

LABOR ACTION

AUGUST 25, 1958

TEN CENTS

SPOTLIGHT

Desegregation Order

The Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals has set aside the order staying integration at Central High School in Little Rock, Arkansas. Governor Faubus, further encouraged by his re-election in a landslide vote, is once again seeking ways and means to circumvent the court order. As it was last fall, the course of events will be determined by the vigor and determination with which the federal government is willing to act.

Can the Negro children seeking nothing more than an education under conditions of full equality with white children hope for a peaceful and orderly beginning of the school year? The answer is clearly no. A relative degree of peacefulness can only be ensured by the presence of federal troops, or by the clear advance announcement that they will appear on the scene the moment there is any sign of defiance of the court order.

The record does not give one great confidence that this time Eisenhower will move in time and with enough political force to do the job without soldiers. That would involve a real national campaign not on the formal basis of "complying with the law of the land," but on the basis of an appeal based on the democratic tradition of equal rights and fair play for all—on the *substance* of the issue. As long as integration requires fed-

eral troops to enforce it, a defeat may have been averted, but no victory has been won.

Teamster Pacts Banned

The AFL-CIO Executive Council has ordered that its affiliates discontinue their pacts with Hoffa's Teamsters on pain of harsh penalty. Only Joe Curran voted against—the same whose dictatorship in

(Continued on page 3)

Proposal for Unity With ISL Carries As SP-SDF Concludes Referendum Vote

The Socialist Party-Social Democratic Federation has just concluded a referendum on their convention decision to "extend comradely welcome into membership, in our Party, to all the present members of the Independent Socialist League, who will make their applications for membership in our Party . . ." (for full text of the resolution see LABOR ACTION for June 16.)

In the referendum, the party membership upheld the decision of the convention by a narrow margin. Max Shachtman, national chairman of the ISL has been officially informed of the adoption of this resolution in a letter signed by the national secretary of the SP-SDF. Final steps to effect this merger of the membership of the ISL into the SPSDF are in the process of discussion.

Auto Workers Gird For Bitter Fight As Production Starts on '59 Models

By JACK WILSON

Detroit, August 10

The hour of decision in the contract dispute between the United Autoworkers Union and General Motors, Ford and Chrysler, turned out to be the time of postponement.

During the hectic days after the old contracts expired on June 1st, the top leadership of the UAW assured its secondary leaders that they'd have to rock and roll throughout the summer, but "we won't work without a contract on the 59's," to use Walter Reuther's phrase.

This strategy has been changed. Now the policy is to wait until 1959 production is rolling at Plymouth, Ford and Chevrolet plants, and then set a deadline. This is not likely to prove very popular with many rank and filers who took a beating in the summer months in many plants but took it in the expectation that when they returned to work on the new models things would be different.

ROUGH IN SHOPS

As it stands now, most models will be in production before the UAW sets a deadline date. The series of wild-cat strikes, slowdowns, and disputes in the

plants before production closed on 1958 car models suggests that it's going to be rough in the shops the next month. How the UAW will manage to regain the ground it has lost on working conditions since the men in the shops lacked the protection of a contract and effective plant bargaining machinery remains to be seen. Of course, the pattern isn't the same in all plants in all companies. Chrysler undoubtedly went farthest in attacking the union. The trouble is that striking Chrysler won't set a pattern for Ford or GM.

The dilemmas of both the UAW and the Big Three in this crisis are explained quite well in an article in the August 7 issue of the Reporter magazine, with all the problems confronting each side. For the UAW it is a question of turning a retreat into an offensive that takes the play away from the corporations. For the Big Three it is a question of being able to stick together in face of the union's obvious aim of trying to take them on one at a time.

It is an open secret in Detroit that the terrific pressure to which the UAW has been subjected during the past few months has produced differences within the leadership. If the union can make gains with a peaceful settlement, these

differences will probably subside. If it is forced to strike, anything but a major victory in the strike might make the temptation to put the blame on someone else in the leadership hard to resist.

PROBLEMS

At the beginning of a new model most plants are plagued with a million and one problems from the question of working over-time, use of seniority for promotions and jobs, setting work standards for the year, etc., which are difficult to settle even with a contract and real bargaining. How this will work out without a contract puzzles many plant leaders. And how far the rank and file will take things in their own hands is another question which bothers not only union leaders but also many of the more farsighted labor relations directors in the plants.

Everyone on both sides of this struggle knows that the union faces its toughest battle in over a decade. Every bit of that indefinable quality will be needed which has enabled the UAW to overcome every crisis in its past. If there be any complacency on the side of the bosses about the final outcome, a glance at history should serve to dispel it.

Arab Nationalism and Nasserism

... page 7

YSL, YPSL Plan Labor Day Merger

... page 5

Not a Trace of "Class Struggle"

... page 4

British Labor and the H-Bomb

... page 2

The Old and Discredited Policies Seek the Cover of a New Phrase

"Indirect Aggression"

By GORDON HASKELL

The Middle East crisis seems to be shrinking down to the proportions of a non-critical mess. It may very well be that for the moment the United States and Britain will find some way of pulling their troops out of the politically untenable position into which they thrust them only a few weeks ago, without suffering an immediate catastrophe. This may be accomplished through some version of the proposals now being debated in the United Nations.

But it is highly unlikely that anything which is now planned by the American government can either offset the world-wide political losses which its actions have incurred; nor is there any plan now in sight which can actually serve to stabilize the situation in the Middle East and assure it a normal growth, free of recurring crises such as the one through which we have just gone.

Recent issues of LABOR ACTION have analysed the clash between the aspirations of the peoples and governments of the Middle East and the objectives of American foreign policy which led to the present fiasco. The social, political and economic development of the Middle East should be subjects for continuing study by socialists, including the specific forms which Arab nationalism has assumed both in that area and in the North Africa. (See material on page 7.)

INDIRECT AGGRESSION

In this article, however, we wish to address ourselves specifically to the new theory of "indirect aggression" and the "right" of one power to intervene by military force in the internal affairs of another country if this be done "at the request of its legitimate government." These two concepts have been at the center of the case presented by the United States in the debate in the United Nations General Assembly. They, and specially the latter, had a lot to do with the difficulty the United States had in lining up the 20-government Latin American bloc to vote for any resolution which might appear to legitimize the American and British interventions in Lebanon and Jordan.

The concept of "indirect aggression" is, at bottom, an inversion of the famous old Clausewitz dictum that war is a continuation of politics by military means. Since "ag-

(Turn to last page)

LABOR SCOPE

By H. W. BENSON

Victor Riesel's Guest

While Victor Riesel was in Europe last month he turned his daily column "Inside Labor" over to guest writers. One labor leader to pinch hit for him was Al Hayes, president of the International Association of Machinists. Hayes, on July 18, called for "summit" talks between labor and management:

"We need an exploratory meeting—a labor-management summit conference—at which industry, including the United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers, including the AFL-CIO and its major affiliates can sit down together to take stock of their common objectives. If such a conference could be held, I think that many of the misunderstandings that now loom so large could be removed."

Perhaps he could induce Ford, General Motors and Chrysler to "talk" but right now the UAW is trying to get them just to bargain.

UAW Strike Vote

By now, the UAW has gone almost three months without a contract with the Big Three and negotiating sessions have been a farce. Production on next year's models begins within a few weeks and the union is readying itself to strike, if necessary.

On July 30, the UAW filed unfair labor practices charges against Chrysler for an "adamant refusal to discuss grievances" and for its unilateral decision not to recognize the regularly established steward system in its plants.

Strike votes, by secret ballot, have been taken in all the Big Three plants. Here are the results:

	for strike	against	per cent for strike
GM	115,973	10,410	91.8
Ford	56,482	2,603	95.6
Chrysler	40,221	2,233	94.6

On August 9, delegates to the Ford, GM and Chrysler Councils voted unanimously to request strike authorization from the International Union. The International Executive Board voted to defer action, using the strike threat as a weapon to try to force the companies into real negotiations, meanwhile waiting for the resumption of full production which would put the union in a more advantageous position. "Despite all our efforts," the union charged, "the corporations have persistently refused, over a period of 140 days, to give any consideration whatsoever to either the legitimate aspirations of their workers or the rights of consumers and the public at large. Instead, they have sought to turn to their own narrow and selfish purposes the temporary tactical advantage placed in their hands by the economic recession and its accompaniment in the form of huge inventories of unsold new cars."

One of the union's demands is for an increase in pension payments to retired workers to bring their purchasing level back to 1955 standards. Last month, the union called upon its retired members to demonstrate in front of the General Motors building in Detroit in support of their demand. An hour before the scheduled beginning of the march, thousands of workers were on the scene and at its height 5,000 workers formed an endless human chain around the block-square building in a demonstration lasting an hour and a half. (In April, the union reported that more than 75,000 workers were getting retirement or disability payments under UAW-negotiated plans.)

FBI Snooping

The FBI has been accused of "snooping into a great many things which are none of its business," by the Oil Workers Union which speaks from its own experience last fall during a strike by its Prestons-

burg, Ky. Local 10-510 against the Kentucky-West Virginia Gas Co. This is the story as told in the July 21 issue of the union's paper *Union News*:

During the strike some gas lines were damaged and the company charged sabotage. The union knows nothing about the situation. At any rate, it is against federal law to interfere with interstate commerce movements and it is a proper function of FBI to investigate and determine whether anybody broke a federal law in connection with the pipeline incidents.

But look at the methods used by FBI. Instead of sending one good gumshoe into the scene, FBI made a big splash by sending a task force of at least five agents to Prestonsburg. They went to the local union and demanded to see all its books and records and to see notes kept by union negotiators during negotiations with the company.

Here the FBI got out of line. Obviously neither local records nor negotiations notes would reflect anything about the alleged sabotage, if any. There was nothing for the FBI to gain, in connection with the case in question, by looking at these records. Surely FBI agents knew this.

Union officers told the FBI agents they would turn over the records only if a proper court order was issued authorizing this action. As for notes on negotiations, there were not any.

It appears obvious that these agents were mischievously snooping into things

not connected with the case they were entitled to investigate. Obviously, they wanted to pry into not the alleged sabotage but the general operations of the union and the negotiations between the union and the company. Neither item is any of the FBI's business.

FBI agents have gained a reputation for such dragnet methods of rounding up information on every subject under the sun. People who have been interviewed by FBI agents will tell you that these agents often ask questions which have utterly no bearing on the matter under investigation. Often they inquire into purely social matters. They have been known to inquire about the intimate relations between marriage partners. In short, they make everything under the sun their business.

And no matter how ridiculous, how frivolous, how unrelated a question may be, the FBI agent jots down the answer in his notebook, or the fact that an "uncooperative" witness refused to answer. All this goes into FBI's famous "raw files" from which it often leaks to mischief makers.

Stellato Loses In Democratic Primary

Carl Stellato lost in his bid for the Democratic nomination for Congressman from the 16th District in Michigan but his showing was impressive. John Lesinski, incumbent, received 27,842 votes;

Stellato, 21,050. Stellato was able to pile up a big vote despite the fact that his campaign was ignored by the labor movement in Michigan except for his own Ford Local 600; the Michigan *CIO News*, for example, gave the race no play in its headlines and in its report of the primary results did not even refer to the fact that a well-known UAW local leader like Stellato had run. Doubtless, the official silence was connected with two facts: 1. Lesinski had been considered a "friend of labor" by the unions which had supported him in the past. Union officials were not ready to take responsibility for defeating him now. 2. Stellato is known as a vigorous critic of Reuther inside the UAW. He entered the race without official clearance; there was no enthusiasm among the UAW leaders for advancing his career. Thus the Stellato campaign became tied up in union politics. But this much is clear from the results: If the labor movement had decided to wage a unified and aggressive campaign for its own candidate it would have won.

In a startling development during the campaign, the official Democratic Organization in the 16th Congressional District voted to endorse Stellato's candidacy. Lesinski was reported (*Detroit News*) to have said, "The Democratic Party had railroaded the Primary Election endorsement for Carl Stellato. . . . For eight years, I've been fighting an attempt to dominate myself, the 16th District and the nation as a whole by a part of the Union."

When asked why he hadn't attended meetings of the Party, Lesinski answered, "It wouldn't be worth while; these meetings are stacked with members of Ford Local 600. We as Democrats welcome unions. We have given them what they have today. But this attempt to dominate the country is too much. We can't swallow it."

Cleveland Taft-Hartley Conspiracy Case: An Astounding Juridical Story Unfolds

The Michigan AFL-CIO News reports (Aug. 7) that the Detroit branch of the American Civil Liberties Union urges that convictions in the so-called Cleveland Taft-Hartley Conspiracy case be appealed up to the Supreme Court if necessary. Seven persons, including four unionists, were sentenced to 18 months in prison and a \$2,500 fine each.

There have been so many assaults upon civil liberties in recent times, so many court cases, so many injustices that still another case, even involving jail sentences, might not be enough to arouse a jaded sense of protest. Yet, this case, despite the fact that it involves unpopular unions expelled from the CIO, has prompted wide sections of the labor movement to speak out. For here, the legal rights of unions in general are under fire. The Cleveland case belongs among the astounding juridical stories of our day and it is not easy, in a few words, to capture the full flavor of what is concocted by prosecutors and inquisitors. The tortuous line of reasoning is a compound of the following:

1. The Taft-Hartley law provides for non-Communist affidavits by union officials.
2. In this case, for the first time non-unionists are penalized under this provision.
3. This deft piece of legerdemain is put over by devising a conspiracy charge which accuses union-

ists and non-unionists with conspiring to violate the law. The government is able to evade the statute of limitations; it is permitted to construct a case for alleged conspiracy out of scraps and irrelevancies that would be excluded in a simple trial for violating the law itself.

In this case for example, one defendant Eric Reinthaler was convicted on the basis of testimony (from a paid government informer) that charged merely that he had transported someone to a meeting which presumably, had formed part of the "conspiracy." Reinthaler was an active member of an IAM local. No one even claims that he falsely signed any affidavit. Without the invention of a conspiracy, there would be no case of any kind against him.

CONSPIRACY

But the government pivots its devious case on Marie and Fred Haug. Marie was an officer of a UE local and then of its IAM successor in Cleveland. Fred was a UE organizer and an officer of a local of the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers Union. They were both charged with having falsely signed a T-H affidavit; the only defendants against whom that charge was leveled. But, and this is what is so outrageous, they were not tried on such a charge but rather that they had conspired with Communists to evade the law.

This they deny. The case against them was built up by government

paid informers. By trying them for conspiring with Communists, the government could throw in the whole kitchen sink. There were appropriate quotations from Lenin; there was the whole record of the Communist Party including its secret work; nine national officers of the CP who had been convicted under the Smith Act were named as co-conspirators but not as defendants and three admitted local Communists were dragged in as fellow conspirators. Thus, with a shred of a piece of an accusation a whole dark mood of alarm, of sinister murky comings and goings, of who-knows-what was created for the jurors. Who could remember that the only real substantive fact related to two persons and the T-H affidavit?

Protests have been filed among others by Locals of the UAW, the Meat Cutters, the Machinists (IAM), Packinghouse Workers and by the Detroit and Wayne County CIO Council.

THE COLLECTED STORIES OF ISAAC BABEL

New edition of a Russian master, including all passages censored in earlier versions (chiefly references to Trotsky).

\$5.00

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

LONDON LETTER

Nuclear Policy Resolutions Flood Labor Party As Annual Conference Shapes Up

"THE H-BOMB CONFERENCE"

By OWEN ROBERTS

The life of a political journalist is so fraught with uncertainty that when a long range speculation pays off there is a great temptation to leaf back through old articles, pick out an apt phrase and then to quote it, saying with a great sense of self satisfaction: "I told you so." I am going to succumb to that temptation by recalling a "London Letter" which appeared in *Labor Action* on January 27 of this year.

Discussing the growing public feeling against Britain's involvement in nuclear war plans, it commented: "It is obvious that, whatever has been decided in the past, the Labor Movement has yet to hear the final word on the question of H-bombs, nuclear armed planes, and rocket launching sites." Now, six months later, the publication of the list of resolutions submitted for the British Labor Party annual conference, due to take place at the coastal resort of Scarborough in a couple of month's, provides positive confirmation of that comment.

The tally of resolutions submitted to the Labor Party headquarters at Transport House from local Labor Parties and affiliated trade unions numbers 428. The big issue on the minds of the local Laborites is clearly demonstrated by the fact that no less than 141 of these resolutions deal with

Legion Spy-Hunters to End Peeking Under Beds

The subversive activities committee of the Minnesota American Legion announced recently that it has received no reports of subversive activity in the state.

The report, made by chairman Wilbur T. Lindholm, stated: "Your committee has not indulged in fanatical searches for alleged subversives. We have not opened a single closet nor have we peeked under a single bed."

The committee of three, in an apparent explanation of its inactivity, further remarked: "We have refused to be part of an unsupported attack on individuals or organizations. We feel that such practices are unfair, undemocratic, and in effect, subversive in themselves because they are contrary to America's fundamental precept of innocence until guilt has been proven under due process of law."

Turning to the international scene, the committee called isolationism a former accepted synonym for Americanism, but now a philosophy that "invites national suicide."

Referring to some Legion activities in the past, the report said bluntly: "The American Legion, nationally, and also in the State of Minnesota, has sacrificed some of its prestige and esteem by its zeal in declaring things to be un-American. All too often, we have adopted the technique of dictators when the machinery of democracy would have better served the cause."

"Great injury can be done to our own country by well-meaning people and organizations who wave the flag of nationalism so vigorously that they are blinded to the realities of the times." The committee concluded that, in the future, its primary function should be a concern with any attack on other free nations and that it should "encourage and welcome all assistance the remainder of the free world can offer."

In addition to Lindholm, Sheriff Ed Ryan of Minneapolis and Chief of Police William Proetz of St. Paul, signed the report.

From AGLU Bulletin

disarmament. But, more important still, 98 of these resolutions demand that Britain contract out of the nuclear arms race by unilaterally renouncing the H-bomb.

To get these resolutions in perspective it is necessary to make a quick flash-back to last year's annual conference of the BLP. On the fourth day of the conference the delegates debated disarmament and foreign affairs—and the big line up of speakers took place around a resolution which demanded, among other things, that "the next Labor Government will itself take the lead by refusing to continue to test, manufacture, or to use nuclear weapons, and that it will appeal to the peoples of the other countries to follow their lead."

ANEURIN BEVAN

In opposition to this resolution the National Executive Committee placed on the rostrum Aneurin Bevan, who argued that to commit the next Labor Government to such a policy meant dismantling the whole fabric of British international relationship without putting anything in its place; and this without consultation with "any members of the Commonwealth". Said Bevan scornfully: "You call that statesmanship? I call it an emotional spasm!"

The outcome of the debate was that the resolution calling for unilateral abolition of nuclear weapons was defeated by 5,836,000 votes to 781,000. In its stead a resolution was carried which urged the Parliamentary Labor Party "to press the Government to give a moral lead to the world by announcing that no further nuclear bomb tests will be undertaken by this country." But even this resolution was a little too strong for Bevan and the NEC as it stood, so Bevan announced that it would be accepted by the NEC on the understanding that it meant the "suspension" and not the "cessation" of tests.

Bevan's declaration at least had the merit of putting in clear terms just what the attitude of the BLP leaders was in relation to nuclear weapons, and it also cleared up the speculation about Bevan's position on the issue. The way was thus opened for those who stood in opposition to the leadership to begin a campaign to swing, not merely the feelings of the LP membership but also the feelings of the public at large.

GROWING CAMPAIGN

In the nine months that have passed since the 1957 conference of the BLP a growing campaign has been mounted against Britain's participation in the nuclear arms race. This campaign has been many sided in that it has been directed against the Tory Government's policies, against the Labor Party's policies and to the general public in an endeavor to win over as many supporters as possible to

an anti-nuclear weapon attitude.

On the broad public front the campaign has been directed by the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament—a wide non-party organization comprised of socialists and non-socialists, pacifists, scientists, intellectuals and anybody who opposes Britain's possession of the 'nuclear deterrent.'

Inside the Labor Party the campaign has been pursued by the left-wing Victory for Socialism group, the weekly paper *Tribune* and by left-wingers of all varieties. Public meetings, demonstrations, marches, leaflets, pamphlets, letters to the press and innumerable articles have kept the issues in the public eye.

POPULAR TOPIC

The result of all this activity is that the H-bomb is now a popular topic of conversation in Britain, and a specific outcome of this is the block of 98 resolutions on the BLP agenda demanding unilateral action to get out of the nuclear weapon club.

Laborite left-wingers have, in fact, indicated that they have no intention of taking the decision of last year's conference as the final word. Small wonder that *The Economist*, a weekly conservative periodical, writes in its current issue: "The demand for casting away the British bomb, coupled with the many specific demands that American bases and rocket sites be closed, too, may give both Mr. Gaitskell [the leader of the Parliamentary Labor Party] and Mr. Bevan some trouble if it is pressed from the floor."

There is, however, a negative feature in this welcomed agitation within the ranks of the BLP against the H-bomb. At last year's conference Bevan was able to score points by indicating that if a future Labor Government renounced the H-bomb it would mean that Britain would have to contract out of all its international military commitments—and, he emphasized, those advocating unilateral abandonment of nuclear weapons had given no indication of what they would put in the place of these current "commitments and obligations entered into with other countries."

A VALID POINT

This, it must be said, was a valid point which struck at the central weakness of the resolution posed in opposition to the leadership's attitude. Unfortunately, among all the resolutions tabled for this

year's conference there is not one which overcomes this weakness and effectively ties up the question of the H-bomb with the broader aspects of foreign policy.

The general tendency seems to be to abstract the H-bomb from all other questions. Thus many of the resolutions are brief to the point of absurdity; a recurrent formulation is: "This conference renounces completely the manufacture and testing of nuclear weapons." Those resolutions which make some attempt to get beyond this bald statement usually progress only to the point of "summit talks" which, they say, will be easier to arrange if Britain gives a lead by scrapping its nuclear weapons.

The nearest approach to a logical follow through of the demand that nuclear weapons be scrapped by a future Labor Government comes in a resolution which asks the Labor Party to make pledges to end the manufacture of nuclear weapons and the ending of agreements with the U.S. on rocket bases and to use these pledges as "a clarion call to the working classes of all countries thus uniting them in an international campaign to end the menace of universal destruction and death by H-bombs and rocket missiles."

DANGLING CASE

Nowhere is there an argued out case that Britain's involvement in the nuclear arms race is but the logical outcome of its involvement in Western military pacts and that such pacts are the expression of the division of the world into two rival power blocs. In the absence of such an analysis it may well be that Bevan will take the rostrum at Scarborough and advance the same arguments as he did at Brighton last year. There is, however, the chance that when the compositing committee takes place just before conference begins (at which all those who have submitted resolutions on similar subjects endeavor to frame a common resolution to go on the floor of conference) some form of composite resolution may embrace part of an existing resolution which, while it does not at the moment mention nuclear weapons, may well be incorporated in an anti H-bomb resolution.

One such resolution is that which stands in the name of Newbury Labor Party and which reads: "This conference recognizes that the continued existence of regional military pacts constitutes a threat to peace, democracy and national independence and that continued membership of NATO by Great Britain is inconsistent with a policy of socialism, friendship and peace."

There is also the chance that a local Labor Party will use its opportunity to submit an amendment to expand on one of the resolutions on nuclear disarmament and link it up with other aspects of foreign policy.

However, all of this is mere speculation and the final outcome will be unknown, until the conference meets. All that can be safely said at this point is that the 1958 BLP conference will probably go down in the records as "The H-bomb Conference"—whichever way the vote goes.

SPOTLIGHT

(Continued from page 1)

the NMU will not stand scrutiny—the same who sits on the AFL-CIO's Ethical Practices Committee to pass judgment on others.

This decision is a logical extension of the expulsion of the Teamsters, and indicates that the top AFL-CIO leadership is determined to pursue its present course rather than to let it become a dead letter. Further evidence along these lines is the demand that Hutcheson of the Carpenters be made to account for his tainted stewardship.

The trouble with this policy is not that it is wrong, but that it is clearly insufficient. As Jack Wilson writes elsewhere in this issue of *LABOR ACTION*, Hoffa has become stronger, both absolutely and relatively since the Teamsters were expelled from the AFL-CIO.

Labor Law Fails

The Kennedy-Ives labor bill has been killed in the House, and hence for this

session of Congress. The labor movement was by no means united in its attitude toward this bill (the railroad brotherhoods were specially opposed to features which might have blanketed them in with the rest of the labor movement). But what killed the bill was really hostility by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the NAM.

The demise of the bill should put a bit of a brake on those radicals who have been claiming that the sole effect of the McClellan Committee and of the "cooperation" or even "capitulation" of the labor leadership to the committee would be harsh anti-labor legislation. The reasons for the CofC and NAM opposition to the bill was that it was not "harsh" enough, in the first place, but even more important, that it had a section which repealed one of the most onerous and dangerous anti-union aspects of the Taft-Hartley Law: that which prevents strikers from voting in collective bargaining elections in struck plants.

NOW—IN ENGLISH
THE FAMED "VOLUME 4"
OF "CAPITAL"

Karl Marx's
HISTORY OF
ECONOMIC
THEORIES

PART ONE

Langland Press—337 pages—\$5.00

Order from

Labor Action Book Service
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

No Trace of the "Class Struggle" Mars A Union's Tranquil Course

By LARRY O'CONNOR

A favorite tenet of the American trade union leadership is that in this happy land the class struggle does not exist. There may, of course, be disagreements, and even tough bargaining between unions and employers. That is just part of the free enterprise system. Here and there, a maverick employer may set out to crush and destroy the union in his plant, as in the case of Kohler or O'Sullivan. There may even be whole sections of the country, like the South, where there appears to be a pretty solid front of employers, politicians, churches and courts against the unions.

All these, however, are merely special cases, regional peculiarities, or regrettable accidents. Take any of them separately, or all together, they do not add up to a "class struggle," or anything like it. That kind of thing may, perhaps, exist abroad, among foreigners, especially in countries where old aristocracies and other factors have produced "social rigidity," or other alien conditions. Or frequently the class struggle is regarded as merely an invention of Marxists, socialists or communists, designed to cause disruption of the natural harmony of our society by an injection of foreign "dogmas" "ideologies," or "isms."

OFFICIAL VIEW

That is pretty much the official view of the "class struggle" by a majority of labor leaders. It is the view emphasized most heavily at union conventions which fall in years in which major contracts are not up for renewal. It is proclaimed in speeches by the most progressive and politically sophisticated leaders like Walter Reuther and James Carey, and by the old-line "business unionists," of the building trades.

True, in recent times a certain notoriety has been earned by a section of the labor leadership which is distinguished by its exploits in waging what might be called the "cash struggle." In its most highly developed form, this is an operation in which hard bargaining over the table between employers and union leaders is replaced by bargaining over the amount of money the union leaders require to guarantee the employer immunity from having to grant concessions to their workers.

But although the point may be made that even this one hundred per cent American free enterprise kind of activity is a displaced, par-

asitic form of the class struggle, it is a digression from our theme. That theme is, in a nutshell, the disparity between the realities with which the labor movement has to deal in America today, and the theory that this reality cannot and should not be referred to in the general term, the "class struggle."

Let us take, for the purposes of analysis, a single issue of *IUE News* (August 18, 1958), official organ of the International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, AFL-CIO.

VIOLENCE IN SYRACUSE

Item 1. "GE Hopes for Violence in Syracuse." This article describes a charge by Henry R. Norman, member of the Board of Supervisors of Onondaga County, that General Electric had attempted to use the Board as a "tool" "for the purpose of coercing the community and breaking the union." Said Norman:

"The campaign the company has been waging for several months indicates that it has no intention of bargaining with the union, yet it does not want to take the responsibility for the strike which I am sure it desires.

"We are being asked to purchase 500 deputy sheriff arm bands for the express reason that a strike is anticipated. The public relations of this action would be to add fuel to the company claim that extreme violence is to be expected. . . .

"This follows the pattern of coercion set by the company. This board should not allow itself to become the tool of the Manufacturers Association of Syracuse and the General Electric Company for the purpose of coercing the community and breaking the union. The company will encourage people to cross the picket lines in the hope that violence will occur.

"Then the deputy sheriffs can swoop down and thereby cause the public to forget the company's refusal to cooperate in any way to avoid the strike."

RIGHT-TO-WORK

Item 2. Two whole pages of the issue are devoted to attacks on the "right-to-work" state laws. This is a nation-wide, heavily financed, massively backed attempt to legislate the open shop. Such laws have already been passed in 18 states. One of the articles points out that while the 18 states account for only 28 per cent of the country's workers subject to minimum wage and overtime provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act, 46 per cent of individual violations have occurred in them.

The success of the "right-to-work" anti-union laws can only be ascribed to the solidity with which they have been backed by the business interests in the states in which they have passed. In states where attempts to pass such laws have been turned back, the victory over them can only be ascribed to the unity with which the labor movement and the workers in general have resisted them. In this matter, can it be said that class is ranged against class?

Item 3. Under the heading "An All-Out Attack On Labor," this article describes the 216-page book "The Labor Bosses — America's Third Party" put out by the Senate Republican Policy Committee. It is described as "a vicious collection of wild charges." Further, the paper quotes with evident approval a Democratic politician as saying: "The attack on the AFL-CIO and on honest trade unions in this Republican document is proof again that the Republican Party is not opposed to dishonesty in unionism but is opposed to unions themselves and to the working people they represent."

NO MONOPOLY

Now, as socialists, we have never claimed that Republicans have a monopoly on representing the capitalists in this country. Such claims have often been made by the same labor leaders who deny there is a class struggle here. But then, is the above simply another "wild charge?"

Item 4. The rest of the paper is full either of news of inner-union affairs, contract gains, news of general interest, or articles under such headings as "Westinghouse Found 'Unfair,'" "Same Old Hooey By GE," "Company Violence in Connersville Strike," "Most Consumers Worse Off Today," "Making It Hot For the Bosses," "Strike Forced by Sylvania," and other items reflecting the good will, harmony, constructive cooperation, and industrial statesmanship which are the rule in relations between workers and their employers in this country.

The class struggle? Not a trace of it!

A Tale of Two Methods

There are two different ways to measure man's work: "science" or rule of thumb; modern or ancient; hypocrisy or vulgarity. This is the tale of two methods.

Chrysler, in keeping with technological advance, uses the new. In an attractively printed little brochure on "Work Standards" it advises foremen in tedious detail how rates of production are imposed upon employees. There are graphs and tables compiled with the aid of ultra-modern precision stop watches and very long division which slices seconds into ribbons.

If foremen read through this booklet they will learn, among other things, how many seconds per man are allowed for toilet duty, determined not by the peristaltic motion of bodily organs but by the far more precise quiverings of tiny micro-metric hair springs.

WILL DISCUSS

Mr. Foreman is cautioned at the end, "Make it clear at all times that you are willing to discuss a work standard fully and in good faith." But be not alarmed; no flesh-and-blood foreman is permitted to question the verdict of mechanical counters, gears and ratchets. To do so would subvert the whole basis of our way of life. The foreman is advised to "discuss" as follows:

"Your job in the initial step of a grievance is to explain and defend the standard and show that it is fair." But suppose, you may ask, the standard is not fair! Don't raise irrelevant questions, just go on reading: "To defend a standard, you must believe in it. So have confidence in your local Work Standards Department. Don't pass the buck. As a member of management, you are just as responsible as the Work Standards Department for maintaining fair and equitable work standards. So don't deny your share of the responsibility by throwing up your hands and saying, 'This is the standard I want.' Say instead, 'I believe that this is a fair standard. What is there about it that you feel is not fair?'"

That is the modern way, the way of science and measurement. But there is still the old, the obvious and the antiquated. Take the following notice scrawled on a sheet of paper by the manager of the Whiting, Indiana refinery of the Standard Oil Co. It is dated April 22, 1958:

HOW MANY MINUTES?

"Should we remove the Toilet Partitions?? It's up to you!!"

"1. We have 40 men assigned in the stores bldg. Assuming that each man used the toilet once per day for 10 minutes we would have a total of 400 man minutes for one toilet. Now to carry further let's assume that every man has to go twice. This would mean that we would have 800 man minutes for one toilet—BUT we have 4 toilets so that would mean that each toilet would be busy for 200 minutes per day not 480 minutes!

"2. It seems to me that we are experiencing undue usage on my personal inspection trips!

"3. Let's reconsider carefully."

It does seem a bit crude. Worse, it is unscientific. Chrysler would never have relied upon a casual personal inspection tour. It surveys the whole scene with stop-watches and records all results in tables and works them into graphs.

H. W. B.

READ ABOUT INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM!

In six special pamphlet-issues of LABOR ACTION, the basic ideas of Independent Socialism are vividly and simply explained.

No. 1—The Principles and Program of Independent Socialism

No. 4—Socialism and Democracy

No. 5—What is Stalinism?

No. 6—Socialism and the Working Class

No. 7—Labor Politics in America

No. 8—Revolt Behind the Iron Curtain

No. 9—Program and Policies of the ISL

Order from 114 West 14th St., N.Y.C. 10¢ each

LABOR ACTION • 19th YEAR

August 25, 1958 Vol. 22, No. 17

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, 1874.—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 MARTINE
SAM BOTTONE

Young Socialist CHALLENGE

August 25, 1958

Edited and Published by the YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE

TEN CENTS

YSL, YPSL PLAN LABOR DAY MERGER

By MICHAEL HARRINGTON

The socialist youth movement will take a great step forward in New York over the Labor Day week-end. At that time, the creation of a single democratic socialist youth group uniting the present YSL and YPSL will be set into motion. The merged YPSL which will come out of these deliberations will be the youth affiliate of the Socialist Party-Social Democratic Federation and part of the general regroupment and revitalization of the American socialist movement.

At the present writing, the exact details of the New York meeting are still unclear. The National Action Committee of the YSL, acting in accord with the 1957 Convention decisions, has declared in favor of socialist youth unification, and an Emergency Convention of the YSL will take place on Friday, August 29th, to work out this perspective. The comrades of the YPSL have also endorsed the same conception and it is hoped that the two organizations will meet in a YPSL Convention on August 30 and 31st. Whether this will take place depends upon the completion of arrangements to dissolve the Independent Socialist League and to bring its former membership into the SP-SDF. The YSL has declared that it cannot dissolve until all of the arrangements for adult regroupment are completed to the satisfaction of all concerned. Should this not be accomplished by the Labor Day week-end, the YSL Emergency Convention will probably pass a motion making it possible to bring the YSLers and YPSLs into a single organization as soon as the adult situation receives its final determination.

PARITY

If the actual merger of the YSL and YPSL takes place over Labor Day, it will be done according to the principle of parity. The YSL will dissolve and be represented at the YPSL Convention by a delegation of 20 former members, and the present YPSL will also have a

delegation of 20. The Convention will hear a proposal, urged jointly by the National Action Committees of YSL and YPSL, to adopt the statement of the Socialist International, "Aims and Tasks of Democratic Socialism," as a basic programmatic affirmation. Politically, this document is a broad definition of the principles of democratic socialism and its adoption also signifies the fact that the merged YPSL will be part of an international movement of hundreds of thousands of young socialists throughout the world.

REPORTS ON CAMPUS

The Convention will also hear reports on the campus scene from delegates who are active in colleges across the country. Among those represented will be student socialists from Columbia, Brooklyn and City Colleges, New York University, Yale, Boston University, the University of Buffalo, the University of Pennsylvania, Pitt, Michigan, the University of Chicago, the University of Colorado, UCLA, the University of California at Berkeley, the University of Washington and other schools. The assembled delegates will thus represent the largest concentration of democratic socialist youth seen in the United States for a decade, and through their activity in socialist campus clubs they will be in contact with hundreds of other young socialists.

It is also planned to launch an

ambitious organizing drive as soon as the unification is accomplished. Tours will go out to the far West, the Mid-West and New England in the fall. A monthly, four-page printed newspaper will be brought out as the organ of the YPSL, and joint action with various student organizations will be charted. At the time of the merger, the delegates will probably set themselves a goal of doubling the membership of the YPSL during the coming school year, and every indication is that this aim can be realized.

ORGANIZING DRIVE

All of these plans have already been approved by the National Action Committee of the YSL and by the corresponding body of the YPSL. Last Thursday, the National Action Committee of the Socialist Party-Social Democratic Federation approved a memorandum on "YPSL-YSL Integration" which provided for merging the YSL into the YPSL according to the procedures outlined in this article. Thus, the only barrier now standing in the way of consummating the unity is the final resolution of the regroupment of the ISL into this SP-SDF. The YSLers are, of course, anxious for all this to be accomplished but, again in line with the decisions of the 1957 Convention, they have declared that they will be unable to take the final steps until the other matter is settled.

If there are still details to be worked out when Labor Day comes around, the YSL proposed to receive full power to implement the perspective already agreed to in conversation with the YPSL comrades. In that case, the actual, final unification would take place on the motion of the executive committees of the two organizations as soon as the details of over-all socialist regroupment are worked out. Thus, it is almost certain that the socialist youth movement will enter the new school year unified, stronger than ever before, and with an aggressive, militant plan of action.

WIRE TO IUSY

With this in mind, the National Committees of the YSL and YPSL have addressed a joint wire to the meeting of the Executive Committee of the International Union of Socialist Youth in Bombay this month. They cabled, "Democratic socialist youth of America send warmest fraternal greetings to the Executive Committee meeting of the IUSY in Bombay, and join with our comrades from many countries in the hope of building international socialism and spreading its ideals to the youth of the world. We are happy to announce the immediate forthcoming unity of the Young Peoples Socialist League and Young Socialist League and look forward to greater participation

and cooperation with the IUSY. In solidarity and socialist comradeship, National Committee, Young Peoples Socialist League, Young Socialist League." The present YPSL is a full member of the IUSY and will, of course, continue in this status, but with the merger it will be able to play much more of an active role.

The Convention will also hear Norman Thomas in a keynote address. By a unanimous vote of the YPSLs and YSLers, it has also been agreed to try to arrange with the SP-SDF so that comrade Thomas can speak as widely as possible for the YPSL. As Challenge has reported before, comrade Thomas is probably the most impressive speaker bringing the word of socialism which the American campus has heard in our time. Last year, for instance, nearly a thousand heard him in Berkeley and seven hundred and fifty at the University of New Mexico. In this, it is particularly fitting that he should be the major speaker at the youth Convention.

ON THE VERGE

Thus, we are on the verge of the most momentous socialist youth event in years. It is to be hoped that Labor Day will witness the actual unification of the two organizations, but even if there is a temporary delay, the YPSL will go forward in the first semester of the new school year. There is general agreement between the present YSLers and YPSLs that they will work together in a common organization to create a truly broad, democratic socialist center for young people. Already, the comrades of the two organizations are engaged in cooperative work in behalf of the candidacy of David Reynolds, SP-SDF nominee for Congress in New York, and in other areas in common discussion clubs. The actual unification of the two groups will consequently be accomplished without any real difficulties since both are committed to democratic socialism and have a record of fraternal relations in almost every organized center.

With this step, the YSL will go out of existence. Its members, however, do not look upon this dissolution as the end of an experience, but rather as the first step of a new beginning. For them, the long and arduous task of holding together and expanding a socialist youth organization against tremendous odds is over — and the more desirable job of bringing the message of socialism to all kinds of new youth and to campuses which have not heard it before is about to begin. This is the significance of YPSL which is soon to come into being, a major step forward in the regroupment of socialist forces under the banner of the SP-SDF.

Put this week on your reserve list—Sept. 1 to Sept. 7

FOR THE

ANVIL CAMP

"a vacation with an education"

at the HUDSON GUILD FARM, Andover, New Jersey

swimming volley ball baseball badminton

and a lecture schedule that can't be beat

Herbert Hill Prof. Robert Alexander Bayard Rustin Samuel H. Friedman

G. August Gerber Darlington Hoopes Herman W. Benson Michael Harrington

Max Shachtman Maurice Spector B. J. Widick Paul Jacobs

for full information on rates, travel information, the lectures, etc. write to

ANVIL, 36 E. 10 St., N. Y. 3, N. Y.

CROSSCURRENTS

CP Attacks "Guardian" on Alliance With SWP

In the last issue of LABOR ACTION, we addressed ourselves briefly to the question: how is it that the Socialist Workers Party, which has sought to raise "non exclusion" to the level of a principle in American radical politics, was nevertheless excluded from placing a single representative on the "United Independent-Socialist" ticket in New York.

We indulged ourselves in the speculation that the SWP had been induced to commit this act of political self-effacement by pressure from those of its allies in the U-I-S group who seek to retain close ties to the Communist Party and who still hope to get its support in the current campaign.

We are now informed that actually the SWP did not put up a fight for a representative on the ticket, because it, or a majority of its leadership, decided that even to make a demand for a representative might put too strong a strain on the bonds which hold the alliance together.

DRIVE WEDGE

The Communist Party, for its part, is using all the means at its disposal to drive a wedge between the SWP and its allies. An article by William Albertson in the August 10 issue of *The Worker* attacks the supporters of the National Guardian for allying themselves with the "Trotskyites," and then goes on to seek to drive its wedge in:

"But we do not give up the struggle to convince those who helped organize this Independent Socialist ticket to change their course. Should they decide to withdraw their full ticket and place a single prominent peace candidate in the field for U.S. Senate, the Communist Party will throw all its resources into such a campaign. Should they refuse to do so, we can give only conditional support to Dr. Corliss Lamont, that ticket's senatorial candidate. All such final decisions will be made when the legal date for withdrawals and changes, September 13, has passed."

Like the ultimatums which preceded wars in the good old days, this one even states the final date for compliance, after which no holds, presumably, will be barred. And its message is clear enough: either drop the rest of the ticket, or count out any support from the Communist Party or its members in the campaign. Along with this goes a scorching attack against the *National Guardian* and McManus, its managing editor, for cooperating with the SWP.

The August 17 issue of the *The Worker* carried a long letter from McManus denying that he or the *Guardian* have become in any way anti-Soviet, and pointing out that they had tried to get CP as well as SWP support and participation in their ticket. In any event, McManus writes: "If the petition effort succeeds, I can assure your readers that the ticket will campaign without qualification for peace and co-existence with the socialist world..."

As can be expected the *Worker* will have none of this. In a lengthy editorial it lashes out brutally against the "Trotskyites" who "spew their poison weekly through their *Militant* against the basic platform of peace and friendship with socialist countries on which Mr. Lamont and the other candidates stand." And again: "There is hardly an issue of their weekly, the *Militant*, that doesn't devote half its copy to anti-Soviet and anti-Communist attacks that equal in viciousness the output of the rabid McCarthyites... The policy of the Trotskyites is to work the anti-Communist game from the left. The net effect of that game is service to reaction..." etc. etc.

Well, it seems like the good old days in more than one respect. The only note missing is reference to the "proof" of the Moscow Trails that Trotsky was in alliance with Hitler and the Mikado.

DILEMMA

The CP's tactics in this situation are clear enough. The position of the SWP, however, is somewhat more obscure. They are now committed to support a slate whose chief spokesmen are known advocates of the "summitry" and ardent adherents of the ideology of "peaceful co-existence" as it is propounded by the Stalinists and Stalinoids the world over. The SWP has been and continues to be a critic of both these concepts, and though the CP's editorial exaggerates, the *Militant* continues to devote articles to criticism of the "co-existence" panacea for the cold war.

This situation can only be ascribed, at bottom, to the ideological contradiction in which the SWP has been for a long time. It appears that, as is inevitable sooner or later, this contradiction is once again manifesting itself in divided councils and a political struggle inside the SWP. It will be interesting to see whether the SWP will be able, in this situation, to provide sufficient counter-pressure to that exerted on their allies by the CP to keep the United Independent-Socialist Campaign Committee together.

Thomas Hits Troops in Mideast At Successful Chicago Meeting

Chicago, August 11.

Norman Thomas was greeted enthusiastically tonight by a crowd of 250 persons at a meeting sponsored by the Chicago Committee to Protest Intervention in Lebanon. The meeting, at which George Watson, dean of students at Roosevelt University, and Prof. William Appleman Williams of the University of Wisconsin also spoke, repeatedly broke into applause during comrade Thomas's speech.

Calling for the immediate withdrawal of all troops from Lebanon and Jordan and for a revitalization and revision of the United Nations so that it could serve as a guarantee for world peace, Thomas received his greatest applause in his castigations of John Foster Dulles and his vehement attacks on the current administration.

He outlined a series of proposals which he said could serve as a basis for peace in the Middle East though he doubted "that they will be adopted". Three primary planks were extensive economic aid to the underdeveloped areas, support to a Federation of Arab states (Thomas stated that the present boundaries of the Middle Eastern states are largely artificial and have no legitimate economic, cultural, historical, or geographical base) and a guarantee for the existence of Israel. Israel exists, according to Thomas, large-

ly as a result of the failure of American capitalism to solve the refugee problem at the end of the second world war, and the refusal of the United States to take in enough D.P.'s.

In referring to the recent change in the government of Iraq, comrade Thomas stated over and over again that Iraq, like most of the Baghdad Pact countries had no popular base for its governments and that, in fact the worst refugee camp he had ever seen, and he'd seen a good many, was in Baghdad itself and was inhabited by Iraqi peasants who had fled from the countryside dominated by the Iraqi landlords.

Both Professor Williams and Dean Watson also attacked the landing of troops in Lebanon, Williams in particular taking particular joy in destroying the slipshod thinking that repeats that "Nasser is another Hitler." Dean Watson, speaking as both a political scientist and a Quaker expressed particular misgivings on the moral question of America's intervention.

Two interesting features of the meeting were the large number of new faces, new that is, to the Democratic Socialist community in Chicago, who attended the meeting, and the extremely favorable personal reaction the audience had to the speech of comrade Thomas.

Needed: A Look at the Social Roots Of Jimmy Hoffa's Rise and Durability

By JACK WILSON

Detroit, August 10

The most interesting aspect of the current investigation into the affairs of Jimmy Hoffa and the Teamsters Union by the Senate Rackets Committee is the way three basic problems involving the rise and influence of Hoffa are being ignored, while only one segment of the social issue involved in the question of racketeering is being played up.

There is nothing in the "exposes" going on in Washington that was not common knowledge in Michigan labor and political circles.

In 1953, a congressional committee investigated Hoffa and began to bring some of the odious practices of Teamsters' officials to light. But when the investigation began to get hot, it was suddenly called off. On Sunday, November, 29, 1953, the *Detroit-News* carried this headline story.

PRESSURE

"Terrific pressure is being exercised on congressmen investigating labor racketeering to abandon their investigation and dissolve the special committee. Representative Win Smith said, 'The pressure comes from way up there,' pointing skyward..."

The story added, "Hoffman (congressman) named names but would not permit their publication. I would give you the names for publication but I am a lawyer and I know I haven't got the kind of proof to make it stand up..."

"Congressman Smith also said, labor leaders told us: You think you are going to do something to us but you will never do anything about this. You just think you will."

Robert S. Ball, the *News* correspondent, quoted committee members asking him to pursue these questions:

Find out about the midwest Senator who today is putting pressure on a powerful congressman from his state to block this investigation.

Find out why the committee so far has

been blocked from one of the far western states.

Find out what Eastern governor effectively blocked this committee from coming into his state."

QUESTIONS

Two other very interesting questions remain unanswered to this day. When the Hoffman committee issued a report on February 14, 1953 criticizing the Wayne County prosecutor's office and the Detroit police department for not investigating labor racketeering complaints, Mayor Albert Cobo, Republican of Detroit, and Police Commissioner Donald Leonard, later a candidate for governor on the Republican ticket, rejected the criticism as slander. (Cobo and Leonard each had the support of Hoffa.)

The Hoffa sub-committee recommended to the full labor committee of congress that Hoffa be cited for contempt of Congress on three counts. The proposal was never acted on. Who stopped it?

On April 13, 1954 Drew Pearson wrote in his column of a meeting between Hoffa and Arthur Summerfield, the postmaster general, in which a deal was made for the Teamsters to support Senator Homer Ferguson for re-election in return for which the probe of Hoffa would be called off. Will the Senate Committee call Summerfield to investigate these charges by Pearson?

Why in 1956, did top business and Big Three auto companies pour \$250,000 into a testimonial dinner to Hoffa?

Unless the committee goes into the business and political aspects of the nature of Jimmy Hoffa and his rise to power, the probe is obviously motivated primarily for the purpose of exposing the sins of the labor movement to whip up anti-labor hysteria in the country.

Getting rid of the individual Jimmy Hoffa is no more of a solution to the problem of racketeering, which depends on business and political support, than the deportation of Lucky Luciano ended racketeering in America.

The social roots of the problem remain largely untouched by the Senate Committee.

CIVIL LIBERTIES BRIEFS

Court Upholds Smith Act Victim's Pension Rights

The United States Court of Appeals ruled recently that the government could not cut off the pension of a wounded World War II veteran because he had been convicted under the Smith Act of conspiring to advocate violent overthrow of the government. The ruling came in the case of Saul L. Wellman, a Communist Party leader.

The appeals court said that a Smith Act conviction in itself did not bring a Communist within the scope of a Congressional statute ending veterans' benefits to persons "guilty of mutiny, treason, sabotage or rendering assistance to an enemy of the United States." In the court's opinion, Judge John A. Danaher said, the Veterans Administration decision to withdraw the pension "basically rested upon Wellman's Smith Act conspiracy conviction," adding that there had been no charges of overt action—by strikes for example—to interfere with the Korean war effort. Judge Kanaher noted that Congress had never made conviction under the Smith Act a ground for cutting off veterans' benefits.

The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and subsequently the Board of Veteran Appeals originally had ruled that Wellman no longer was entitled to receive a disability pension. They said his conviction during a Smith Act trial in 1954 of advocating violent revolution disqualified him under a law providing for-

feiture of benefits for anyone guilty of "rendering assistance to an enemy of the United States of its allies." Wellman had helped an enemy, the Veterans Administration decided, by being a Communist while the Korean war was in progress.

The American Civil Liberties Union, which represented Wellman because it felt an important question of equal treatment under law was involved, filed suit in Federal District Court at Washington, D.C. There, Judge Matthew F. McGuire dismissed the case on grounds that his court lacked jurisdiction. McGuire relied on Federal laws which said the Administrator's decisions on questions concerning claims for benefits or payments are final and not subject to judicial review. The ACLU then carried the case to the U.S. Court of Appeals.

From *ACLU Bulletin*

ALL BOOKS REVIEWED

in

LABOR ACTION

are obtainable from

Labor Action Book Service

114 West 14th St., New York

A DISCUSSION ARTICLE

ARAB NATIONALISM and NASSERISM

By SAM BOTTONE

In the past several years there have been a number of articles by contributors to LABOR ACTION which have discussed Nasserism, military "socialism" and the new social forces in the Middle East. Of particular interest are the articles by Clovis Maksoud, a Lebanese socialist, in the June 6, 1955 issue and by Brijen Gupta, an Indian socialist, in the February 11, 1957 issue. Both deserve to be re-read in the light of current developments.

Nasserism has become a decisive factor in the Middle East because it has come to be equated with pan-Arab nationalism. It is over six years since the Egyptian Army Junta overthrew the Farouk monarchy and for the greater part of the time Nasser and the Junta were considered just another example of a military dictatorship. But slowly, beginning with the ouster of the British from the Suez Canal Zone, the nationalization of the Suez Canal, and then the British-French and Israeli aggression of October 1956, Nasser has become the dominant Arab political figure.

GREATER INFLUENCE

And today with U.S. and British military intervention into Lebanon and Jordan following the military coup against the King Feisal dictatorship in Iraq, all forces which have pushed Nasserism into the forefront of Arab nationalism have been strengthened. The prospect is for greater influence of Nasserism in the Arab world because of the exacerbation of the problem which has been at the foundation of the Egyptian dictator's growing influences: the efforts of Western imperialism to maintain hegemony and control of the Arab world, its oil fields and military bases.

Nasserism has meant in practice the fight against Western imperialism, for Arab independence, for unification of the divided Arab lands, for a republican form of government against the feudal dynasties, for non-involvement in the power struggle between Washington and Moscow and some kind of social reform. This accounts for its widespread and even enthusiastic support among the Arab masses and intellectuals. Many see in it the road toward real independence for the Arabs and a break with the backwardness and feudalism which has left them so helpless and dependent on the whims of foreign powers.

But popular support is one thing, and the class basis of a regime is another. And so the questions raised in Comrade Findley's letter are extremely relevant. The problem of an accurate designation of Nasserism's class character can only be tentative. The problem is not only the gaps in information but that much information appearing in American publications is colored by the interests of State Department and Zionist propagandists determined to discredit Arab nationalism.

MOVEMENT

The real problem resides in the fact that Nasserism in all its manifestations is in the process of development and is not standing still waiting for its snapshot to be taken. Three years ago it appeared relatively easy to take the snapshot—the Egyptian regime seemed to be another, perhaps more dynamic, example of a military dictatorship such as those which came to power in Syria after the defeat suffered by the Arab armies in the Palestine war of 1948.

But with the Egyptian-Syrian union into the United Arab Republic, the growing influence of the U.A.R. in other parts of the Middle East, and the role of the Baath socialist as one of the mainsprings of the drive for Arab unification, the situation becomes much more complicated. New forces are involved in other Arab lands who, while acknowledging Nasser's leadership in the struggle against Western imperialism, are not necessarily committed to the idea of a military dictatorship as the ideal, permanent or even the temporary form of the regime of an enlarged United Arab Republic or a broader feder-

ation. The key factor is the role of the Baath socialist and other forces in Arab society which look toward the involvement of the masses in running the affairs of society and not the autocratic, albeit benevolent, rule of a military Junta.

The line of development depends on a number of factors, none of which can be forecast at this time. First is the course

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

A Socialist Analysis of Nasserism Is Needed

To the Editor:

It is one thing to support Nasser against foreign imperialism. But that is not enough. What is Nasser? What is his social base etc. I have not as yet seen a Marxist analysis of Nasser and Nasserism.

Nasser obviously does not represent the working class. Trade unions, strikes and all independent political organization of the workers are prohibited.

Neither does he represent the peasantry. With the exception of a "Potemkin" village there has been no land reform. Little has been done even in a traditional paternalistic fashion to improve the lot of fellaheen.

Nasserism does not give the workers and peasants even that spurious "status" that Peron gave them in Argentina.

Does Nasser represent the feudal and landowning classes? No. He kicked their chief representative, the king, out of the country.

There is no indication that he is the choice of the bourgeoisie or acts in their special behalf.

Does he represent the civil service, the educated who end up in the civil service, or the declassed intellectuals who can find no place in the limited civil service and professions? A case can be made to prove that he represents the "educated." That is, however, a long cry from a modern social class or important social force.

Was he put into power by any political party or movement? That could give us a clue? Today it seems hard to recall, but Egypt had a well-developed political party system including a strong Arab Nationalist Party. Did they place him in power? No. Not only did they not put him into power but they opposed him and were suppressed by him.

Nasser was put into power by the Army and represents primarily, if not exclusively, the army. A tentative conclusion is that he is a Bonapartist dictator fulfilling the traditional role of such dictatorship: ruling when other classes are incapable of carrying out their historic roles.

Modern advances have weakened the

of the of the imperialist struggle for control of the Middle East, including the possibility of Russian imperialism replacing the West. Second is the action of Arab socialism in supporting or opposing dictatorial rule as a "necessary stage of democratic development." And third, the kind and extent of industrialization—how fast will or can the Arab lands industrialize, and what will be the role of the state in such industrialization.

INDUSTRIALIZATION

Industrialization is a long-term process, and admittedly, it is less of a factor in immediately determining the course

of development. In respect to the dissolution of political parties in Syria following the formation of the UAR and the establishment of a National Union along the lines of what exists in Egypt does not bode well. But we have little information on the functioning of the Baath in either Syria or Egypt although Brijen Gupta reported in LABOR ACTION on March 10, 1958 that several months before unification, Nasser permitted the Baath to open a branch in Egypt and to organize political and trade union activity. Whether it is functioning or Nasser subsequently forced it to suspend operations or liquidated it, is unknown.

Whether the Baathists have only temporarily agreed to suspension of political parties, including their own, or whether

old feudal setup in the Arab countries so that the landowning class finds it difficult to rule. The bourgeoisie is not strong enough to take power. The working class is only in an infant stage. The peasantry is backward and has not had the benefit of Populist or Marxist education and organization as in Europe.

The result—the army is the only modern social power and establishes its Bonapartist rule and military dictatorship over the Arab people.

A Bonapartist dictatorship can and does attract considerable popular support. History is full of examples. The question is even if this dictatorship acts for national unification should socialists consider it the embodiment and THE vehicle for the nation-revolution or look to other social forces?

The concept that Nasserism is a Bonapartist dictatorship points also to the following:

1. It is unlikely if not unable to make any major social reforms so badly needed in the Arab countries.

2. Those Arab Socialists who look to the various Arab armies as the instruments of Arab Nationalism will suffer the fate of the Baathists: suppression.

3. Socialist support to steps that Nasser makes toward unification can only be of the kind that they gave to Bismarck in his Prussian unification of Germany or the support we gave to the Negus of Ethiopia in the struggle against foreign domination.

4. One must expect and be on the lookout for many reactionary features in his program. Even in Arab unification one can expect stress on the reactionary parts of Pan-Arabism and Pan-Islamism rather than modern Arab nationalism. The Arab Nationalists must be warned of these dangers.

5. Also a tendency to overlook the just national rights of other nations in the area, such as Israel, the Kurds, Berbers etc., and the regional needs of other Arabs, i.e., Syrians, Moors, etc.

This is a modest contribution but one which I hope will lead to an analysis of Nasserism.

Al Findley

they have embarked upon a course of action which will lead to the consolidation of the authoritarian tendencies in Arab nationalism is still open. An interview in a recent issue of France Observateur quotes Salah Bittar, one of the leaders of the Baath Socialist Party of Syria, as speaking approvingly of establishing a political organization similar to Tito's Socialist Alliance. This has the appearance of searching around for a theoretical and political formula to justify the suppression of political democracy.

If this is so, then it can not be ascribed to just another expression of the authoritarian character of Arab nationalism.

The Baath Socialists have been one of the Arab groups, if not the foremost group, working for democracy through trade union and political activity among both the working class and the peasantry. One of the characteristics of the Baath Socialists which has distinguished them from the pure and simple Arab nationalists has been their determination, at least in the past, to combine the struggle for Arab independence and unification with the social struggle at home against feudalism and capitalism.

SECONDARY PLACE

The consequence, if not the meaning, of Syrian-Egyptian unity seems to have led the Baathist to relegate the social struggle to a secondary place in their program in the interest of a broader united struggle against Western imperialism. In the particular circumstances of the Middle East, such a tactical shift contributes toward a strengthening of military "socialism," and the prestige of the military Juntas. Therefore, this becomes more than a tactical move, but a decision of far-reaching political importance.

The reasons for the assertion of the primacy of nationalism is not difficult to find, and it is tied in with the rise of Nasser as the dominant political figure in the Arab world. We are witnessing today the rise of a new form of Arab nationalism quite distinct from the traditional nationalist leadership which came to prominence after the first world war. In brief it seeks to win real independence and to end all forms of foreign domination. In the course of the struggle to end the pro-Western client state status of the Middle East nations, the new Arab nationalism has come into head-on conflict with the West. The power struggle between the U.S. and Russia has added to the complexity of the situation, and served to harden the resolve of the U.S. and Britain to keep the Middle East as a Western sphere of influence both for its oil and strategic value. And as long as the Arab fight for independence and unification, extending beyond the idea of nominally independent client states, has to be conducted on a near-military basis, then the role and importance of the army will be extended. The groups which have represented a democratic ideology and sought to implement it in action have been swept along with the need for a broad unity of the Arab people against imperialism, and in the process have subverted political democracy.

The only statement we know of by a prominent Baath socialist dealing with the attitude toward Nasser appears in "The Middle East in Transition" edited by Walter Z. Laquer. It is an article by Gebran Majdalany, a Lebanese socialist, formerly a member of the Progressive Socialist Party of Lebanon (usually associated with Kammel Djumblatt) and who left it to join the Baath. Writing in the Spring 1957, he says:

BAATH SOCIALISTS

"The open support of the Baath and other Socialist Parties for Nasser's regime in Egypt is principally due to his foreign policy. Socialists have every reason to believe that the encouragement of this progressive foreign policy will inevitably lead the regime to depend more and more upon the Egyptian masses, on the progressive movements in other Arab countries, who alone will support it as a movement of emancipation. . . .

"The aggression against Egypt after the act of nationalization (which the Arabs saw as a step toward emancipation) furnished another proof that Egypt was the champion of Arab independence. The moderates who sought a compromise between nationalism and pro-Western ideas found themselves faced with a difficult choice; for it was no longer possible to keep neutral: one had to choose either Egypt and independence, or the West as represented by the members of the Baghdad Pact. . . .

. . . the Baath has led the campaign

(Turn to last page)

"Indirect Aggression" — —

(Continued from page 1)
gression" has always had specifically a military connotation, now comes the concept that "indirect aggression" is a way of carrying out war by non-military means, or at least by means which do not involve the military forces of the "aggressor nation."

As the term is being used by the American government, it appears to include all the means of political warfare which have been developed so rapidly during the past half century. Radio propaganda, subsidized newspapers, bribed officers and politicians, support of political co-thinkers by any and all means—all these can be part of "indirect aggression."

Now, it is true that in the case of the Middle East the American contention has been that such means have been employed not merely to pressure governments, to seek to influence or intimidate them, but actually to overthrow them and bring the nations over which they rule under the domination of the government which is practicing the "indirect aggression." It is only in such an extreme case that the American government has claimed the "right" to use its armed forces to prevent the "aggressor" from succeeding.

CHARACTERISTIC APPROACH

It is indeed characteristic of the whole approach of the American government that it should seek to convert the very terminology of political warfare into that of military warfare for the purpose of equating them. For a long time it has been apparent that the United States is peculiarly incapable of waging political warfare successfully, and has constantly, since the end of World War II, sought to make up for this incapacity by direct military means (including alliances, military aid programs, etc.).

Now, it is clear that no known method of "indirect aggression" has a chance of succeeding unless the policies and aims of the "aggressor" finds a widespread echo among the population of the nation against whom the proposed "aggression" is directed. A clear example in the Middle East: no amount of radio propaganda directed at Israel from Cairo could conceivably inspire a political movement which would endanger the Israeli government.

FOMENTING REVOLT

This illustration (which could be duplicated indefinitely) demonstrates the point that to accuse a country of "indirect aggression" is simply the same thing as accusing it of successfully helping a revolution in another country. This was underlined by Secretary Dulles in his recent speech to the Veterans of Foreign Wars in which he referred repeatedly to "civil strife which was being fomented from without." Having said that, however, the whole weight of analysis and the proposals to deal with the problem put forth by the United States are such as to ignore the essential political element involved, that which makes the strife "civil," and to concentrate rather on the

aspect of foreign "fomentation." Thus, in the same speech Dulles continued: "We must of course recognize that this issue of indirect aggression is a delicate one. On the one hand it is clear, beyond a possibility of a doubt, that nations are free to seek, and to get, help, as against a genuine external threat. On the other hand we must be careful not to encourage or condone armed intervention which of itself may subvert the will of a foreign people. We saw that occur when the Soviet Union sent its armored divisions into Hungary in order to repress what the United Nations found to be a spontaneous uprising of the Hungarian people."

It would be foolish to think that the essential distinction being made by Dulles is between "spontaneous" and "non-spontaneous" or "fomented" revolutions. Such a distinction is utterly impossible in the modern world, in which the political atmosphere of the whole planet is steeped in "fomentation," that is, in conflicting social systems and the ideas and ideologies connected with them. If the American government, or the powerful social democratic parties of Europe had actually been able to give moral and material aid to the Hungarian revolution, would that have made it any less "spontaneous" or more "fomented from abroad?" Would it have made the Russian military suppression of that revolution any more justified?

The distinction which the American government actually employs is between support of those governments and movements which are its puppets or allies, and those which are not. The Russian government employed the same criterion in Hungary. The effective distinction in the cold war is that the Russians are able to support even nationalist revolutions which they do not and cannot control, because such revolutions have been, in the main, directed against the old capi-

talist powers which are identified with the United States in the cold war. They have been able to support neutralism as long as this is confined to movements inside countries allied with the American bloc; they find it hard to stomach when it develops in their own sphere, a la Tito.

LATIN AMERICA

It is interesting that the Latin American countries have put up a strong resistance to the doctrine of the permissibility, or "legality" of one government coming to the military aid of another when the latter claims it is in danger of "indirect aggression." These governments are not moved so much by abstract considerations of international law as by the concrete political circumstances of their own continent.

It is well known that a number of Latin American countries are peculiarly susceptible to "civil strife." Also, that in many cases a dictator, imperilled by such strife, would very much like to call for the assistance of a neighboring dictator. Over and beyond this is always the power of the Colossus of the North which, on the basis of this doctrine, could bolster any friendly regime against any form of internal subversion on the grounds that this was a product of "indirect aggression."

(The overturn of the Guatemalan government of Arbenz was, of course, as clear a case of "indirect aggression" as one could imagine. That is, the rebels were organized, financed and inspired by the United States, and the Arbenz government's pleas for any kind of help were thwarted by America's firm "hands off" policy. But even in this case it is clear that except for the presence of a goodly number of Guatemalans ready and willing to take a hand in overthrowing the government, the revolt would have failed. Our point is not to deny that there may be revolutions which are less rather than more expressions

of spontaneous mass disaffection from the government, but that no doctrine of military intervention can be made to have the clear and universal applicability of a rule of law.)

UNRECEPTIVE EAR

The major speech (referred to above) in which Dulles sought to explain and justify the American intervention in the Middle East by the claim that it was an attempt to stop "indirect aggression" had as its theme that American foreign policy is against appeasement, will not yield to considerations of expediency, and is firmly rooted in principle. That principle is: that it will resist, and help other nations to resist aggression whether of the direct or indirect varieties.

This announcement falls on unreceptive ears the world over. For one thing, if taken literally, it is obviously far too rigid a rule for nations to live by. And actually it is clear that the United States government has one set of standards in all things, including definitions of "democracy," "legitimate governments," "spontaneous uprising," which it applies to allied capitalist regimes, and a completely different set of standards for regimes or movements directed against its set foreign policy are involved.

Socialists are also for a foreign policy based on principle. We would be the last to claim that how, in every concrete case, our principles are to be applied is absolutely clear or devoid of ambiguity. The world is not that simple a place to live in. But in our case the fundamental guiding principle is to encourage and support all movements toward self-emancipation and democracy, whatever form they may take. In a world in flux this is a far sounder, and more stable principle to be guided by than that of using American troops to defend governments, often unwanted by their own peoples, against "indirect aggression."

Arab Nationalism and Nasserism — —

(Continued from page 7)

for a federation between Syria and Egypt, and the party's acceptance of two ministerial posts in the present Syrian cabinet has no other explanation but the Baath's desire to promote this plan. Any idea of federation with Egypt would have been unthinkable by Socialists two or three years ago; it is only since they became convinced that Egypt was sincerely seeking political and economic liberation from all foreign interference, and lending moral support to all the movements for Arab liberation, that the Socialists have accepted this idea of federation, which the Baath now regards as a basis for their unified action . . .

"But if Socialist aims are effectively to guide the course of Arab politics, it is necessary that the Socialists should continue their present collaboration with Egypt. That collaboration is not likely to be called into question as long as the tensions in the Arab world persist; but when quieter times return, the Socialists will be able to pursue this policy of the outstretched hand towards Egypt only in so far as Egypt presses on with the liberalization of her regime, which has already begun. Egypt, which is completely isolated from Arab reaction, seems prepared to fulfill that condition; and if she does so, Arab socialism will

be equally ready to inspire and direct the same development in the Arab countries during the next few years. If not, the struggle must go on without Egypt: in which case the contest may be a finer one, but will certainly be more arduous and sanguinary."

The problem which American socialists face in trying to evaluate the actions of the Baath socialists is that we have seen, at least thus far, precious little evidence of the liberalization which is supposed to have already begun. The elections last year which elected Nasser as president of Egypt were conducted on a plebiscite basis, and although there were a few examples of oppositional candidates, this is no more proof of political democracy than the few disputed candidates in Yugoslavia proves that Tito runs anything but a dictatorship.

What remains unanswered is why, if the Nasser regime represents the progressive forces in society as well as the will and the interests of the masses, the people can not be allowed to express these interests in their own name rather than through the voice of the military Junta. If Nasser is the voice of the aspiration of the Arab masses, then why does it follow that political liberties have to be denied the people?

The future, or rather the present

course, of the Baath is, in my opinion, a decisive factor in evaluating Nasserism. In a sense it is an X factor representing a force for genuine democracy but of indeterminate weight. If the Baath militants continue their political and trade union activity to build a mass movement expressing and representing the interests of the workers and fellahin, even though formal organized political parties no longer exist, then it can be said that Nasserism in general represents a progressive force extending beyond the struggle against imperialism. If not and all political work has been abandoned or suppressed in the interest of Nasser's hegemony of Arab nationalism, then the future for a democratic Arab nationalism is dim.

All of this is really prefatory to a discussion of some of the points raised in comrade Findley's letter. In the next issue, I want to discuss the nature and extent of the land reform program. The land reform in Egypt is the only one carried out in the Middle East and it offers clues as to the tendencies of the regime.

**SCREEN the NEWS
with Labor Action
A sub is \$2 a year—**