

LABOR ACTION

October 7, 1957

TEN CENTS

Young Socialist CHALLENGE

Inside Four Pages

International Debate
Integration Struggle

Civil Liberties
Ban H-Bomb

Racketeers and Union Democracy

... page 2

Kiss the 'Thaw' Goodbye

... page 7

SPOT-LIGHT

The French Crisis

The French cabinet of Bourges-Maunoury has fallen over the Algerian issue. The "framework law" on Algeria, discussed elsewhere in this issue of LABOR ACTION by Ahmed Bekhat proved unacceptable to the French colonialists and their supporters in France, and to the Algerian nationalists. Thus France once again faces the crisis from which there is no issue short of freedom for Algeria.

Reports from France indicate the utter paralysis which grips the French nation and French politics. The Socialist Party, confused and compromised as a result of the imperialist policies of the Guy Mollet government and leadership remains an indispensable element for any stable cabinet in France. But the SFIO, just because its opportunistic actions are so clearly in contradiction to socialist principles, cannot gain additional popular support and break out of the vicious circle in which it, as well as France, are caught.

In the meantime, the Communist Party on the one side, and De Gaulle and worse, on the other, stand poised to "solve" the French crisis in their own way—a way
(Turn to last page)

President Eisenhower Reluctantly Forced to Strike

A BLOW FOR DEMOCRACY

By GORDON HASKELL

We are witnessing what may well be one of the great turning-points in American history. Pressed to the wall by the patient but indomitable and relentless determination of the Negroes of the South to win full civil rights for themselves, a reluctant president has been forced to use federal troops to put down open and blatant defiance of court orders for the beginning of school desegregation in Little Rock, Arkansas.

The paratroopers in Little Rock will not put an end to the resistance of the Southern racists to the school-integration order of the Supreme Court. Their presence may not even succeed, in the short run, in guaranteeing the right of nine Negro children to continue to attend Central High School in Little Rock. But their presence is further proof, to the Negroes struggling for their rights as well as to the segregationist leaders trying to hold back the tides of history, that there is only one final issue to this struggle: victory for civil rights, for democracy and equality.

Perhaps no single feature in the historic drama which has unfolded

around Little Rock underlines the inevitability of this victory more clearly than the hesitation and reluctance with which President Eisenhower met the issue. From beginning until all but the end he appeared willing to permit open defiance of, if not rebellion against the government of which he is head. And even when he addressed the nation to explain his deployment of troops in Little Rock, he made it perfectly clear that what motivated him was not the desire to enforce desegregation of the schools, but the necessity to uphold the prestige and authority of the courts in the face of open defiance.

Nevertheless, this reluctant man, whose sympathy appears to be more with the racists than with their victims, who has publicly proclaimed repeatedly that he would never use troops to defend the civil rights of Negroes in the South, has been forced by the pressure of events to do what no president has done before him. What could more eloquently testify to the enormous pressure the Negro struggle for equality is putting on the whole structure of American politics.

On the surface it appears that federal troops had to be called out to prevent an organized mob, incited and backed by the governor of Arkansas, from flouting a court order. And it is of course quite true that only the openly defiant action of Governor Faubus in calling out the Arkansas National Guard to prevent the entry of nine Negro children into Central High School forced the issue to a head at this particular time and place. But that defiance would have won the day if the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People had decided to back down and give up the attempt to get these children into this school now. Faubus could have withdrawn his troops; no mobs would have gathered; and Eisenhower could have continued his golfing vacation undisturbed.

RELENTLESS PRESSURE

In the past, such has been the fate of many an attempt of Negroes to take another step toward equality. The brutal beating of a Negro minister in Birmingham who sought to lead a few children into a lily-white school—a beating which promises to go unpunished—is proof that there is a long road ahead before even open and public defiance of the law will be put down, specially in the Deep South. But the relentless pressure of the Negroes for equality, the mass determination and heroism which they have shown time and again in recent years, that is what makes Faubus' hesitance so futile, and Eisenhower's reluctant support of their struggle so significant.

What impact will the act of calling out troops to defend school integration in Little Rock have on the political relation of forces in the country? While it must be remembered that this is only one factor, however weighty, in a very complicated structure, it is important to try to divine what its effect will be.

With regard to the fate of the Republicans, President Eisenhower's decision, belated though it was, represents a clear victory for the forces which are willing to sacrifice the party's prospects in the South for the immediate advantage of swaying the Negro vote in key areas in the North.

As to the Democrats, the split in the party is now wider than it ever has been before. For Faubus' rebellion is as much a logical fruit of the vacillation, equivocal
(Turn to last page)

FRANCE The "Framework Bill" Which Led to French Cabinet Crisis

Proposed Law a Shallow Fraud

In French political practice, some important public problems are dealt with on the legislative level by "framework laws," which indicate the policy to be followed in each particular case and provide an outline of the institutions that are to implement this policy. If the "framework law" is adopted by Parliament, it is then spelled out in greater detail by "application laws." The most recent of the framework laws is a bill on Algeria which the government of Bourges-Maunoury has introduced on the eve of the UN debate on the Algerian questions. It has already been rejected by both Algerian nationalist organizations (MNA and FLN) who will not accept any status that is imposed on the coun-

try without consultation of the people or of the nationalist parties. It has also met opposition in France, from the right-wing parties who are opposed to the merest shadow of autonomy, and from the liberals and the CP, who argue that the law falls so far short of the nationalist demands, that it could not even cover an orderly political retreat.

In the following article Ahmed Bekhat, Secretary General of the French Federation of the U.S.T.A. (Algerian Workers Union), analyzes the law and explains its present significance. The article first appeared in the September issue of La Voix du Travailleur Algérien, monthly of the U.S.T.A.—A.G.

Territorial Assembly. In Algiers, there would be a Federal Assembly, elected by the Territorial Assemblies (comparable to the U.S. Senate) and a Federal Executive, presided over by a representative of the French government who would have the right to veto the decisions of the Assemblies and territorial authorities. An Arbitral Chamber (analogous to the U.S. Supreme Court), residing in Paris, would arbitrate without appeal the differences arising between the various ethnic and religious groups.

The correspondent of the New York Times attempted to help Lacoste by writing that "The Minister of Algeria favors a change in the French Constitution to make a federal structure possible, of the type that governs the British Commonwealth. He considers that within such a framework Algeria could take its place as an independent nation." Lacoste, however, insisted that there could be no question of an autonomous Algeria federated to the French Republic, but only of a federal structure within the country. These clarifications will only increase the suspicion of the American government.

What is the future of the "framework law"? It is not necessary to be a prophet to predict that it will not even be taken into consideration by the Algerian nationalist parties. But, even within the
(Continued on page 7)

By AHMED BEKHAT

In an interview to the New York Times, R. Lacoste has "unofficially" revealed the plan which he expects to miraculously stop the war in Algeria.

Its preamble stipulates that Algeria is an integral part of France, since "such is the will of all Europeans living in Algeria, and also of the great majority of the Mos-

lem population." Algeria would be divided in six semi-autonomous territories enjoying a large degree of autonomy. The territories are composed of departments which in turn are made up of municipalities. At each stage, assemblies will be elected by Moslems and Europeans on a common electoral roll. However, the electoral law would prevent an outnumbering of the European minority by a "just representation" clause. Each territory would be ruled by an Executive Council responsible to the

LABOR SCOPE

Rank and File, Racketeers, and Union Democracy

By BEN HALL

It would take a rash man to predict the outcome of the elections at the teamster convention especially since it may all be over by the time this appears in print. But it is possible to understand some of the forces at work.

If Hoffa is defeated, it would be a spectacular demonstration of the power of a united labor movement to affect the course even of its biggest and strongest affiliates. The expose of racketeering at the Senate hearings did Beck and Hoffa no good; but from all indications they could have survived. But when the top labor officials of the AFL-CIO moved against them, it was a different story. If Hoffa can be defeated, the program that will ruin him will be the call to keep the Teamsters in the federation. Labor unity will have proved decisive. In less than a year, Beck has been smashed and Hoffa's fate is uncertain.

WHERE ARE RANKS?

But if he should win, we expect to hear the vociferous question: where is the rank and file? As though the average union member has some magical way of cutting through all the obstacles and dangers that our highly placed citizens have been unable or unwilling to surmount all these years. Al Hartung, president of the International Woodworkers of America, was vehement at his union's convention last month. "I say to those rank and file members in the unions where corruption exists," he told the 300 delegates, "Where are your guts? What are you afraid of? Why don't you attend your meetings and kick them out?"

No doubt everyone should have guts. But it is worth recalling that none of the labor leaders who are now demanding Hoffa's scalp and who read Beck out of the labor movement so recently were impelled to criticize them by name a year ago. Was it lack of "guts"? Or did they think it was clever diplomacy? Whatever it was, it hardly justifies a haughty demand upon the rank and file who feels that his job and perhaps his life are at stake.

For one thing, it is not so easy for the rank and file to know the truth. The biggest and most honest labor officials were silent for years, guided by that peculiar etiquette which rules out criticism of one official by another. None of them ever told the ranks of the teamsters what was going on. And the ordinary union member now hears charges of disgraceful conduct against his leaders who yesterday were respected members of the community of labor leaders; and he hears them for the first time from a Senate Committee whose most prominent members he suspects as enemies of labor. He distrusts those who now expose his former leaders. And it is not only the Teamster rank and file who is led astray. Take, at random, two reactions from within the labor movement:

THE INNOCENT

Commenting upon Hoffa's acquittal on charges of trying to bribe a Senate Committee investigator, Carl Stellato, president of UAW Ford Local 600 writes in *Ford Facts*, July 27, "The Jimmy Hoffa trial is a prime example of efforts to convict outstanding people in the labor movement through newspaper headlines, false charges and by paid stool pigeons." Hardly the full story of the Hoffa trial!

And in the *MESA Educator*, published by the Mechanics Educational Society of America, AFL-CIO, a union which is socialistic in its official outlook, we read (August): "A United States Federal Jury has found Jimmy Hoffa not guilty. The jury obviously recognized the attempted frame up for what it was. . . . If anyone has drawn the conclusion that we have been in Hoffa's corner, they are right. We were in Hoffa's corner because it was obvious to anyone who was not swept along by the thought of possible personal gain through the fanfare of infamous anti-labor investigations that Hoffa had been framed. But more than that. We are in Hoffa's corner because the Teamster's Union in general and Jimmy Hoffa in particular, have stuck their necks out to help us and every other union whenever we have been involved in a strike."

If some rank and filers wonder whether the whole business isn't just a frame-up of a good union man, can we be amazed?

WHAT SHOULD THEY DO?

But there is no point in going too deeply into that. The fact is that the rank and file will have very little to say about who shall be their next president. By the way, what should they do about it? Shall they from organized opposition groups inside each local and fight for reform? Shall they try to upset their leadership from below? That was how those who formed the IUE fought CP control in their union. But who with prestige, who with authority calls upon the Teamster ranks to do that? Answer: no one.

The Teamster convention will be dominated by the machine of paid and appointed officials who sit as delegates or who dominate others who are delegates. That is not new in American unions. But in most unions, the men who constitute this paid staff are basically union men. But in the Teamsters Union, this machine has apparently been so corroded and corrupted by assorted rackets that its loyalty to labor has vanished to be replaced by a simple loyalty to one another.

Now, "let the rank and file rise up!" it is said. But the machine has been built and strengthened over the years by a systematic destruction of the democratic rights of the membership—that has happened in many other unions too. What is necessary is an equally systematic restoration of democracy from within the union and encouraged and defended from without. And for that, some changes in the labor movement as a whole would help. We commend to the reader an editorial in *Labor's Daily* on September 11 reprinted from the *New York Post*.

"The fact [is] that the Teamsters' convention will be primarily an assemblage of big and little bureaucrats with deep investments and involvements of their own in the corrupt past. How can the system be beaten? . . . fundamental . . . is the issue of how a 'two-party' system can be established within the ranks of unions. The blunt reality is that in most unions there is no effective machinery for the functioning of an opposition. Nearly all labor newspapers are monolithic house-organs for incumbent officers; even in the most enlightened unions opposition often tends to be regarded as a dangerous way of life. It is hard to see how government regulation could alter this condition. But it is equally hard to see how union abuses can be curbed as long as union democracy remains a sham in most places."

Amen!

Hoffa Moves Fast To Keep Protection of Union Card

By JACK WILSON

Detroit, Mich.

Racing against time and events to keep for himself the valuable protection of a union card and a position in the labor movement, Jimmy Hoffa was all set to take over the Teamsters presidency this week. There is little hope that he could remain within the cover of the union movement if the Teamsters convention election of president were postponed for three months, since the McClellan labor rackets committee has some blockbusters to throw Hoffa's way.

The McClellan committee last week did a good job of bringing out some of the Hoffa story in Michigan. And as we suggested in our last article, his reputation became more tarnished with the revelations.

But the main point of the revelations about Hoffa's operations were somehow missed in the additional 34 point indictment the Senate committee issued against Hoffa this week.

GANGSTERISM

It is that Hoffa—like the Purple gang that terrorized Detroit in the 1930's—reached and maintains power over the Teamsters Union here not because of "work" for the union, but because of the sheer physical reign of terror which he has successfully employed—and which is only possible because as Hoffa has often bragged, "I've got the right connections in high places."

That is one aspect of the Hoffa story which the Senate committee seems to have little interest in. How was Hoffa able to get people as powerful as John Bugas, vice president in charge of industrial relations for the Ford Company, to be listed as top guests at the testimonial dinner for Hoffa two years ago?

How was he able to get a congressional investigation called off just when it hit pay dirt in 1953?

CROSSCURRENTS

Where Joe Clark Stands

Joe Clark, former foreign editor of the *Daily Worker*, spoke before a surprisingly small audience of about 150 at a meeting sponsored by the Socialist Unity Forum on Sept. 27 in New York City.

The talk called "Where I stand" was both a repetition and extension of his letter of resignation from the CP. What was interesting was more of the mood of his break with Stalinism rather than the theoretical analysis of the history and future of the radical movement in the U. S.

Clark made it abundantly clear that he is for democratic socialism and that socialism must be democratic. And in recounting the crimes of Stalinism—the murders and concentration camps—he said that these are not "small errors which have to be rectified."

But on the question of whether Russia is still socialist, Clark is unable to complete the development toward a consistent democratic socialist position. He still believes that Russia is a form of socialism: "state socialism." But he makes it perfectly clear that this is not the type of socialism he believes in or wants.

Yugoslavia and China are referred to as the first socialist revolutions since the Russian Revolution. Left out is the Stalinist transformation in virtually all of East Europe. It was unstated whether China and Yugoslavia represent the type of "socialism" he is for, or a form of "despotic socialism," which he is against.

At this point Clark has a Deutcherite position toward the winning of democratic rights for the people in the Stalinist Empire. Any socialist, according to Clark, who looks toward a complete revolutionary transformation in Russia, Hungary or Poland is harming socialism. In-

The committee brought out most of the facts on the Pontiac local. The rank and file revolted. Their leaders got worked over, elections were postponed, and finally when the scandal became so great, and four racketeers running the local were arrested and convicted of extortion, it looked like a clean-up from within might be possible. But Hoffa put the same boys back on the job. He paid their families the salaries and expenses while the racketeers were in jail. It was all in keeping with the code of the underworld. "You gotta take care of the boys when they are in a jam."

The stories around Detroit of the operations of this gang are many. Is it true that the AFL state secretary-treasurer has been forced to hide "hot boys" under Hoffa's orders? Is it true that two of Hoffa's boys chased after his sister-in-law and forced her back from California after she fled from his kid brother who was wanted on armed robbery charges? What are the connections between Hoffa and his cronies and the racketeers who tried to assassinate Walter Reuther in 1948?

As a matter of fact, the whole Hoffa story is still so incredible that it beggars description.

For a proper appreciation of the vast stakes involved in the current Teamsters convention, it should be remembered that not only the \$34,000,000 Teamsters union treasury is involved, but a vast nationwide network of racketeer operators have a vital interest in Hoffa "beating the rap." For a new and successful technique has been worked out by Hoffa for making fast bucks. And thus far it's all legal.

Most of the parasitic scum parading as unionists under Hoffa's protection don't merely belong out of the union movement, they belong in jail. It is a terrible disgrace to the labor movement that they, and their similars in other unions, have been tolerated, protected and made "respectable" by the union leadership for so long. Though their ouster from the labor movement doesn't begin to be a cure-all for its problems and ills, it is an elementary and essential measure of organizational sanitation.

stead he looks upon the bureaucrats as the dynamic force reforming Stalinism. The people, of course, will be applying pressure from below, but in Clark's schema they will have a subsidiary role.

It was clear that Clark was attempting to rethink many problems which face the socialist and radical movement. He gave open praise to much of Trotsky's analysis of the degeneration of the Russian Revolution and Rosa Luxemburg's little pamphlet, "The Russian Revolution."

Pervading Clark's remarks was the repeatedly stated need to rethink, re-evaluate and revise Marxist thought on all subjects. It is part of breaking with all the dogmatism and hostility to rethinking problems which characterizes the Stalinist movement.

On the grounds of the socialist movement in the U. S., Clark was on shakier grounds. The small parties are an obstacle to socialism, he stated, but he had little to say about what socialists should do except rethink and revise.

Los Angeles Communists Suspend Five Members

Five suspended members of the Communist Party in Los Angeles have issued an "Open Letter to Members of the Communist Party" in an attempt to appeal what they claim has been arbitrary and unconstitutional treatment by the party leadership.

The five members claim that the "crime" for which they were pilloried and finally suspended from the CP was to set up a discussion group which "in-

(Turn to last page)

LABOR ACTION • 18th YEAR

October 7, 1957 Vol. 21, No. 34

Published every other week by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone WATKINS 4-4222—Re-entered as second-class matter July 26, 1957 under the act of March 3, 1879.—Subscription: \$2 a year; \$1 for 6 months.—Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

Editor: GORDON HASKELL
Assoc. Editor: HERMAN BENSON
Business Manager: Mel Stack

Editorial Board:

GORDON HASKELL
HERMAN BENSON

MAX MARTIN
SAM BOTTONE

WHAT'S GOING ON?

For the only thorough account of the crisis in the American Communist movement, read the new booklet by

H. W. BENSON

The Communist Party At the Crossroads

25 cents. Order from:
New International Pub. Co.
114 West 14 Street, N.Y.C.
(15¢ each in bundles of 10 or more.)

The New Crack-Down on the Arts in Russia

KISS THE 'THAW' GOODBYE

By LARRY O'CONNOR

Which way are things going in Russia in the wake of the last purge in the Kremlin? Are the hopes of those who look for a "natural" democratization of the country from the top down being buttressed by developments, or is the trend toward a "hard" period apparent?

One of the barometers of political trends in a country where the totalitarian grip of the rulers has been loosened for a while is the state of culture and the arts. This is an area several steps removed from the political and economic arenas where class tensions and clique struggles take most direct and naked forms. Since what happens in the cultural field happens in the public view (except when manuscripts are killed by the publishers), it is here that events cast their shadow before on the rise of upheaval, and where the last ripples of a struggle which is over tend to linger.

In Hungary and Poland the ferment in student, literary and intellectual circles generally was the yeast which raised the dough of revolution. And even in Russia, where the masses have not yet broken through the bureaucratic crust, the excitement, and open spirit of rebellion have shown themselves in the universities and even in the writers' clubs where some of the richest men in Russia foregather.

Dudinstev's *Not By Bread Alone* has become world famous. A whole series of novels, plays, poems and articles have appeared reflecting the same critical spirit. But after the shock of the revelations about Stalin, after the few months of real ideological disarray in which it seemed that a miracle of liberation had been wrought at least for the arts in Russia, the crack-down came.

MAN OF LETTERS

None other than Nikita Khrushchev, that renowned man of letters, led the assault. Thus, there could be no confusion about the source of the new "directives," or what they mean. In a series of speeches delivered over the past few months, Khrushchev has made it clear that the artists and writers might as well kiss the "thaw" goodbye, for the long Russian winter is at hand.

Here is a typical excerpt, from which the drift of the whole can be deduced:

"The entire history of the development of Soviet society most convincingly proves that guidance by the party and the state, their attention to artistic creation and concern for the writers, artists, sculptors, composers, have insured outstanding successes of literature and art, the flowering of the socialist culture of all the peoples of the USSR. The party's decisions on ideological questions defined the major tastes and basic principles of the party's policy in the sphere of art and literature, and they retain their force at the present time. One of the major principles is that Soviet literature and art must be inseparably linked with the policy of the Communist party, which constitutes the vital foundation of the Soviet system."

The New York Times Magazine, September 29, 1957

This question is so clear that none others need be added, although the article from which it comes runs for several pages of direct quotation. Russian literature must reflect the latest wrinkle in the policy of the ruling clique in the party, and let no one be carried away by any "unprincipled" and "liberal" idea

JUST OUT

New International

A New Stage in The Russian Crisis, By Max Shachtman • *What Is Orthodox Marxism?* By G. Lukacs • *Unions, Racketeers and Senators*, By H. W. Benson • *An Amalgam of Marx and Keynes*, By T. N. Vance.

50 cents

114 W. 14th Street, New York 11, N.Y.

that the role and nature of the arts are somewhat broader.

It is one thing to decide to put the handcuffs back on in the literary field, and another to do the job. Since the top clique is still treading warily, and seeks to keep the bureaucracy and even the people on its side, the mass blood and concentration camp purge is held in abeyance. But the trouble is that no matter how clearly the leadership may speak, without such a purge a daring soul here and there is still willing to take a chance and speak out clearly, or with veiled but unmistakable meaning, and voice the deepest yearning of the mass of the people for dignity and freedom.

The latest of these bold spirits to come to international attention is (and this alone proves that wonders will never cease, and that hope should spring eternal from and for humanity), believe it or not, Ilya Ehrenburg.

We do not want to waste space to describe and classify Ehrenburg in detail. Suffice it to say that if ever the terms "literary hatchetman" and "bloodhound of the bureaucracy" applied to anyone, he was the man. Yet, he has now been attacked in *Literaturnaya Gazeta*, official literary magazine of the regime, for an article he published on the 19th-century French writer Stendhal in the Moscow monthly *Inostrannaya Literatura* (Foreign Literature).

ESSENCE OF TYRANNY

In the context of a campaign by the bureaucracy to lay on Stalin's shoulders all blame for the "defects" of the regime, Ehrenburg quotes Stendhal as follows:

"What counts is not the personality of

the tyrant but the essence of tyranny. A tyrant may be intelligent or stupid, good or evil—whatever the case, he is both all-powerful and powerless, he is frightened by conspiracies, he is flattered, he is deceived, the prisons fill, the cowardly hypocrites whisper, and the silence becomes so complete that the heart almost stops."

And not to place the blame for all heresy on Stendhal alone, Ehrenburg writes: "He belongs to us, and everyone is entitled to see in him his teacher . . . Stendhal's experience refutes not only the sayings of the distant past; it also dispels many illusions of the present day which are at times passed off as incontrovertible truths."

And he quotes from Stendhal further: "The novel is a mirror on a broad road. At times it reflects the blue sky, at other times the mud, the puddles, the bumps, and you accuse the man who holds the mirror of lacking taste. The mirror reflects mud, and you blame the mirror. You would do better to blame the road with its bumps on the highway department."

To this Ehrenburg adds his own comment: "No matter how precise the social analysis of the development of society, no matter how much individuality is subordinated to social processes, the world of the novel is different from philosophical generalizations, state plans, statistical data."

MUCH MORE

There is much more in the way of an open or indirect attack on the regime, its politics, and its artistic "theories." (For those who are interested, see *The New Leader* for September 16, 1957.) And this is not some poor, young, hungry, wild-eyed writer, but Ehrenburg, a man made rich and famous by the regime! It is likely that it was precisely his exalted position which made it difficult for the editors to turn down his article.

If Ehrenburg writes like that, consider what the other writers, and the masses must think! That is why Khrushchev's literary directives must get clearer and harsher as times goes by.

French Framework Law — —

(Continued from page 11)

French political parties the framework law does not seem to stir up much enthusiasm: it takes into account neither the real situation in Algeria, nor the resolution of the Assembly of the U.N.

The preamble itself, which only restates the terms of a letter addressed to President of the Council Bourges-Maunoury by the colonialist associations (Federation of Algerian Mayors, Veteran's Committee, Universities Movement, Algerian Student's Union and the French Rally of Algeria), makes further consideration of the law unnecessary: nobody can claim in good faith to stop the Algerian war on the basis that "Algeria is France."

BID FOR U.S. OPINION

Let us go further. To justify the law "historically," Lacoste has discovered that Algeria never had any internal unity, but was composed of "autonomous regions." In fact, Algeria already had a geographical, linguistic, economic and political unity before the conquest. Nonetheless, the insistence with which Lacoste mechanically applies the American constitution to Algeria (autonomous territories, federal assemblies and executives, supreme court, etc.) is a striking feature of his abstract and lifeless scheme. There is a simple explanation for this. Lacoste considers his plan above all as a device to impress American public opinion on the eve of the UN debate. For this reason the interview was given to the correspondent of the New York Times, who had been hitherto treated with hostility by Lacoste's services.

The State Department has informed the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs that if

no "democratic and just" solution could be found before the UN debate, the American delegation would abstain. This abstention would involve a massive vote against France. The position of the Latin American countries in particular would no longer be doubtful. For the French government, the problem is how to avoid this condemnation, and the methods used to that effect are the same as last year. French diplomats will visit these countries and will defend the French position — this time on the strength of the bill of the framework law.

A NEW PROPOSAL?

Mr. Pineau himself, interviewed by Bourges-Maunoury as a socialist parliamentarian, clearly expressed his doubts as to the success of this operation.

Does the framework law represent an innovation over the Algerian statute of 1947, which was imposed on the Algerian people and never applied? The Federal Assembly which would replace the old Algerian Assembly will have fewer powers than the latter; its functions will be essentially functions of co-ordination, and the same is true of the Federal Executive which would replace the Government Council. The powers of this Executive are limited by the fact that its decisions are not applicable without the consent of the appointed representative of the Republic, who is invested with a higher sovereignty.

In his commentary to the bill, Lacoste does not even bother to hide the maneuver:

"It is inconceivable, he writes, to transform Algeria into a federal and sovereign State without first solidly organizing a superior federal authority. To act otherwise would amount to giving Algeria a real independence in exchange for hy-

"I was Too Cowardly To Remain Dishonest"

I have before me as I write the explanation that was given to friends of mine who visited Julius Hay, the old communist dramatist, in Budapest. To tell the truth, I remember Hay from the time of our common exile in Zurich as a rather hard man and a particularly narrow-minded Stalinist.

"Several factors contributed to my evolution," said Hay. "The first of these, I admit, was a simple matter of taste. Like all our writers and artists, I suffered from Stalinist bad taste in matters having to do with culture and aesthetics.

Another factor was the experience of the permanent injustice in our society. Also, I was struck by the obvious bankruptcy of an economic system which, according to our affirmations, ought to have proved its superiority.

To all others, and which in actual fact, has ruined the country, the fourth and perhaps decisive factor was the behavior of the younger generation. For though it's true that writers have been in the vanguard—which is in keeping with an old Hungarian tradition on which we pride ourselves—I admit readily that, in my own personal case, it was not I who roused the spirit of freedom in the younger generation, but that, quite the contrary, it was the younger generation that drove me forward. For years I gave courses and addressed students and young workers at meetings and in clubs; I was constantly aware that what I said had no power to convince them, that my explanations seemed to these young people to be mere eyewash. I began to speak more freely about bureaucratic excesses and deviations from socialism in our country. The more leeway I gave to my critical spirit, the more I felt myself carried along by an irresistible generation.

Our young people are thirsting for freedom, and we writers have understood this. It is perhaps our poet Zek who has best expressed what I mean: "I was too cowardly to remain dishonest."

—From "Hungary—a Call for Self-examination" by Ignazio Silone in *IUSY Survey*.

pothetical federal ties which might arrive too late even if they should be established later."

The bill provides for an "arbitral court" and for elections on a common roll, seemingly new institutions. What are the facts?

The "arbitral court" would pass decisions on all "discriminatory measures and abuses interfering with the right of each community to exist and to freely develop." This court, however, will be composed in such a manner as to give the "ethnic French" a majority. It would include an equal number of Algerian French and Moslem personalities, but also members of the Council of State and of the Court of Appeals. And, to avoid the establishment of a strong power in Algeria, the court would reside in Paris.

As to the common electoral roll, the commentary explains that "Its application will be determined by a body of special rulings." What is hidden in these rulings? Judging by past experience, we shall witness a return to the old system where the left hand takes what the right hand has given.

The whole bill is nothing but an operation to mislead international public opinion; at the same time, it by-passes any concrete proposals. Its fate will be the same as that of innumerable plans elaborated by colonialism to mislead the Algerian people. If the object is really to put an end to the blood letting which exhausts both the French and the Algerian peoples, it is imperative to call together a round-table conference of the authentic representatives of the Algerian people, who will examine with the French government the conditions of a cease-fire.

Blow for Democracy

(Continued from page 1)

education and retreat of the liberal Democrats on the civil rights issue in the name of "party unity" as it is of the frenzied fear and hatred of the racists.

While Eisenhower was trying to dodge the issue during the first three weeks of September, liberal Democrats were quite free and easy with charges of "vacillation," "indecision" and the like. "If only Truman had been in the White House," the story went, "he would have acted firmly and decisively." In general, Northern Democrats tended to concentrate their fire on Eisenhower for his failure to "face the issue," while themselves firmly turning their faces away from the fact of common membership in the Democratic Party with Faubus.

Whatever Truman might have done in this situation, is it not a fact that during twenty years of Democratic rule the extensive federal police powers were never used to enforce or defend the civil rights of Negroes in the South? And let no one say that Democratic presidents did not have the legal authority to act against such outrages as lynchings, mass denial of the right to vote, and the like. Eisenhower has demonstrated that there are ample powers at hand in the constitution and the laws to enforce civil rights. He has acted, with clear legal authority, a few weeks after Congress, at the insistence of the Southern politicians, expressly threw out of the civil rights bill authorization to call out troops for its enforcement.

In the whole chain of events which led up to the present crisis the continued political cohabitation in the Democratic Party has weakened the support which the labor and liberal movements would have liked to and could have given the Negroes who are fighting for their rights. In order to maintain their ties with the "moderate" Southern wing of the party, the labor-liberal wing has constantly yielded to their pressure on civil rights. But the "moderates," far from being able to bring equal pressure on the racists, have tended to serve as a buffer and a cloak for the latter's unreconstructed campaign to maintain Jim Crow in full force in the South.

CASE IN POINT

The "federal troops" section of the civil rights bill in the last Congress is a case in point. The moment Senator Russell and his cohorts spotted this provision in the bill, they conducted an all-out spread-eagle campaign against it. It was of no avail to point out, as many did, that the president has the right to call out troops to enforce the constitution and federal laws, whether or not this provision was in the bill. Though an astute lawyer like Russell knew this to be true, it was not to the point. The racists were out for a symbolic victory, and they got it. The "moderates" howled that this was not statesmanlike moderation, and liberal Democrats fell over themselves in assurances that this was not really intended, that it was a mistake, and the like. The provision was thrown out of the bill.

CROSSCURRENTS

(Continued from page 2)

cluded five of us, two members of the SWP, an ex-member of the Communist Party who had recently resigned to join the SWP, one member of the County Committee of the CP, and one member of the California State Committee of the CP." The group, they claim, met for two months to discuss political and theoretical questions.

At a session of the Los Angeles County convention of the CP last March the group was denounced as "a conspiracy" organized under the discipline of the Socialist Workers Party by "paid agents" for the purpose of destroying the CP" by the member of the County Committee who had attended. Subsequently the members who failed to "recant" were denounced before their club by party leaders, and suspended by majority vote of the club without, according to the letter, the accused being afforded any of the procedural rights spelled out in the party constitution.

But then the racists decided to push their luck. If the nine Negro children and their NAACP backers in Little Rock had been made of the stuff of liberal Democratic Senators, the racists would have carried the day there too.

Now the Northern Democrats, and especially the labor-liberal wing of the party, have to face the issue more squarely than they ever have before. The president's act, however reluctantly and hesitantly taken, will give the Republican Party a big talking point in the crucial cities of the North. Only a clear and dramatic break with the Southern wing of the party can hope to restore some of the damage. But such a break would mean a deep-going realignment of political forces in the country. The liberal-labor wing of the Democratic Party has shown an enormous capacity to overcome every consideration of principle and many of practical politics in the interest of party unity. But a force which has been able to move President Eisenhower off dead center is not to be taken lightly.

As LABOR ACTION goes to press, the president is meeting with a committee of four Southern "moderate" governors to discuss the situation. The governor of Georgia, originally selected by the Southern Governors' Conference as a member of this delegation, has announced he will not attend because Eisenhower has said that the discussion must deal with the whole problem of compliance with the school integration order of the Supreme Court, and not only with the presence of federal troops in Little Rock.

INCONCLUSIVE

The outcome of the conference at the White House is likely to be as inconclusive as was the previous ill-fated conference between Eisenhower and Faubus. The "moderates" can only speak for themselves. The withdrawal of Georgia's governor makes that plain enough. Eisenhower cannot finally withdraw the federal troops until it is clear that neither Faubus nor his undercover gangs will take this as their signal to again defy the court's orders. It is likely that the troops will be in Little Rock for a long time, even if reduced in numbers to a symbolic sentry or two, or to federalized units of the Arkansas National Guard.

In the meantime, forces are at work, both in Arkansas and in the rest of the South against the racist troglodytes. Prominent among them are powerful businessmen who recognize that as long as the South is kept in turmoil over the civil rights issue, its attractiveness to additional capital investment from the North is decreased.

Thus, Faubus has met strong resistance in his plan to call a special session of the state legislature for the purpose of privatizing the Central High School in Little Rock. The papers reveal that a committee of twenty-four businessmen has been meeting in Little Rock to "seek a solution of the city's recent crisis that will include community acceptance of the integration of nine Negro pupils at

"So far as we know," says the letter, "this is the first case of its kind since the passage of the new constitution. It is a clear test of the genuineness of the promises made by the national and local leaderships of the party to give full democracy to the ranks. The manner in which our case has been handled shows, we believe, that, far from reexamining the former autocratic methods of operation and changing the tragic mistakes of the past, they are stubbornly persisting in them."

Comment: It is clear that the SWP's chief "contribution" to the regroupment atmosphere in the radical movement is to seek to raid every other organization. The CP's own record of internal "democracy" is also well known. Organizational commando raids on the one hand, and bureaucratic suspensions and expulsions on the other hardly contribute to an atmosphere in which a genuine and fruitful confrontation of ideas is possible.

Central High School." Among these men are such prominent local business figures as Joshua K. Shepherd, an insurance man past president of the Little Rock Chamber of Commerce, and William M. Shepherd (no relation) a vice president of the Arkansas Power and Light Company, and former national president of the Junior Chamber of Commerce.

WANT NORMALCY

It is hardly to be expected that these men are moved by deep sympathy with the fight for civil rights. But they recognize that mob violence and troops in full field kit in city streets do not fit in with the picture they seek to paint for Northern capitalists with funds to invest in the South. They oppose Faubus' rebellion, and seek some way of restoring normalcy and tranquility to the community.

While the labor movement in much of the South does not appear to be in a position to play an independent role in the situation, the national labor movement can and has certainly done so. While the Little Rock crisis was at its height, and Eisenhower seemed gripped by irresolution, the California State Federation of Labor, in convention assembled, passed a motion calling for impeachment for "a president who fails to carry out his oath of office to uphold the nation's Constitution." Many union bodies passed resolutions against Faubus' action, and for speedy enforcement of the law. The labor movement plays a considerable unpublicized role in backing the organizational and financial efforts of the NAACP in many key cities of the North, and so forth.

But the enormous role the labor movement could play in mobilizing and organizing national sentiment and action for civil rights is to a considerable extent hamstrung by its commitment to the Democratic Party. If one of the long-range effects of the entry of federal troops into Little Rock is to weaken and even destroy that commitment, the fight for civil rights as well as for every other aspect of democracy and progress in America and the world will have been given a big push forward.

 * **New Edition** *
 * **Three Volumes in One** *
 * **History** *
 * **of the** *
 * **Russian Revolution** *
 * **By** *
 * **LEON TROTSKY** *
 * **Trotsky's great classic, now** *
 * **available again for the first** *
 * **time in years.** *
 * **List \$12.50 our price \$10.00** *
 * **Labor Action Book Service** *
 * **114 West 14th St., N.Y.C.** *

New Perspectives for
American Socialism
The Case for Unity
 Introduction by
 Max Shachtman
 ten cents
INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST LEAGUE
 114 West 14th Street
 New York 11, N. Y.

Pro-Union Sentiment Strong Among Teenagers

A recent nation-wide survey of teenage opinions of labor and management reveals that 93 per cent of the boys and 92 per cent of the girls answered "yes" when asked if labor unions were necessary.

When asked if they themselves would join a union if working, 80 per cent of the boys and 75 per cent of the girls said they would.

About 55 per cent of the boys and 48 per cent of the girls said they thought most unions were managed honestly, but 30 per cent of the boys and 39 per cent of the girls held that most unions were badly and corruptly managed. About 12 per cent of both boys and girls thought they were indifferently managed.

Despite the overwhelming majority who consider labor unions to be necessary, more youngsters think that labor is at fault in "friction between labor and management" than management. Here 47 per cent of the boys and 57 per cent of the girls blamed labor; 24 per cent of the boys and 18 per cent of the girls blamed management, and 27 per cent of the boys and 24 per cent of the girls blamed both.

According to Eugene Gilbert, president of the Gilbert Youth Research Co. which made the survey, many of the young people questioned stated that they based their opinions on corruption in the labor movement on TV showings of the Senate committee investigation.

A similar survey of youth opinion in the Lehigh Valley conducted by the *Sunday Call-Chronicle* of Allentown, Pa., showed similar results. Eighty eight per cent of the young people polled by the *Sunday Call-Chronicle* felt that labor unions are a vital part of our economic scheme, while 52 per cent believe unions are managed badly or corruptly. According to Marilyn Bullock, who wrote up the survey for the paper:

"The interviewees divided roughly into two groups; those who had experience with unions, either through personal contact or through members of their families who belonged to unions, and those who knew only what they read in the newspapers, learned in school or saw on television.

"One consistent factor characterized both groups. They each candidly admitted to knowing very little about unions.

"The prevailing attitude is summed up by one 17-year-old Allentown girl who asks: 'People who are older and more experienced than we are don't understand or want to understand the labor-management problem, so how can we?'"

Based on articles in the Allentown Pa. *Sunday Call-Chronicle*, Sept. 1, 1957.

SPOTLIGHT

(Continued from page 1)

which means that the end of the refusal to grant democracy and freedom to Algeria will be that France loses her own freedom.

As the overlord of the capitalist world, the United States is inevitably drawn into the crisis of French imperialism. Although it has sought to play a role of benevolent "neutrality" (in practice, to let France suppress her colonies where she can, and yield to their struggle for freedom where she must), this becomes increasingly difficult as France shows no signs of being able to put an end to the crisis either through an imperialist victory, or by recognizing defeat.

The question is not so much whether the U.S. is going to play a role, but rather what kind of a role is this government going to play. For consistent democrats, and for socialists, there should be no doubt about it. Their weight must be thrown into the scales to press for American support to the just democratic aspirations and struggle of the Algerian people. And even though such a policy may earn resentment and hatred in France, in the long run it will be to the best interests of France as of democracy in the world in general.

Will the 'Silent Generation' on Campus Answer White Supremacy in Little Rock?

By MICHAEL HARRINGTON

The Civil Rights struggle is the most explosive issue in American politics.

As this is being written, Federal troops stand guard in Little Rock; Orval Faubus is continuing his insane policy of provocation and it is possible that the school system will be made "private" so as to avoid integration; the Republicans, having procrastinated and allowed the situation to develop, are now taking a "tough" line; and the Democrats, mortally compromised by the Party affiliation of every racist politician in the South, are attacking on both a liberal and segregationist front.

This demands immediate action:

There should be demonstrations of support to the magnificent Negro students of Central High on every college and high school campus in the nation.

Everybody who has not done so should immediately join the National Association for the Advancement of Colored

People, so as to create a gigantic wave of support for integration throughout the United States.

The issue should be raised in every youth organization in the land, in the religious social action committees, in the political clubs, on student government.

For it is obvious that the students of America have a particular responsibility in this crucial situation. They should make clear to the nation that they stand behind the Negroes of Little Rock and of Nashville and of all the other embattled cities of the South. They should encourage

the excellent sentiment which has already developed among the white students of Central High. They should communicate with their fellow students in the South, Negro and white.

This, we feel, is the single most decisive issue before the students of America this Fall. If it isn't faced now, it will return to haunt the campus next September and the September after that. For the conflict on integration is not going to be wished away; it is not "moderate," as Adlai Stevenson would have it. It has to be faced openly and without equivocation. And so far, the students of America have not lived up to their responsibility. Incredible as it may seem, the tremendous battle in the South has not expressed itself forcefully upon the campus. At many colleges, the NAACP is an organization which has not yet commanded the support of the broad mass of the student body. In others, campaigns like the Enroll for Freedom petition of last year hardly got off the ground.

But it is not enough to act; America's students must also understand.

If there was ever the least shred of a doubt about America's present party system, now it is resolved. For the events in Little Rock are the result of the combined alliance of the Republican and Democratic Parties, both of which have refused to give full-hearted support to integration. And it should now be obvious, even to the most superficial observer, that a resolution of this crisis will probably not be found within the framework of the present system of tweedledum and tweedledee. Look at the facts.

INTEGRATION

The Democratic Party has been basically split on the issue of integration for years. On the one hand, the Northern liberal-labor wing of the Party has attempted to take a decent stand, and the political pressures pushing it in this direction have been intensifying. But on the other hand, the committee chairmanships, the centers of party power, are in the hands of the South. And the Democrats of the South are committed to fighting integration with every means at their command. It was a Democratic senator, Olin Johnson, who told the Democratic governor, Orval Faubus, to resist the use of Federal troops by an insurrection.

This is the key to understanding the present situation. It explains, for instance, why the Civil Rights plank passed by the Democratic Convention in 1948 (and precipitating a walk-out of the extreme racist wing of the Party) remained a pious bit of rhetoric. For if the liberals have a tendency to dominate the speeches of the Democrats during election year (since the mass appeal of the Democrats is to be the liberal-labor forces in this country), the Southerners dispose of the real power. In 1948, they were able to sit back and let Hubert Humphrey and Harry Truman talk. The resounding "Fair Deal" victory—won in such a way as not to require the Southern votes—was a paper triumph.

And so it was with the recent Civil Rights struggle in Congress. The liberals ran out on the fight, for they were opposed by a solid phalanx within their own party, and confronted by the desertion of part of their own forces. The result was a bill which, nearly one hundred years after the Emancipation Proclamation, probably will not guarantee the right of the Negro to vote in the states of the Deep South. But then, this is the inevitable pattern. The Northern liberals are not personally cowards, they do not turn tail for the joy of running (indeed, many of them eyeing the Negro defection from the Democratic ticket

[Turn to page 4-c]

"PEACE"-CLEAN BOMBS FOR DIRTY WARS

Last Spring, there were signs of a growing mass revulsion against the H and A Bombs.

German scientists spoke out; Albert Schweitzer made his protest; in the United States, a petition initiated by Linus Pauling picked up great support from scientists; the Vatican made known its doubts and hesitations.

Among American students, the most significant result of this consciousness was the campaign at the University of Washington in Seattle. During examination period, a student drive led to a petition which was signed by a huge number. It appeared that this development pointed the way to a concentration of the youth reawakened in America around the issue of banning the bombs and halting the tests. At the University of Chicago, and on other campuses, groups got together to work on projects directed against nuclear holocaust.

FUROR DIED DOWN

But during the summer, the furor died down. The world, it appeared, had once more lapsed back into a mood of stunned apathy, refusing even to think of the terrible consequences of the nuclear armaments race.

As this is written, it is difficult to tell whether the student protest of last Spring will continue. One of the major focuses of discussion on the campus as the school year begins is the Moscow Youth Festival, and the State Department's policy toward it. This was apparent in the first editions of various student newspapers. It showed a healthy interest in a matter of direct concern to American student youth. Certainly the Moscow Festival was calculated to be a mask for Communist despotism, but the fact did not justify the State Department's reaction to it. And more than that, the actual Festival was not a simple "show." Russian youth heard dissenting opinions on Hungary loudly expressed.

But what about the Bomb? Are the

American students going to let the issue go? In a sense, the H-Bomb is a reality as difficult to comprehend as the figures of astronomy. Its potential is so fantastically destructive, the image of a Third Nuclear War so literally unthinkable (though possible), that many people can't even face the issue. A child caught in a well in New York will attract the concern of the entire nation; the possibility that millions upon millions of children may be annihilated is too impersonal, too enormous a fact to deal with.

IMAGINATIVE LEAD

And yet, that is precisely where American youth must come into the picture. If the student movement has any special place in our society, it is exactly in the role of taking the imaginative lead, of discussing problems before they become of general concern to the country as a whole. (Thus, for example, the youth of *Po Prostu* in Poland, or of the *Petofi Circle* in Hungary.) The American student has not lived up to this role in the past five years. And if the Bomb issue goes by, marked only by a Spring fever of discussion in 1957, then the tradition of apathy and withdrawal which has characterized the campus in recent years will have won a notable victory.

At the National Student Association Congress this summer, some used another argument to evade the issue. The NSA, they argued, should only take positions on questions which actually affect the student as a student. It should stay off the debates which are crucial to society as a whole. But if this attitude becomes pervasive, then it will mean that the student body has totally abdicated its critical function. For if the campus is really intensely concerned with the political issues which bear directly upon it—like academic freedom, congressional investigating committees and the college, and so on—then it will be concerned with the question of the Bomb. The student's vision of the world cannot be compartmentalized; it can't concentrate on this or that academic policy and ignore . . . the H Bomb.

And the attitude which the students

must take? That is, we think, obvious. Stop the Tests! Ban the Bomb!

In a sense, these demands are only a beginning. The tests can be stopped, the bomb could even be banned, and the fight for peace would be far from won. For the struggle going on in the world today is not something which can be mediated by the "good will" of the two opposing camps, or signed away by a treaty. It is a social struggle between two mighty social systems, both of which seek the right to organize the world. The United States has announced, through the International Cooperation Administration (and with State Department protests, but apparently to no avail) that all aid to under-developed countries will be directed toward building up private capital in those areas. Russia made plain in Hungary that there are sharp limits to what it will tolerate in the satellites in the form of "National Communism." In short, both power blocs are fighting to extend the sway of their social system, and both subordinate man's longing for freedom to this goal.

ISSUE FOR STUDENTS

But if this sharp social conflict can't be conciliated by treaties, the banning of the Bomb and the stopping of the tests would be a tremendous step forward for peace. Above all, it would symbolize the fact that the people of the world are on the move, that they have wrested a concession from both of the two power blocs. It would not usher in the millenium; but it would be a magnificent development, one which would move toward the ultimate solution of striking at the causes of war itself, the social struggle of the two blocs.

This is an issue which affects the student because it affects the entire world.

There should be student action on every campus in the United States now. All who can agree on the most basic demand of stopping the tests and banning the bomb should get together and make their voices heard.

Challenge, and all democratic socialists, promise all the aid in their power to such a movement.

Young Socialist CHALLENGE

organ of the Young Socialist League, is published as a weekly section of *Labor Action* but is under the sole editorship of the YSL. Opinions expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of the *Challenge* or the YSL.

Young Socialist Program for A Meaningful Youth Movement

By EDWARD HILL

We believe the American student scene is undergoing its thaw.

Since 1948, all youth political organizations have declined, and some have disappeared. The Labor Youth League, then fraternally related to the Communist Party, had about 6000 members. Last year, as part of the general process of disintegration in the organizations in America which were sympathetic to Russian Communism, it formally disbanded. Students for Democratic Action, the youth affiliate of Americans for Democratic Action, suffered a precipitous decline in the past five years.

Socialist organizations were no exception to the process of decline.

Today, the Young Socialist League is the largest, nation-wide organization of democratic socialist youth. Yet, at the time of its foundation in 1954, the YSL faced an uphill battle for survival. This was the period of McCarthyite reaction and student apathy, and a general mood that World War II was inevitable was abroad in the land. It was all that the socialist youth movement could do to stay alive.

But now changes are taking place. There is a new optimism, there are signs of stirring on the campus. Last year:

- Thousands of students, and some twenty-campus organizations rallied to defend the civil liberties of *Daily Worker* editor John Gates who had been barred from speaking on City College campuses.

- In New York, Philadelphia, Antioch, Yale, Chicago and other campuses, students joined in the Prayer Pilgrimage for Freedom, a mass movement of over twenty thousand Negroes and whites who went to Washington to demonstrate for Civil Rights.

- On the West Coast, at the University of Washington in Seattle, over two thousand students signed a petition calling for an end to nuclear tests.

In each one of these movements, and in many others, units and members of the Young Socialist League were involved. It was this experience which led the YSL to adopt an aggressive, outward perspective for this fall and to place the problem of rebuilding a significant socialist youth movement in the united States in the forefront of its activity. As this is being written, the first Fall YSL National Tour is taking place, reaching to St. Louis, Denver, Albuquerque, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Portland and Seattle. Another tour will be undertaken in mid-October, and students at the University of Michigan, Antioch, the University of Chicago, Oberlin, Ohio State and other schools will hear the politics and program of democratic socialism. In New York, Philadelphia, New Haven, Albany, Buffalo, Pittsburgh, Chicago, Albuquerque, Los Angeles, San Francisco and Seattle, YSL units and organizing committees are beginning their

work of the new school year.

But what form should this activity take? What is the realistic perspective for socialism in America among the youth?

At its Third National Convention this summer, the YSL placed the reunification and rebuilding of the American socialist movement at the center of its activity. One of the reasons for the decline in American socialism has been the warring of miniscule sects, the constant antagonism of opposing socialist programs. "Why don't you people all get together and unite" has been a persistent criticism directed at the socialist movement for years. During the recent period, this unity has become a possibility. The strength and pre-eminence of the Communist Party, which attracted many sincere people to its socialist slogans and yet used them to defend a totalitarian society, has been shattered. The Hungarian Revolution brought all socialists closer together in their common solidarity with the magnificent struggle of the workers and students there. The Civil Rights movement has become the most significant social development in America since the foundation of the CIO. All these factors, and

many others, make unity and rebuilding possible and necessary.

For us, the way to rebuild means: to end the socialist sects.

The division of the socialist movement into competing organizations, each clutching its own "finished program," must come to an end. In its place, there must be a broad movement which is really in the thick of the day to day struggles of American life: for civil rights, for civil liberties, for the labor movement and for peace. Indeed, there once was such a movement in America, the Socialist Party of Eugene V. Debs. It included militant workers, intellectuals, students, professionals, artists. It made a tremendous impact upon this country and it was a serious political force.

That is the kind of movement we want: a broad, unsectarian movement in the mainstream of American life. We believe that there should be a single party for all socialists who accept a minimal program: for democratic socialism, for the defense of democracy everywhere. Such a Party would stand up and be counted on Hungary, on Montgomery, on Suez and Algeria. It would have all kinds of disagreements within it, including Marxists and anti-Marxists, pacifists and anti-pacifists, Christian socialists and atheists, in a single organization. As we see it, it would be a vital force in American life, it could begin the arduous task of restoring socialism to the ranks of the labor movement.

TREMENDOUS APPEAL

We think such a party would have a tremendous appeal to the young people of America. It would mean that democratic socialism would speak on the

campus with a single, compelling voice. It would mean that young people could be attracted, not simply to the socialist idea, but to socialist action.

A new Debsian Party! This is the way for American socialism to break out of its sectarian isolation. For us, the first step on this road is a broad unity around the Socialist Party-Social Democratic Federation, the party which has inherited the tradition of Debs. We of the YSL have our criticisms of the SP-SDF, and we will continue to make them in a fraternal fashion. But we believe that the SP-SDF can be the center for the revitalization of the American socialist movement. We have proposed a program of unity to the SP-SDF, calling for the unity of the Independent Socialist League and the SP-SDF, with the YSL participating in the formation of an affiliated youth organization.

During the coming year, this program for unifying the socialist movement, for bringing socialism to America, will be at the heart of our activity.

But we aren't going to fight for this unification simply by writing resolutions and making speeches. We believe that we can build the YSL now, that the youth of America are waking up from their long apathy. We believe that the way to win people, right now, to socialism is by deeds as well as words. There is the fight for civil rights. Last year, YSLers were active in raising money for Montgomery, helping put over the concert at which Martin Luther King's wife, Coretta, sang in New York; YSLers were in the thick of the Enroll for Freedom campaign which raised money for relief to victims of the racist terror in the South; and YSLers helped in a dozen localities to make the Prayer Pilgrimage

YSL PROGRAM

This is the YSL program: to fight, here and now, for the great immediate issues of our time, for Civil Rights, Civil Liberties, Peace and the rights of Labor; and to point in these immediate struggles to the necessity of reunifying and revitalizing the socialist movement in America through creating a broad, Debsian Party.

Civil Liberties Supreme Court Victories Important, But Reaction Prepares its Counter-Attack

So far, 1957 has been a crucial year for civil liberties. The historic Supreme Court decisions of the late Spring and early Summer dealt a mighty blow to various aspects of the witchhunt. And yet, the battle is far from won. In particular, the academic freedom situation is still extremely ambiguous.

The effect of the Supreme Court rulings on the Smith Act, on the powers of Congressional Committees and the Fifth Amendment is, of course, all to the good. The ability of the witch-hunters to destroy a man in a trial by publicity may have received a mortal blow. And yet, a strong opposition is building up in the United States. There has already been one defeat with regard to the right of an accused to see the FBI file testimony which forms the basis of the charges against him. The law passed by Congress is an obvious limitation on the ruling of the court.

MORE OMINOUS

But even more ominous is the report that an all-out offensive against the Court's civil liberties decision may be in the making for the next session of Congress. A series of factors make it quite possible that a sizable legislative bloc can be assembled to undo the victories of earlier this year. A few months ago, the plight of civil liberties in the Senate was somewhat obscured by a paradoxical alliance. The Solid South and the Northern liberals banded together to defeat various reactionary amendments to the bill on FBI files (the struggle was later lost, however). The reason for this alliance was related to the civil rights sell-out. It was part of the Southerner's payment to the Northwestern liberals who ran out on that fight. Thus, a false impression of the strength of the civil libertarian forces was created.

This next session, such a bloc is highly unlikely. The civil rights struggle has so intensified that the Southerners are clear-

ly preparing an all-out offensive against the Supreme Court. There is even talk of a fight for a Constitutional Amendment which will limit the scope of the Court's power. In this context, the regular, old-line forces of reaction will probably have their Southern cohorts back in the fold for an attack on freedom.

In this sense, the recent victories in the area of civil liberties are not definitive. They are the first round. And if a powerful counter-attack is mounted, the decision will be made, not in the tradition-bound chambers of the High Court which are susceptible to political pressure in the long run but which may go against the stream (either in a reactionary or a progressive way) in the short run, but in the halls of Congress. That means that the fate of civil liberties in the coming months will depend on the political resources of pro-libertarians. And precisely because the victories were won by Supreme Court fiat and not through the political organization of those who oppose the witchhunt, that poses real problems.

So far, the campus has failed to respond to the challenge. At the height of the witchhunt during the Korean war, the campus was one of the victims. During this period, all student political organizations declined. The fight against the firing of professors who took the Fifth Amendment, the fight for the right of students to hear speakers of their own choice, the fight against the demand for the membership lists of student political

clubs, these were lost time and time again. The campus was not a bulwark against McCarthyism, even though there were signs of opposition such as the Green Feather campaign of three years ago. Students not only did not interest themselves as a group in the general battle for civil liberties; they lost many of their own rights as well.

EXCELLENT STATEMENT

The excellent statement of the American Civil Liberties Union on student rights, made last year, remains a piece of paper. By changing this, by fighting for it, students will be doing more than securing their own rights. They will be making a real contribution to civil liberties throughout the nation.

In this context, a retrospective look at the free speech fight in New York last Spring is instructive. The issue was joined when John Gates, editor of the *Daily Worker*, was banned from speaking on all city college campuses because he had been jailed under the Smith Act. Student protests took place at Queens College and City College, the two campuses specifically effected. At Columbia, a private college not under the city's rules, two clubs, the Debs Society and the John Dewey Society, sponsored successful meetings for Gates. In the wake of this development, the Debs Society at Columbia became the center of a city-wide student protest. But after one meeting, attended by representatives and observers from about twenty student groups, the plans for a campaign came to naught.

And yet, the Gates protest was effective. It proved what student action could do. For within a few weeks, Buell Gallagher, the president of City College, debated a spokesman of the Communist Party; another City College meeting heard Joseph Clark, then foreign editor

(Continued on bottom of next page)

ARE YOU FROM

New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Buffalo, Albany, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, St. Louis, Denver, Los Angeles, Albuquerque, San Francisco, Seattle or Portland?*

DO YOU WANT

to fight for socialism on the campus and in the youth movement?

THEN CONTACT

the YSL Unit or Organizing Committee in your area, or write to

YSL
114 W. 14th Street
New York, N. Y.

*If you're not from any place where we are, start us where you are. Write to the above address.

Socialist Clubs Put Controversy Back on Campus

Two independent socialist college clubs in New York are opening the new term with important meetings this year.

The E. V. Debs Club of Brooklyn College was recognized by the College last Spring. Its first major meeting, to be held on October 16th, will feature a debate between Joseph Clark, former Foreign Editor of the *Daily Worker* who recently resigned from the Communist Party and the *Daily Worker*, and Max Shachtman, national chairman of the Independent Socialist League. Shachtman and Clark will confront each other on the question of the nature of Russian society. This will be one of the first times that Clark has spoken in public since his resignation from the Communist Party, an event which received national coverage in the press.

The Debs Club at Brooklyn is an independent, democratic socialist discussion group. *Challenge* urges all its readers on the Brooklyn campus to contact this broad socialist club.

The Debs Society at Columbia University is beginning its third year of activity. Last year, it became the center of campus attention when it led a campaign to defend the civil liberties of John Gates, editor of the *Daily Worker*. Gates had been denied the right to speak on city college campuses because he had served a prison term for violation of the Smith Act. The Debs Society is an anti-Communist organization, but it believes in defending the civil liberties of all. It sponsored a meeting for Gates and two other speakers (both anti-Communists, one from the Young Socialist League, the other a representative of the American Civil Liberties Union). The Society was also the focal point for an attempt to organize a city-wide protest on the Gates issue.

At its first meeting this year, Columbia Debs heard Michael Harrington, national chairman of the Young Socialist League, speak on democratic socialism. Its next major project is a debate between a defender of the National Office for Decent Literature, a controversial Catholic organization which has engaged in pro-censorship activity, and a representative of the American Civil Liberties Union which opposes the activity of the NODL. The Columbia Debs has also announced a postcard campaign on the Sharkey-Brown-Isaacs bill against discrimination in housing in New York. (A similar campaign will probably be undertaken at Brooklyn College.)

Both of these clubs are independent of any national affiliation. However, their work, part of the possibility of a socialist resurgence in America, is of great importance and deserves the support of all democratic socialists in the New York area.

Civil Liberties — —

(Continued from page 2-c)

of the *Daily Worker*, and a group of radicals (including Michael Harrington, national chairman of the Young Socialist League); and Brooklyn College Students For Democratic Action also sponsored Clark, along with Harrington and Sheldon Ackley of the American Civil Liberties Union. Both the *New York Times* and *Post* came to the defense of the students in the process.

The Gates fight is a clear indication of what can be done when students unite and act. And it is possible that a similar test case will soon be brought on the West Coast. Yet this was the first really political protest around a civil liberties issue to involve a wide range of students in recent years.

For some, it appears that the Supreme Court has ended the witchhunt. This is a dangerous point of view. Many institutions of the witchhunt (including the Army's pernicious screening system) remain in force. The question of civil liberties, both in the nation, and on the campus, may well become a burning issue in the near future. The campus, it is hoped, will make a better showing this time.

Russian Communist Youth Get An International Challenge

The Young Socialist League has called for an international debate —with no holds barred.

In the letter reproduced on this page, three students, co-chairmen of the YSL's National Student Committee, have proposed to the Russian Young Communist League that simultaneous debates be arranged in Russia and the United States between members of the two organizations. If the proposal is accepted, it will mean that Russian students will hear the point of view of democratic socialism for the first time in decades; and that American students will have the opportunity to listen to a free and open confrontation between representatives of the Russian Young Communist

League and democratic socialist youth from the United States.

Commenting on the letter, YSL National Chairman Michael Harrington said, "We were particularly disgusted by the stupidity of the State Department stand on the Moscow Youth Festival. The YSL has always stood for absolute freedom of travel. But more than that, we were concerned that the debate which took place on the streets of Moscow was more or less haphazard. We feel that the best way to get a real airing of views is to have an organized political confrontation. Given these two aims—that of affirming the principle of free discussion and of defending the right to travel—we decided to send off our letter."

In the letter, the socialist students made it plain that they are opponents of the Russian regime and wish to engage in a frank debate. The details of the project will be arranged when, and if, the Russian Young Communist League accepts the socialist proposal. However the YSL made it plain to the Russians that they were interested in setting up a nation-wide tour, taking the debate between democratic socialism and Communism to scores of campuses throughout the United States. It is, of course, expected that if the project goes through, the Russians would arrange a similar tour throughout Russia for the American socialists.

YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE

114 W. 14th Street, New York, N. Y.

September 25, 1957

Central Committee
Young Communist League
Moscow, Russia

Gentlemen:

We are writing on behalf of the Young Socialist League, a democratic socialist youth organization of American students and youth.

We noted with regret that at the recent Moscow Youth Festival there was, as reported in the press, no presentation of the democratic socialist opposition to Communism. We agree with the statements at the Festival that there should be free discussion among the youth of the world, but we believe that this discussion will be most worthwhile if it counterposes political points of view in open debate.

Specifically, we favor debates between democratic socialists and Communists. From our point of view, Communism is an anti-democratic system that has nothing in common with the socialist organization of society. You, of course, hold the opposite view. We seek a public, open confrontation of these two attitudes.

In the United States, we have consistently stood for civil liberties and freedom of speech. We have defended the rights of Communists to be heard (our members were very active in seeing to it that the editor of the *Daily Worker* could be heard by students in New York). That we disagree sharply and basically with Communists is, of course, obvious, but that does not change our advocacy of democratic rights for all. Indeed, one of our fundamental criticisms of Russian Communism is precisely that it denies this democratic freedom.

Thus, in proposing a debate to you, we wish to make it clear that we do so because we disagree with the Young Communist League of Russia on fundamentals. To us, socialism cannot exist without the fullest freedom, including the right of open, organized political opposition. And it is because we have such opposed views that we suggest a confrontation.

Therefore, we propose the following to you: that the Young Socialist League will raise the money to pay for the expenses of two members of the Russian Young Communist League to come to the United States, and will arrange a

nation-wide tour for the purpose of arguing the fundamental differences between democratic socialism and Communism; and that the Young Communist League of Russia raise money and arrange for a similar tour of the Russian universities for two speakers to be designated by the Young Socialist League. The exact details can be worked out by us through subsequent correspondence if you accept our proposal.

This proposal does not involve any official agency of the United States Government. It comes from us alone. As democratic socialists we have exercised our right to criticize and oppose the policy of the United States Government. In this, we have been subjected to a certain amount of official persecution, but we still have been able to maintain a press, to hold public meetings and to advocate our ideas before the students and young people of America.

If you accept this suggestion, we would want to raise various questions in debate: we would want to argue our conviction that the road to peace lies through opposition to Russian Communism; we would confront you with the clear evidence of the democratic and socialist character of the Hungarian Revolution, which we support, and of the imperialist nature of the Russian intervention. In short, we propose that there be no limitation of any kind on the right of either party to the debate to raise any issue. For ourselves, we are confident of the ideas which we hold and have nothing to fear from such free discussion; and we hope that you feel the same way.

In conclusion, we do not feel that the cause of international peace will be served by evading differences. You have stated that you favor the exchange of opinion between youth throughout the world. We propose this debate—carried on simultaneously in Russia and the United States—as our response to your affirmation.

We look forward to an early reply from you to our proposal.

Sincerely,

Co-Chairmen
National Student Committee
YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE

PETER NOVICK,
Columbia University

NANCY AHEARN,
University of Chicago

ARLON TUSSING,
University of Washington

cc: *Komsomolskaya Pravda*

THE AIM OF THE YSL

The Young Socialist League is a democratic socialist organization striving to aid in the basic transformation of this society into one where the means of production and distribution shall be collectively owned and democratically managed. The YSL attempts to make the young workers and students, who form its arena of activity, conscious of the need for organization directed against capitalism and Stalinism.

The YSL rejects the concept that state ownership without democratic controls represents socialism; or that socialism can be achieved without political democracy, or through undemocratic means, or in short in any way other than the conscious active participation of the people themselves in the building of the new social order. The YSL orients toward the working class, as the class which is capable of leading society to the establishment of socialism.

—From the Constitution of the YSL

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

ANVIL

The ONLY Student Socialist Magazine in America

IN THIS ISSUE:

Uneasy Russian Youth

The Dialectical Lukacs

The Negro Fights For Freedom

Existentialist Agony

British Student Movement

25 cents per copy Bundles of 5 or more at 20 cents 5 issues for \$1.00

Write to:

ANVIL, 36 East 10th Street, New York 11, N. Y.

Little Rock and the Campus—

(Continued from page 1-c)

in 1956 obviously wanted to make an impressive record). Rather, the liberal-labor forces are put into this position by the very nature of the Democratic Party. Their vast strength, their appeal on the basis of demands for Civil Rights and social welfare, stand in sharp conflict with the very structure of the Party to which they belong.

ACTED TOO LATE

But what about the Republicans? Eisenhower acted—too late. Characteristically, he was playing golf during the crucial days of the crisis. He apparently thought he could charm Faubus out of opposing integration by a simple meeting. And then when it was too late, when the authority of the Supreme Court had been flaunted by Faubus' provocations and the actions of a mob of fifteen hundred people, he took the step of sending in the federal troops. By then, it was too late to avoid an incredibly bad political situation. Successful blows had been struck against integration, and that fact is obviously in the mind of every racist governor in the South.

Coupled with this is the fact that all kinds of reactionary Republicans in Congress have taken the road of giving lip-service to Civil Rights. America has been treated to the strange sight of a card-carrying right-winger like Everett Dirksen, a man who has been dragged into the twentieth century by the heels, standing up as a champion of human rights. As a maneuver, it was a fine piece of work. In part, it was responsible for the increase in the Republican vote among Negroes last year. But it doesn't form the basis for a real change in Civil Rights.

For however much the Republicans might veer on the Civil Rights issue, however much they might be responsive to the pressures of the moment, that cannot obscure an enormous fact: that the Republican Party is the chosen instrument of Big Business in the United States and as such it stands opposed to the needs of millions of Negroes. The Negroes of Milwaukee were confronted by a terrible choice during the recent campaign which elected Proxmire to the Senate. Whether to vote for the Democrats who stand opposed to the Negro as a Negro in a blatant, obvious way; or to vote for the Republicans who, whatever their demagoguery toward the Negro, stand opposed to the Negro as a worker and, as shown by Eisenhower's role in the recent Civil Rights fight, will not deliver in the sphere of civil rights either.

IMPOSSIBLE DILEMMA

The dilemma is an impossible one. So much so that it cannot continue to exist for long in American politics. And this fact suggests another crucial dimension of the events at Little Rock.

Many people have been amazed at the incredible courage of the Negro students at Little Rock. And obviously, there is a quality of personal determination and bravery in the case of each young Negro who faces a howling mob and the troops of the National Guard. Yet, another fact is also obvious: that this bravery is becoming a national phenomenon, that wherever the racists attempt to thwart integration whether it be in Tennessee or Arkansas, there you will find young Negroes who are prepared to stand up for their rights, no matter what the odds are.

The reason for this is of incalculable political significance. Throughout America, Negroes are on the march. Their social movement has broken through the hypocrisy and official lies of this society in a way that nothing else has done since the rise of the CIO in the thirties. It is this sweeping phenomenon which was present in the Montgomery Bus Boycott, which continues to grow despite the beatings and bombings and the killing.

It is this fact of a tremendous section of the American people on the march which batters away at the reactionary and obsolete two-party structure in this country. For, however the politicians may wish it, the civil rights fight is not going to diminish after quiet comes back to Little Rock. It is not going to become

"reasonable" in the near future. The accumulated hatred of oppression and love of freedom that has been building up for years and years among America's Negroes has burst out in a gigantic movement. May 17, 1954, the day of the Supreme Court decision, was only the lighting of a fuse. The material of the explosion had been gathering for years.

WHAT WILL THEY SAY?

And what will the liberals tell the Negroes of New York in the Congressional election next year? What will they say during the Presidential race of 1960. How will they explain their fellow party members, Orval Faubus, James Eastland and Hermann Talmadge. When someone asks, why do you vote to make these men committee chairmen, why do you help them to become governors, what will they say?

The vast majority of progressive Americans are committed to a program of liberal reform. As socialists, we believe that this is inadequate. But the argument here is not between socialism and liberalism. It is the question of the crisis within liberalism. For it is now plain for all to see that on the most significant social issue of the day, American liberalism's commitment to the Democratic Party has imposed upon it a policy of cowardice, defeat and useless compromise. It is now plain, from a liberal point of view as well as from a socialist, that the road to serious immediate gains lies through a basic political realignment in the United States.

And the essential point of this realignment must be: that the liberal-labor movement, with its allies among the Negroes, farmers and salaried city dwell-

ers, break with the Democratic Party as it is now constituted.

We have no get-rich-quick scheme for accomplishing this necessary development. We do not even know how it will come about—through a fight within the Democratic Party leading (as it inevitably would if seriously carried on) to the expulsion of the South and the victory of the labor movement; or through the creation of a new independent political party. What we do know is the essential effect which must take place. The labor and liberal movement must speak in their own name, must shatter through their policy of compromise and offer a real alternative in American politics. For us, this would mean the creation of a labor party, that is, of a party whose organized core would be the political instrument of the American workers, but a party whose appeal would go far beyond the ranks of the union movement itself.

On an issue like Little Rock, such a party would not be bound hand and foot as the liberal Democrats were during the past few weeks. It would not content itself with making criticism of Eisenhower for acting "too late," which was the militant sounding line of the liberals in the current crisis, a position which ignored the fact that he was acting against a Democrat. This is not to say that a simple break in the present structure of American politics would work an overnight wonder. It is only to say that it would open up the real possibility of a party seriously dedicated to the struggle for Civil Rights.

Little Rock had made this clear: neither the Republicans or the Democrats offer a real alternative to those

who are for Civil Rights. The only way out is for a basic political realignment in American society.

This program is for the future, though we hope it will not be too far distant. But in the immediate present, there is a necessity to return to the point with which we began: that immediate action must be taken now. In the long run, we believe that such action must move in the direction of creating a new political party in the United States. But for now, we believe that all those who believe in Civil Rights—whatever their position on other political questions in America—must join together and make the voice of the American student heard.

PROGRAM OF ACTION

The Young Socialist League has dedicated itself to such a program of immediate action. In doing so, it wishes to join together with every democrat who is for human decency for the Negro in America. All should join together and

- demonstrate in support of the Negro students of Central High on every college campus in the nation;

- raise the issue of support to the struggle for integration in all student clubs, in student government and NSA;

- swell the ranks of the NAACP on campus; vote this way for a clear and unambiguous stand for Civil Rights.

These three points seem simple. They are the responsibility of anyone who has an elementary sense of the grave issues involved in Little Rock. But so far, the American campus has not even risen to this level of action. The Negro students in Little Rock have made their position bell-clear. Shall we ignore their courage, and the basic questions which it raises?

Eye-Witness Report on South in Anvil

The Fall issue of ANVIL has just been published.

The first twelve pages of this issue consist of a section on "The Negro Fights For Freedom." Beginning with an analysis of the Civil Rights Act, the section follows up with four first hand reports from the south. First there is an article on the struggle at an all-Negro school, Alcorn College, in Mississippi, written by one of the Alcorn professors. This is followed by John Boardmann's account of how he was expelled from Florida State University for participating in the movement for integration. And the section is completed with two reports by Murray Kempton, New York Post columnist, on the situation in Montgomery, Alabama and Rock Hill, South Carolina.

Following the Civil Rights section are two editorials: on the possibilities of the regroupment of socialist forces in the United States, and an editorial on the H-Bomb.

In their editorial on socialist regroupment, the editors of ANVIL express their great hope that the era of socialist sects is drawing to a close, that the possibilities of building a socialist movement in the United States are real. They promise to assist, to the best of their ability, all attempts at the building of a democratic socialist movement.

The editorial on the H-Bomb begins with a call to STOP THE TESTS! BAN THE BOMB! It hails the growing sentiment against the Bomb, and the peace movement that this sentiment represents. But it also points out the illusions that are liable to arise out of a movement based simply on the Bomb issue. That is, the belief that stopping the tests and banning the bomb can lead, by itself, to peace. For this, the editorial maintains, more general demands—like withdrawing all troops from Europe—are necessary. Yet it is certainly heartening to see the people voicing their utter horror at the horror of the H-Bomb.

There are three cultural pieces in this

issue of ANVIL. The first deals with "The Existentialist Agony," and is written by Mel Stack. It is a critique of the inconsistencies and dilemmas of existentialist thought as well as the contributions that existentialists have made with their concern with the individual. Using Sartre and Camus to illustrate how the existentialist approaches social life, i.e., man in society, the author points to the flaw in this school of thought: the tendency to divorce man from his conditions, to abstract him from his environment, to deny his being as a social animal.

Next is a contribution by Michael Harrington, national chairman of the Young Socialist League, on George Lucaks. Lucaks, the Hungarian Marxist critic received attention in the United States for his participation in the Hungarian Revolution, where he held a post in the Nagy government. But he is one of the greatest literary critics of the century as well as one of the finest minds. Harrington attempts to show the dichotomy that existed in Lucaks—on the one hand a basic humanitarianism, on the other a commitment to Stalinism (until last year). This dichotomy produced the unique result of a great artist operating under the aegis of a system that was the antithesis of everything which stood for artistic creation. And, moreover, Lucaks supported that regime. But at last the dichotomy was resolved as the Hungarian Revolution swept Lucaks into choosing the side of freedom.

Bob Bone, who teaches at Yale University, has contributed a review of the movie, "Baby Doll." Calling it one of the finest of Hollywood's movies in many years, Bone analyses the film both in terms of its social symbolism and its individual sexual relationships. It is an excellent job on this artistic expression of the development of industrialism in the South.

There are also two articles dealing with student movements in the world. One is on the British youth, written by a recent graduate of Oberlin College who has been visiting in England. The second concerns the developments among the Russian youth as the events since the Khrushchev revelations reverberate within Russian society. This article is

written by Max Martin Dombrow, national secretary of the Young Socialist League.

ANVIL is completed by reviews of two books—Draper's *Roots of American Communism*, and Howe's *Politics and the Novel*.

This breakdown of the contents of this issue of ANVIL will give a concrete example of what the magazine attempts to express. It tries to bring the ideas of democratic socialism to students and young people. It presents the socialist choice as against the world power struggle with its exploitation and continuous threat of war. Its columns are open to all who wish to critically examine the socialist traditions.

SEATTLE

Thursday, October 10

The Liberal Failure On Civil Liberties

Speaker

Bogdan Denitch

Nat'l. Field Rep., YSL

7:30 P.M. Admission free

Freinds Meeting House

W. 40th and 15th Ave. N.E.

(Just across from U. of Wash. Gate 1)

the next day, October 11

Party

522 N. 68th St. (Between Aurora and Greenwood)

All the beer you can drink for 60 cents Dancing

Portland, Oregon

Hear

BOGDAN DENITCH

National Field Representative, YSL

on

THE H-BOMB

AND THE FIGHT FOR PEACE

8 P.M. at Finnish Workers Hall

(North Fremont and Montana)

Sponsored by Portland Open Forum