalk and demagogy. The constitution recently announced by Haile Selassie has been hailed in America as an unprecedented step taken by an absolute monarch in the direction of democracy, and has generally been given a twentieth-century type of build-up.

Before examining its provisions, it will be instructive to consider the constitution of 1931 and the proclamations of 1941. The 1931 constitution provided for a parliament consisting of an upper house, the Senate, made up of the nobility and appointed by the emperor, and a lower house, the Chamber of Deputies, appointed by nobles and the headmen of villages. In 1941 "notables and land-tax payers" were given the suffrage to vote for electors who were then to choose the deputies from among themselves.

All right: as some people would put it, it isn't a perfect democracy but it's a step. The trouble is that there has never been any such election; or, in the interests of fairness, let us say that if there has been one it has been kept such a dark secret that even such a friend of Ethiopia as John Gunther has been unable to find out about it.

So now the 1955 constitution provides for universal suffrage (including women), and there is no need to stop there. They could announce democratic initiative and recall, and make everyone even happier. But we aren't supposed to start looking for an election for two years yet, and the Ethiopian record shows that we should not get too feverish about looking for it even then.

The 1931 constitution did not grant the Deputies much power. In a delightful bit of phrasing it says, "no law may be put into force without having been discussed by the Chamber of Deputies and having obtained the confirmation of the emperor." (Italics added.) Also, "when the deputies have an idea which could be useful to the Empire or to the nation, the law reserves to them the right to communicate it to the emperor through their president, and the Chamber shall deliberate on the subject if the emperor consents thereto." Since there is no official press coverage of the proceedings of Parliament, and there is an absolute censorship on all "political" items in the (now non-existent) non-government organs, we cannot even know if this political showplace has been operating.

In the new, improved model of a constitution, Parliament is granted legislative powers, but Haile Selassie has the right of imperial veto, a veto which is final. The provision that has everyone jumping with admiration says that the emperor has the right to rule by decree in the absence of Parliament, which has the power to abrogate such decrees when it reconvenes. The catch here is that the emperor has the power to dissolve Parliament at will. A nice bit of doubletalk occurred when the emperor said of the new constitution: "articles have been inserted ... to provide for the protection of the essential liberties and rights of the people. Thus We have provided ... that freedom of speech and the press is guaranteed..." And thus we are led to believe that

And thus we are led to believe that these freedoms already exist, whereas, for instance, censorship of the press is at the same time so rigid and so capricious that attempts to publish non-government papers have failed, and all that exists is a meager handout mostly exalting the emperor.

WHY THE BALLYHOO?

"Considering that Ethiopia is a largely primitive country. . . ." Thus the *Times* editorialist expresses his awe at the daring altruism of this man, this King of Kings, Conquering Lion of Judah and Elect of God. "But," he goes on, "the emperor is probably right in holding that the way to democracy is the practice thereof." And the way to public relations is the practice thereof. Just as **emperors of Ethiopia** (up to and including Haile Selassie) for a long time past found it expedient to proclaim periodically that "slavery is totally and absolutely abolished now."

The question arises, of course, why it is necessary to perpetrate this fraud. The population is 95 per cent illiterate, and nothing is provided for them except a police force. The motive is not likely to be an attempt to sell them the idea that they are part of a functioning democracy, more especially since, illiterate or not, they are likely to know whether any voting has been going on. More probable is another explanation. Since (as the admiring Robert C. Doty, correspondent to the New York *Times* says) Ethiopia is showing "a clear-intent to stand up and be counted as part of the free world," it finds it necessary to put up a front to this "free world" which likes to make claims of democracy.

Fage Sever

Military agreements have been concluded with the United States, which likes its friends to appear a little democratic. More important, probably, is the need to put up a good show in the United Nations. The 1931 and 1941 provisons were sufficient to get the UN go-ahead to grab Eritrea, under the guise of federation, thus gaining access to the sea for this land-locked kingdom, but it was a close thing. The recent outcry over the annexation of the Houd, Domo and Ogaden Somali territories, from Britain, probably aroused the government to the need of a better justification for its next contemplated move, which is taking over Italian Somaliland when Italy's trusteeship runs out in 1960.

So a new constitution is proclaimed, well in advance, and since the roads are next to non-existent and the airlines controlled by the government, it might well be difficult to prove any claim that elections have ever taken place.

Ethiopia is a self-styled empire and intends to be a growing one, dreaming of bringing all of the Horn of Africa under its control. Eritrea, which once had a free press and some political freedom, is now under the heel of the Elect of God, and it would be a sad day indeed if the relatively politically advanced people of Somalia were to suffer the same fate.

Where Are the Liberals? - -

(Continued from page 1)

"Labor-union leaders are very unlikely to dominate a new Congress."

A look at the Democratic Party, and the political winds (if one can call them that) which appear to be blowing in and about it, seems to confirm the view that business has little to fear from a Democratic victory. If the Democratic program, as it shapes up in the legislative measures proposed by the Democrats in Congress, is distinguished from that of the Republicans in any way, it is in the direction of higher expenditures for armaments, higher government outlays for farm supports, etc. Since this emphasis is not accompanied by any version, however faint, of a "soak-the-rich" method of financing the increased expenditures involved, it certainly is not bad for business.

The Democratic Party in Congress has just split on the Natural Gas Bill, but not along the usual lines. Unless the liberal Democrats are induced to withdraw the Powell amendment to the school construction bill, the party is bound to split on the issue of whether or not some real economic pressure should be applied to the Southern racists on the school integration fight.

Stevenson, in a defiant talk to a California Negro audience, has come out against the Powell amendment; he hews to the line of his deal with the Southern to support him. racists whom he need He has refused, utterly refused, to promise any measures to force the South to obey the desegregation order. But even if the Powell amendment is withdrawn, there is simply no way of getting around the fact that as things stand now the race issue is the biggest domestic political issue, and on that the Democratic Party cannot stay united. An attempt to gloss over that issue in this campaign could do more to spark some kind of a third party movement than any other factor.

and it would be illegal for the administration to give money for the construction of segregated schools. Thus, they claim, the only actual effect of the amendment will be to force the Southern Democrats to kill the whole bill in the Senate, with the result that badly needed schools will not be built all over the country.

Other union leaders, headed by Walter Reuther of the UAW, take the position that there is absolutely no assurance that the administration will bar expenditures for segregated schools without the amendment. They insist that this amendment is necessary not only to assure that the funds appropriated be used to provide better educational facilities regardless of the race of the children who are to use them, but that it is a method of applying legitimate pressure on those Southerners who are openly organizing to flout the Supreme Court decision.

Thus the NAACP lines up with the more progressive wing of the labor movement on one side, while the Southern Democrats, Adlai Stevenson and the conservative labor leaders line up on the other.

WHY ADLAI?

The papers report that the Executive Council of the AFL-CIO is discussing the possibility of a special convention of the united labor movement this year to take up political issues. Although whether to hold such a convention will not be decided till after this issue of LABOR ACTION has gone to press, the reports are that the CIO unions tend to press for it. while many of the AFL leaders are cool to the idea. They don't want to repeat the 1952 experience when they endorsed Stevenson only to see him go down to defeat. But whatever they may decide, the fact is that one of the chief causes which impelled the labor movement to unite at this time was the fact that labor had been taking a political beating. Despite its enormous economic strength, the passage of the Taft-Hartley Law, and the tendency of increasingly conservative administrations to interpret it ever more harshly against labor, have made things extremely tough for the unions.

thinking of most labor leaders, as of most liberals, runs to the support of Adlai Stevenson as the Democratic candidate. It is clear that for one reason or another there is a widespread feeling in liberal-labor circles that Stevenson is the only man capable of beating Eisenhower.

Since the two-party system makes it inevitable that both parties be clusters of diverse and often incompatible social and political groupings, Stevenson's alleged vote-getting power is perhaps sufficient to explain why so many liberals are for him. What is much more difficult to understand is why they seem to be for him so enthusiastically, and why they seem to rule out any other possible candidate for the party as simply an obstacle to Stevenson.

The actual fact, on the record of Stevenson's public actions and utterances since the last presidential campaign, is that he is about as pallid, washed-out and uncertain a "liberal" as one can easily imagine.

He is distinguished for the refusal to take a forthright position on *any* serious issue which faces the country, while handling all of them with the gaudy rhetoric which is his hallmark.

In fact, if one is really compelled to give a reason for the apparent liberal enthusiasm for the man, it must be that liberalism in America is just as fuxy and washed-out and timid about its own objectives in the coming campaign as he is, and is vastly relieved to find a candidate who gives forth with torrents of the kind of high-sounding doubletalk which relieves them of having to face up to the issues. As a matter of fact, if the reports from California are accurate, Kefauver may have decided to take a courageous stand which will put the liberals of all stripes in a pretty untenable position. If he comes out on the race issue, while Stevenson continues to play his cynical game of trying to maintain the unity of the party at all costs (that means, at the expense of the Negroes of the South), what will the ADA and the Reuthers and the rest of them do?

WE are not for Kefauver, either for candidate of the Democratic Party or for president of the United States, of course; but the studied way in which the liberallabor coalition continues to pretend he is not there, while madly cheering for the man who does not even deign to make promises to them, proves not only that they are once again displaying their characteristic lack of principle, but that they are, in cold practice, forfeiting most of the influence they could have inside the Democratic Party in advance.

Why? The reason is simple. Because of everyone else among the Democrats who is for Stevenson, the liberals' particular interests get lost in the rush.

The machine bosses are for Stevenson because they think he may be able to win. The Southern leaders are for him because he has made it clear that as far as he is concerned they can kick the Negroes in their area around to their heart's content. Democratic businessmen are for him because he is "sound" from their point of view. That is, he refuses to be "demagogic" by taking a stand in favor of economic measures which would favor the underdog at their expense.

The struggle which is being conducted by the Negroes in the South, and the rabid reaction to it, will simply not disappear from the political scene.

STEVENSON'S LINE-UP

The repercussions of the struggle are felt in the new united labor movement. Conservative leaders of the AFL, dominated by the Building Trades whose reactionary attitudes are reinforced by their direct interest in a vast school construction program, have lined up against the Powell amendment.

Their specious argument, like that of Adlai Stevenson, is that the Supreme Court decision has settled the question,

1121

Whether or not the gentlemen who have foregathered for their annual winter meeting in comfortable Miami Beach decide to make the dramatic gesture of an extraordinary national political convention, they and the movement they lead is going to have to intervene in the political struggle one way or the other.

At the moment it appears that the

KEFAUVER'S BID

One of the things which makes the apparent passionate commitment of most liberals to Stevenson this early in the campaign seem peculiar is the fact that, even from their own point of view, which we as socialists do not share, he is not their only possibility. There is available a handy, eager alternative. That, of course, is Senator Kefauver.

What is wrong with Kefauver in liberal eyes? His voting record, as compiled by both CIO and AFL political leagues, is perfect. Though he comes from the South, he has taken a *more* forthright stand on the burning question of racial equality than has Stevenson.

Though he may not be as witty or brilliant a speaker as Stevenson, he is intelligent and shrewd. And since the days of Harry Truman and Dwight Eisenhower it has become clear that intelligent gifts stand low down on the list of essential qualifications for the presidency. And since the liberals are for him just because he is "their kind" of man, he can forget about them and devote himself to gathering votes from disgruntled Eisenhowerites.

Whether Stevenson and his liberallabor supporters will find it possible to run through the nominating convention and the campaign itself on the present basis, only time will tell. If the struggle in the South gets even hotter, if an economic downturn or other events sharpen **up labor's** relations with the more conservative sections of the Democratic Party, Stevenson may find himself in real hot water. If we read his political nature correctly, faced with having to make a choice he will either vacillate too long or will turn to the right, where he obviously feels most at home.

In such circumstances labor might not be able to swallow its pride and its interests and stay docilely in the traces of the Democratic wagon.

Page Eight

No.

+

The Natural Gas Sellout -

(Continued from page 1)

pressed in the New and Fair Deals. It impairs the effectiveness of their 'giveaway' campaign cry, dealing as it does with a natural resource not unlimited in quantity. The people it helps most are those often found in the GOP camp at election time." (Jan. 27, 1956)

No Peanuts

The wealth and power of the oil and gas industry is something to behold. Of the 19 wealthiest corporations with assets over a billion dollars, nine are petroleum corporations.

The assets, according to the National Industrial conference Board (the research arm of the NAM), total \$21.2 billion of the \$41.2 billion which comprise the assets of the top 19 corporations. The industry is dominated by about 30 large corporations while there are several thousand independent producers under the domination of the giants.

The petroleum industry's power is world-wide, extending to domination of the Venezuela and Middle East oil basins. With the discovery and opening of new fields in Italy, France and Austria, the American oil corporations are rushing in, and attempting to dominate the continental oil market.

The U. S. international oil companies encouraged the overthrow of the Mossedegh regime in Iran and capped it off by cutting itself in as the major oil cartel in Iranian production.

At this time the Arabian-American Oil Company (Aramco) and the British Iraq Oil Company are engaged in a small-scale war, each supporting rival armies, for control of the Buraimi oasis in the remote state of Oman near the Persian Gulf. One of the purposes of Prime Minister Eden's visit to Washington was an attempt to moderate or mediate, if possible, this shooting war.

One thing can be said about the oil industry: when it goes after something, it isn't playing for peanuts. At issue in the Buraimi oasis is the control of the Middle East basin where about threequarters of the known world oil reserves are located. Aramco alone controls Middle East oil reserves about as large as those existing in the United States.

At issue in the Natural Gas Bill (the Fulbright-Harris Bill) is the freeing of the gas producers from possibility of effective federal regulation. It would open the door for an increase in the cost of natural gas which would immediately be passed on to the residential consumer.

According to most estimates it would amount to about \$600 million a year. The other consequence will be the increase in valuation of the known oil reserves, controlled mostly by the dominant 30 companies, by about \$10 to \$12 billions.

King Oil

Probably no sector of American capitalism is as rapacious in its greed and brazen in its methods as the petroleum industry. Not satiated with its worldwide positions where its tentacles lead to every major oil field in the so-called "free world," not content with the multibillion dollar steal of the tideland oil, nor with the special depletion allowance of 27½ per cent of its income tax, it now is

on its way to dipping further into the pocket of every consumer through a rise in the price of natural gas.

Oil has overthrown governments, bribed cabinet members, and bought congressmen. When the oil industry decides it wants something, both parties take notice; party labels disintegrate and the distinction between liberal and conservative in American politics blurs. Some congressmen develop a case of apathy while others find that pressing affairs demand their attention in the far corners of the world

If it were possible to crawl into a hole and hibernate until the entire business is over, the overwhelming majority of the congressmen would do it. Only a few men with a certain amount of courage, or immunity to oil pressure, stand up to try vainly to arouse public opposition.

Such has been the record of the natural-gas steal.

Back to the '20s

Writing on the "debate" in the Senate, the liberal columunist Thomas. Stokes says:

"There are a few senators who are actively and sincerely trying to stop this obnoxious bill. But they are conscious, as they carry on in this vacuum, that so far as the powers-that-be in the Senate are concerned, this is supposed to be only a sham battle, a 'debate' for the record.

"The scene in the Senate reflecting the apathy and cynicism of those you elected as your servants to protect your interests has about it a 'this-is-where-l-came-in' reminder. It carries me back to to the 1920s when big money was moving the pawns about here in Washington.

"But Teapot Dome and Elk Hill of the day, from which only a couple of big oil companies were to profit—if eagle-eyed Senators Bob LaFollette of Wisconsin and Tom Walsh of Montana had not stopped them—are chicken-feed companies will get out of this bill if it passes, and legally, by donation of Congress." (Jan. 27.)

The line-up on the Natural Gas Bill roughly followed producer-versus-conconsumer interests: oil companies, independent producers and congressmen from producing states against the labor unions, consumer groups, local distributing companies, and congressmen from consuming areas. By and large it was a showdown of the political power of the interests of the vast majority of the American people against the oil industry —and the oil industry won.

This issue was a good example of the wolf-in-sheep's-clothing technique often used by giant corporations. It is relatively simple: instead of campaigning directly in its own name, the lobbyists in and out of Congress argue that the beneficiary would be a large number of small businessmen.

Distributor's Angle

On this occasion, it was the 5000 to 7000 independent oil and gas producers which provided the lamb's garb. Although freeing the small independent producer from federal regulation would undoubtedly relieve the squeeze on them, the bill would reap hundreds of millions and eventually billions for the giant corporations which dominate the industry.

Senator Douglas in his effective blasting of this technique pointed out that 85 per cent of the producers contribute only 2.1 per cent of the gas output. And 39 large producers contribute a little more than 68 per cent of output. When the bill came up for final vote, Senator Douglas, who led the Senate op-position, took the proponents of the bill at face value. He proposed an amend-ment eliminating 5360 of the 5569 producers from federal regulation, leaving the 197 who produce 90 per cent of output under regulation. This was defeated. The position of the local gas-distributing companies is an interesting oner By and large they were in opposition to the bill, and the reasons are not difficult to understand. If gas prices from the wellhead were to rise sharply, they could get caught in a squeeze, as they tried to pass the increases on to the consumers. However, the Senate "debate" as re-ported in the press did not go into the position these distributing companies have in relation to the consumer's pocketbooks. Under present law the transmission companies that bring the gas into the urban areas are under Federal Power Commission regulation: and the gas. produced in the individual states, would be free of regulation. The distributing companies received their own version of the Harris-Fulbright bill in 1954 when Congress passed the Hinshaw-Bricker

Law which exempted the local distributors from federal regulation, leaving them to local regulation, whatever that may be.

The Right to Steal

The argument of the oil lobbyists is that they want no different treatment from the distributing companies, that is, they want to be left to the tender mercies of their own oil-soaked state legislatures.

Besides, they add, why single out the producer for federal regulations? The cost to the consumer originating with the producers varies from about 3 to 10 per cent, that's all, whereas the local distributors add about 70 to 85 per cent to the final cost. And looking at the FPC data submitted to the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee which held hearings last May and June, you find it is true.

This was admitted during the hearings by Mayor Joseph Clark of Philadelphia who was chairman of a mayor's committee opposing the bill. Under questioning by Senator Daniel of Texas, the oil lobby's representative on the Senate committee, Mayor Clark admitted:

"Now, I know it has been argued with a good deal of strength—and I will admit that is the strongest argument of those who agree with Senator Monroney and Senator Daniel—that the cost to the consumer of the field (producer) price to the pipeline company is a relatively small part of the total cost, and that therefore, we are really being a little pennypinching when we come down here and protest about it."

What follows from this admission for the oil industry is that they too want the "right" to dip their fingers further into the consumer's pocket. But it does raise questions whether it is the main culprit that is being held up for criticism in the present Senate "debate."

Low-Cost Furor

During the many weeks the Natural Gas bill was before the Senate, it evoked no great interest. But at the last moment before the vote, Senator Case of South Dakota announced that someone tried to bribe him with a contribution of \$2500. Now the Senate is in a furor over it.

When the oil companies were in the process of gouging everyone in sight, there was an empty Senate chamber with most senators heading for storm cellars, Miami Beach or the campaign trail. Now with a few thousand dollars at issue, investigations spring to the fore determined to clear the good name of the Senate.

But when a Negro co-ed is forced to leave the University of Alabama under the pressure of racist mob violence, scarcely a finger is raised in that august body.

It is difficult to work up, any excitement over the \$2500. For one thing Senator Case was not a fence-sitter on the issue, but already committed to vote for the gas grab. He was probably voting for it out of rock-ribbed conservative convictions.

Besides, since the campaign contribution (Case is up for election this year) came at the last minute from an unknown source, he might have felt that it was a plant by anti-gas-bill forces.

It is also difficult to see how the investigations by two Senate committees will really make a thorough probe of the oil and gas lobby. Senator Aiken, a Vermont Republican, said. "Never, since I have been in Washington (15 years), have I seen such varied types of lobbying used to promote legislation."



and the stand of the

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 unreleating 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 Staligist 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!

Get	Acquainted!
114 We	dent Socialist League st 14 Street ork 11, N. Y.
the ide	t more information about eas of Independent Social- nd the ISL.
🗆 I wan	t to join the ISL.
NAME (p	lease print)
ADDRES	s
	24
CITY	
ZONE	STATE

At last available!

The SECOND volume of

Leon Trotsky's THE FIRST FIVE YEARS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

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

All orders must be accompanied by payment.

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

Lating Decision

Bark or Bite?

But will the Democratic leadership which just engineered the gas grab permit a thorough investigation of the oil lobby whose interests it has just served so well?

Such an investigation would have to become an investigation of Congress itself, of the campaign contributions which members of both the House and Senate have received from the oil lobby. Can anyone imagine Senators Johnson and Daniel submitting a true financial statement of the contributions received from oil lobbyists or their front organizations or representatives?

Perhaps a few Senate liberals will be allowed to bark at the end of the leash for a little while. But as the presidential campaign draws nearer, they will close ranks with the Southern conservatives and part-time liberals like Monroney and Fulbright. After all, if they are unwilling to split with the racists over civil rights, who can imagine them parting company over a gas bill which they feel will be forgotten by summer?

